Urban Dreams and Realities in Antiquity

Remains and Representations of the Ancient City

Edited by

Adam M. Kemezis

BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

PART 2
City as Space II: Landscapes in Literature

PART 3
City as Identity I: Cultures in Stone

PART 4
City as Identity II: Communities on Paper

Remembering Pre-Israelite Jerusalem in Late Persian Yehud: Mnemonic Preferences, Memories and Social Imagination

Ehud Ben Zvi

Introduction

The textual repertoire of the literati in late Persian Yehud and the literati themselves seem obsessed with memories of Jerusalem, mainly of a past and glorious Jerusalem, of a late monarchic, sinful and eventually destroyed Jerusalem, and of a future, ideal Jerusalem. Although Jerusalem during the late Persian period was a small town,[1] and perhaps even partially because it was small, it became a most central site of memory for its literati. Eventually, Jerusalem served as a central site of memory for other, much later communities; as such it both influenced and was shaped by diverse, later Judaic, Christian or Muslim traditions over vast spans of time and space.[2]

During the approximately two hundred years of Achaemenid rule in the Levant (538–332 BCE)—the same time period within which most of the books that eventually ended up in the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament emerged, at least more or less in their present form—Jerusalem, as a city that populated the social memory of the community, was a central, focal point for shared imagination and for structuring the central mnemonic narratives of the community.

---

1   This is not the place to discuss the vast literature on estimates of the population of Persian period Jerusalem. It suffices to state that the city was a relatively small town with less than 2,000 people and probably significantly less than that. For some literature on the matter, see Lipschits 2009 and 2010 423–453; Finkelstein 2009 and 2010 529–542; idem 2008 501–520; idem 2008 1–10; and more recently, Finkelstein, Koch and Lipschits 2011. See also Geva 2007 50–65 (Hebrew); Kloner 2001 91–95 (Hebrew); cf. Lipschits 2003 323–376; Carter 1999; Faust 2003 37–53. It is worth noting that even those who advance a 'maximalist' view of Persian period Jerusalem—which in itself is a minority viewpoint—agree that the Persian period city was just a fraction of the late monarchic Jerusalem. For a 'maximalist' view see Barkay 2008 48–54 (Hebrew)—Barkay suggests that Persian Jerusalem was about 120 dunam (p. 51)—and for criticism to this position, see works above, esp. those of Finkelstein.

2   This said, this essay addresses *only* constructions and memories of Jerusalem that existed within late Persian Yehud.

One of the most important of these narratives was the 'from temple to temple' narrative. Its main plot opened with the process leading to establishment of the temple in Jerusalem, then meandered through multiple vignettes of the Judahite monarchic period that took much social mindshare (see Kings, Chronicles) and which, on the whole, portrayed the period as leading to the city's ideologically justifiable destruction. The plot then largely focused on the calamity of destruction and exile and continued with the establishment of a second Jerusalemite temple, which as important as it was, stood a far cry from the glorious temple of the golden past (e.g., Hag 2:3; cf., even if later, Ezra 3:12). It reached its apex and conclusion in the glorious, future, utopian temple that stood at the very heart of an utopian Jerusalem, which at times was imagined as standing at the very heart of an utopian world (e.g., Isa 2:2–4; 56:1–9; 65; Mic 4:1–4; Ezek 40–44; 47:1–2; Hag 2:4–9; Zech 8:3; Ps 46:4–5; 48:2–3, 8–9; *passim*).[3] This is not the place to study at length this central mnemonic narrative. It suffices, however, for the present purposes to note its ubiquity in the discourse of Judah/Yehud (or at least, that of its literati) in the late Persian period.

Another narrative, closely intertwined with the preceding one, moved from David, Yhwh's chosen king, through many Davidic kings, both good and bad, to a future, utopian Davidic king or even a Davidic community (i.e., a community to whom the promises of David apply and one ruled directly by Yhwh). Jerusalem as a complex, condensing and comprehensive site of memory was shaped to evoke the story of the people and their interactions with the deity, both in time and space in the past and future.

The mnemonic Jerusalem at the core of either one of these closely related narratives stood at the center of the literati's construction of Israel in Yehud (i.e., the Persian province of Judah). As such, this Jerusalem of memory played crucial roles in processes of identity formation.[4]

But if this mnemonic system closely interwove the concepts evoked by the terms 'Israel' and 'Jerusalem,' and in doing so, shaped much of their range of meaning, and if Jerusalem embodied and communicated the foundational mnemonic narratives of 'from temple to temple,' and 'from past David to future David' and thus construed a Jerusalem-centered Israel, why did Jerusalem

---

3 I recently discussed some of these images elsewhere. See Ben Zvi, forthcoming.

4 The likely role of the historical temple in Jerusalem in the production and reproduction of their literary repertoire and its struggle to achieve prominence in Judah during the period is consistent and partially, but *only partially* explains these developments in social memory. These issues, however, stand beyond the scope of this essay.

embody and communicate also prominent social memories of a pre-Davidic and pre-Israelite Jerusalem, and what roles did the literati's construed memories of the previous residents of Jerusalem fulfill in their mnemonic system?

Constructing, Imagining and Remembering Differences

As one begins to address these questions, one of the most promising approaches is to place social memories about the previous residents of Jerusalem within a larger context of memories of inhabitants of other cities and regions of 'the land' who were about to be dispossessed by Joshua/Israel/Yhwh—according to the basic 'historical' narrative agreed upon by the community at the time. The case is strengthened by additional considerations. For instance, the Jebusites, the previous inhabitants of Jerusalem who were defeated by David, were explicitly referred to time and again in various lists of the dispossessed nations within the authoritative repertoire of the community (see Exod 3:8, 17; 13:5; 23:23; 33:2; 34:11; Deut 7:1; 20:17; Josh 3:10; 9:1; 11:3; 12:8; 24:11).[5] In addition, not only was Jerusalem in 'the land,' but it was also conceived as the very heart of 'the land' and stood symbolically for it numerous times within the discourse of the period. Thus, for instance, the exile from Jerusalem (and Judah, which in turn was also symbolically represented by its main city, Jerusalem) was conceptually associated with exile from the land.

Although one *might* have anticipated that the conquest of Jerusalem and the portrayal of the Jebusites would be construed and remembered as the culmination of the conquest story and the story of the replacement of the previous residents of the land with the Israelites,[6] and although there was a strong generative grammar that would have led to such a development, the following observations demonstrate that this was not the case; to the contrary, there were very significant points of divergence.

Two central, connective, didactic and very salient differences are particularly relevant for the present purposes.[7] First, the dispossessed were, for the most part, construed as dispossessed because of their wickedness—a preferred

---

5   One may add that in Josh 10, the Jerusalemites and their king were explicitly characterized as 'Amorites' (see vv. 3, 5, 12). On the place of the Amorites in the community's social imagination and memory as a people bound to be dispossessed before Israel due to their sinful behaviour see Gen 15:16; 1 Kgs 21:26; 2 Kgs 21:11.

6   Cf. Josh 23:4–5.

7   By connective aspects I mean aspects that are clearly connected to other aspects.

systemic choice within the ideological mindscape of ancient Israel. Since their calamity was supposed to match their actions,[8] they became magnets for negative attributes and, as such, excellent candidates for social and ideological processes of 'othering.' They were construed as kind of anti-(ideal) Israel. Accordingly, remembering them served to 'otherize' whatever was characterized as 'anti-Israelite.' Thus, if following Yhwh's instructions/torah was considered the epitome of what Israel should do, the dispossessed nations were construed within the discourse of the community as practitioners of and as the embodiment of anti-torah behaviour.

