



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from:
Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (eds.),
Memory and the City in Ancient Israel
© Copyright 2014 Eisenbrauns. All rights reserved.

Exploring Jerusalem as a Site of Memory in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods

EHUD BEN ZVI
University of Alberta

Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to explore, within the context of the relevant period, matters associated with social memories of Jerusalem. The first section discusses interactions between different ways in which Jerusalem served as a site of memory and contributed to the shaping of other sites of memory and core mnemonic narratives in the community. This section deals also with processes by which material signposts in Jerusalem influenced the discourse of the period and the ways in which Jerusalem was remembered and, conversely, the effect that Jerusalem of the mind had on social and political developments. In other words, it traces connections between material Jerusalems and the Jerusalems of the mind and vice versa. The second part of this chapter explores some of the images and concepts that the site of memory Jerusalem embodied and communicated in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period.

Exploring Matters of Social Memory about Jerusalem: Between “Mind” and “Matter,” “Matter” and “Mind,” and Other Considerations

Urban centers, ancient as well as modern, have populated, socially shared memory-scapes. The multiple associations evoked by cities contributed much to social memory and significantly impacted social mindscapes in the ancient

Author's note: This is one of a triad of essays dealing with memories of Jerusalem. The other two are “Remembering Pre-Israelite Jerusalem in Late, Persian Yehud: Mnemonic Preferences, Memories, and Social Imagination,” in *Urban Dreams and Realities: Remains and Representations of the Ancient City* (ed. Adam Kemezis; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); and “Jerusalem as a Mnemonic System and the Social Mindscape of Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud/Judah,” which is forthcoming in a volume of collected essays edited by F. Amsler and C. Nihan. The research leading to this essay and related works on social memory in ancient Israel has been supported by a grant of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Near East. Ancient cities served as the actual, worldly landscape populated by “material” sites of memory, some of which were personal and others of which were directly and intentionally involved in the shaping of a collective social memory, such as palaces, temples, inscriptions, walls, gates and the like. Cities were sites of social memory in a very different way. Like Babylon or Nineveh, they served as ciphers that activated and communicated various mnemonic worlds as they integrated multiple images, remembered events, and provided a variety of meanings in diverse ancient communities. Within the community that identified or positively associated itself with them, these cities served as ciphers that evoked and communicated a sense of order and construed a past and future that, in turn, played important roles in inner processes of formations of self-identity. These cities embodied and evoked central mythical images and memories that socialized the mnemonic community so that they might share a social mnemonic landscape and a general social mindscape. Social memories affected and to some extent effected not only the way in which people thought and understood the world and themselves but also their actions, including those related to cities. Thus, certain cities emerged to a significant extent the way they did because of social memories; their importance and relevance were at least, in part, the outcome of social memory.

Although cities that serve as sacred cities in “traditional” societies share some important features, whether they are inside or outside the ancient Near East,¹ this essay is primarily about the Jerusalem of the late Persian / Early Hellenistic period.² This city was extremely unlike the very large, central, imperial cities of the ancient Near East in terms of its population, political and economic clout, and even its social organization.³ But it was still a sacred, cen-

1. See, for instance, Diana L. Eck, “The City as a Sacred Center,” in *The City as a Sacred Center. Essays on Six Asian Contexts* (ed. Bardwell Smith and Holly Baker Reynolds; International Studies in Sociology and Social Anthropology 46; Leiden: Brill, 1987) 1–11.

2. Jerusalem has a long history as a central, sacred city before and after the period discussed here. The chapter, as appropriate to the theme of the present volume, is devoted to the late Persian or Early Hellenistic period in Judah/Yehud.

3. For demographic studies about Jerusalem and its surrounding areas during the Persian period, see, among others, Oded Lipschits, “Persian Period Finds from Jerusalem: Facts and Interpretations,” *JHS* 9/20 (2009). On-line: http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_122.pdf; idem, *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2005), esp. pp. 258–71; idem, “Demographic Changes in Judah between the Seventh and the Fifth Centuries BCE,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (ed. Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2003) 323–76; Israel Finkelstein, “Persian Period Jerusalem and Yehud: A Rejoinder,” *JHS* 9/24 (2009). On-line: http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_126.pdf; idem, “Jerusalem in the Persian (and Early Hellenistic) Period and the Wall of Nehemiah,” *JSOT* 32 (2008) 501–20; idem, “Archaeology and the List of Returnees in the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah,” *PEQ* 140 (2008) 7–16; Hillel

tral city⁴ for a particular community that, unsurprisingly, thought of it as the central city of a future, worldwide empire they believed would certainly come.

Jerusalem served as a central site of memory in late Persian Yehud in two main ways. On the one hand, it was the site that embodied and brought together in some meaningful way multiple material sites of memory the residents of the period encountered in their daily lives. These sites included, for example, a temple whose building and furnishings were much poorer than other central temples and poorer than the Jerusalemite temples that existed in the memory of the community (see Hag 2:3; compare Ezra 3:12). In fact, this material temple was not considered worthy of much writing and, thus, of much remembering in terms of its building or furnishings, as any comparison with descriptions of other temples or sacred cultic buildings of the past or the future (e.g., Ezekiel 40–44) that existed within the literary repertoire of the community clearly shows (see, for instance, 1 Kings 5–6; compare Exodus 25–28; 35–40).⁵ The temple itself was thus conceptualized as a marker of a post-calamity period, a reminder of a glorious past and of a glorious future that is “not yet.”

Geva, “אומדן אוכלוסיית ירושלים בתקופותיה הקדומות: ההצעה המינימליסטית” [“Estimating Jerusalem’s Population in Antiquity: A Minimalist View,”] *Erlsr* 28 (Teddy Kollek Volume; 2007) 50–65; Amos Kloner, “Jerusalem’s Environs in the Persian Period,” in *New Studies on Jerusalem* (ed. Avraham Faust and Eyal Baruch; Ramat Gan: Ingeborg Rennert Center for Jerusalem Studies, 2001) 91–95 [Hebrew]; compare Charles E. Carter, *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study* (JSOTSup 294; Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1999); Avraham Faust, “Judah in the Sixth Century B.C.E.: A Rural Perspective,” *PEQ* 126 (2003) 37–53. See also a summary of the situation in Kirsi Valkama, “What Do Archaeological Remains Reveal of the Settlements in Judah during the Mid-Sixth Century BCE?” in *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and Its Historical Contexts* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin; BZAW 404; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010) 39–59.

4. It is important to stress that “cities” and even central “cities” in this context are not necessarily defined by having a large population (see bibliography in the previous note) or by their being walled. Jerusalem was without a wall when the temple was established, and if at a later stage in the Persian period it was surrounded by a wall, the latter was certainly not a massive defensive wall meant to withstand the attack of any significant army. It is worth noting also that, within the social mindscape of the period, cities had “daughters,” that is, secondary, small and mainly rural settlements. But conceptually, “daughters” belong to the same category as “mothers.” What characterized a central sacred city was neither the size nor the wall but a conceptualization of the city as the place of a “great god,” a place connecting “heaven and earth,” a central place in the divine economy, and the like. This is discussed in the subsection “Jerusalem, Cities, Houses and Cosmos,” below.

