



EGYPTIAN GOLA IN PROPHETIC AND PENTATEUCHAL TRADITIONS: A SOCIO-HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Jaeyoung Jeon
University of Lausanne

ABSTRACT

The diverse descriptions in the Hebrew Bible of Judahites/Israelites in Egypt reflect the dynamics of the geo-political relations between Yehud and Egypt, mainly during the Persian period. The different descriptions of the Judahite inhabitants in Egypt in Jeremiah 24:8, 42:7–22, and 44 and in Exodus 5 may indicate the changes of the attitude towards the Egyptian diaspora during the Persian period. A similar phenomenon is found in the priestly literature between Ezekiel 20 and Exodus 6. The changes in the pentateuchal texts may reflect the geo-political situation of the period from the revolt of Inaros (460 BCE) to the end of the reign of Darius II (404 BCE). A later redactional layer in the Pentateuch that is marked by a strong anti-Egyptian sentiment may have been a scribal response to pro-Egyptian positions in both Yehud and Egyptian diaspora during the 28th to 30th Egyptian Dynasties (404–343 BCE). The positive oracle towards Egypt and Egyptian diaspora in Isaiah 19:18–25 may reflect the period of Ptolemaic hegemony in Palestine around 300–200 BCE.

INTRODUCTION

From the Patriarchs in the Old Testament to the Holy Family in the New Testament, the inhabitants of Israel, driven by famine, political oppression, or war, repeatedly sought asylum in Egypt. Large-scale immigrations to Egypt began with the invasions of Israel by eastern empires, such as Assyria and Babylonia, yet the Judahite population in Egypt continued to grow throughout the Persian and Hellenistic periods. By the first century CE, the number of Jews in Egypt was estimated at around 300,000, about 20 percent of the Greek-speaking population of Egypt at the time.¹

Unfortunately, not much is known about the immigration and settlement process of the Judahite population in Egypt during the Babylonian and Persian periods. The Egyptian Diaspora has only been sporadically documented in the Bible; extra-biblical sources, such as the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, provide only few clues as to the

inclusion of this community in Judahite affairs during the mid-Persian period. Consequently, the study of the influence of the Egyptian Diaspora on the formation of biblical traditions has been relatively neglected, leaving scholarly interests to focus mainly on the contribution of the Babylonian Diaspora. Against this backdrop, this essay will survey the possible influence of the Egyptian Diaspora on the biblical authors and redactors in the changing religio-political context in Egypt and Palestine. For this purpose, some texts from the Later Prophets and the Pentateuch have been selected and grouped together for analyses of the dynamics of the changing view of the Egyptian Diaspora in those texts. Firstly, (1) the dynamics within the Deuteronomistic texts presented in the oracles in Jeremiah against the Judahite refugees in Egypt and the narrative of Moses' first confrontation with Pharaoh in Exodus 5 will be analyzed. This part will endeavor to prove that the negative attitude towards

the Egyptian diaspora in the earlier text (Jeremiah) has been changed in the later text (Exodus 5), in spite of the literary influence from the former to the latter. The part will be followed by (2) the analysis of similar dynamics in the priestly scribal tradition, especially focused on Ezekiel 20 and Exodus 6. In addition, (3) a later redactional layer in the Pentateuch that harshly criticizes pro-Egyptian claims will be discussed. Since the layer can be dated later than both Exodus 5 and 6, the layer may reflect a later, changed view on the Egyptian diaspora. Another shift in the positive direction, (4) the prophecy of the salvation of Egypt and the Egyptian Diaspora in Isaiah 19, will also be investigated with a focus on its dating. Such a positive attitude toward Egypt and Egyptian diaspora is rarely found in Hebrew Bible, which may reflect a new stage in the political relationship with Egypt. In the last part, (5) the dynamics of the changing attitude towards the Egyptian diaspora in those texts will be interpreted within the changing geo-political relationships among Egypt, Persia, and Yehud in the Persian and early Hellenistic periods.

JEREMIAH AND DEUTERONOMISTIC SCRIBAL INFLUENCE JEREMIAH

As a rule, the Book of Jeremiah does not describe Egypt as a favorable asylum, and Judah's political dependency on Egypt is often criticized (e.g., Jer 2:36).² Such a negative perspective of Egypt is extended to the Judahite refugees in Egypt, as is reflected in three later redactional passages in Jer 24.8, 42.7–22, and 44. The negative attitude towards the refugees in Jer 24:8 is found within the parable of the good and bad figs (Jer 24:1–10). In this parable, the good and bad figs refer to the exiles in Babylon and the remnant in Judah, respectively. The bad fig, that is Zedekiah, his officials, and the rest of the remnant, will be punished by disgrace (קללה), sword (חרב), famine (רעב), and pestilence (דבר), which will bring about their total destruction from the land given to them by YHWH (vv. 9–10). The punishment of the remnant is extended to those who fled to Egypt through Jer 24:8bβ: “and those who live in the land of Egypt” (והישיבים בארץ מצרים). The inclusion of the inhabitants of Egypt, however, appears to be unexpected, for it deviates from its literary context as an oracle confined to Babylonia and Judah. Critics, therefore, usually assign this brief phrase to a later Deuteronomistic or post-Deuteronomistic addition based on Jeremiah 42.³

In Jeremiah 42 (esp. vv. 7–22), an oracle directs

against the flight to Egypt in a close literary connection with Jeremiah 24. The oracle is given to Azariah, Jonathan, and the people with them in answer to their inquiry after the murder of Gedaliah. In the oracle, which is often attributed to a Deuteronomistic redactor,⁴ YHWH commands them to stay in the Land and not to flee to Egypt. YHWH warns that otherwise, His wrath will follow them, and they will perish by the sword (חרב), famine (רעב), and pestilence (דבר; vv. 16–17, 22). The oracle explicitly states, with a similar wording to that of Jer 24:9, that the fate of the refugees in Egypt will be the same as that of the former inhabitants of Jerusalem (v. 18).⁵ The three types of punishments, the sword (war), famine, and pestilence (42.16–17, 22) are identical to those found in Jer 24:10. The only new element is that they will not be able to return to the Land (42:18bβ), which corresponds well with the situation of a diaspora.