In other words, memories of the dispossessed contributed much to the creation of a system of a set of interwoven bipolar, dualistic mental maps, e.g., torah vs. anti-torah; Israel vs. the dispossessed nations; ability to stay in the land vs. removal from the land. Memories of repeated warnings given to past Israel to not behave like the dispossessed nations, for if it does it will be dispossessed as well, is a point made time and again (see, among many others, Lev 18:3; Deut 18:9–12; 2 Kgs 16:3; 17:8; 21:2, 6, 8).[9]

Certainly there were texts that evoked social memories that not all the supposedly dispossessed were actually dispossessed (e.g., Josh 13:1–7). But even these memories contributed to the main point, as the remaining previous residents of the land were commonly imagined as being left in the land by Yhwh to tempt Israel to do the evil in the sight of its deity (Josh 23:13; Judg 2:21–23; 3:24); in this they played the role of the temptress (female, 'other') to

---

8 To be sure, there was not a single mnemonic scenario for the removal of the previous inhabitants of the land within the social memory of the community (or at least, its literati). In fact, there existed several mnemonic scenarios. For instance, there were those involving forced expulsion, either due to Yhwh's manipulation of 'nature' [e.g., Exod 23:28; Josh 24:12] or through other means with Yhwh's support, but there were also scenarios that involved physical extermination (mainly, but not only, in Deuteronomy; e.g. Deut 7:23). All of these scenarios involved the removal of the previous inhabitants of the land and thus, from their perspective a terrible catastrophe, which within the discourse of the period was associated with their 'wickedness.' In other words, their dispossession was construed as just punishment. Imagining such a past and such causality at work served obvious didactic/socializing purposes.

On the mentioned scenarios see Weinfeld 1991 382–384; Schwartz 2004 151–170 and bibliography.

9 To be sure, the point of these maps was not to address the imagined dispossessed nations that populated the social memory of the community nor the non-Israelite Persians, but to remind the Persian period community that the catastrophe of 586 BCE happened because their ancestors, i.e., Israel and thus they themselves, as it were, behaved like the nations that were dispossessed before Israel and thus were also rejected from the land.

a male Israel (e.g., Num 25; 1 Kgs 11). These texts thus also construe the 'other' as 'anti-Israel' and as certainly worthy of dispossession and complete removal from 'the land.'[10]

As mentioned above, the Jebusites, i.e., the defeated residents of Jerusalem, appear in a general list of dispossessed (and 'worthy of dispossession') nations. But how were they construed and remembered by the community as it read *specific* references about them in its textual repertoire? Which particular portrayals of the Jebusites were encoded in and communicated by these texts?

To begin with, it is particularly significant that despite (a) the explicit inclusion of the Jebusites among the common lists of the nations that were dispossessed before Israel (e.g., Exod 23:23; 33:2; 34:11; *passim*), and (b) the obvious potential to turn them into magnets for negative attributes, this path was not taken. To be sure, there was potential not merely for assigning negative attributes, but for using the Jebusites to construe an anti-Jerusalem so as to project it in portrayals of Jerusalem under particularly sinful kings and thus to shape social memory not only in terms of oppositional dyads such as 'Israel and anti-Israel/dispossessed nations' (see, for instance, 1 Kgs 21:26; 2 Kgs 16:3; 17:8; 21:2, 11; 2 Chr 33:2 and note the comparisons with dispossessed groups, but never with the Jebusites per se), but also dyads of 'Jerusalem and anti-Jerusalem/Jebusite Jerusalem.' But, significantly, this path was not taken.

The community in Yehud developed social memories that failed to include any narratives of the Jebusites developed according to these lines or that served the aforementioned purposes. The obvious rhetorical/didactic benefits that would have resulted had the Jebusites been used in that way, and the systemic preferences for the emergence of the type narrative mentioned above raises the question of what may have countered any tendencies towards creating them. Before addressing these matters, though, the case for the construction (and mnemonic use) of the Jebusites in a manner different from the typical (construed) 'dispossessed nation' within the discourse of the community has to be made, not just stated.

To begin with a negative argument, there are relatively few particular references to (Davidic or pre-Davidic) Jebusites within the authoritative repertoire of the late Persian period community in Judah,[11] and, most significantly, none

---

10   A minority explanation for their presence was they were left so Israel may learn how to wage warfare (see Judg 3:1–2; but see already Judg 3:4–7).

11   Contrast with the numerous references to the Canaanites, Amorites, and the 'peoples that Yhwh dispossessed' and their 'ways' in the repertoire of the community. Not only the presence of references to these people groups but also a certain density of negative portrayals of them within the discourse of the community is necessary if they are to

of the references draw particular attention to their sins. Even among these few references to a pre-(Davidic) conquest Jerusalem there are some that can be easily explained as necessary outcomes of other narratives. To be sure, all these instances carry meanings, but their main thrust was not to evoke substantial social memories about pre-Israelite Jerusalem and its inhabitants.

For instance, according to 1 Sam 17:54, David took the head of Goliath and brought it to Jerusalem, which within the basic world of the narrative was still Jebusite at the time.[12] The reference to this action is not an anachronism, because the term implies "a retrojection of present conditions through ignorance of the past,"[13] but rather a case of departure from temporal consistency for the purpose of shaping a 'better' narrative—in this case, for the purpose of a narrative that successfully brings together the first great victory of David and 'his city,' which is also Israel's and Yhwh's city. A central spatial site of memory (Jerusalem) is thus associated with a communal memory about a core event in the beginning of David's career and thus in the development of the monarchy and the path towards the establishment of the temple.

This essay is not the place to analyse this case or other instances in which temporality is less important than symbolic and, above all, mnemonic meanings. It suffices to note, however, that such a reference to Jerusalem does not really evoke memories of a pre-Israelite Jerusalem. This said, it is worth noting that nothing particularly negative about Jebusite Jerusalem transpires from the reference.

A second example: to remember David as *the* king who conquered Jerusalem and turned it into the capital of his/Yhwh's kingdom required, of course, to imagine and remember an enemy to be defeated by David, namely the Jebusites. Yet, the main role of the Jebusites in that story was to be defeated, and their only action was to taunt David—as per the usual, cross-cultural topos of the mistakenly confident group (or person) about to fall. Not only is the matter particularly undeveloped,[14] but also and most significantly, the community when reading Samuel is asked to evoke and remember their taunt, which refers to the 'blind and the lame,' for its implications about later policies of ritual exclusion in (later) Jerusalem (2 Sam 5:6, 8),[15] and when reading Chronicles just

---

become successful mnemonic ciphers for Israel when it behaves in 'ungodly' ways within the social mindscape of the community.

12   David's conquest of Jerusalem was at the time still many years in the future and is many chapters further along in the narration; see 2 Sam 5:6–9

13   See Campbell 2003 182.

14   Contrast with Josephus, *Ant.* 7.61.

15   See, for instance, Olyan 1998 218–227.

to remember that they said to David "You shall not enter here" (1 Chr 11:5).[16] In both cases, mindshare is drawn to the event of the conquest and the city itself, not to the sinful character of the Jebusites.