5. See David J. A. Clines, “Haggai’s Temple, Constructed, Deconstructed and Reconstructed,” in *Interested Parties: The Ideology of Writers and Readers of the Hebrew Bible* (JSOTSup 205; Gender, Culture, Theory 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 46–75 (esp. p. 53); originally published in *SJOT* 7 (1993) 19–30.

One has to assume that ruins were probably seen in the area in and around Jerusalem throughout the Persian period.⁶ These ruins and empty spaces also served to bring home the presence of a past and of its catastrophic fate. These ruins would reinforce a sense that the community is just the “remnant” of a terrible calamity, whose memory probably remained for generations in the community.⁷ The buildings of Jerusalem served to shape a collective memory obsessed with a past calamity, which, within the social mindscape of the community, was tantamount to being obsessed with the importance of YHWH’s past judgment. It also meant obsession with closely related activities such as (a) construing and remembering the actions of Judah and Jerusalem that made them worthy of such a divine punishment within this discourse and (b) construing hope for a restoration that will return not to the prejudgment situation that led to disaster but to a new hopeful, stable future.⁸ The repertoire of books that carried particular authority within the Jerusalem-centered literati in the late Persian / early Hellenistic period particularly reflected these “obsessions.”⁹

6. Compare David Ussishkin, “The Borders and *De Facto* Size of Jerusalem in the Persian Period,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (ed. Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006) 147–66.

7. In a short period, Judah suffered a reduction of 70–75% in its population, and close to 90% in some areas (for example, Jerusalem environs, eastern strip). The city was burned and uninhabited, due to war, famine, associated diseases, deportation, and migration caused by the economic collapse that followed and was engendered by the sociopolitical collapse. Even in Benjamin, which was the least affected of all regions, the population dropped by more than 50%. A catastrophe of this magnitude could not but be remembered and become a site of memory or cipher bearing a weighty significance for generations after the event, particularly among those whose self-identity was grounded in a close identification with those afflicted by the disaster but also within any polity or community that imagined itself and was understood as standing in continuation with the one that had suffered a calamity such as this. See Hermann-Josef Stipp, “The Concept of the Empty Land in Jeremiah 37–43,” in *Concept of Exile* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin) 103–54. He compares this shrinkage of population with that caused by the Thirty Years’ War, which was far less dramatic. To put it in today’s numbers, this would be equivalent to the loss of about 25 million Canadians or more than 230 million Americans (pp. 144–50). It is worth stressing that there was no demographic or economic recovery to anywhere near the level of late monarchic Judah during the Persian and early Hellenistic periods.

8. A social preference toward the development of discourses of hope (and utopian thinking) in this sort of community is to be expected. See my “Reading and Constructing Utopias: Utopia/s and/in the Collection of Authoritative Texts of Late Yehud. General Considerations and Some Observations,” *Studies in Religion* 42 (2013) 463–76.

9. The underlying assumption is that most of the books included today in the Hebrew Bible in more or less their present forms are representative, to at least a significant degree, of the general authoritative repertoire of these literati in the late Persian / early Hellenistic period. This is a reasonable assumption, at least concerning the pentateuchal collection, the Deuteronomistic Historical collection, the prophetic books collection, Chronicles, and most of the psalms and Proverbs.

Within a province that was called Yehud, not Benjamin, even though its demographic and economic center was Benjamin and its political capital was located at Mizpah in Benjamin for a while, memories that reinforced a sense of continuity with the past enjoyed a systemic preference. Persian-period Jerusalem and its temple evoked and shaped memories of monarchic Jerusalem. Moreover, it evoked memories of monarchic Judah. Without a doubt, one may claim that the ideology according to which Jerusalem stood symbolically for Judah was one that would have been particularly promoted by the incipient temple in Jerusalem, with the likely support of the Persian center. Certainly, it had been at the core of monarchic-period discourse and the perception of Judah outside its borders.¹⁰ Yehud could not have rejected this construction without substantially erasing any claims of continuity between Persian Yehud and monarchic Judah.¹¹ The very building of the temple evoked and communicated a sense of continuity with the past temple and thus shaped and reshaped a memory of old Jerusalem in which the temple becomes more important than any other building and institution. This process created a core mnemonic metanarrative from temple to temple that, within the discourse of the period, was also one from David to Cyrus and from monarchic Judah to Achaemenid Yehud. At the same time, it also evoked a sense of a third and final movement, from past temple to present temple to future utopian temple, from monarchic Judah to Persian Empire to YHWH's empire on earth; from David to Cyrus to either an elevated David or Israel (or both) at the center of YHWH's kingdom.

Up to this point, I have referenced ways in which encountering material sites of memory in Jerusalem after the city's destruction in 586 B.C.E. shaped a comprehensive site of material memory that affected the production of the intellectual discourse of the literati, their memories, and their general mindscape. Even these material sites of memory had to be socially construed and encoded, but indisputably, there was a material side to them.

At the same time, material sites of memory were not a necessary requisite for a Jerusalem that existed in the mind and the shared imagination of the community. The memories evoked by such a Jerusalem of the mind, with the temple as its center, were most likely the reason that the temple and eventually, Jerusalem were rebuilt in the Persian period. On the surface, the building of a local temple in the midst of a destroyed, unpopulated and unwallled town in an extremely depopulated area rather than in the local political, social, economic, and demographic center does not make much sense. It is an anomaly, further emphasized by the fact that it required not only local but also imperial

10. So, for example, *ABC* 5, rev. 1. 12. The text is also available in Jean-Jacques Glassner, *Mesopotamian Chronicles* (SBLWAW 19; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004) 230–31.

11. See my "Total Exile, Empty Land and the General Intellectual Discourse in Yehud," in *The Concept of Exile in Ancient Israel and Its Historical Contexts* (ed. Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin; BZAW 404; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 155–68 (p. 165).

support. The only reason for rebuilding the temple in Jerusalem rather than (re?)building a temple to YHWH elsewhere in the province was the strong existence of a Jerusalem of the mind whose social memories required that YHWH's house be at the place the community remembered YHWH to have selected for that purpose.¹² Building temples in the ancient Near East usually would have occasioned substantial discontinuities with the past,¹³ but they would be construed and accepted as appropriate because they evoked and activated a sense of continuity with a remembered (and thus construed and constantly reshaped) past.¹⁴ The Jerusalem of the mind had a central role in creation of the material Jerusalem of the Persian period.

Of course, various Jerusalems of the mind impacted not only the process of rebuilding an incipient temple but also continued to interact dynamically with the actual city throughout the Persian period. Certainly, repeatedly remembering the preeminence of Jerusalem and its temple likely contributed to the rise of the institution of the temple and, thus, of the city to the position of preeminence it had attained already by the late Persian period.¹⁵ But Jerusalems of

12. For a different position on this matter, see Diana V. Edelman, *The Origins of the "Second" Temple: Persian Imperial Policy and the Rebuilding of Jerusalem* (Bible World; London: Equinox, 2005). For a response to Edelman's position, see Ralph W. Klein, "Were Joshua, Zerubbabel, and Nehemiah Contemporaries? A Response to Diana Edelman's Proposed Late Date for the Second Temple," *JBL* 127 (2008) 697–701.