In Jeremiah 44, another ominous oracle is given to the diaspora communities in Migdol, Tahpanhes, Memphis, and Pathros, announcing the same warning that was given in Jeremiah 42. The warning includes punishment by sword, famine, pestilence, and disgrace (vv. 12–13, 27; 42.16–17, 22; also 24:10); loss of the possibility to return to the Land of Judah (v. 14; 42:18); and becoming a curse (לקללה) and reproach (לחרפה) (v. 8; 42:18; also 24:9). The oracle goes further in vv. 3–8 by harshly condemning their continuous religious transgression with typical Deuteronomistic terms, such as “other gods” (אלהים אחרים vv. 3, 5, 8) followed by “you did not know” (אשר לא ידעום) (v. 3). This passage is followed by an argument between Jeremiah and the people (vv. 15–30) that reveals the people's religious practices in Egypt, including the worship of the Queen of Heaven (vv. 17–18). Although critics often doubt its historicity,⁶ this chapter may reflect the author's knowledge of the Egyptian Diaspora in his time, especially concerning their syncretic religious practices. The three passages in Jeremiah (Jer 24.8b, 42.7–22, and 44.), as seen above, share a negative view of the Egyptian Diaspora expressed in similar language, and can be assigned to the same, probably Deuteronomistic, (circle of) redactor(s).⁷

A POSSIBLE LITERARY INFLUENCE ON EXODUS 5

The Jeremiah passages discussed above seems to have influenced the pentateuchal Exodus tradition, particularly in Moses' first confrontation with Pharaoh in Exodus 5. Classical source criticism regarded this narrative as JE, originating from the

Monarchic period. However, in recent Pentateuchal scholarship, the classical sense of JE is generally dismissed and an exilic or post-exilic date of its composition is preferred. Also, Exodus 5 is now regarded as later than DtrH and JerD, produced, or at least influenced by Deuteronomistic scribal tradition.⁸ The recent studies therefore support the direction of influence from Jeremiah (JerD) to Exodus 5. Literary influence is found, for instance, in Exod 5:3:

Then they said, “The God of the Hebrews has revealed himself to us; let us go a three days’ journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to the LORD our God, or he will fall upon us with pestilence (בְּחֶרֶב) or sword (בְּחֶרֶב).”

Several observations point to the intrusive nature of this passage. In their petition to the Pharaoh, Moses and Aaron present YHWH’s impending threat of sword (חֶרֶב) and pestilence (דָּבָר) as the motivation behind the journey into the wilderness. Such a threat by YHWH is, however, unexpected within the literary context of the first half of the Book of Exodus, which is preoccupied with the themes of oppression and salvation. Exodus 1–2 focuses on the oppression of the people and the birth of the savior, while Exodus 3–4 proclaims the salvation of the people. No justification for YHWH’s violent threat can be found in these chapters.⁹

Moreover, the threat of punishment does not coincide with the role of the plagues-motif in the following chapters (Exod 7–12). Plagues are inflicted upon Egypt as punishment for disobeying the prophetic and authoritative command to Pharaoh “Let my people go” (שְׁלַח אֶת עַמִּי, Exod 7:14, 26; 8:16, etc.).¹⁰ The use of this formulaic expression in Exod 5:1b–2 results in a contradictory doublet with Exod 5:3 since the former generally depicts YHWH as the mighty savior of the people and not as the God who threatens the lives of his own people. Exod 5:1–2b has therefore been considered part of another source or redaction, whereas v. 3 has usually been considered an integral part of the narrative.¹¹ Elsewhere I have concluded that the former is a later addition that incorporates the first confrontation narrative (Exod 5:3–6:1) into the larger framework of the plague narrative.¹² The scope of the present paper does not allow for an in-depth discussion of the redaction-critical issues of the text, but it is noteworthy that the narrative of the first

confrontation (Exod 5:3–6:1) is widely recognized as originating from a different literary source or redactional phase than the preceding and preceding narratives.¹³

The possible origin of the narrative, especially the motif of YHWH’s punishment of the people by the sword (בְּחֶרֶב) and pestilence (בְּדָבָר) in Exod 5:3, can be traced to the literary influence of the Jeremiah texts discussed above. This kind of punishment is a prominent motif in Jeremiah appearing a total of fifteen times.¹⁴ W. Fuss therefore argues that Exod 5:3 was literarily influenced by Jeremiah through a Deuteronomistic redactor.¹⁵ Furthermore, both Exod 5:3 and the Jeremiah texts (Jer 24:8; 42:16–17; 44:12–13) mention the threat of the sword and pestilence to the Israelite/Judahite people in Egypt, which is unique to these passages in the entire Hebrew Bible. While the sword and pestilence are mentioned as a means of divine punishment in other biblical texts, such as Ezekiel and Chronicles,¹⁶ the punishment in those instances is imposed mostly upon the people of Judea or in particular Jerusalem, but not in Egypt. Therefore, the unprecedented idea in Exod 5:3 that YHWH may send the sword and pestilence upon his own people in Egypt was most likely influenced by the Jeremiah texts.

The literary effect of the Jeremiah texts is further manifested in the similarity of the plots in Exodus 5 and Jer 42–43. In the former, the Israelites cooperate with the Pharaoh (v. 10), while disobeying the divine plan for their salvation, and distrusting Moses’s prophetic role (Exod 5:21a). The Israelite officers (שָׂרִיפִים) appointed by the Egyptians even accuse Moses of endangering their lives (Exod 5:21–22). The narrative concludes with YHWH’s announcement of his plan to force Pharaoh to set them free, which, in this context, refers to the imminent plagues. Similarly, in Jeremiah 42–43, Azariah and Johanan, the representatives of the people, exhibit a pro-Egyptian position by leading their people to Egypt. They neither trust Jeremiah as a true prophet (Jer 43:2,) nor obey YHWH’s command not to flee to Egypt (Jer 43:4–7). They also accuse Jeremiah of endangering their lives (Jer 42:3). In the conclusion of the narrative, YHWH announces the coming destruction of Egypt by the Babylonians (Jer 43:7–13).