In addition to the negative evidence, i.e., the lack of a particular negative characterization of the Jebusites or of their construction as 'anti-(ideal) Israel,' there is in fact evidence for a positive characterization of the Jebusites, unlike the case of the other dispossessed nations. For example, there is the characterization of Jebusite Jerusalem in the story of the rape in Gibeah (see Judg 19:10–30). Reading the text evoked in the community the image of a foolish Levite who thought that an Israelite city would be a better place to lodge than Jebusite Jerusalem, just because one was Israelite and the other not. Whatever other messages this story communicated, it certainly created a positive memory of a pre-Israelite, Jebusite Jerusalem. Moreover, if Gibeah was meant to evoke memories of Saul's city within the readership, and Jerusalem meant to evoke memories of David's city, then the Jebusites would have been discursively associated with David.[17]

The latter observation brings up another crucial difference between (construed, social) memories of the conquest of the land during Joshua's time and those of David's conquest of Jerusalem. Unlike the case of the narratives associated with Joshua, the one about his conquest of Jerusalem nowhere states that David expelled, never mind exterminated, the residents of Jerusalem, nor that he would find it desirable to have done so.[18] Moreover, the story of David's conquest of Jerusalem is placed within and particularly informed by its context in both Samuel and Chronicles. Both books portray and ask their readership to remember a post-conquest, prominent Jebusite who was alive and well. This Jebusite possessed a field even after David's conquest (2 Sam 24:16–18; 1 Chr 21:15–28; 21:28). David is not condemned for letting the Jebusites live, and indeed the mentioned Jebusite is portrayed in a positive light and is instrumental to the establishment of the proper site of the temple. David is not remembered as a ruler who dispossessed him, but as one who bought the Jebusite's property for full price.

There are additional divergences between memories of Joshua and his conquest of 'the land' and David's conquest of Jerusalem that impact the way in

---

16   Contrast with 1 Sam 17; 2 Kgs 18:19–25; Isa 47:8–13; Ezek 27; Amos 6:1; Obad 3; Zeph 2:15; *passim*

17   See, for instance Amit 2000 178–184 and esp. p. 181.

18   Josephus reshapes the biblical text and tells the story as 'it was supposed to be' and thus indirectly confirms that for him the absence of any note about expelling the Jebusites in both Chronicles and Samuel carried a message. For Josephus's version, see *Ant.* 7.65.

which the Jebusites were construed and remembered. Joshua was remembered as engaging and defeating many powerful kings.[19] The dispossessed nations were remembered as mighty, many, and often engaging Israel in large coalitions. The characterization of the enemy as mighty was a necessary feature for the construction of the heroic character of the conqueror. Of course, in the case of memories of Joshua and the conquest, the stress was not only or even mainly on the heroic character of Joshua, but on that of Yhwh, the one who dispossessed nations.[20] Thus, the community developed and remembered mnemonic narratives about the deity's taking possession of the land in the far past that explicitly and repeatedly portrayed the events as requiring and involving mighty divine actions.[21] In these narratives Yhwh was both imagined and 'encountered' by the community as a powerful warrior deity whose actions frequently evoked the highest heroic images within the social mindscape of the community, images that were associated with Yhwh's role in the foundational period of Exodus (see, for instance, acts of turning the sea/river into dry land).[22]

Drawing attention to and turning memories of mighty warriors (divine or human) and their deeds into central sites of memory for the group required some detailed narratives. This requirement was obviously fulfilled in the case of the Exodus and the conquest of the land. Even a cursory reading of the books of Exodus and Joshua demonstrates the point beyond any doubt. Moreover, memories of these great heroic deeds were brought to bear and echoed in many different works within the repertoire of the community (e.g., Isa 43:16–17; 63:11–14; Mic 7:15; Ps 66:6; 78:11–14; 106:21–22; 114: 3–5; 136:13–16) and one may safely assume that they held a very significant social mindshare.

---

19   See the long list of kings in Josh 12, references to fortifications and to large coalitions in Joshua. It has been widely recognized that some neo Assyrian motifs (including 'the one vs. the many') are present in Josh 1–11/12. See, for instance, Van Seters 1990 1–12; Römer 2005 83–90; Younger Jr. 1990.

20   The heroic/warrior character of Joshua is balanced by the need to characterize him as a Moses-like leader and his successor and above all, because of the strong systemic preference to emphasize the heroic character of Yhwh. It is Yhwh who fought for Israel not Joshua (cf. Josh 23:3 and *passim*), just as it was Yhwh, not Moses, who separated the waters. The widespread portrayal of the dispossessed people as powerful is most often meant to stress Yhwh's heroic powers (see, for instance, Num 13:25–33; Deut 7:1; 9:1–2; Josh 23:9; Ps 135:10–12; Neh 9:22–25).

21   The widespread portrayal of the dispossessed people as powerful is most often explicitly meant to stress Yhwh's heroic powers. See, for instance, Num 13:25–33; Deut 7:1; 9:1–2; Josh 23:9; Ps 135:10–12; Neh 9:22–25.

22   See, for instance, and quite explicitly, Josh 2:10; 4:23 5:1; cf. Ps 114:3, 5; 135:8–12.

But what about the conquest of Jerusalem by David or Yhwh? The community believed the city of Jerusalem to be at the center of the 'land' and above all at the center of 'the world.' David, the greatest hero and the leader who took more territory than any other king within the social memory map of the community, conquered Jerusalem. Needless to say, without such an act neither the conquest of the land nor the establishment of the temple, at the core of the world of the community, could have taken place. Taking all this into account, one might have anticipated repeated references to David or at least Yhwh and their heroic deeds in association with the conquest of Jerusalem. One might have expected the existence of detailed narratives commemorating that event time and again and bringing it to the 'present of the community.'[23] Certainly any comparison with memories of the conquest of the land by Yhwh/Joshua would lead us to anticipate all of the above for the conquest of the city that 'embodied' the land, as it were.

But the story of the conquest of Jerusalem was not allocated much narrative space within the repertoire of the community (see 2 Sam 6–9a; 1 Chr 11:4–7a) and not much mindshare would have been allocated to it within a community that construed and remembered its past by reading and rereading the authoritative books in its repertoire. Despite all the considerations mentioned above, the actual conquest narrative of Jerusalem consisted of only three and a half or four verses. From the perspective of the community, there was a lot to read, imagine and remember about Jerusalem, but how it was conquered by David played a very minor role.[24]

Moreover, despite the fact that David was obviously remembered in the community as a warrior hero (e.g., 1 Sam 18:7; 1 Chr 11:2 [// 2 Sam 5:2])[25] and despite the fact that usually great heroes of the past are remembered to have performed at least some acts of heroism when it comes to their most important

---

23   Cf. portrayals of other conquests of Jerusalem, whether Titus, Crusaders, or Ṣalāḥ ad-Dīn, and their impact on social memory of the relevant communities.

24   Jerusalem and related terms (e.g., Zion) appear explicitly well over 800 times in works that were later included in the HB and which were most likely among and on the whole representative of the repertoire of the time. Given that, for obvious reasons, Jerusalem could not appear much in the Pentateuch or in historiographical narratives shaping memories of a pre-David and thus pre-Israelite Jerusalem, this is a very large number. Talmon noticed many years ago that Jerusalem and related terms are proportionally more attested in this corpus than in late-Second Temple literature (when Jerusalem was a much larger city) and or later rabbinic literature (despite Jerusalem's centrality in rabbinic Judaism) and needless to say in the New Testament. See Talmon 1971 300–316.

25   To be sure, not only as a warrior hero (see Psalms), but certainly as a warrior hero.

achievements, the narratives of the conquest of Jerusalem (as reflected and shaped by both Samuel and Chronicles) and the memories that these narratives evoked in the community failed to assign David any particular acts of personal heroism when it comes to this particular event (contrast, for instance, with the extensive narrative and memories associated with his defeat of Goliath).