13. After all, any activity of building or rebuilding brings something "new" that has to be incorporated and "appropriated" by the past. Moreover in most cases, (re)building or even "repairing" involves the removal of something considered to be sacred. For this reason, actions of rebuilding, repairing, or even making minor changes in temples or their sacra may be portrayed as acts of impiety or even sacrilege from the perspective of those who negatively construe and remember the (re)builder/repairer agent (e.g., Ahaz, Naram Sin, Nabonaid, "sinful priests," and so on). See, for instance, Paul-Alain Beaulieu, "Nabonidus the Mad King: A Reconsideration of His Steles from Harran and Babylon," in *Representations of Political Power: Case Histories of Change and Dissolving Order in the Ancient Near East* (ed. Marlies Heinz and Marian H. Feldman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2007) 137–66 (pp. 143–44). It is worth noting in this regard that despite the negative characterization of Herod, his (re)building activities were not construed as a sacrilege; instead, his role as (re)builder of the temple was deemphasized in literature from the period close to and following the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.

14. One may note the emphasis on the literature of the period on the continuity of ritual, personnel (the same lines of priests), sancta (for example, the vessels), sacred space and sacred (cyclical/ritual) time.

15. Contrast even the case of Samaria, the other main Yahwistic province in which there was also a temple. Note the asymmetry between the Samaritan and Yehudite addressees of the letters sent by Jedaniah and his colleagues the priests in Elephantine, which unequivocally points to the high status of the Jerusalemite temple in Yehud by 407 B.C.E. The letters were sent to "Delaiah and Shelemiah, sons of Sanballat, gover-

the mind and social memory did not evolve in a vacuum. They were part of the social memory of a particular historical community and thus historically contingent, both in a narrow and a wider historical sense. The inner Yehudite social processes that led to the religiocultural-political prominence of Jerusalem over Benjamin shaped and drew much attention to Jerusalem as a site of memory. The sociopolitical and cultural location of Yehud in the Persian Empire also affected the shaping of Jerusalem as a site of memory. Persian kings were brought to memory as supporters of the building and appropriate establishment of the temple, as royal figures lending it prestige, and as instruments in the hands of YHWH for these purposes, as the discourse of Yehud required. At the same time, as the last observation already hints, the very same social and cultural location led to processes of hybridization in which cultural patterns associated with “empire” are turned around to support local identity formation and social reproduction, as well as forms of inner social organization. All this contributed to the shaping of images of Jerusalem. The social, political, and cultural location of Yehud entailed constant interplay with Samaria and their respective elites during the Persian period. These matters also influenced the shaping of social memories about Jerusalem and the mindscape they enjoyed within the Yehudite community. The internal social location of the literati writing and reading the texts in which these memories of Jerusalem were encoded and evoked by reading also played important roles, particularly if these literati were likely supported in one way or another by the Jerusalemite temple.

nor of Samaria” and in first instance, to “Jehohanan the High Priest and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem, and to Ostanes the brother of Anani and the nobles of Judah,” and later to Bagavahya, the governor of Yehud. See Bezalel Porten et al., *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* (Leiden: Brill, 1996) 139–49; Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (4 vols.; Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1986–99) 1:68–75 (B19 = TAD A4.7 = Cowley 30; B20 = TAD A.4.8 = Cowley 31). Of course, the very presence of the temple required the presence of priests and various services to maintain the cult; the very presence of collected tribute and taxes in the site, at least from some point in the Persian period that of some human and “material” infrastructure to make whatever was collected safe. All these processes could not but affect the “material” city. On the likely roles of the Persian-period temple, see Joachim Schaper, “The Jerusalem Temple as an Instrument of the Achaemenid Fiscal Administration,” *VT* 45 (1995) 528–39; idem, “The Temple Treasury Committee in the Times of Nehemiah and Ezra,” *VT* 47 (1997) 200–206. The presence of a treasury in Jerusalem may have contributed to the shift of the provincial capital from Mizpah to Jerusalem and the presence of some fortifications. See, for instance, Oded Lipschits, “Achaemenid Imperial Policy, Settlement Processes in Palestine, and the Status of Jerusalem in the Middle of the Fifth Century B.C.E.,” in *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*, 19–52 (p. 40). Compare Christopher Tuplin, “The Administration of the Achaemenid Empire,” in *Coinage and Administration in the Athenian and Persian Empires* (ed. Ian Carradice; BAR International Series 343; Oxford: B.A.R., 1987) 109–66 (pp. 128, 130).

Because I have discussed some of these issues elsewhere, the next section will focus on various aspects of the Jerusalems of the mind of the late Persian/early Hellenistic period rather than on the historical background from which they emerged and with which they interacted and reshaped themselves, though both aspects should be kept in mind.

*Exploring Matters of Social Memory about Jerusalem:
Some of the Central Constructions of “Jerusalem”*

Introduction and Matters of Mindshare

Jerusalem and related terms (for example, Zion) explicitly appear many more than 800 times in works later included in the HB, which most likely were representative of the repertoire of the time. For obvious reasons, Jerusalem could not appear frequently in the Pentateuch or other historiographical narratives shaping memories of a pre-Davidic, pre-Israelite Jerusalem. S. Talmon noticed many years ago that Jerusalem and related terms are proportionally attested more frequently in this corpus than in late-Second Temple literature, when Jerusalem was a much larger city, or in later rabbinic literature, despite Jerusalem’s centrality in rabbinic Judaism, or in the New Testament.¹⁶ The matter is not only numerical; the Deuteronomistic historical collection is largely teleologically oriented toward the catastrophe symbolized by the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple. Jerusalem stands at the center of the collection of prophetic books. Jerusalem and its temple play a central role in Psalms and in Chronicles. All the basic metanarratives of Yehud involved the past and future fate of Jerusalem.

These observations are indicative of the extent of social mindshare among the literati of the period that Jerusalem occupied—the Jerusalems of the mind and memory. Because this mindshare was comparatively larger in Yehud in the Persian period than it was both in the Second Temple period and when there was no material (Jewish) Jerusalem or temple as in the rabbinic period, the matter does not appear to be simply or mainly a case of extensive communal remembering about what has been lost and will be regained. The difference between late Persian Yehud and the rabbinic period seems to be that Jerusalem and its temple had to strive to achieve centrality in the Persian period, while it was undoubtedly was central in the rabbinic era.

The vast number of references to Jerusalem in the repertoire of the period makes it impossible to undertake here even a basic analysis of Jerusalem as a comprehensive site of memory that embodied and communicated multiple images, at times in tension with each other, and integrated them together under a common cipher that embodied and communicated even more meanings and

16. See Shemaryahu Talmon, “The Biblical Concept of Jerusalem,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 8 (1971) 300–316.

images. The plethora of images, places and contexts in which Jerusalem was evoked and the plethora of manners in which Jerusalem in one way or another was integrated into almost any main metanarrative that existed within the discourse of Yehud makes this sort of endeavor impossible. Thus, I will explore *a few* of the aspects and images that contributed to the construction of this site of memory and to its dominant position in the memory-scape of the community.