In spite of the literary similarities between the Exodus and Jeremiah texts, some significant differences of religious perspective exist between the two. Jeremiah 44 deals primarily with religious

practices, harshly criticizing the adulterous worship of the Queen of Heaven by the people in Egypt (vv. 7–10, 15–25). By contrast, Exodus 5 neither directly mentions nor harshly blames the Israelites for their religious transgressions, focusing only on the increased suffering of the Israelite people. W. Zimmerli, therefore, rightly notes that “nothing is said about religious disloyalty” in the description of the complaints of the Israelite representatives (Exod 5:21).¹⁷ If indeed Exodus 5 presupposes Jeremiah 44, as has been suggested above, the omission of the wrongful religious actions of the people in Egypt may not be coincidental. The absence of such criticism may reflect a positive change in the attitude towards the Egyptian Diaspora. Such a change would have taken place during the time that elapsed between the composition of the two narratives. The political context of such a change is discussed below.

To be sure, Exodus 5 deals with the old, pre-monarchic period in the literary context of the salvation story, which is quite different from Jeremiah. One may therefore argue that the religious transgression motif was omitted purely for a literary purpose. Nevertheless, ancient scribal writings cannot be totally detached from their socio-historical contexts; and the contexts should exercise further influence, when they speak of a highly political, national history of origin such as the Exodus. It is unlikely that the author of Exodus 5 never considered his contemporary Egyptian diaspora when he narrates a story about the Israelites in Egypt. The negative descriptions of the Judahites in Egypt in the Jeremiah texts must have undergone a process of critical review and screening by the author in relation to the contemporary Egyptian diaspora. The omission is, therefore, better understood as a result of the author’s intentional choice in his socio-historical context. This argument can be further supported by the fact that a similar phenomenon is found in a different scribal tradition, the priestly tradition.

EZEKIEL, THE EZEKIEL SCHOOL, AND THE PRIESTLY TEXTS IN THE PENTATEUCH

EZEKIEL AND THE EZEKIEL SCHOOL

Another literary connection between the description of the Egyptian Diaspora and the Exodus generation may be observed in Ezekiel and the Priestly Texts in the Pentateuch. Ezekiel describes Egypt as an unreliable ally of Judah, as well as the source of Judah’s religious disloyalty to the Lord throughout

the generations (especially Ezek 29–32).¹⁸ Notably, according to Ezek 20:7–8 and possibly also 23:27,¹⁹ the Exodus generation in Egypt had already disobeyed YHWH and defiled itself with the idols of Egypt (גלולי מצרים) and detestable things (שקוצי עיניו). Such religious transgressions continued throughout the periods of the wilderness, the conquest, and the monarchy until Ezekiel’s own time (vv. 9–31), thus perpetuating the blame on the Exodus generation.

This harsh criticism is directed at the elders of Israel in the Babylonian exile (vv. 1, 31) therefore its relation to the Judahite refugees in Egypt remains ambiguous. A clearer case for transference of the focus from the Exodus generation to the current diaspora occurs in Ezek 20:32–44, which is often considered as a later addition by the Ezekiel School.²⁰ The passage describes the “second Exodus” from the various nations where the people had been scattered, closely following the language and motifs of the previous verses.²¹ In doing so, the guilt of the Exodus generation, mentioned earlier in the chapter, is projected onto the current generation. In particular, v. 36 explicitly connects the Exodus generation with the current generation in the diaspora:

As I entered into judgment with your ancestors in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so I will enter into judgment with you, says the Lord God (Ezek 20:36).

The diaspora in the passage is not confined to the Babylonian Diaspora, but encompasses the diaspora of “all the nations where they are scattered” (v. 34). The Egyptian Diaspora was, therefore, intended to be included, although it is not explicitly mentioned.

The Ezekiel School’s attitude towards the scattered people in other nations is ambivalent. On the one hand, Ezek 20:32–33 (cf. v. 39a) continues to identify the religious transgressions of the people and announces their punishment in the wilderness (vv. 35–36, 38). On the other hand, vv. 39–44 present a positive outlook on the future. According to v. 40, all of the House of Israel (כל בית ישראל) will be restored following the second Exodus. Such ambiguity may represent a positive phase in the gradual change in attitudes towards the diaspora, including the Egyptian one.

THE PRIESTLY TEXTS

A dynamic change in the description of the Exodus generation is visible also in the Priestly account of

the Exodus in the Pentateuch, especially the P version of the commissioning of Moses in Exodus 6. As already recognized by critics, this text carries close literary affinities with Ezekiel 20. The two texts share similar language and motifs, such as YHWH revealing Himself in Egypt (Ezek 20:5; Exod 6:2), the announcement of salvation (Ezek 20:6; Exod 6:6), salvation with outstretched arms followed by judgment (Ezek 20:33, 36; Exod 6:6), and the acknowledgement of YHWH with the formulaic phrase “I am YHWH your God” (אני ה' אלהיכם, e.g., Ezek 20:5, 20, 42; Exod 6:7).²² While a detailed discussion of the different views on the direction of the literary influence between P and Ezekiel is not included here, it is more convincing that Exodus 6 presupposes Ezekiel 20 especially because the former changes YHWH’s oath to give the Land to the Exodus generation (Ezek 20:6, 42) to an oath with the Patriarchs (Exod 6:8).²³

Despite the literary similarities between the two texts, significant differences in the description of the Exodus generation in Egypt do occur. The Priestly Text describes the people’s disobedience to Moses, yet excuses this behavior as the result of discouragement and hard labor:

Moses told this to the Israelites; but they would not listen to Moses, because of their broken spirit and their cruel slavery (Exod 6:9).

The verse briefly reports the reaction of the people in a neutral tone without criticizing their disobedience, focusing rather on the hardships of slavery in Egypt. Furthermore, the religious transgressions of the generation, which are harshly criticized in Ezekiel (Ezek 20:7–8), are omitted from the present text. Considering the close affinities between the present text and Ezekiel 20, the omission in Exodus 6 does not seem to be coincidental and reflects a more positive attitude towards the Egyptian Diaspora.