This is even more noteworthy in Chronicles, a book that reflects and evokes a memory of the conquest of the city as the first royal act of David (1 Chr 11:3–8). Even as the book seems to follow common generative mnemonic grammars and show a distinct preference to associate the main epic-heroic acts of a great king with the beginning of his reign[26] and thus creates anticipation for references to David's heroism, it fails to do so. The text in 1 Chr 11:3–8 does not evoke any particular memories of his epic-heroic deeds or great military wisdom. Instead of emphasizing David's military heroism,[27] it explicitly brings his building activities after the conquest to the attention of the community (1 Chr 11:8), which makes him the first and most important pious builder king—a very important *topos* in Chronicles. It is not by chance that in Chronicles the first pious, royal building activity in the land takes place in Jerusalem or is conducted by the best king in the book, David.

To be clear, the point I am advancing is *not* that David was not remembered as a powerful military hero within the community, or that the community would not have construed the story of his conquest of Jerusalem as a significant achievement, but that not much textual attention and thus likely not much social mindshare was drawn first to the entire story of the conquest of Jerusalem (in contrast to, for instance, the Exodus, the conquest of the land, or the preparation and building of the temple in Jerusalem) in general and to David's

---

26   "The author is applying to the figure of David an epic-heroic topos long established in Ancient Near Eastern historiography. Assyrian kings claim to have taken some of their most significant actions at the very outset of their reigns or to have achieved their greatest victories during the first year" (Knoppers 2004 545). Of course, since the conquest of Jerusalem is brought to the beginning of his reign, this military campaign is the first of the king (contrast with 2 Sam), and within Chronicles, the first to which the attention of the readership is drawn, but in the past world of Chronicles, David was already a hardened warrior leader when he became king (1 Chr 11:2). For a different approach, see Wright 1997 150–177 (159–160).

27   No action of personal military heroism or military craftiness is particularly evoked. Instead, if there was a warrior hero in the story in Chronicles, it was Joab not David (1 Chr 11:6). Cf. 2 Sam 6–9a and 1 Chr 11:4–7a with Josephus, *Ant* 7.60–64 and notice how the latter stresses David's heroic character; this is consistent with Josephus' tendency to underscore the courage of David. See Feldman 1998 544–550.

own heroism during the conquest of Jerusalem in particular. When the memory of David the hero was brought to the present of the community, stories like his defeat of Goliath were brought up, but not much about what he did when he conquered Jerusalem.

Most of the book of Samuel is about David and more than a third of the book of Chronicles—which presents itself as a history from Adam to Cyrus—is devoted to David (see 1 Chr 3, most of chs. 6, 11–29). But reports of David's conquest of Jerusalem spanned only three and a half to four verses. This is obviously not a random or accidental distribution of narrative space. The relative lack of stress on the event and the lack of emphasis on David's heroic aspect in relation to this conquest cannot be taken for granted. The absence of emphasis results from and reflects a strong system of preferences and dis-preferences in terms of shaping social memory within the community that clearly overpowered mnemonic tendencies to lionize David's heroic character in association with the conquest of 'his' city or to make the conquest a central site of memory.

On the surface, one may link these absences with a well-attested tendency in Yehudite social memory to *not* remember some foundational characters (e.g., Abraham, Moses) as the trans-cultural, usual 'manly warrior hero.'[28] This tendency may have been at work in the general construction of David in Chronicles and Psalms, but even if it stands somewhat in the background, it certainly fails to explain why David was not the only main personage that was remembered far more as Jerusalem's builder (esp. by the Chronicler) than as the hero of mighty deeds who conquered Jerusalem.

Unlike narratives about the conquest of the land or the Exodus, there is no reference to mighty deeds of YHWH in the conquest of Jerusalem. To be sure, texts as Josh 23: 4–5 point to the potential within the community for a narrative emphasizing YHWH's conquest of the last and most important part of 'the land;' there was opportunity for presenting the event as the culmination of the fulfillment of the prophetic words of Joshua, of which late Persian period, Yehudite literati would have been aware, or perhaps associating the successful completion of the conquest with the piousness of the people or its leader, David, who counterbalanced prior acts of rebellion against YHWH, even if momentarily.[29] Yet, such a narrative is missing from the main set of social memories encoded in, and evoked and virtually experienced through the reading and rereading

---

28   See, for instance, Ben Zvi 2013, 3–37 (31–34), Römer, 2008 and 2009, 293–306.

29   Cf. Josh 23:4–13; Judg 2:1–3 and the *general* tendency in the social mindscape of the community to associate success with following YHWH's commandments and failure with rejecting them.

of their authoritative, past-constructing repertoire of texts. Indeed, in sharp contrast to the numerous references to Yʜwʜ as the deity of wondrous heroic deeds who brought/took Israel up/out from Egypt or gave 'the land' to Israel or removed its previous occupants so as to allow Israel to settle, to the point that these became main attributes of the deity,[30] nothing remotely similar was developed within the community in relation to a Yʜwʜ who conquered or gave Jerusalem to Israel, even if Jerusalem was construed to be the center of 'the land.' Yʜwʜ was imagined as the 'creator' or 'builder' of Jerusalem,[31] but not as its conqueror and the main mighty deeds with which the deity was associated with the city were related to the (re)building of an utopian Jerusalem in the future, not with any conquest of the past.[32]

In sum, there is good reason to assume that there was a strong generative grammar that led, against significant odds, to the shaping of a social memory in the community in a way that clearly distinguished between the conquest of the land by Joshua/Yʜwʜ and David's conquest of Jerusalem. This generative grammar and its outcome in terms of social memories in late Persian period Yehud could not but play a significant role in the construction of the Jebusites.[33] But before positing explanations for the existence and prevalence of a generative system of preferences and dis-preferences that shaped the community's memories of David's conquest of Jerusalem, two matters must be addressed.

Turning to the first of these matters, one might be tempted to argue that the two conquests ('the land' and Jerusalem) were remembered differently, because they were historically different. Such explanations were relatively common several decades ago, but most scholars today would agree that they hold no water.[34] As the narrative of the Israelite conquest of the land demon-

---

30   E.g., Exod 6:7; Lev 11:45; Deut 1:25; 2:29; Josh 24:17; Judg 2:12; *passim*.

31   Being Jerusalem's creator (ברא) / builder (בנה) was one of Yʜwʜ's attributes. See, for instance, Isa 65:18–19; Ps 102:17; 147:2 cf. Isa 54:5; Ps 51:20.

32   When it comes to Jerusalem, there is some element of *imitatio dei* in the construction of David. The city is David's city (e.g., 1 Chr 11:7) and also Yʜwʜ's city (Isa 60:14; cf. Zech 8:3); moreover, both are its archetypal builders. This issue demands, however, a separate discussion that cannot be carried out within the boundaries of this chapter. (Note also that Israel and the nations other than Israel are also imagined as future builders of the city; e.g., Isa 60.)