Jerusalem, Cities, Houses, Cosmic Order and Divine Wisdom

Creation in the ancient Near East was construed as a “macrocosmic” house. The basic metaphor for social organization was the “house of the father,”¹⁷ and from the macrocosmic perspective, this father/patriarch was the high deity of the group. The “house” included cities, and cities included houses, some of which were houses of deities. All were built/created with wisdom and stood because they were established with wisdom. Houses had to be provisioned and filled with good, appropriate things;¹⁸ if a house is filled with a city or cities, then the latter also should be filled with goods, people, wisdom, and of course, a divine house or houses.

When the divine resident was a high god, then it resided in its house in the city and in the cosmic house at the same time, and a direct connection between the two was construed. The city was included in the house and, at the same time, included it. Moreover, the city was necessary for the maintenance of the house and provided context for it, as the latter was imagined as the central element that filled the city. Conversely, the temple filled the city and the world with the essential goods for its prosperity and maintenance. To illustrate, “En-ki’s ‘house’ is the entire cosmos, which is made prosperous from out the local temple/Abzu with its gifts of life-giving waters.”¹⁹

Closer to our topic and time, but still standing in relation to these then millennia-old conceptual images, YHWH’s future presence in the temple in Jerusalem is associated with fertilizing waters emerging from the place in Ezek 47:1–12 and also with the image of a future fountain in the temple, which

17. See, for instance, J. David Schloen, *The House of the Father as Fact and Symbol: Patrimonialism in Ugarit and the ancient Near East* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2001); Mark S. Smith, *The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel’s Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001) 54–66; Raymond C. van Leeuwen, “Cosmos, Temple, House: Building and Wisdom in Mesopotamia and Israel,” in *Wisdom Literature in Mesopotamia and Israel* (ed. Richard J. Clifford; SBLSymS 36: Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature 2007) 67–90; reprinted and slightly revised, “Cosmos, Temple, House: Building and Wisdom in Ancient Mesopotamia and Israel” in *From the Foundations to the Crenellations: Essays on Temple Building in the Ancient Near East and Hebrew Bible* (ed. Mark J. Boda and Jamie Novotny; AOAT 366; Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2010) 399–421.

18. See van Leeuwen, “Cosmos, Temple, House.”

19. Citation from *ibid.*, 401.

appears in texts as different as Joel 4:18; Zech 13:1; 14:8; and Ps 46:5–6 (cf. Isa 33:21). YHWH himself was construed as ‘the fountain of living water’ (מְקוֹר מַיִם חַיִּים; see Jer 2:13; cf. Ps 36:10[9] and also Jer 14:8; 17:13²⁰), so there is nothing strange in a generative grammar that would give rise to images of his house and city containing a fountain of enlivening waters. One may note also that this sort of image carries Edenic connotations and partially construes future Jerusalem as a second Eden.²¹ Within this mnemonic world, the garden thus becomes a city and the city a garden.

To be sure, Jerusalem was construed not only as the source of mythical “water” but also, for example, as the place in which YHWH shines. As a result, it had to be imagined as the site in which מְכַלֵּל יָפִי ‘the perfection of beauty’ was achieved on earth (Ps 50:2). Memories of future Jerusalem as a source of mythical light partially embodying the divine presence, to which nations and rulers (that is, the human world) would come, were reflected in and evoked through the reading of Isa 60:1–3, read in a way informed by Isa 60:19–20.

Multiple, complementary, imaginative acts served to construe memories of utopian Jerusalem. Each of them contributed to and shed light on Jerusalem as a site of memory. Jerusalem was imagined as a fountain of water and of light but also, and in related ways, a fountain of wisdom / divine knowledge for the world. Within the general context of the ancient Near East, the world cannot endure without (divine) wisdom. Within the world of thought of the Jerusalem-centered literati during the late Persian or early Hellenistic period, this wisdom was identified, in part, as YHWH’s instruction.²² Thus, it is not sur-

20. On the double meaning conveyed by the reference to YHWH as מְקוֹר יִשְׂרָאֵל in Jer 14:8; 17:13 see, for instance, William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 433.

21. On Jerusalem as Eden, see Terje Stordalen, “Heaven on Earth—Or not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature,” in *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History* (ed. Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg; FAT 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 28–57, esp. pp. 36–40; and the essay on pp. 115–155 of this volume by Diana Edelman, “Gardens in Biblical Memory.” For a recent comparative study of some images and constructions in the (so-called) Akkadian “apocalypses” and texts such as Ezek 47:1–12; Joel 4:18; and Zech 14:8, see Daniel Bodi, “Les apocalypses akkadiennes et bibliques: Quelques points communs,” *Revue des Études Juives* 169 (2010) 13–36; and Stordalen, “Heaven on Earth.”

22. See, for instance, Deut 4:5–6; Psalm 19; or texts such as Job 28:28 as read within a community in which “fear of YHWH” was understood as (at the very least as) following YHWH’s instruction (e.g., Deut 6:2, 24; 13:5; 17:19; 31:12; 1 Sam 12:14). For the potential impact of this correlation on other texts (e.g., Isa 55:1–5), see Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 40–55* (AB 19A; New York: Doubleday, 2002) 369. For texts likely later than the period discussed here that reflect a similar overlap between wisdom and divine instruction in different ways, compare the language of Ezra 7:14 with that in Ezra 7:25. To be clear, I make the claim not that the concepts of Wisdom and YHWH’s instruction were fully interchangeable during the late Persian / early Hellenistic period but that a most significant ideological overlap existed. As for later periods, for stud-

prising to note that images of a future, utopian Jerusalem associate the establishment of this sort of place with the spread of ‘knowledge’ (דעה) of YHWH (see Isa 11:6–9, 65:17–25).²³ Thus, one finds texts such as כִּי מִצִּיּוֹן תֵּצֵא תוֹרָה וְדְבַר־יְהוָה מִירוּשָׁלַם ‘For out of Zion shall go forth instruction and the word of YHWH from Jerusalem’ (Isa 2:3; Mic 4:2).

Within this social mindscape, the image of Wisdom as a city dweller calling to people to adopt her ways (Prov 9:1–6) and preaching in and around the city (see Prov 8:1–3) could not but associate her with both (a) “every city, and even the entirety of the inhabited world”²⁴ and (b) Jerusalem, the space associated with YHWH’s instruction. Divine wisdom is thus cosmic and world-encompassing but also, at least partially, Jerusalem-bound. When construed from the latter perspective, the reference to the heights of the city in Prov 8:2 as the place in which people may encounter Wisdom likely evoked the image of the Jerusalemite temple.²⁵

ies on Sirach and (the book of) Torah, keeping in mind texts such as Sir 24:23, see, for instance, John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997) 54–61. For the proposal that Sir 24:23 reflects Sirach’s understanding of Deuteronomy, see Gerald T. Sheppard, *Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct: A Study in the Sapientializing of the Old Testament* (BZAW 151; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1980) 66; and see Sheppard’s discussion of Sir 24:3–29 in 19–71. It is possible that Sirach reflected a reading of the text that preceded him. On the various meanings of *torah* in the late Persian period, see also Moshe Greenberg, “Three Conceptions of the Torah in the Hebrew Scriptures,” *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Stegemann; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990) 365–78. For a recent epistemological study of the multiple relations between ciphers such as Wisdom and Torah, see Ryan O’Dowd, *The Wisdom of Torah: Epistemology in Deuteronomy and the Wisdom Literature* (FRLANT 225; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009).

