Strategies for Survival or Recipes for Oppression? A Critical Discussion of the Work of Daniel Smith-Christopher[1]

ESIAS E. MEYER
DEPARTMENT OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT
UNIVERSITY OF STELLENBOSCH

ABSTRACT

This article is a critical engagement with the work of Daniel Smith-Christopher who has attempted to describe the social impact of the exile on the group of people who were taken to Babylon. Suffering changed their identity and their understanding of who they were. In order to survive, they had to develop strategies to cope with their new reality. The exiles understood themselves as a group 'purified' by the experience of exile. In their own eyes they were the 'true' Israel. Smith-Christopher has consistently argued that what they did when they returned to the province of Yehud should be understood in this light. His work is contrasted with that of other scholars who were more interested in the plight of those who remained in the land which leads to questions such as the following: Is it responsible to only present the side of the deported elite as Smith-Christopher is doing? And: When do strategies developed for the sake of survival change into recipes for oppression?

A   INTRODUCTION

Mark Brett (1996:4-5) begins an essay entitled 'Interpreting Ethnicity' by referring to the plight of Australian Aborigines and their struggle to retain their identity. This struggle to retain social identity, or what could be called 'ethnicity', brings them into conflict with what he calls the 'homogenizing presumptions of Western liberalism.' Brett (1996:5) argues that biblical critics have 'an ethical responsibility to address this web of questions'. Later, using the work of Daniel Boyarin (1994), Brett (1996:17) argues that ethnocentrism only seems to be undesirable 'when it is combined with homogenizing political power.' Struggles to hold onto cultural identity 'might be perceived as "racism" in the hands of the dominating group while it is "resistance" in the hands of a subaltern collective'.[2]

---

[1]   Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Old Testament Society of South Africa (OTSSA), Pretoria, 22-24 August 2007.

[2]   Brett (1996:17) is quoting from Boyarin (1994:242).

To put it differently, one could say that a strategy developed for the sake of cultural survival could be *bad* when the group in question is dominant and *good* when the group in question is being dominated by some other group. Although Brett (1996:20) thinks that it is 'ethically important to take asymmetries of power into account', he still argues that 'dominated communities are not entirely free of ethical constraints.' Unfortunately that is more or less where his essay ends and it is not clear what these 'ethical constraints' might be.

This article will attempt to address this issue by focusing on scholarly debates with regard to the deportation of the Judean elite and their subsequent (and partial) return to the province of Yehud. Daniel Smith-Christopher has provided us with an excellent description of the survival strategies developed by the deported elite. Smith-Christopher (2002) has recently produced a 'biblical theology of exile.' The greater part of this article is a critical engagement with this work and the following two issues will be addressed. *Firstly*, in his description of the struggle of the refugees for survival, there is no room for the 'ethical constraints' that Brett wishes to impose. There is, *secondly,* no acknowledgement that what one group perceives as a survival strategy could very well be experienced as oppression by another group.

A further question that could be asked is whether it is responsible to write a theology of the exile without any attempt to represent the view of those in the land who were never deported.

B   SIDING WITH THE LANDLESS

Smith's[3] (1989) initial work, *The Religion of the Landless*, attempted to develop a sociological model to describe what happens when communities experience exile. A major question in his work was: how do such communities survive the suffering? In his 1989 work he identified four strategies of survival, namely to adapt structurally (Smith 1989:93-126), to develop new leadership (Smith 1989:127-138), to acquire ritual behaviour (Smith 1989:139-151) and to develop hero stories (Smith 1989:153-178). His first major work was therefore an attempt to describe what a survivor group has to go through in order to survive being cut off from the things that gave them identity.

Much more recently Smith-Christopher (2002) has produced 'A Biblical Theology of the Exile'. He (2002:25) sums up his objective in his book as follows:

> … the readings of biblical texts offered in the chapters that follow
> will presume the viability of a community in exile, and the ability to
> engage in resistance, even outside of nationalist aspirations or impe-

---

[3]   Daniel Smith married in 1992, after which his surname changed to Smith-Christopher. See footnote in Smith-Christopher (1994:243).

rial connivance. I then propose that such readings may inform a radical Christian theological resistance to our own history of imperial connivances and the theologies that have so long excused and supported them.