33   See below.

34   Several decades ago, the question of whether Jebusite Jerusalem was deeply integrated in and highly influential in the shaping of the Davidic kingdom and its traditions was a 'hot topic.' On this debate see, for instance, Roberts 1973 329–344; Jones 1990 119–142 and the extensive bibliography mentioned in these works. These debates were based on assumptions about the basic 'historicity' of many of the details in the narrative (or

strates beyond any doubt, 'historicity,' in our terms, was not a necessary require-
ment for the development of a preferred narrative or even sets of balancing
narratives, as is demonstrated in this case.[35] From a systemic perspective, the
main requirements were that the narrative must (a) be consistent with and sup-
portive of the other main narratives of the mnemonic community and (b) be
coherent with the general social mindscape of this group (e.g., on matters such
as its take on causality, what constitutes pious appropriate behaviour and the
like).[36]

Constructions of the character of the society that existed in Jerusalem before
it turned into an Israelite (or even Judahite) city, and of the fate of its original
inhabitants were part and parcel of the social memory of a community in
late Persian Yehud and were not governed by what historically transpired in
Jerusalem centuries earlier.[37]

As we turn our attention memories of a pre-Davidic conquest of Jerusalem,
the minor report evoking an image of an early Israelite, pre-Davidic conquest
of Jerusalem in Judg 1:8 comes to the forefront. There might have been a
tradition about an Israelite conquest of Jerusalem well before David (see also

---

some reconstructed, hypothetical precursor of the narrative), which in turn were based on
proposed early datings of the relevant texts. Today, most critical historians tend to agree
that none of these texts is from the Davidic/Solomonic period. Instead, they maintain that
these texts appeared centuries later and represented later viewpoints; moreover, many of
these scholars tend to doubt, with very good reason, the existence of a historic Dadivic
'empire' *as described* in the books of Samuel (and Chronicles; e.g., Sass 2010 169–174 and
bibliography). (For an example of an opposite position with directly bearings on the use
of the texts discussed here to reconstruct the history of 'Davidic period,' see Cogan 1997
193–201.) Finally, even if there was some leader of a band of para-social elements named
David who took over Jerusalem and established a chiefdom, neither this David nor his
Jerusalem were close to the David or Jerusalem of the narratives and above all, the social
memory of the community in late Persian period Yehud.

35 This is not the place to discuss the archaeological data that shows that the narrative in
Joshua cannot be taken as a direct representation of historical events. The literature on
the matter is extensive and conclusive. For a summary, see, for instance, Finkelstein and
Mazar 2007. To be sure, the quest for historicity in this narrative is misguided to begin with
and arises from a misunderstanding of the genre of the book of Joshua.

36 Incidentally, similar criteria tend to influence strongly the chances for integration into
social memory of even contemporary groups of particular (construed) memories. This
matter, however, stands beyond the scope of this paper and cannot be elaborated here.

37 This holds true whether we today are able to reconstruct the historical society of pre-Judah
Jerusalem and the circumstances leading to its fall or perhaps integration into Judah or
not.

Judg 1:7 and cf. Josh 10:1–27; 12:10). But not much attention is drawn to it.[38] It played no substantial role in the construction of memories about Jerusalem in Persian period, Jerusalem-centered Yehud and never developed much social mindshare and ended up with a minimal narrative space in ancient Israelite historiography and its social memory.[39] This is neither because such a tradition would have been in direct tension with texts such as Josh 15:8, 63, which associate Jerusalem with Benjamin, not Judah,[40] nor because of the note in Judg 1:21 that the city was not captured by the Israelites (Benjaminites) and that they and the Jebusite live together 'till this day.'[41] Instead, other processes governing systemic selection and dis-selection were at work. To mention some of them:

First, scholars working on social memory have noticed a (cross-cultural) tendency towards oneness, that is, characters that already have much mindshare tend to develop further mindshare while at the same time pre-empting the development of memories of potential competitors to their roles, which then tend to be far less remembered and even forgotten.[42] Within the matters dis-

---

38   Notice, for instance, the lack of any stress on Jerusalem in Josh 12:10.

39   The statement about the minimal textual space allocated to this memory is correct also
      if we consider the entire authoritative repertoire of the community at the time. I assume,
      along with the vast majority of scholars, that the Pentateuchal, the deuteronomistic/his-
      torical, and the prophetic collections were part of the authoritative repertoire of the late
      Persian period literati in Yehud, in a form relatively close to the present one, and that these
      texts, along with Chronicles, at least some Psalms and Proverbs and books such as Lamen-
      tations, constitute for the most part a representative approximation to the contents of that
      library.

40   From the perspective of the literati in late Persian Yehud who were acquainted with Josh 15:
      63 and Judg 1:21, the city was both Benjaminite (Judg 1:21; see also Josh 18:28) and Judahite
      (Josh 15:63), and thus, it was Yehudite. Moreover, since from their own perspective Yehud
      stood for 'Israel,' Jerusalem was also Israelite. This thinking shapes and is reflected in
      additional constructions of the past. See, for instance, the reference to the residents of
      Jerusalem in 1 Chr 9:3; and cf. 2 Chr 11:14–16. "For the Chronicler, Jerusalem has always been
      the centre of 'all Israel', where people from the tribes have lived, both during and after the
      time of the united kingdom ... [a] list of the inhabitants of Jerusalem should then naturally
      include Ephraim and Manasseh" (Japhet 1993 208).

41   Cf. the book of Joshua explicitly states that Joshua conquered the entire land and that
      he did not. See Josh 11:23, which is followed by a list of defeated kings in Josh 12, and
      which is immediately followed in the text by Josh 13:1–6. Cf. Josh 23:1–5 and Judg 1:1–2:5.
      These tensions do not lead to less social mindshare or narrative space. In fact, tensions
      like these may serve as attention getters and draw particular attention to the matter (and
      serve well for didactic purposes; see the case mentioned above). But this is not the case
      here.

42   For an example of tendencies towards mnemonic 'oneness' see Schwartz 2009 123–142

cussed here, this means that there was little room within the set of social memories of the late Persian period Yehudite literati for evoking, imagining, and developing much social mindshare for pre-David, earlier Israelite conquerors of Jerusalem. David, only one personage, was *the* conqueror of Jerusalem.

Second, any emphasis on a previous conquest would have led to an image of a Jerusalem that was lost to Israel and then settled by the Jebusites. This image would have stood contrary to the main thrust of the constructions of Jerusalem within the community. Jerusalem, unlike 'the land' (or significant portions of it) was not imagined as a place in which foreigners could potentially settle and displace Israel. This is a community in which post-David Jerusalem was construed as either an Israelite city (i.e., Judahite or Yehudite) or not inhabited at all. In other words, if Israel becomes anti-Israel and thus the city is destroyed, it can only be resettled by Israel.

Third, the lateness of the conquest of Jerusalem allows not only for David to conquer Jerusalem for the first time, but also provides an explanation for the (construed) absence of a temple in Israel until the Davidic/Solomonic period.

Fourth, since there existed within the discourse of Persian period Yehud a mental map of Israel that had Jerusalem at its center (see, for instance, Ezekiel and the idea that Jerusalem belongs to 'all Israel;' see also Chronicles[43]) and in which the city symbolized both country and people, the absence of Jerusalem within Israel's map in the pre-Davidic period conveyed a sense that Israel was still in the process of constituting itself, even after the Exodus, Sinai and the conquest of the land by Joshua. Israel's founding figure was Moses, but Israel was still in need of a secondary founding figure, David (and his associate Solomon), because Israel, as understood by the community in Yehud, was not properly constituted until Jerusalem was able to house the temple.[44]

Fifth, the above mentioned approach is consistent with and generates a tendency to stress the difference between David and previous leaders, and especially the previous Israelite king, Saul, who ruled in the area and was imagined as powerful, but who did not attempt to take Jerusalem. In contrast,

---

      and see bibliography for the general approach. This tendency is related to the so-called "Matthew Effect." On the "Matthew Effect" see Rigney 2010.