23. From the perspective of the late Persian or early Hellenistic period, these two texts informed each other. Significantly, both were associated with the same prophet of old, Isaiah, who was directly associated with Jerusalem. The book of Isaiah reached its compositional form well before Sirach; see Sir 48:18–25, which assumes a memory of the prophet shaped by, and reflecting a reading of the book of Isaiah as a whole and as a book encoding memories about the monarchic-period prophet Isaiah.

24. Michael V. Fox writes in relation to Prov 8:1–3: “The scene and events are atemporal: Wisdom addresses mankind in all cities, inside and outside the city walls, in high places and low grounds, repeatedly and forever. Her city represents every city, and even the entirety of the inhabited world. Ancient Near Eastern mythology often represented the cosmos as a city, and some cities were regarded as microcosms of heaven and earth” (*Proverbs 1–9* [AB 18A; New York: Doubleday, 2000] 267). Compare Leo Perdue, *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of the Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994) 86–87.

25. See Leo Perdue, *Proverbs* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2000) 140. The image of Wisdom at the gates was related to the image and administration of justice, which, if done in a way consistent with divine wisdom, provides

Central cities in the ancient Near East were conceptualized as ordered and ordering sites,²⁶ embodying and providing divine wisdom/knowledge. This construction carried a flip side that impacted on the way in which cities served as sites of memory. When these cities were construed and remembered as being disordered and thus disordering, they had to be imagined as embodying, providing and propagating “folly” or “misleading knowledge.” Given that wisdom / divine knowledge was considered absolutely necessary for the world to endure, the foolish city threatened not only itself but also the world as a whole. The fate of the city was imagined as having larger repercussions.²⁷

Within the discourse of Yehud, on the one hand, matters were exacerbated because YHWH, the only divine being worthy of being called “God,” was construed as having only one possible house/city on earth, and the deity could not remain in an unsuitable house/city. The emerging generative grammar of this discourse led to constructions of an effect on the cosmic level for Israel’s sinfulness (e.g., Jer 4:22–28; Zeph 1:2–3) and a sense that what happened in or around Jerusalem (Judah) is crucial for the fate of an Israel that includes more than Judah (for example, Chronicles). Above all, it led to a sense that a temple-less or Jerusalem-less condition can only be a temporary situation. Within this discourse, YHWH will return to Zion/Jerusalem, the city will (and needs to) be rebuilt, and when this happens, the world will finally reach a stable situation. The city will be recognized worldwide as the sacred center of the world and people will come to it, receive its blessings, and honor it by filling it with all kinds of (voluntary) gifts, thus contributing to the process of its building (for example, Isa 60:1–18; 61:5; Hag 2:6–9; compare Isa 2:3; Jer 3:17; Mic 4:2).²⁸

the harmony and order deemed necessary for the long-term existence of the polity/city. So Perdue, *Wisdom & Creation*, 86.

26. See Amélie Kuhrt, *The Ancient Near East, c. 3000–330 BC* (2 vols.; London: Routledge, 1995) 2:617.

27. The idea that the fate of a (central) city may affect the cosmos is well attested in the ancient Near East. For an illustration, see, for instance, Jack M. Sasson, “An Apocalyptic Vision from Mari? Speculations on ARM X:9,” *Mari: Annales de recherches interdisciplinaires* 1 (1982) 151–67 (p. 164).

28. On the importance of “filling,” see van Leeuwen, “Cosmos, Temple, House.” All these images of central cities at the center of the world that existed in the ancient Near East relate to and evoke conceptual images of “world empires.” In the case of Babylon or Nineveh, they reflected and related to social constructs of empires as well as to the existence of historical, social, political, and economic empires. In the case of Israel/Yehud, the empire was only one of social imagination, set in the future. But memories of that empire impacted the social mindscape and social memory of the community, which remembered not only the past but also its future, having experienced repeatedly, though vicariously through reading, the shared, communal experience of this future. On the common ancient Near Eastern *topos* of the “city at the center of the world,” see, for instance, the classic discussion of Mario Liverani, “Memorandum on the Approach to Historiographic Texts,” *Orientalia* 42 (1973) 178–94 (pp. 189–91; on

The images of Jerusalem discussed in this subsection provide excellent examples of how general cultural patterns and even generative grammars that were most often employed in the service of the ideology of dominant political powers of the area were appropriated and reshaped into motifs at the service of local cultural/ideological resistance. They advanced claims that the true center of the universe was not to be found in the imperial cities but in a poor and seemingly marginal city. Contrary to present and past “global” empires that were centered in these cities, they imaginatively experienced and became acquainted with vignettes of a future empire whose center was Jerusalem. They had memories of this certain future Jerusalemite empire, which will come at some undefined future time but which was already created and consistent with YHWH’s will and the true structure of the cosmos. This type of hybridity contributed to the stability and social reproduction of the community in which it evolved and to the long-term stability of the empire.²⁹

Hierarchies and Gendered Images: A Few Observations

Within the mindscape of the community in Yehud, the focal point, that is, the house of the higher deity, defines the city, and conversely, the city is imagined as the house of the deity.³⁰ Both are construed as the center of the cosmic world and of the earthly world in Yehud.³¹ But again, Jerusalem was not imagined and remembered only through the images evoked by the term *house*. As is well-known, in the ancient Near East cities were construed as female figures.³² Although a full discussion of the discursive implications of these

bringing gifts, see also pp. 191–93.) The motif of bringing gifts to the imperial center is widely and clearly attested, for instance, in neo-Assyrian and Achaemenid royal texts.

29. This is a point that deserves separate analysis. I have discussed these matters in “On Social Memory and Identity Formation in Late Persian Yehud: A Historian’s Viewpoint with a Focus on Prophetic Literature, Chronicles and the Dtr. Historical Collection,” in *Texts, Contexts and Readings in Postexilic Literature Explorations into Historiography and Identity Negotiation in Hebrew Bible and Related Texts* (ed. Loius Jonker; FAT 2/53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011) 95–148; and more extensively in “The Yehudite Prophetic Books and Imperial Context,” in *Divination, Politics and Ancient Near Eastern Empires* (ed. Jonathan Stökl and Alan Lenzi; ANEM/MACO 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014) 145–69.

30. On the blurring of boundaries and terms in relation to Jerusalem, with numerous examples from the Psalms, see Susan Gillingham, “The Zion Tradition and the Editing of the Hebrew Psalter,” in *Temple Worship in Biblical Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. John Day; LHBOTS 422; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005) 308–41 (pp. 313–16).

31. E.g., Ezek 5:5. Note also previous references to the central fountain that play on the concept of the fountain at the sacred cosmic center. On this matter, see, for instance, Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14* (AB 25C; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 399.

32. For a discussion of the gender of cities and Jerusalem’s unique attribution of a personified biography, see the essay on pp. 21–40 in this volume by Stéphanie

gendered associations and the ways in which they may shape social mindscape is beyond the scope of the present work,³³ a few considerations suffice for the present purposes. Given the three most common, structural female roles within the ideational “house,” female Jerusalem was to be construed and remembered in the main through the activation of three main generative images: (a) mother, (b) daughter, and (c) wife.³⁴

Jerusalem was explicitly remembered in terms of a mother (e.g., Isa 49:17–18; 54:13). Her children and at times very clearly “sons” are, of course, the residents of the city (whether in the future, past or present) that stands for an Israel. (I will return to this point).