His book is thus an effort to learn from the community in exile's resistance in order to develop a present-day theology of resistance and nonconformity. One should also note that he regards Christian history as a history of 'imperial connivance'. In the second chapter, entitled 'Violence and exegesis: the history of the exile', Smith-Christopher (2002:54) states:

> In writing about the exile, I chose to write from the perspective of an empathy, if not open sympathy, with the attempts of refugee Hebrews to rebuild a social life from the pieces left by the Chaldean militias of the sixth century…

Smith-Christopher is thus openly sympathetic towards the exiles because of their struggle for survival, which he clearly admires. This inclination explains why, in a previous essay, he had adamantly criticised any effort to 'depreciate the crucial significance of the exile' (Smith-Christopher 1997:8, n. 3). To depreciate the significance of the exile would mean to deny the struggle of the exiles for survival and to deny their suffering. He concluded that previous essay by stating that the post-exilic community 'reveals the typical behavior patterns of a minority community that has closed ranks tightly to maintain identity and faith' (Smith-Christopher 1997:35). Smith-Christopher thus insists that we should only judge this community in the light of the reality of their struggle.

One of the specific issues that Smith-Christopher has engaged with often[4] enough is the so-called mixed-marriage crisis in Ezra 9-10. He begins his discussion of this topic in his theology with the following complaint (2002:146):

> One must say, however, that the Priestly influence in the postexilic community has rarely been read with either theological or sociological sympathy, most notably in the case of 'reading' Ezra.

He (2002:146) thinks that the interests of some modern scholars play too big a role in their reading of this text. Smith-Christopher (2002:146) is not impressed by scholars such as Hugh Williamson,[5] David Clines[6] and Lester Grabbe,[7] who

---

[4]   See especially Smith-Christopher (1994:243-265), where he specifically engages with the mixed-marriage crisis. See also Smith-Christopher (1996:122-127).

[5]   Smith-Christopher (2002:146 and 1994:243) specifically refers to the following remark by Williamson (1985:159):

> The treatment described in these two chapters of how Ezra tackled the problem of mixed marriages is among the least attractive parts of Ezra-Nehemiah, if not the whole Old Testament.

openly express their disgust with this incident. Contrary to their opinions, Smith-Christopher (2002:146) thinks that Ezra's policies should be understood within two wider circles to make sense of them 'sociologically and theologically', and then he adds in brackets, 'even if one still has moral objections.' The *first* circle is the fact that Ezra is a representative of the Priestly traditions, which include Leviticus and Ezekiel. *Secondly*, he once again refers to 'the context of minority and refugee behaviors in circumstances of subordination.' He thus insists that scholars should at least attempt to understand Ezra's world view before they judge his behaviour.

Smith-Christopher (2002:151-157 and 1994:246-253) then offers a sociological overview[8] of mixed marriages in many modern societies and eventually he (2002:157) concludes that this kind of separation is 'consistent with a group under stress.' For Smith-Christopher (2002:157) 'Ezra's action was an attempt at inward consolidation of a threatened community.'

Another important aspect of Smith-Christopher's argument is the fact that he is convinced that Ezra 9-10 is not really about marriages to real foreigners, but was probably a disagreement amongst Jews (2002:152):

> It is clear that Ezra conceived of the approved group as consisting only of former exiles (9:4). But even if this was a rigid definition for the writers of Ezra, the possibility remains that these 'mixed marriages' were considered 'mixed' only by Ezra and his supporters and not in the first case by the married persons themselves.

In further support of his argument, he (2002:158) adds that the groups referred to in Ezra 9:1 are old terms for ethnic groups who had disappeared from the

---

6   See Smith-Christopher (2002:146 and 1994:243), where he complains about Clines (1984:116), who is 'appalled by the personal misery brought into so many families by the compulsory divorce of foreign wives [and] outraged at Ezra's insistence on racial purity, so uncongenial to modern liberal thoughts.'

7   Grabbe (1998:50-65) described the post-exilic community as 'xenophobic'. See Smith-Christopher (2002:146). Yet later Smith-Christopher (2002:157) uses the term *himself* when he states that 'terms such as "the holy seed" clearly indicate a group xenophobia'.