Indeed, there is some evidence to show that the priestly scribal group during the Persian period was more inclusive of other Judahite communities. A papyrus from the Jewish community in Elephantine dated to the late 5th century BCE requests the support of the Jerusalem community, including its priesthood, in rebuilding its Yahwistic temple (TAD A4.7). Although the response from Jerusalem is not known, the Elephantine community’s expectation

for support at least indicates that the Egyptian Diaspora did not consider the Jerusalem priesthood to be hostile toward them. Other evidence comes from the sacred precinct of Mt. Gerizim where some of the local ostraca contained Aaronide names with the title of “priest” (כהן or כהנא), which may indicate a close relationship between the temples of Jerusalem and Gerizim.²⁴ The ostraca are dated to the early Hellenistic period, yet the relationship most likely had begun during the Persian period. During the Hellenistic period, according to Josephus, Onias IV, a Zadokite priest in Jerusalem, was exiled to Egypt and built a temple in Leontopolis (*The Jewish War* 1:33; 7:421–436; *Antiquities of the Jews* 12–13). These examples suggest that the priestly group in Jerusalem was inclusive of other communities outside Yehud. Furthermore, the Priestly Tabernacle, which is the mobile sanctuary of YHWH, was most likely an expression of their idea that God is omnipresent and not confined to a specific place or sanctuary. As J. Watts rightly points out, the priestly regulations in the Pentateuch legitimize ritual activities, not by a certain sanctified place, but by proper procedures and priests (Aaronide).²⁵ This idea is contradictory to the Deuteronomistic ideology of the single legitimate sanctuary and probably influenced the inclusive attitude of the priestly scribes. Such an inclusive approach may have also been the result of the political interests of the Achaemenid Empire. We will return to this point shortly.

CRITICISM OF “EGYPTIAN NOSTALGIA” IN POST-P REDACTION

In the Pentateuchal narratives of the Exodus and the Wilderness, one finds a consistent theme of disgruntlement. The Israelites complain about the shortage of food and water, threat of war, Moses’ leadership, and the hardships of the wilderness. The dissatisfaction is often unified thematically with the motif of the people’s longing for Egypt and their desire to return there. This desire is harshly criticized as treason and provokes divine anger and retribution. However, many of these passages have been regarded as late additions to the existing texts. Most recently, a thorough study by T. Römer concluded that the passages containing “Egypt nostalgia” or the “return to Egypt” motif, such as Exod 13:7, 14:11 (16:3), 17:3, Numbers 11:18–20, 14:2–4, 16:12–13, 20:4–5, and 21.5, belong to a post-priestly

and post-Deuteronomistic layer of redaction.²⁶

As such, these passages may be understood as another phase in the change of attitude toward Egypt and the Egyptian Diaspora. In contrast to the earlier P and Deuteronomistic texts, such as Exodus 5 and 6, which are marked by a more inclusive attitude toward the Jews in Egypt, the passages of Egypt nostalgia harshly criticize the pro-Egyptian claims of the people. From a religio-political perspective, the redaction of the passages was possibly the literary response of pro-Persian scribes to pro-Egyptian claims made by the people of the time. F. V. Greifenhagen similarly examined the pro-Egyptian claims in the complaints of the people in Exodus and Numbers and suggested that the claims' "very articulation indicates the possibility of the existence of such a perspective."²⁷ The new political reality that provided the context for the debates between the pro-Egyptian and pro-Persian sides arose from Egypt's newly gained independence from the Persian Empire during the late Persian period (4th century BCE). This point will be discussed below in detail.

ISAIAH 19

Another major change in the attitude toward the Egyptian Diaspora is visible in Isaiah 19:18-25. The oracle refers favorably to five cities of Canaanites and YHWH worshippers, one of which, according to LXX, is even referred to as a city of righteousness (v. 18).²⁸ The Yahwistic altar (מזבחה) and pillar (מצבה) in the land of Egypt (v. 19) are recognized affirmatively. The passage further declares the ultimate salvation of the people there (v. 20) and goes on to acknowledge that all of Egypt will become YHWH's people (vv. 21-25). This unique and positive attitude toward Egypt and the Egyptian Diaspora is thought to have developed through multiple stages of redaction. Critics date the redactional activities to the period ranging from the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses (525 BCE) to the Hellenistic period and often claim that the passage is one of the youngest ones in the Book of Isaiah.²⁹ The passage is particularly significant in that, as critics believe, the five cities mentioned in v. 18 may be the cities of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt, one of which is Heliopolis, and the altar mentioned in v. 19 is possibly the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis.³⁰ Notably, their religious practices, signified by the altar (מזבחה) and pillar (מצבה; v. 19), are legitimized as a sign of YHWH's presence in Egypt (v. 20, cf. Joshua

22:26-28). The positive recognition of Egypt and the diaspora represents a remarkable change from the late layers of Jeremiah that harshly chastise the religious practices of the diaspora (e.g., Jeremiah 42 and 44) and also deviates significantly from the criticism of the pro-Egyptian claims in the late redaction layers of the Pentateuch.

From a religio-political perspective, the positive description of the Egyptian Diaspora in this passage may reflect amicable ties between Yehud and the Egyptian Diaspora communities, implying that pro-Egyptian attitudes no longer caused a political problem. The period that most satisfies these conditions is the Hellenistic period, especially the period of Ptolemaic hegemony in Palestine around 300-200 BCE.³¹ Under the Ptolemaic rule, Judeans enjoyed relatively peaceful relations with Ptolemaic Egypt, even experiencing economic growth caused by this relation.³² During this period, a massive immigration of Judeans into Egypt began, including not only those who were forced to immigrate but also those who were seeking economic opportunities. Accordingly, the population of the Egyptian Diaspora increased dramatically.³³ In contrast to the late Persian period, when the independent Egyptian dynasties represented a threat to the pro-Persian local authorities of Yehud, Ptolemaic Egypt was no longer a hostile political entity for the latter. The shift in the relationship between Egypt and Palestine may have generated a new level of positive interconnection between the local people and the diaspora communities in Egypt. Therefore, the sharp difference between the anti-Egyptian sentiment of the late Pentateuch redactors and the positive view of Egypt found in the current passage can be explained by the rapid geopolitical change during the Hellenistic period.