Jerusalem was often remembered in terms of בת ציון ‘daughter/female Zion’ (*passim*) and at times as ‘daughter/female Jerusalem’ בת ירושלים (see 2 Kgs 19:21; Isa 37:22; Zeph 3:14; Zech 9:9; Lam 37:22). The term בת evoked the meaning ‘daughter’, which in turn, evoked “father,” which in this case could only be imagined as YHWH.

Jerusalem was also imagined as YHWH’s wife (Isa 54:5–8; 62:4), just as Israel is in other texts (for example, Hosea 2, and note the “parallel” in Isa 54:5–8). In either case, within the gendered social mindscape of the period, the imagining of the city as female led the community’s generative grammar of imagination to create appropriate males who should “own,” protect, and enjoy her.

Even when YHWH was not necessarily or always imagined as Jerusalem’s husband, the deity was imagined as rejoicing over her. For instance, readers of Isa 65:18–19 encounter a YHWH who “remembers” his future joy in Jerusalem, when he will create her and complete this creation by filling her with joy, goodness, and goods. But there is also Isa 64:4–5:

לֹא־יֵאמֵר לָךְ עוֹד עֲזוּבָה וְלֹא־רָצָךְ לֹא־יֵאמֵר עוֹד שְׁמָמָה כִּי לָךְ יִקְרָא חֲפָצִי־בָהּ וְלֹא־רָצָךְ
 בְּעוֹלָה כִּי־חָפֵץ יְהוָה בְּךָ וְרָצָךְ תִּבְעֵל:
 כִּי־יִבְעַל בְּחֹר בְּתוֹלָה יִבְעִלוּךְ בְּנֵי־וְיִמְשׁוּשׁ חֲתָן עַל־כִּלְיָהּ שֵׁשׁ עֲלִיךְ אֵלֶיךָ:

You shall no more be referred to as a forsaken/divorced woman
 and your land shall no more be referred as desolate/lack in fertility

Anthonzioz, “Cities of Glory and Cities of Pride: Concepts, Gender, and Images of Cities in Mesopotamia and the Bible.”

33. The bibliography on these issues is extensive. For a recent study, see, for instance, Christl M. Maier, *Daughter Zion, Mother Zion: Gender, Space and the Sacred in Ancient Israel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008). See also Julia M. O’Brien, *Challenging Prophetic Metaphor: Theology and Ideology in the Prophets* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008) 125–51.

34. The motif of the “promiscuous adulteress” (often referred to as “the whore”) is in this context a negative variant of the “wife” motif. Sinful Israel/Jerusalem was construed and remembered not only as YHWH’s wife but also as “the promiscuous adulteress/whore” who cannot but commit adultery time and again (*passim*). See the ensuing discussion.

but you shall be called “my delight is in her”
 and your land, Married/Intercoursed
 for YHWH delights in you,
 and your land shall be married/intercoursed.
 For as a young man marries / has intercourse with a young woman,
 so shall your sons marry / have intercourse with you,
 and as a groom rejoices over a bride,
 so shall your god rejoice over you.

This text clearly and explicitly advances the image of YHWH as the husband of Jerusalem in a future successful and happy marriage as seen from the perspective of the gendered ideology of the time. But there is more. There is a preferred generative grammar according to which good (male) Israelites are supposed to imitate the deity. Hosea marries Israel and so YHWH. YHWH marries Jerusalem and so the Israelites/Jerusalemites who possess her at the “worldly level” within these utopian (and heavily ideological) acts of imagination. These Jerusalemites/Israelites cannot be other than Jerusalem’s sons, that is, her dwellers. The text is not as strange as it may appear at first.³⁵

Within this context of strongly gendered images (and social mindscape), it is also worth mentioning that Jerusalem was construed and remembered as YHWH’s beautiful, glorious crown; a royal diadem in YHWH’s hand (Isa 62:3; cf. Prov 12:4). It was not imagined as a female deity and could not have been imagined as such within the discourse of the community. However, like its counterpart, Israel, when construed in terms evocative of a marriage of eternal faithfulness to YHWH,³⁶ and certainly, given the image of YHWH’s permanent presence in its/her midst, which required holiness, some godly attributes had to be assigned to Jerusalem as well, directly and indirectly (see Isa 1:26; 52:1; Jer 3:17; 31:23; Ezek 48:35—the very conclusion of the book of Ezekiel; Zech 8:3).³⁷

35. If the reference to “your sons” is exchanged with “your builders,” no substantial change occurs, because “your builders” are “your sons.” On this, see also pp. 212–13.

36. For a recent study that deals with female, marital, queenly, and crown-related images of Jerusalem in Isaiah, which advances the minority position that Jerusalem never becomes a deity, see Christl M. Maier, “Daughter of Zion as Queen and the Iconography of the Female City,” in *Images and Prophecy in the Ancient Eastern Mediterranean* (ed. Martti Nissinen and Charles E. Carter; FRLANT 233; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009) 147–62.

37. Given the discourse of the period, when the “female” city was imagined as disordered and thus disordering, as embodying, providing, and propagating “folly” or “misleading knowledge,” as rejecting YHWH and so on, it was imagined as a whore. A comprehensive analysis of central sacred cities (Jerusalem, Babylon, Samaria) cannot omit this aspect. But given that the present study does not and cannot attempt any form of comprehensiveness, and given that the motif is well known and has been discussed in many other contributions, it is fully acknowledged but not addressed here. On these

Just as remembering future Israel, remembering the future Jerusalem within the context of the poor, small city provided hope. Moreover, like other utopian images shared by a community, it facilitated an exploration of alternative “realities,” of perceived lacks in the present, and turned a “nowhere” into a “somewhere” that figured prominently in the discourse of the community, which was certain it would become a worldly “somewhere” sometime.

*Divine Creation and Building Jerusalem,
Secondary Human Partners, and Imago Dei: A Few Observations*

Within a discourse in which Jerusalem is construed and remembered as the city of YHWH (e.g., Pss 46:5; 48:2, 9; 87:3; 101:8) that stands at the center of the cosmos and plays cosmic roles such as being its “throne” on earth,³⁸ it is easy to understand why both its destruction (*passim* in prophetic literature and elsewhere) and its building were imagined to require divine intervention. YHWH was imagined as the builder of the city, and two of YHWH’s attributes were ‘creator’ (בִּרְאָ) and ‘builder’ (בְּנֵה); see, for instance, Isa 65:18–19; Pss 102:17; 147:2;³⁹ cf. Isa 54:5; Ps 51:20). Imagining the cosmic creation of new heavens and a new earth led directly and almost immediately to imagining the creation of a new Jerusalem, both as a place of human dwelling, work, and joy and as a peaceful, Edenic place in which the wolf and the lamb will eat together and the lion will eat straw (Isa 65:17–25).⁴⁰

But building Jerusalem, just as destroying it (*passim*), also required human hands, as the readership of all of these texts knew (e.g., Isa 62:6–7; 2 Chr 36:23; Haggai). Moreover, the process of building Jerusalem could not have been imagined as complete until the city would be filled with all that belongs to her, including not only the temple but also, among other things, walls, goods, pilgrims, and, of course, joy.⁴¹ Within this inner Yehudite discourse, human

issues, see, for instance, Robert P. Carroll, “Whorusalamin: A Tale of Three Cities as Three Sisters,” in *On Reading Prophetic Texts: Gender-Specific and Related Studies in Memory of Fokkeli van Dijk-Hemmes* (ed. Bob Becking and Meindert Dijkstra; BibIntS 18; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 67–82 and the works mentioned on p. 210 n. 33 above.