43   See note 38.

44   On the explicit pairing of Moses and David, see Chronicles. On the matter, see De Vries 1988 619–639; Riley 1993, 61–63; Cf. Kleinig 1992 75–83; Schniedewind 1999 158–180 (177–178); Ben Zvi 2011 13–35 (29–32). This construction of the past may not have been a 'radical' innovation of Chronicles, but rather Chronicles may have voiced and developed basic approaches to the past that might have existed before its writing. (For 'Moses' and 'David' in later periods, see Mroczek 2008.)

and to make the point even more salient, David in Chronicles marches against Jerusalem immediately after he becomes king of Israel.[45]

Sixth, the lateness of the setting up of Jerusalem as an Israelite city in the distant past also carried a sense of helical repetition of history, as following the catastrophe of 586 BCE, Jerusalem and its temple was established anew at a time within a map of Yehud that contains well and long-established Benjaminite ('Saulide') centers. Jerusalem, city and temple, is again the 'late comer' who happens to stand at the center of Yehud, Israel and even the world, and displace all earlier Israelite centers.[46]

All these considerations not only pre-empted the development of a strong social memory about a pre-Davidic conquest of Jerusalem, but show the kind of constraints, systems of preferences and dis-preferences, and generative ideological grammars that shaped the ways in which the discourse of Persian Yehud construed David's conquest of Jerusalem and in which this event was remembered, at least by the literati of the period.

This being so, what could have created such a preference for a construction of Jebusite Jerusalem in terms so distinct from those who were construed as dispossessed by Joshua? Why was Jerusalem so different from 'the land' and Joshua from David? Why, although Jerusalem as a site of memory was closely associated with David, did the latter's conquest draw only relatively minor attention in contrast to many other aspects of memories of Jerusalem and David?

Imagining Jerusalem and Jerusalemites, and Construing 'Worlds' through Social Memory

To a large extent one may say that all groups are mnemonic communities, that is, groups shaped around a set of widely shared memories of the past that help to make sense of the group, or in other words, that provide it with an identity and ability to socially reproduce itself. The community in Yehud that construed itself as a 'text/torah' centered community was certainly a mnemonic community. What people remembered of their past or future (e.g., the memories of 'experiencing' through acts of imagination the utopian future evoked through the reading and re-reading of prophetic literature) played an important role for

---

45   Note also the Saul/Gibeah—David/Jerusalem contrasting pairs and their roles in shaping social memory. See above and Amit 2000 181.

46   On 'helical' rather than 'cyclical' see note 60.

the self-understanding of the community and the shaping of their social mind-scape. For the purposes advanced, it is particularly important, as mentioned above, that Yhwh was remembered as the 'builder' of Jerusalem and not its conqueror.

Within the discourse of late Persian Yehud, Jerusalem was marked as the sacred centre of the world, the place destined to be the site of the only legit-imate temple of Yhwh well before David conquered it, evident in the explicit references to Jerusalem in Abraham stories (see below) and to the 'city that Yhwh will chose' in Deuteronomy, which were read in Yehud as references to Jerusalem.

During the late Persian period Jerusalem was marked as the place for the mythical 'waters' that will emerge from the temple/city (cf. Ezek 47:1–12 Joel 4:18; Zech 13:1 and 14:8; Ps 46:5–6; cf. Isa 33:21), a city on which Yhwh shines, a source of mythical light to which nations and rulers (i.e., the human world) come (see Isa 60:1–3; 19–20) and מכלל יפי 'the perfection of beauty' that can actually be achieved on earth, even if only in the future, and which in the meantime exists in the shared imagination of the community (Ps 50:2). To be sure, the community had only a small, poor temple and city, but none of this could have demoted Jerusalem of its status and place in the divine economy. Moreover, all these utopian attributes were construed as certain to come, because without them, without the cosmic city at the center providing divine 'water,' 'wisdom,' 'light' to the world, the latter could not be imagined as reaching its stable status under the kingship of Yhwh. Similarly, Jerusalem before David was not even Israelite, but already had its place set in the divine economy and was certain to achieve its role and house the temple at some point.

Within this discourse, David's conquest by itself did not change the nature of the place or its relation to Yhwh, nor did the destruction of the city in 586 BCE, for that matter. To be sure, David's conquest like Cyrus' declaration (2 Chr 36:22–23) allowed the materialization of other developments. But they played a secondary, enabling role to the transformation of the city to the place of the temple. Building its proper (i.e., Davidic) temples, which symbolically were one temple, was building Jerusalem and building the ground for the fulfillment of its necessary role in the cosmos.[47] David, Solomon and Yhwh did that in the past,[48] and Yhwh will do that in the future and then 'reside' in the city

---

[47] Ben Zvi forthcoming.

[48] To lesser extent, Cyrus, alongside with Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel and the high priest Joshua, son of Jehozadak (e.g., 2 Chr 36:22–23; Haggai), did that too within the main

forever. Social memory is drawn to these central matters and thus shapes what is important to remember about them. It is far more important to remember David's role in the preparations for the building of the temple and establishing rules for worship within it than to remember his conquest of Jerusalem. In fact, remembering one more than the other served to make a strong point about what is important for the community within its discourse.

In addition, there was a tendency within the social mindscape of the literati to construe the temple as inimical to war (and shedding human blood).[49] The temple tended to be associated with 'rest,' not with military victory (e.g., 1 Chr 22:7–9; 28:3; cf. 1 Kgs 5:17–19).[50]

The association of Jerusalem with sacred space, whether the temple stands on it or not, has implications in terms of preferences and dis-preferences for the construction of its inhabitants. As mentioned above, from David's conquest, through the vicissitudes of multiple generations, including military defeats and even the razing of the city, Jerusalem was remembered as inhabited by Israel or not at all.[51] But what about the time before David's conquest?

The mnemonic community in Yehud had to remember and imagine the existence of a pre-Israelite Jerusalem and Jerusalemites. This went together with the construction of Israel as coming 'from outside the land' and a systemic dis-preference for potential mnemonic narratives about a Jerusalem built on 'virgin soil.'[52] The community encountered not only the Jebusites of the period

---

mnemonic narratives of the community, but the 'second temple' that they established, as per Yhwh's command, was secondary in importance to the (Davidic/) Solomonic and the future, utopian temple. As usually is the case in main mnemonic narratives, the original and the final points carry more mindshare within the community than what is between them; moreover, the fact that the 'second temple' which the community could see not only with the eyes of their imagination, but also with their physical eyes and with which they interacted in 'material ways' regularly was poor and certainly not 'glorious' may have contributed to the social construction of this temple as a temporary one, to be superseded by the 'glorious' and certain to be utopian temple of future Jerusalem.

49   See, among others, Japhet 1993 397–398, Niditch 1993 139–140.

50   It is possible that this tendency had a role to play in, at least, readings of Exod 20:25 (cf. Deut 27:5) even if not necessarily on the origins of the instructions set in these verses. Cf. the later readings of these verses reflected in m. Middot 3:4.

51   Cf. the motif of the 'empty land.'

52   Theoretically, one might imagine a different original myth of Jerusalem, namely as a city built by David on completely new place (cf. the case of Samaria; see 2 Kgs 16:24), but if this were the case, such a Jerusalem will lack continuity with its (imagined) past (e.g., with the city encountered by Abraham, with Mt. Moriah, with the alien city that was much better than Gibeah, which was also the city that became Saul's capital).

of David and the Judges but also other non-Israelite inhabitants of Jerusalem. The most salient of them was the non-Israelite Melchizedek who was a priest of אל עליון 'the High God' (Gen 14:20) during the time of Abraham. This foreign king was even partially Israelitized in Ps 110:4. In fact, according to this text, Yhwh associates the Davidic king with Melchizedek, and the community of readers is expected to follow.