THE GEOPOLITICAL DYNAMICS IN EGYPT AND YEHUD DURING THE PERSIAN PERIOD

Recent biblical scholarship dates an increasing number of biblical texts to the Persian period, a trend in the study of the Pentateuch in particular. The Persian period is, however, a long timeframe, spanning over two hundred years, during which the geopolitical landscape of Yehud and Egypt continued to change. Therefore, a more precise dating of sources within the "Persian period" should be attempted, especially with respect to Egyptian chronology. It is here suggested that the major geopolitical changes in Egypt can be used as a

criteria for establishing a chronological framework for the biblical texts discussed so far.

The first phase can be defined as the period between the Persian conquest of Egypt by Cambyses (525 BCE) and the successful revolt of Inaros (460 BCE). This period is marked by the relatively stable rule of the Persian Empire over Egypt. Local revolts, such as the one in 486 BCE, had been successfully subdued without any significant threats to the empire. In Yehud, the restoration of the temple in Jerusalem progressed during this relatively stable political period. Unfortunately however, not much is known about the Egyptian Diaspora and its relationship with the community in Yehud. An Aramaic letter from Elephantine (TAD A4.7) reports that the temple of *Yahô* did exist throughout this period and until its destruction by Egyptian troops in the late 5th century BCE (around 410 BCE). According to this letter, Cambyses did not damage the temple during his campaign, although he destroyed all the other temples dedicated to Egyptian deities. There are debates concerning the historicity of this claim, especially concerning the date of the first building of the temple.³⁴ It is, however, notable that in the memory of the Judahite community in Elephantine, the community endured the political transition from the 26th Egyptian dynasty to Persian rule and persisted until the late 5th century. It might be methodologically inappropriate to generalize the case of Elephantine; however, this case may, at least, be one example of the Egyptian Diaspora communities that enjoyed the political stability provided by the Persian Empire. If this was the case, there is no impending reason, from a political perspective, for the biblical authors' change in attitude toward the diaspora in Egypt. If the earlier layer of Ezekiel 20 during the Babylonian period is considered, the continued development in the later layers of Ezekiel 20 and Jeremiah 24; 42; 44, including the negative attitude toward the Egyptian Diaspora, may roughly be dated to this phase of the Persian period.³⁵

The second phase can be defined as the period from the revolt of Inaros (460 BCE) to the end of the reign of Darius II (404 BCE). With the help of Greek support, Inaros and Amyrtaeus defeated the Egyptian satrap of the empire. A large-scale military expedition was carried out in retaliation by the empire, resulting in the defeat and capture of Inaros (456 BCE); however, Amyrtaeus continued to lead the rebels in the Delta until 449 BCE.³⁶ The recurring

rebellions, aided by Greek support, diminished the empires' control of its western border. Consequently, the empire endeavored to strengthen its command on the western frontier, including Yehud. Nehemiah's rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem (445–432 BCE) and the mission of Ezra (either 458 BCE or 398 BCE) can be understood within this context.³⁷

During this time, it is believed that many Judahites of the Egyptian Diaspora served as mercenaries.³⁸ Cultivating strong ties between the pro-Persian local authorities of Yehud and the Judahite mercenaries in Egypt may have been a deliberate strategy of the Persian Empire. The papyri from Elephantine show that the Persian authorities of Yehud and Samaria intervened in the religious issues of the diaspora community in Egypt, in matters such as setting the precise date for the Passover festival (Passover Papyrus, cf. Exod 12:18), rebuilding the temple of *Yahô* (TAD A4.7; A4.8), and the prohibition on animal sacrifice (TAD A4.9; A4.10). Greifenhagen interprets Persian interventions in matters of sacrifice as an effort to "assert the authority and centrality of the Jerusalem temple by downgrading the importance of the Elephantine temple."³⁹ The imperial support for Jerusalem may represent the empire's strategy to maintain tight control of the Judahite mercenaries in politically unstable Egypt through the superior religious authority of the pro-Persian Jerusalem temple.

The formation of the Pentateuchal narratives, especially the narrative of the Exodus, can be understood in a similar sense. The Exodus narrative is marked by a distinct anti-Egyptian sentiment that thematically separates the Israelites from Egypt.⁴⁰ This theme persists from the earlier pre-P Deuteronomistic layers to the post-Priestly redactions. This fact indicates that the literary formation of the current form of the text began or was accelerated during this period. It is not the intention of this article to address the much-discussed issue of the Persian authorization of the Torah.⁴¹ However, it can be, at least, said that the anti-Egyptian sentiments in the narrative coincide with imperial interests and are well explained by the geopolitical situation in Egypt and Yehud.

It has been argued above that the non-Priestly (Exodus 5) and Priestly passages (Exodus 6) reflect a more inclusive attitude toward the Egyptian Diaspora than can be found in earlier prophetic texts. This attitude indicates that the biblical authors

composed those texts in consideration of the Egyptian Diaspora in order to include them with the pro-Persian Yehud.⁴²

The third phase includes the early and mid-4th century, stretching from the successful revolt by Amyrtaeus II (404 BCE), which led to the independence of Egypt from Persia, until the fall of the empire to Alexander the Great (330 BCE). During this period, Egypt regained its independence through the 28th to 30th Dynasties (404–343 BCE), despite the short reestablishment of Persian rule by Darius III at the end of that period (343–330 BCE). The repeated Persian attempts to re-conquer Egypt failed, and the empire lost its control over Egypt. In contrast, Egypt grew stronger and expanded its influence to Palestine.⁴³ The Persian Empire reorganized the southern frontier of the Fifth Satrapy around 400 BCE by a series of military constructions in southern Palestine. Fantalkin and Tal interpret the constructions as “an imperial response to a new geopolitical reality in which Egypt was no longer a part of the Achaemenid Empire.”⁴⁴