8   One such theory (Smith-Christopher 2002:153-154) is 'hypergamy theory', which understands intermarriage as an exchange of human commodities. This usually means that success-minded men of a lower status will attempt to 'marry-up' by marrying females from a higher status group. Applied to Ezra, this rather questions the understanding of many scholars that the returned exiles were much better-off compared to surrounding people. Another sociological theory, according to Smith-Christopher (2002:154-155), is called 'group boundary maintenance', where immigrant groups will initially intermarry, until the immigration group is established as a viable community. Then pressure increases on the group to return to endogamous marriage.

scene a long time before Ezra.[9] Similar arguments have been put forward by some other scholars, such as Eskenazi and Judd (1994:266-285)[10] and Washington (1994:217-242).[11]

Smith-Christopher thus wants modern scholars to judge Ezra less harshly, since he reacted in a manner consistent with people who have experienced this kind of suffering. Thus we should not prejudge Ezra's attempts to keep his community pure by laying ethical constraints on him on the basis of values from our world. In the last chapter of his theology Smith-Christopher (2002:198) argues that we should honour Ezra's strategy of nonconformity and that the church could learn from it. Smith-Christopher (2002:198-199) then acknowledges that he shares 'the general disgust with this episode' in Ezra, but still thinks that we should consider other perspectives. Then, as Brett previously did, he also mentions the struggles of minority groups such as Native Americans to retain their identities in a world where homogenization seems to be the trend. For Smith-Christopher Ezra's attempt to keep his community 'pure' is thus (in Brett's terms) a case of *resistance* and not *racism* and what Ezra was doing is typical of a vulnerable survivor group struggling to survive within a homogenizing reality.

Smith-Christopher thus builds his theology on the experience of those who were deported and the strategies that they developed during their struggle for survival. This led to the crisis in Ezra 9-10 in which Jews had to divorce people who probably regarded themselves as Jews as well; the only difference was that the latter group did not experience the deportation.

It should be clear by now that Smith-Christopher consistently sides with the deported elite even after their return to the Yehud. Yet is it responsible to

---

[9]   Smith-Christopher (2002:158) also argues that the presence of texts which portray a more lenient attitude toward people of foreign origin supports his understanding of this as an inter-Jewish issue. These texts include: Jonah, Ruth and Isaiah 60:1-5. I am not sure how these texts support his argument.

[10]   Eskenazi & Judd (1994:266-285) offer further arguments from modern Israel on how more conservative groups would not regard other groups as Jews, although the latter regard themselves as such. They conclude their essay as follows (1994:285):

> Given this interpretation, the women of Ezra 9-10 could have been Judahites or Israelites who had not been in exile and who, in the eyes of the early returnees, were appropriate marriage partners. … What we add to earlier interpretations is an illustration of how it can happen that well-intentioned, loyal Jews marry persons who, in the course of time, lose their legitimacy in the Jewish community.

[11]   Washington (1994:238) also points out that there 'had been no Canaanites, Hittites, Perizzites or Jebusites in Judah for centuries…' Washington (1994:238) argues that this list is a combination of peoples from texts such as Exodus 34:11-16, Deuteronomy 7:1-4 and 23:2-9.

ignore those who did not experience deportation when you write a theology of the exile? In Smith-Christopher's work no attempt is made to understand the identity of those who remained in the land and the question is: who will speak on their behalf?

C   SEEING THOSE DEEMED INVISIBLE

The late Robert Carroll started a debate in 1992 with an article entitled 'the myth of the empty land' (1992:79-93). In this article he presented his view that texts such as Leviticus and Chronicles[12] which present the land left behind by the exiles as empty as a fabrication of the deported elite. It was in their interest to present the land as empty and the people as invisible in order to enhance their claim of ownership to that same land. If one were to say that Smith-Christopher's sympathies lie with the elite who actually experienced the deportation, then one could say that Carroll's sympathies lie with those left behind. Carroll was more interested in the silenced voices or, in other words, those deemed invisible by the elite in Babylon.[13]

Other scholars have argued similarly. Barstad (1996) wrote a book with the same title as Carroll's article. Barstad (1996:47-55) added some archaeological arguments to the debate, arguments which have been criticised from some quarters.[14] Yet 10 years after Carroll's original article Joseph Blenkinsopp (2002:173) states that '"the myth of the empty land" has a long pedigree'. Blenkinsopp (2002:177) himself agrees mostly with Carroll and sums up his understanding as follows:

> The myth of the empty land is therefore the creation of the Judaeo-Babylonian immigrant community which achieved social, economic and religious dominance in Judah during the first century of Iranian rule.