David symbolically became Melchizedek, but by the time of Chronicles and most likely earlier, he was also a kind of second Abraham.[53] Most significantly, the story of Abraham's purchase of a burial place from Ephron (Gen 23) and David's purchase of the site of the threshing floor of Araunah/Ornan, that is, the place of the future temple (1 Chr 21:21–22:1; cf. 2 Sam 24:20–25) became mutually evocative, one being the type of the other.[54] The first act of possession of the land in the land (Abraham's purchase of the Cave of Machpelah from Ephron) and the final—and most crucial—act of possession of the land (David's purchase of the place of the future temple) became intertwined. A mnemonic narrative emerges, starting from the purchase of a burial place (the Cave of Machpelah) and leading to the source of (ordered, proper) life, the temple. Significantly, neither of the two changes of possession were imagined (or could have been imagined within the discourse of the community) as involving violent dispossession. By extension, and since Jerusalem is symbolically associated with the temple within the social mindscape of the community, a tendency to draw less attention to the violent/heroic aspect of the conquest of Jerusalem emerged.

Of course, like his predecessor Abraham, David had to encounter a proper, positively construed 'other' after his conquest of Jerusalem with whom he could interact and from whom he could purchase the field. The sacredness of the place shaped a discursive and mnemonic preference for such a narrative.

In addition, the very unique sacredness of Jerusalem and its role in the divine, cosmic economy as the city of the main deity also shaped a systemic preference to construe the place as designated by Yhwh well before David's time, and thus its selection was also understood as essentially independent of David (see, for instance, the association of Jerusalem and Mt. Moriah in 2 Chr 3:1).[55] One may assume that there is a kind of discursive un-ease, and

---

53   On David and Abraham see also Clements 1967. On the general memory of David in the late Persian and Early Hellenistic periods, see, for instance, Edelman 2013.

54   See, among others, Zakovitch 1985 175–196 (181); Alter 1999 358–359; Japhet 1993; McDonough 1999 128–131; cf. Harvey 2004 60.

55   Of course, this claimed association is at the core of another "front" in the mnemonic struggles between Yehud and Samaria (or their discourses), as Samarian text consistently

thus there was a systemic dis-preference to imagine a city which stands 'at the center of the world,' and is necessary for its existence, as constantly and only populated by evil characters, who cannot but constantly pollute it. It is more likely to imagine that at least from time to time, it included 'others' with whom Israel/David/Abraham were able to interact positively and even at times partially identify.[56]

Remembering David and his Jerusalem meant construing and remembering a Melchizedek in Jerusalem; remembering David and his Jerusalem meant construing and remembering Araunah/Ornan, and indirectly, Abraham and Ephron; that is, remembering David and his Jerusalem meant remembering a Jerusalem populated by people significantly different from the dispossessed nations of the book of Joshua. These memories construed pre-Davidic Jerusalemites who were not fully 'the Other,' but were in fact partially Israelitized, in Yehudite memory.[57] Moreover, even if pre-Israelite, partially Israeli-

---

     associated Mt. Moriah with Mt. Gerizim. On the struggle over the memory of Mt. Moriah (and of Abram) see Kalimi 2002.

56   A comparison with the mnemonic narratives about the 'conquest of the land' is particularly helpful in this regard. Of course, the land was also conceived as 'selected' for Israel before Joshua. In some texts (esp. those reflecting the thinking of the Holiness Code) the land itself is considered 'holy' (see Milgrom 2008 2412–2413). Abraham and the other patriarchs were remembered as central, foundational figures of Israel who, like David, encountered and interacted with positively portrayed (and remembered) local residents (see Ben Zvi 2013 [18–21]), but in the case of Abraham and the patriarchs, such encounters reflect the tendency to imagine good residents, at least from time to time, without facing the ideological problem of dispossessing them, for the dispossession is set in the far future, i.e., in the days of Joshua; in the case of David, the narrative has to bring together positive portrayals and dispossession within the same period. The fact, that David's Jebusites are characterized in positive terms unlike Joshua's 'Canaanites' is thus far more remarkable and deserves particular attention. See below.

57   To be sure, the characterization of 'the other' in the land appears in several patriarchal stories not only in relation to Jerusalem. It shapes and reflects accommodation and even appreciation of 'the other' in the land in the present of the world portrayed in the narratives and in the world of the late Persian period community reading these texts, but at the same time in the context of a group that through their shared imagination as they read their authoritative texts experienced vicariously worlds in which any 'other' is displaced from the land. Whereas in the world of the patriarchal narratives, the 'positive other' with whom the patriarchs collaborate is not to be attacked and thus can be easily imagined as behaving properly, 'the other' in Jerusalem at the time of David which had to be attacked so as to be conquered according to the main mnemonic narratives of the community is still portrayed unlike the other pre-conquest Canaanites, but has to be partially Israelitized and compared to the dwellers of the land in the patriarchal period (e.g., Aurunah/Ornan

tized Jerusalem was not remembered often, some of its characters were memorable and this is especially the case with Melchizedek (see Ps 110).[58]

Remembering Araunah/Ornan was also remembering that the altar was built in a place that was not associated with war or conquest, but with food and life (the threshing floor), the end of pestilence and death, and the image of a sword-holding hand that relaxes and ceases to kill (2 Sam 24:15–25; 1 Chr 21:15–28).

Even if such a Jerusalem took a relatively small mindshare of the community in the Persian period, still Jerusalem could not to be remembered as just another city in the rest of the land *nor* could its inhabitants be remembered like those facing Joshua.

There was strong tendency to balance the discontinuity that was inherent in mnemonic narratives of the Davidic/Israelite conquest of Jerusalem with the continuity in the special status of Jerusalem within the discourse of the community. There was a tendency to prefer narratives that set Jerusalem, as the city of 'the temple,' aside from other cities and lands within 'the land,' and again, this had an indirect influence on the way in which the David's Jebusites and other characters were imagined. There was a tendency to emphasize 'building' over 'conquering' when it comes to Jerusalem and, again, this tendency had an indirect influence on the characterization of the Jebusites of the period. In addition, remembering a future Jerusalem to which all nations will flow (e.g. Isa 2:2–4; 56:1–9) generates tendencies to imagine past Jerusalems in which pious non-Israelites lived and co-existed with Israel.[59] After all, communities in antiquity often tended to construe many of their social memories according to helical, temporal plots, linking past and future;[60] the past was often conceived as some kind of (pregnant) image of the future, and the future of the past.

Of course, all these were Jerusalems of memory and dreams, imagined and vicariously 'experienced' through reading and rereading by a community in

---

and Ephron) who lived together in peace with patriarchs. This noteworthy fact sheds light into the memory-scape of the community in late Persian Yehud and the different mnemonic and ideological tendencies that contributed to its shaping.

58   Melchizedek became a significant figure in the late second temple period. See, for instance, 11Q13/11QMelchizedek. Later still, see references to Melchizedek in Hebrews.

59   See Abraham and Melchizedek; David and Araunah/Ornan; David and the mercenaries who stand loyal to him when Absalom rebels; and cf. with the very significant statement in Judg 1:21b.

60   I prefer 'helical' over the more common 'cyclical' since these plots rarely involve exact returns, but rather return to similar, comparable situations; there is a cycle but also some element of temporal linearity.

late Persian period Yehud. These Jerusalems were all far removed from any actual, historical Iron Age I city or any of its historical predecessors. Their social memory was not 'history' in any form that we may identify today as 'professional, academic history,' nor could have been. At the same time what this community of shared imagination thought about their past and their (construed) Jerusalem is a subject of interest to historians studying this late Persian community. This essay is a contribution to this type of research.

Bibliography

Alter, Robert. 1999. *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Amit, Yaira. 2000. *Hidden Polemics in Biblical Narrative*. Leiden: Brill.

Barkay, Gabriel. 2008. "Additional View of Jerusalem in Nehemiah Days", in *New Studies in the Archaeology of Jerusalem and Its Region 11*, eds. D. Amit, and G.D. Stiebel. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority and the Hebrew University: 48–54 (Hebrew).