The local authority of Yehud seems to have remained by and large faithful to Persia until the defeat of Darius III by Alexander the Great;⁴⁵ however, the same may not have been true of the diaspora communities in Egypt. They were no longer under Persian rule, but under the rule of the reestablished Egyptian dynasties. In this context, it is unlikely that the diaspora communities remained loyal to the Persian Empire; it is more reasonable to assume that the diaspora communities became pro-Egyptian or, at least, were subjected to Egyptian dynasties. During this time, the Egyptian dynasties grew more stable and stronger, enabling themselves to extend their military activities to the coast of Palestine. Regaining Egyptian rule probably stimulated the growth of the pro-Egyptian position in Yehud and provoked internal friction between the mainstream pro-Persian position and newly rising pro-Egyptian sentiment. This was probably the geopolitical context of the “Egypt nostalgia” passages in the late redactional passages in the Pentateuch. The pro-Egyptian position may have represented a significant threat to the pro-Persian/anti-Egyptian local authorities of Yehud. The harsh polemic against pro-Egyptian claims by the redactors of those passages may, therefore, represent pro-Persian scribal reactions against growing pro-Egyptian sentiment. Through this polemic, the redactors have probably endeavored to maintain the

religious and political authority of the Yehud leadership in both the communities in Yehud and Egypt. The polemics of pro-Egyptian claims also corresponded to the interests of the Persian Empire during this period.⁴⁶

CONCLUSIONS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

I have endeavored in this essay to trace the changes in attitude toward the diaspora communities in Egypt found in the prophetic and Pentateuchal texts and suggest that the changes were probably driven by the dynamics of the geopolitical state in Egypt and Yehud. During the Babylonian and early Persian periods, negative views of the Egyptian Diaspora were formulated (Jeremiah 42; 44; Ezekiel 20). In the second phase of the Persian period, relatively inclusive attitudes toward the Egyptian Diaspora were taken by the Pentateuchal authors probably in accordance with imperial interests. Considering that such a change of attitude is similarly found in two different scribal traditions (P and Dtr), the change was more likely originated from a common, socio-historical changes rather than purely literary considerations. Nevertheless, during the following period of Egyptian independence, defined as the third phase of the Persian rule, the pro-Egyptian sentiments that were likely found among the diaspora communities in Egypt and in Yehud were harshly polemicized by post-P/post-Dtr redactors of the Pentateuch. The redaction can also be understood in terms of the Persian interest in tightening control over its western border. Again, the oracle in Isa 19:18–25 exhibits a positive attitude toward both Egypt and the diaspora communities there, which possibly reflects a shift in the geopolitical reality from Persian rule to Ptolemaic hegemony in Palestine as well as the new relationship between Jerusalem and Egypt.

The biblical texts discussed so far may represent only a few of the diverse positions in the periods in question. The Hebrew Bible, especially the Pentateuch, is a complicated fabric of texts representing various traditions and conflicting ideas, generated by scribes with diverse religio-political backgrounds. For instance, the Joseph novella (Genesis 37–50) has also begun to be discussed as a post-Priestly narrative formulated in Egypt during the Persian period legitimizing life in the diaspora.⁴⁷ The discussion provides a possibility to find in the novella a contradicting voice to the post-P polemic of the pro-Egyptian positions. The two contradictory

positions may indicate that the Pentateuch contains scribal contributions from both pro-Egyptian and pro-Persian groups. Such a diversity of the religious-political positions and their interactions in the Hebrew Bible, and the Pentateuch in particular, should be investigated in further research.

NOTES

- ¹ F. V. Greifenhagen, *Egypt on the Pentateuch's Ideological Map: Constructing Biblical Israel's Identity*, JSOT Sup. 361 (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002): 252; J. Modrzejewski, *The Jews of Egypt: From Ramses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Philadelphia; Jerusalem: Jewish Publ. Society, 1995), 74.
- ² See, G. Galvin, *Egypt as a Place of Refuge* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 125f.
- ³ Thiel, for instance, puts this phrase an addition made after 587 in connection with Jeremiah 42–44. Holladay specifies that the current addition was made based on Jer 44:27. See, W. Thiel, *Die Deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremia 1–25* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl, 1973), 257, 261; W. L. Holladay, *Jeremiah: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. 1–25* (Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 659ff. Carroll regards the phrase as an integral part of the chapter, but he claims that the entire chapter (Jeremiah 24) is a late strand. See, R. P. Carroll, Robert P. *Jeremiah: A Commentary* (Old Testament Library. London: SCM Press, 1986), 486f.
- ⁴ See, for example, E. W. Nicholson, *Preaching to the Exiles: A Study of the Prose Tradition in the Book of Jeremiah* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970); W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremiah 1–25*, WMANT, 41 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973); W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jeremiah 26–45*, WMANT, 52 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981). R. Albertz assumes three successive phases of Dtr redaction during 550–520 BCE, while T. Römer dates it roughly to the first half of the Persian period (before 450 BCE). See R. Albertz, “Die Intentionen und Träger des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks,” in R. Albertz et al. (eds.), *Schöpfung und Befreiung. FS C. Westermann* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1989), 37–53. T. Römer, “The Formation of the Book of Jeremiah as a Supplement to the So-called Deuteronomistic History,” in D. Edelman, Diana and E. Ben Zvi (eds.), *The Production of Prophecy: Constructing Prophecy and Prophets in Yehud* (London: Equinox, 2009): 168–183. For later dating, see, e.g., K-F. Pohlmann, *Studien Zum Jeremiabuch: Ein Beitrag Zur Frage Nach Der Entstehung Des Jeremiabuches*, FRANT 118 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1978). See also, recently, C. J. Sharp, *Prophecy and Ideology in Jeremiah: Struggle for Authority in the Deutero-Jeremianic Prose*, Old Testament Studies (London and New York: T. & T. Clark, 2003); E. Otto, “Der Pentateuch im Jeremiabuch. Überlegungen zur Pentateuchrezeption im Jeremiabuch anhand neuerer Jeremia-Literatur,” *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 12 (2006): 245–306. For the brief survey of the discussions for the Dtr redaction in Jeremiah, see, Römer, “Formation,”: 168–171.
- ⁵ The literary similarity between Jer 24:9 and 42:18 is remarkable in not only the subject matter but also the words לקללה (curse) and לחרפה (reproach). Jer 42:18 uses the term מקום paradoxically, altering it to an indication of the Land of Judah from that of other lands they will be scattered (Jer 24:9).
- ⁶ See, e.g., Holladay, *Jeremiah* 2, 303.
- ⁷ For these chapters of Jeremiah, the old Greek texts are much shorter than MT, so that critics tend to give more authenticity to the former. Also for our concern, for instance, in many Old Greek texts the pestilence is absent in Jer 42:17, 22; 44:13 (MT verses number). However, the MT and the LXX are not significantly different in their perspectives on Egypt and Egyptian diaspora. See also, Galvin, *Egypt*, 119ff.
- ⁸ For a Deuteronomistic Composition, see, E. Blum, *Studien Zur Komposition Des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin ; New York: W. de Gruyter, 1990): 27–28, 39–40; J. Jeon, *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story: A Redactional-Critical Study in Exodus 3–4 and 5–13* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 211–216. For a Late Yahwist compilation influenced by DtrH, see J. Van Seters, *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* (Louisville Ky: Westminster/John Knox