Some German scholars such as Thomas Willi (1995) and Rainer Albertz (2001) have presented similar arguments. Both Willi (1995:22-26) and Albertz (2001:68-80) are critical of the land being presented as a *tabula rasa*, although

---

[12]   Carroll (1992:79-82) specifically refers to 2 Chronicles 36:17-21 and Leviticus 26:27-39. Both these texts present the land as desolate, enjoying a time of rest or Sabbath. He contrasts these texts with others such as 2 Kings 24:14, 25:12 and Jeremiah 39:10, 52:15, which depict the land as emptied of *significant* [his italics] people, but not totally empty.

[13]   See my discussion of Carroll (Meyer 2005: 25-34).

[14]   For severe criticism, see Oded (2003:55-74), who rejects arguments that the presentation of the land as empty originated from the Judeo-Babylonian elite in the early Achaemenid period. Or see Fried (2003:21-54), who argues that the land was not empty of its people, but rather of its god. See also Smith-Christopher's (2002:46-47) response to this debate, which will be discussed below.

their analyses of texts such as 2 Chronicles 36[15] differ. Both Willi (1995:25) and Albertz (2001:84) argue that life in some rural areas probably went back to normal not so long after the deportation.

When one asks the question as to exactly how many people were left in the land, one (obviously) gets fairly diverse answers. Two examples should do. Albertz (2001:74) claims that scholars agree that those deported to Babylon were not the *only* representatives of Israel, which also included those who remained in the land and those who went to Egypt. *Yet scholars differ over the proportional size and significance of these different groups.* Albertz (2001:80) himself argues that the population of Judah at about 600 BCE was about 80 000. Of these, more or less 20 000 were deported and the same number probably died or fled. Thus remaining in the land we have about half of the original population.[16] An Israeli scholar, Lipschits (2005:270), also estimates that about 40 000 people were left in the land in the Babylonian Period, although he gives the population before the destruction as 110 000, which means that just above a third were left in the land.[17] It thus seems that most scholars would agree that people remained in the land, although they differ on the relative size of this group compared to the original population (which was what Albertz argued).

---

[15]   For Willi (1995:22-23) the description of destruction in 2 Chronicles 36:14-23 is specifically aimed at Jerusalem and not the whole of Judah. For him this text does not present the *whole* of Judah as a *tabula rasa*, but only Jerusalem. Albertz (2001:20-21) understands 2 Chronicles 36 similarly to Carroll and Barstad as presenting the *whole* of Judah as empty and enjoying its Sabbaths. Albertz (2001:73) also agrees with what the title of Barstad's book implies, but later Albertz (2001:75, n. 124) mentions that Barstad underestimates 'die Tiefe des Einschnittes, den das Exil bedeutete...'

[16]   Although Albertz (2001:80) presents a ratio of two to one with regard to those left in the land and those deported, he argues that both groups had 'das gleiche Gewicht'. It is not clear what he means by this. Is it weight in terms of importance? Or power? Or was the impact of the two groups on the production of the Hebrew Bible equal? It could not possibly be the latter, for why do we have so few texts which represent the views of the 40 000 who were left in the land?

[17]   Lipschits (2005:352-359) has no doubt that some texts in the Bible deliberately presented the land as empty. Where Carroll, Barstad and Blenkinsopp focused on texts from Leviticus 26 and 2 Chronicles 36, Lipschits identifies a presentation of the land as empty in 2 Kings 25. The initial account in what he calls Dtr[2] consists of 2 Kings 25: 1-11 and 13-21. If read in this way, the land is presented as fairly empty. 2 Kings 25: 22-26 was later added in Babylon, but based on a source from Judah. In this text there is an acknowledgement that some life did continue in the land. Verse 12 was added only after the return to the land and it represents the perspective of those who returned from exile. It should be understood as an attempt to downplay the significance of those who remained.

Many scholars would argue that most of those who remained lived in the area of Benjamin and the northern Judean hills.[18]

To return to Smith-Christopher (2002:45), in the second chapter of his book, where he reassesses the social and historical impact of exile, he engages with this issue under the subtitle 'The myth of the empty land: doubts about exile.' For Smith-Christopher this whole debate should be regarded as an attempt to depreciate the significance of the exile and to cast doubt on the historical reality of the deportations.[19]

This seems to be the point where Smith-Christopher's sympathies for the deported elite lead him to misread fellow scholars. Is the debate about the 'myth of the empty land' as it has been conducted by specifically Carroll, Barstad and Blenkinsopp really an attempt to question the historical reality of the deportation, or if you will, the 'exile'? It is simply not true, since none of them dispute the *fact* of the deportation. None of them would question the immense impact of the deportation on the group which experienced it. The important thing to understand is that their interest lies more with those who remained behind and their work is an attempt to acknowledge the presence of those in the land presented by many texts as invisible. It is an attempt to present their side of the story, whereas Smith-Christopher tends to campaign for the elite who were deported and who partially returned.