38. See Jer 3:17 and compare 1 Chr 29:23, Ps 132:7, Lam 2:1, and Isa 66:1, which do not negate the need to build and fill the temple and Jerusalem (see the rest of Isaiah 66) but which set these activities within the context of YHWH’s cosmic house that encompasses all. Compare 1 Kings 8.

39. בִּנְיָהּ יְרוּשָׁלַיִם יְהוָה in Ps 147:2 probably should be translated ‘the builder of Jerusalem is YHWH’ (cf. New Jerusalem Bible).

40. From the perspective of the intended readership, the imagery in this text is supposed to inform and be informed by Genesis 2–3. The reference to the snake and its eating dust constitute an obvious, textually inscribed signpost connecting this memory of a future Eden/Jerusalem with that of the past Eden (cf. Gen 3:14). Needless to say, this text is supposed to inform and be informed by Isa 11:6–9.

41. Cf. van Leeuwen, “Cosmos, Temple, House,” esp. pp. 399–404.

beings, both Israelites and non-Israelites, could and at times were imagined as partners with YHWH in building/creating Jerusalem, even if at different levels (e.g., Isaiah 60; 62:6–7; 65:18–24; Haggai; 2 Chr 36:23). There is an element of *imago dei* or correspondence in actions and feelings; note, for instance, the explicit, textually inscribed tendency to construe an intertwining of YHWH's joy and human joy in, for instance, Isa 65:18–19.

Remembering Monarchic Jerusalem: A Few Observations

As a site of memory, Jerusalem embodied and communicated the memories already mentioned above but also memories of a late monarchic city that was emblematic of chaos and the dissolution of divine knowledge and order. It was remembered as a city in which divine instruction and true prophets were rejected, which was justifiably punished and burned down. As mentioned above, memories of catastrophe associated with the fall of monarchic Judah played a very prominent role in the memory-scape of the community, for obvious reasons. One of the most basic and central Yehudite metanarratives moves from sin to punishment involving destruction, exile, and alienation and on to a future Utopia in which YHWH and Israel would be permanently aligned with each other. Remembering Jerusalem was remembering both its past and future, turning Jerusalem into the most memorable site of memory embodying the main narrative of Israel's past and future.

The basic metanarrative appears in multiple forms; it lies at the very core of the prophetic books collection. For instance, the history of Israel is encapsulated in the marital story of Hosea/YHWH and his wife/Israel in Hosea. The woman is Israel. YHWH chose her when she was young (exodus-wilderness) and the couple enjoyed a brief time of faithfulness. She is also a woman who, by nature, cannot but fornicate (that is, sin) and is then punished, but YHWH will bring her back. This time, however, he will provide her with divine attributes that will remove her 'fornicating nature' (אשת זנונים) and allow for a future, stable relationship between them.⁴²

Significantly, the metanarrative was constantly reinforced in Yehud by multiple physical sites of memory in ways that the story of YHWH/Hosea with his wife could not. After all, people lived in a city and general physical environs that reminded them constantly of a former glory and a past calamity. But there was another important difference between the two. In the basic metanarrative encapsulated in Hosea's story, YHWH found his wife when she/Israel went up from Egypt, in the wilderness (Hos 2:16–17). Jerusalem could not evoke that memory, because within the facts about the past that were agreed on within the community, the city becomes Israelite and a site for memory that stands for Israel (in the main) only after David's conquest.

42. See my "Remembering Hosea: The Prophet Hosea as a Site of Memory in Persian Period Yehud," forthcoming in a collective essays volume in honour of a colleague.

Thinking of Jerusalem helps to balance a common narrative of the story of Israel. A new foundational event, the building of the temple, and a new central hero, David (and to some extent Solomon), are added to the very foundational events of Exodus and Sinai and their foundational hero, Moses, even if in a secondary position. An entire historiographical work, Chronicles, in part was aimed at achieving this balance. As a site of memory encapsulating the story of Israel, Jerusalem performs a similar work. It draws attention to the foundational roles of the choice of Jerusalem and of David.

A section of the city and, by extension, at times all of Jerusalem was construed and remembered as *עיר דוד* ‘the City of David’.⁴³ The city was remembered as belonging to both David and YHWH and as a site of memory, shaped an *ad hoc* conceptual area shared by both.⁴⁴ Another *ad hoc* conceptual area emerges: YHWH chooses David and YHWH chooses Jerusalem. The chosen city is directly related to the chosen king, and both choices were construed as intertwined (see explicitly 1 Kgs 8:16 // 2 Chr 6:5) in the past and often across time and into the utopian era (see, for instance, Isa 11 as informed by Isa 65:17–25). Both relate to Israel, who is also chosen by YHWH.

To remember Jerusalem as David’s city was not only to remember a future, utopian city or even a past utopian city (David’s Jerusalem) but also to remember the capital of a monarchic polity. It is to remember the fall of that polity and it is to remember that no Davidide is king of Judah in the present. It is both to be reminded of continuity and discontinuity between the kingdom of

43. E.g., 2 Sam 5:7–9, 6:12; 1 Kgs 8:1; Isa 22:9. On the readership’s understanding that Jerusalem is the City of David in 2 Sam 5:7–9 and its potential narratological implications, see, for instance, Jan P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel: A Full Interpretation Based on Stylistic and Structural Analyses* (Studia semitica neerlandica 27; Assen: van Gorcum, 1981–93) 162–63. Note also “the Chronicler changed the burial place of King Amaziah of Judah and wrote that he had been buried ‘in the city of Judah (בעיר יהודה)’ (2 Chron. 25:28), while his *Vorlage* relates that Amaziah had been buried ‘in the city of David (בעיר דוד)’ (2 Kgs 14:20)” (Issac Kalimi, “Jerusalem—The Divine City: The Representation of Jerusalem in Chronicles Compared with Earlier and Later Jewish Compositions,” in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* [ed. M. Patrick Graham, Steven L. McKenzie, and Gary N. Knoppers; JSOTSup 371; London: T. & T. Clark, 2003] 189–205 [p. 191]). For a revised version of this essay as part of a comprehensive elaboration of Kalimi’s views about the representation of Jerusalem in Chronicles, see idem, *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing* (Assen: van Gorcum, 2005) 85–157. For a different position regarding *עיר דוד* in Chronicles, see Peter Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* (WMANT 42; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973) 61–63, 197.

44. Cf. Diana V. Edelman, “David in Israelite Social Memory,” in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* (ed. Diana V. Edelman and E. Ben Zvi; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 141–57, esp. pp. 148–51.