- Press, 1994), 70–72. For a post-P redaction see J. C. Gertz, *Tradition Und Redaktion in Der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen Zur Endredaktion Des Pentateuch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 335–345.
- ⁹ Exod 3:18 similarly mentions three days of journey to the wilderness, yet this verse is a later addition based on Exod 5:3. For a detailed discussion, see Jeon, *Call of Moses*, 125–127.
- ¹⁰ It has long been recognized that the plagues, especially the non-Priestly part, are organized very systematically in a framework with formulaic expressions, forming a structural unity. One of the unifying factors is that every non-P Plague episode begins with YHWH's formulaic command to Moses to confront Pharaoh, either in a longer (7:15a; 8:16a; 9:13a) or a shorter (7:26a; 9:1a; 10:1a) form. The commands are followed by YHWH's command to set the people free and announcements of the plagues, which are also formulaic (7:26b; 8:16b; 9:1b, 13b; variations: 5:1; 7:16a; 10:3). For further discussion, see Jeon, *Call of Moses*, 215–217.
- ¹¹ Since Wellhausen (*Hexateuch*, 71f.), the separation between vv. 1b–2 and 3ff. has been broadly accepted in Pentateuchal scholarship. For a history of research and further discussion, see Jeon, *Call of Moses*, 208–211. Cf. Gertz, *Tradition*, 335–345.
- ¹² See Jeon, *Call of Moses*, 208–211.
- ¹³ Noth, for example, regards the narrative as the most ancient one, while Gertz puts it as a very late, post-Priestly addition.
- ¹⁴ See, e.g., Jer 14:12; 21:7, 9; 24:10; 27:8, 13; 29:17–18, 42:22; 44:13.
- ¹⁵ See W. Fuss, 103–104; also, he assigns חרב and דבר to a Deuteronomistic redactor. See, W. Fuss, p. 391.
- ¹⁶ See, e.g., Ezek. 5:12; 6:11; 7:15; 28:23; 33:27; 1Chr 21:12; 2Chr 20:9, etc. also in Amos 4:10.
- ¹⁷ W. Zimmerli, *Ezekiel: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 409. Van Seters argues that Exod 5 (esp. 5:3) has been influenced by Ezekiel 20, especially by the divine wrath on the Exodus generation in Ezek 20:8. Yet, Exodus 5 is distant from Ezekiel 20 in that the former does not mention the religious transgression of the people, which is the major cause of YHWH's wrath. See Van Seters, *Moses*, 74.
- ¹⁸ For a detailed discussion of those chapters, see, S. K. Minj, Sudhir Kumar, *Egypt: The Lower Kingdom: An Exegetical Study of the Oracle of Judgment against Egypt in Ezekiel 29,1–16* (Frankfurt ; Bern: P. Lang, 2006).
- ¹⁹ According to Ezek 23.27, Israel's adultery (זנות) began explicitly from the land of Egypt (מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם). The meaning of the adultery is nevertheless ambiguous whether it indicates a political alliance with Egypt or a religious transgression. In v. 30 both are criticized, but vv. 28–30 seems to be a late addition. See, e.g., Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, p. 490.
- ²⁰ For further discussion and references, see, Zimmerli, *Ezekiel*, pp. 413ff.
- ²¹ See, e.g., Corrine Paon, "'I Myself Gave Them Laws That Were Not Good': Ezekiel 20 and the Exodus Traditions," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 69 (1996): 73–90; D. I. Block, *The Book of Ezekiel 1–24* (Grand Rapids Mich. [etc.]: W.B. Eerdmans, 1997), 651; P. M. Joyce, *Ezekiel: A Commentary*, LHOTS 482 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009), 153; R. L. Kohn, *A New Heart and a New Soul: Ezekiel, the Exile and the Torah*, JSOTSup 358 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 2002), 107–110; C. A. Strine, *Sworn Enemies The Divine Oath, the Book of Ezekiel, and the Polemics of Exile*, BZAW 436 (Boston: de Gruyter, 2012), 190ff.
- ²² See, for further discussions, J. Lust, "Exodus 6,2–8 and Ezekiel," in M. Vervenne (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Exodus, Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation*, BETHL 126 (Leuven: Leuven University Press: Peeters, 1996): 209–224; B. Gosse, "Le livre d'Ezéchiel et Ex 6,2-8 dans le cadre du Pentateuque," *Biblische Notizen* 104 (2000): 20–25; B. Gosse, "Exode 6,8 comme réponse à Ezéchiel 33,24" *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 74 (1994): 241–247; Jeon, "A Source of P?: the Priestly Exodus Account of the Book of Ezekiel," *Semitica* 58 (2016): 77–92. Cf. Kohn, *A New Heart*, 98ff.
- ²³ For further discussions and the references for the different positions, see, Jeon, "A Source of P?" 82–84.