Ben Zvi, Ehud. 2011. "One Size Does Not Fit All: Notes on the Different Ways in Which Chronicles Dealt with the Authoritative Literature of its Time." In *What was Authoritative for Chronicles?*, eds. Ehud Ben Zvi and Diana Edelman. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 13–35.

———. 2013. "The Memory of Abraham in the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud/Judah", in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*, eds. Diana Edelman and E. Ben Zvi. Oxford/New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 3–37; republication with minor changes of "The Memory of Abraham in the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud/Judah", in *The Reception and Remembrance of Abraham*, eds. P. Carstens and Niels-Peter Lemche. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 13–60.

———. Forthcoming 2014 "Exploring Jerusalem as a Site of Memory in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Period", in *Memory and the City in Ancient Israel*, eds. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Campbell, Antony F. 2003. *1 Samuel*. FOTL 7. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Carter, Charles E. 1999. *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study*. JSOTS, 294. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Clements, Ronald E. 1967. *Abraham and David: Genesis XV and its Meaning for Israelite Tradition*. Naperville, Ill: A.R. Allenson.

Cogan, Mordechai. 1997. "David's Jerusalem: Notes and Reflections", in *Tehillah le-Moshe. Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*, eds. Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler and Jeffrey H. Tigay. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 193–201.

De Vries, Simon J. 1988. "Moses and David as Cult Founders in Chronicles." *JBL* 107: 619–639.

Edelman, Diana. 2013. "David in Israelite Social Memory", in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*, eds. Diana Edelman and E. Ben Zvi. Oxford/New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 141–157.

Faust, Avraham. 2003. "Judah in the Sixth Century B.C.E.: A Rural Perspective." *PEQ* 126: 37–53.

Feldman, Louis H. 1998. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Finkelstein, Israel. 2008. "Archaeology and the List of Returnees in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah." *PEQ* 140: 1–10.

———. 2008. "Jerusalem in the Persian (and Early Hellenistic) Period and the Wall of Nehemiah." *JSOT* 32: 501–520.

———. 2009. "Persian Period Jerusalem and Yehud: A Rejoinder." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9, article 24, available online at http://www.jhsonline.org, reprinted under the same title in 2010. *Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures VI: Comprising the Contents of Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, vol. 9*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press: 529–542.

——— and Amihai Mazar. 2007. *The Quest for the Historical Israel: Debating Archaeology and the History of Early Israel*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

———, Ido Koch and Oded Lipschits. 2011. "The Mound on The Mount: A Possible Solution to the 'Problem With Jerusalem.'" *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11, article 12, available online at http://www.jhsonline.org, reprinted under the same title in 2013. *Perspectives in Hebrew Scriptures VIII: Comprising the Contents of Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, vol. 11*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press: 317–339.

Harvey, John E. 2004. *Retelling the Torah: the Deuteronomistic Historian's Use of Tetrateuchal Narratives*. JSOTS 403. London/New York: T & T Clark.

Geva, Hillel. 2007. "אומדן אוכלוסיית ירושלים בתקופותיה הקדומות: ההצעה המינמליסטית" ("Estimating Jerusalem's Population in Antiquity: A Minimalist View"). *EI* 28. Teddy Kollek Volume: 50–65 (Hebrew).

Japhet, Sara. 1993. *1 & 2 Chronicles*. OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox.

Jones, Gwilym H. 1990. *The Nathan Narratives*. JSOTS 90. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.

Kalimi, Isaac. 2002. *Early Jewish Exegesis and Theological Controversy: Studies In Scriptures in the Shadow of Internal and External Controversies*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum.

Kleinig, John W. 1992. "The Divine Institution of the Lord's Song in Chronicles." *JSOT* 55: 75–83.

Kloner, Amos. 2001. "Jerusalem's Environs in the Persian Period", in *New Studies on Jerusalem*, eds. A. Faust and E. Baruch. Ramat Gan, Israel: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies: 91–95 (Hebrew).

Knoppers, Gary N. 2004. *1 Chronicles 10–29: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB, 12: New York: Doubleday.

Lipschits, Oded. 2003. "Demographic Changes in Judah between the Seventh and the Fifth Centuries BCE", in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, eds. Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 323–376.

———. 2009. "Persian Period Finds from Jerusalem: Facts and Interpretations." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9, article 20, available online at http://www.jhsonline.org, reprinted under the same title in 2010. *Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures VI: Comprising the Contents of Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, vol. 9*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press: 423–453.

McDonough, Sean M. 1999. "'And David was old, advanced in years': 2 Samuel xxiv 18–25, 1 Kings 1, and Genesis xxiii–xxiv." *VT* 49: 128–131.

Milgrom, Jacob. 2008. *Leviticus 23–27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3B. New Haven; London: Yale University Press.

Mroczek, Eva. 2008. "Moses, David and Scribal Revelations: Preservation and Renewal in Second Temple Jewish Textual Traditions", in *The Significance of Sinai. Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, eds. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Niditch, Susan. 1993. *War in the Hebrew Bible: A Study in the Ethics of Violence*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Olyan, Saul M. 1998. "'Anyone Blind or Lame Shall Not Enter The House': On The Interpretation of Second Samuel 5:8b." *CBQ*: 218–227.

Rigney, Daniel. 2010. *The Matthew Effect: How Advantage Begets Further Advantage*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Riley, William. 1993. *King and Cultus in Chronicles. Worship and the Reinterpretation of History*. JSOTS 160. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Roberts, Jimmy Jack Mcbee. 1973. "The Davidic Origin of the Zion Tradition," *JBL* 92: 329–344.

Römer, Thomas. 2005. *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History. A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. London: T. & T. Clark.

———. 2008. "Moses outside the Torah and the Construction of a Diaspora Identity." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 8, article 15; available at www.jhsonline.org, reprinted under the same title in 2009. *Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures V: Comprising the Contents of Journal of Hebrew Scriptures, vol. 8*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press: 293–306.

Sass, Benjamin. 2010. "Four Notes on Taita King of Palistin with an Excursus on King Solomon's Empire," *Tel Aviv* 37: 169–174.

Schniedewind, William M. 1999. "The Chronicler as an Interpreter of Scripture", in *The Chronicler as Author. Studies in Text and Texture*, eds. M.P. Graham and S.L. McKenzie. JSOTS 263. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press: 158–180.

Schwartz, Baruch J. 2004. "Reexamining the Fate of the 'Canaanites' in the Torah Traditions", in *Sefer Moshe. The Moshe Weinfeld Jubilee Volume*, eds. Chaim Cohen, Avi Hurvitz and Shalom M. Paul. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns: 151–170.

Schwartz, Barry. 2009. "Collective Forgetting and the Symbolic Power of Oneness: The Strange Apotheosis of Rosa Parks." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 72: 123–142.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. 1971. "The Biblical Concept of Jerusalem," *jes* 8: 300–316.

Van Seters, John. 2005. "Joshua's Campaign of Canaan and Near Eastern Historiography." *sjot* 4: 1–12

Weinfeld, Moshe. 1991. *Deuteronomy 1–11*. ab, 5a. New York: Doubleday.

Wright, John W. 1997. "The Fight for Peace: Narrative and History in the Battle Accounts in Chronicles", in *The Chronicler as Historian*, eds. M.P. Graham, K.G. Hoglund and S.L. McKenzie. jsots 238. Sheffield: jsot Press: 150–177.

Younger Jr., K. Lawson. 1990. *Ancient Conquest Accounts: A Study in Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical History Writing*. jsots 98. Sheffield: jsot Press.

Zakovitch, Yair. 1985. "Assimilation in Biblical Narratives", in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed., J.H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 175–196.