Judah and the province of Yehud, but of a clear continuity between temple and temple. Significantly, Solomon, the actual builder of the temple, was not construed as a military hero. He fought no wars, just like the leadership of Yehud did not; instead, he was a wise man.⁴⁵

To remember Davidic/Solomonic Jerusalem was to evoke and construe a story about a glorious, Jerusalem-centered, unified Israel under these kings. This story served also to bring together the cultic world of the first foundational past, centered on the Ark, tabernacle, and covenant, with that of the second foundational past when the temple was established and both to the future glorious temple from which light, water, and divine wisdom flow and to whom all flow, while at the same time (ideologically and imaginatively) connecting all of them to the community's, present, Persian-period ('Davidic/Solomonic') temple at the core of their Jerusalem.

But by doing so, the concept and memory of Jerusalem informed and controlled the meaning of the foundational narratives of Exodus and Wilderness that were shared with Samaria in such a way that turned them into unshared and unsharable collections, due to their (exclusivist) Jerusalem-centered perspective (see, for instance, 1 Kgs 8:16 // 2 Chr 6:5). Remembering their Jerusalem together, the literati contributed to their own sense of identity, social cohesion,⁴⁶ claims of unique legitimacy, and set ideological and social boundaries

45. This is consistent with a tendency to deemphasize warrior/military features in main heroes within the discourse and the social memory of late Persian/early Hellenistic Judah/Yehud. This tendency impacted on the (main) ways Moses and Abraham were characterized, and in Chronicles, although David remains a military hero, the emphasis is elsewhere. See also the David of Psalms. Even Joshua is imagined as meditating day and night on ספר התורה 'the book of (YHWH's) instruction' (Josh 1:8). This tendency, with its correlated constructions of "masculinity," is consistent and reflects the mindscape of the literati of a society without any significant military power of its own. Although "traditional" constructions of warrior-like heroes still existed in the period, it is only during the Hasmonean period that this tendency ceases to be dominant. These matters require a separate discussion. I have addressed these issues in relation to remembering Abraham and Moses in the late Persian/early Hellenistic period in my "The Memory of Abraham in Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Yehud/Judah" and "Exploring the Memory of Moses 'The Prophet' in Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Period Yehud/Judah," in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination* (ed. Diana V. Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 3–37. A prior version of the former essay has been published in *The Reception and Remembrance of Abraham* (ed. Pernille Carstens and Niels Peter Lemche; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2011) 13–60. For Moses, see Thomas Römer, "Moses outside the Torah and the Construction of a Diaspora Identity," *JHS* 8/15 (2008). On-line: http://www.jhsonline.org/Articles/article_92.pdf.

46. I discussed the role of "preaching to the choir"-type activities for enhancing social cohesion among the literati in Jerusalem in my "On Social Memory and Identity Formation."

around the remembering community. It was a crucial action in their mnemonic struggles with Samaria, where, by the late Persian period, most worshippers of YHWH in “the land” lived.

The very logic of this process strongly emphasizes Jerusalem’s place as the capital of Israel, not of Judah alone. It is a capital that should be inhabited by all pious Israelites (cf. 1 Chr 9:3; 2 Chr 11:13–16). By doing so, it creates a Yehud that stands for and even is Israel while it reinforces a Jerusalem-centered understanding of what Israel (not Yehud) is and should be.

Balancing Images: A Few Observations

Additional aspects of the Jerusalem of mind and memory can be explored,⁴⁷ but for present purposes, those advanced above suffice. However, an important feature of this Jerusalem cannot be omitted: the ubiquitous presence of balancing images. For example, the unique sacredness of Jerusalem and its role in the divine, cosmic economy shaped a systemic preference to construe the place as designated by YHWH well before David, so that 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).⁴⁸

Jerusalem is David’s city, but the defining and crucial house in the city, the temple, was built not by him but by the wise Solomon. Chronicles, in turn, balances the memory by emphasizing that David actually provided all that was needed for the temple and set its rules. Many texts bring together the future David and future Jerusalem and associate them with the future, utopian kingdom of YHWH (for example, Isaiah 11). These texts shape memories of a future kingdom that belongs to both David and YHWH, with Jerusalem as its capital. Some texts shape memories of a past Davidic kingdom that was YHWH’s kingdom, without clearly stating anything about the future (see 1 Chr 28:5; 2 Chr 13:8), while many other texts remind readers of a utopian, future Jerusalem and a utopian kingdom of YHWH in which no Davidide appears (for example, Obadiah, Zephaniah, Hosea 14).

Jerusalem is Israel and embodies Israel, but it is also remembered as a non-Israelite city, a late conquest. It is a “Canaanite” city where readers of the authoritative repertoire of the period encounter pious people, including a non-Israelite named Melchizedek who was a priest of אֱלֹהֵי עֵלְיִזֶק ‘the High God’ (Gen 14:20), which in turn is then balanced by Ps 110:4, which partially Is-

47. For example, the Yehudite, construed memory of remembering Jerusalem then and there when Israel was in Exile; see Ps 137:1–6.

48. This claimed association is at the core of another “front” in the mnemonic struggles between Yehud and Samaria (or their discourses), since Samaritan texts consistently associated Mt. Moriah with Mt. Gerizim. On the struggle over the memory of Mt. Moriah and of Abram, see Isaac Kalimi, *Early Jewish Exegesis and Theological Controversy: Studies in Scriptures in the Shadow of Internal and External Controversies* (Assen: van Gorcum, 2002).

raelitizes the foreign king.⁴⁹ This type of example can be multiplied; another involves Jerusalem in the land of Benjamin but also in Judah; see Josh 15:8, 63; 18:15, and Jerusalem's status as conquered and not conquered in Judg 1:8, 21. Those mentioned above suffice to demonstrate that an element of fuzziness played a part in the construction of Jerusalem as a site of memory, just as in any other site of memory in Yehud.⁵⁰

Final Consideration

The preceding observations demonstrate that the city of Jerusalem was a site of memory that did not necessarily foreground images of busy markets, workers, human houses, or an implied urban characterization of labor. Instead, this site of memory communicated a sense of utopian and eternal cosmic sanctity. As such, Jerusalem had to exist eternally but also had a reality outside historical time, just like its foundational streams of waters.⁵¹ This Jerusalem, which populated and generated texts and evoked memories of past and future events, served as a beacon making sense of the past. It provided hope for the future, facilitating a Jerusalem-centered version of traditional ancient Near Eastern motifs consistent with the discourse of the community. At the same time, it turned a potential cognitive dissonance into an argument sustaining the main tenets of the then-present community while simultaneously contributing to the formation of in-group boundaries that separated the community from other communities of YHWH-worshippers in the vicinity of Yehud as well as the role and centrality of the temple within Yehud.

49. See also Judg 19:11–12. In this text the Jebusites are implicitly construed as better than (some) Israelites.

50. I expanded on this point in my essay “On Social Memory and Identity Formation.”

51. Compare Martti Nissinen, “City as Lofty as Heaven: Arbela and Other Cities in Neo-Assyrian Prophecy,” in *Every City Shall Be Forsaken: Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East* (ed. Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak; JSOTSup 330; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 172–209.