- ²⁴ The Levitical names such as Amram (עמרם), Eliezer (אלעזר), Pinchas (פנחס), and Levi (ליי) were found. For a further discussion, see, G. N. Knoppers, *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 128f. See also J. Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, HCOT (Leuven; Paris [etc.]: Peeters, 2013), 103ff.
- ²⁵ See, J. Watts, *Leviticus*, pp. 104ff.
- ²⁶ These passages exhibit thematic and linguistic similarities, as well as relative lateness within the literary stratigraphy of the Pentateuch. For instance, Exod 13:17 and 14:11–12 are thematically combined, and these passages share the motif of return to Egypt in fear of war with Num 14:2–4. The language and expressions found in the people’s complaints in Exod 17:3 and Num 20:4–5 are remarkably similar. Num 21:5 summarizes the various preceding complaints. Num 16:12–13 and the episode of Dathan and Abiram (Num 16:12–15, 25–34*) as a whole, traditionally assigned to JE, have been recently regarded as post-P and post-Dtr composition. See, T. Römer, “Egypt Nostalgia in Exodus 14–Numbers 21,” in C. Frevel (ed.), *Torah and the Book of Numbers*, FAT II 62 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 66–86. E. Aurelius, Aurelius, *Der Fürbitter Israels: Eine Studie Zum Mosebild Im Alten Testament*, CBOT 27 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1988), p. 147; Blum, *Pentateuch*, 123; U. Schorn, “Rubeniten als exemplarische Aufrührer in Num 16f*/Deut. 11,” in S. L. McKenzie and J. van Seters (eds.), *Rethinking the Foundations: Historiography in the Ancient World and in the Bible: Essays in Honour of John Van Seters*, BZAW 294 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 251–268, 261
- ²⁷ See Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, 204–205.
- ²⁸ The puzzling “city of the destruction (ההרס עיר)” in MT is rendered in most LXX text as the “city of Asedec (πόλις ἀσεδῆκ).” ἀσεδῆκ seems to be transliteration of Hebrew הצדק (the righteousness).
- ²⁹ For detailed discussions, see, H. Wildberger, *Jesaja 13–27*, BKAT 10, 2 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verl, 1978), 733ff.; O. Kaiser *Isaiah: 13–39: A Commentary* (Translated by R. A. Wilson. 2nd ed. OTL. London: SCM Press, 1980), 108ff.; J. Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 19 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 317ff.; W. A. M. Beuken, *Jesaja 13–27* (Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 192f. Cf. J. D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, WBC 24 (Waco: Word books, 1984), 256ff.
- ³⁰ See, e.g., B. S. Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 114; Kaiser, *Isaiah*, 108.
- ³¹ If we regard the altar in v. 19 as the temple of Onias (around 170 BCE), the verse may be understood as the last phase of the formation of the current oracle.
- ³² See R. A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007), 34ff.
- ³³ For example, 100,000 Jews were moved to Egypt by Ptolemy I for colonization of military settlements (*The Letter of Aristeas*, 12–14). See, Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, 252.
- ³⁴ For the early dating for the time of Manasseh (mid-7th century BCE), see B. Porten, Bezalel. *Archives from Elephantine: The Life of an Ancient Jewish Military Colony* (Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968), 119; for a later dating, after the fall of Judah, see, e.g., S. G. Rosenberg, Stephen, “The Jewish Temple at Elephantine,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 67.1 (2004): 4–13.
- ³⁵ For a similar dating of the Jeremiah texts, see Römer, “Formation,: 168–171.
- ³⁶ See J. M. Cook, *The Persian Empire* (London; Melbourne [etc.]: J.M. Dent, 1983), 127; J. D. Ray, “Egypt 525–404 B.C.” in J. Boardman, et al (eds.), *Cambridge Ancient History* Vol. IV. (1988), 276.
- ³⁷ See, e.g., L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1992), 131; Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, 229. For the late dating of Ezra, see, e.g., K. G. Hoglund, *Achaemenid Imperial Administration in Syria-Palestine and the Missions of Ezra and Nehemiah* (Dissertation Series / Society of Biblical Literature, no. 125. Atlanta Ga: Scholars Press, 1992): 40–44. Moreover, archaeological evidence such as a series of similar, square-shaped fortresses throughout the Levant in the mid-5th century may indicate such imperial efforts. See,

- Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, 229; K. G. Hoglund, *Achaemenid*, 213. For a criticism of this archaeological interpretation, see, A. Fantalkin and O. Tal, "The Canonization of the Pentateuch: When and Why?" *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 124 (2012): 1–18, 201–212.
- ³⁸ See, e.g., Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, 21ff.; Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, pp. 226ff.
- ³⁹ See, Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, pp. 238.
- ⁴⁰ For the separation between the Israelites and Egyptians in Exodus narrative, see Greifenhagen, 46–157.
- ⁴¹ For this issue, see the discussions in J. W. Watts (ed.), *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*, Symposium Series, no. 17 (Atlanta Ga: Scholars Press, 2001). See, also, K.-J. Lee, *The Authority and Authorization of Torah in the Persian Period* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011).
- ⁴² This is not to say that the Pentateuchal text, even in its earlier form, had already been circulated among the Jews in Egypt. Until the late 5th century BCE, the Judahites in Elephantine were religiously in a "pre-Torah" stage in which they had no knowledge or concern for the Pentateuchal laws. No biblical text was found there, while a part of *Words of Ahikhar* was found.
- ⁴³ The scarab of Pharaoh Nepherites I (399–393 BCE) found in Gezer and the destruction layers in the Shephelah and the Negev (around 380 BCE) may indicate Egyptian expansion to Palestine. See, Greifenhagen, *Ideological Map*, 232. See, also, Fantalkin and Tal, "Canonization," 9–17.
- ⁴⁴ See, Fantalkin and Tal, "Canonization," 5, for further reference see Fantalkin and Tal, "Canonization," p. 5 n12
- ⁴⁵ See, Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews* XI, 317–319. See also Fantalkin and Tal, "Canonization," 210.
- ⁴⁶ See, also, Fantalkin and Tal, "Canonization," 209.
- ⁴⁷ See, e.g., Römer, "The Joseph Story in the Book of Genesis," in K. Schmid and F. Giuntoli (eds.), *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch: New Perspectives on Its Redactional Development and Theological Profiles*, FAT 101 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 185–201, 201. See, also, F. Giuntoli, "Ephraim, Manasseh, and Post-Exilic Israel," in *The Post-Priestly Pentateuch*, 203–232.