---

[18]   See, for instance, Lipschits (2005:270) who concludes his chapter on 'The Significance of the Material Culture' as follows:

> The Babylonians concentrated their effort on Jerusalem and its environs, while the region of Benjamin and the northern Judean hills were hardly touched and continued almost unchanged in terms of settlement patterns and demography.

Lipschits (2005:271) then continues that most of the exiles were probably residents of Jerusalem and that the Babylonians did destroy the Shephelah, but that there is no evidence 'of deportation from either the Benjamin region or the northern Judean hills.' See also Barstad (2003:6), who also argues that 'the northern part of Judah and Benjamin were not affected'. Oded (2003:66-67), who is very critical of Barstad's view, agrees with this assessment of Benjamin, but he is adamant that 'the situation in Benjamin (or Transjordan) *could not be analogous* in any way to the situation in Judah proper' [his italics].

[19]   Smith-Christopher (2002:46) agrees with Barstad's initial point that one could seriously question the presentation of the land as empty as 'an accurate picture of Palestine after 586.' Yet he is very critical of the rest of Barstad's work, especially his archaeological arguments. Barstad (1996:20) argues that the fact that Lamentations is of such high poetic quality *and* produced in Palestine indicates that many significant people were left behind. Yet Smith-Christopher (2002:46-47) asks 'how can we laud the quality of the poetry and ignore the subject of that poetry?' See also the archaeological data that Smith-Christopher (2002: 47-49) refers to in order to refute Barstad's arguments.

If Smith-Christopher is correct that the inappropriate marriage partners in Ezra 9-10 were Jews who did not experience deportation, but remained in the land, it is not far-fetched to argue that they were the same people whom other biblical texts (e.g. Lev 26) regard as invisible. In all these texts we find the same world view or ideology that the true Israelites were those who were deported and returned. Those who remained in the land are either regarded as invisible, or deemed inappropriate to marry. Davies (1998:135) describes it as follows:

> A population visible to the modern historian is either invisible or transparent in the literature of the immigrants.

I argue that scholars have an ethical responsibility to at least attempt to present their case and to see those deemed invisible. Furthermore, scholars such as Carroll, Barstad and Blenkinsopp have not allowed texts produced by the immigrant community to dictate to them how they should view the people left behind. At some stage Smith-Christopher (2002:103) does acknowledge this when he refers to an essay by Carroll (1998):

> I believe, however, that Carroll can be misread in this context. As I read Carroll's work, he is not arguing against the historical realities of 587/586, but rather protesting that the literary and theological assessment of the significance of those events ought not to be dictated by one particular theological tradition – certainly not only those of the central temple elite from Jerusalem.

Yet is that not exactly what Smith-Christopher himself is doing, that is, he is allowing a 'particular theological tradition' to dictate to him? This is inadvertently what happens when Smith-Christopher continues to be sympathetic to the deported elite.[20]

Yes, it is clear as Smith-Christopher argues that these texts were produced by a group who had suffered and who survived, but it is not enough to acknowledge that. We need to go further and ask whether the strategies that they developed in order to survive could not later be used to oppress others.

D   CONCLUSION: IS IT ONLY ABOUT SURVIVAL?

In all fairness to Smith-Christopher (2002:200), with regard to the incident in Ezra 9-10, he concludes his book in a far more critical and a less sympathetic fashion:

---

[20]   It is particularly bothersome that the Book of Lamentations is discussed in Chapter 3 under the following heading: 'Listening to cries from Babylon: On the Exegesis of Suffering in Ezekiel and Lamentations.' Why is the Book of Lamentations dealt with under this heading? It is not a cry from Babylon, but from Judea. Smith-Christopher himself clearly states this when he discusses the book, but it still does not belong under this heading.

> In short, Ezra fails where the biblical canon itself does not, because the witness of Ezra is supplemented by Deutero-Isaiah and Jonah. Ezra teaches us to remain committed to unique identities, with all the appropriate discipline that this requires.

In his theology of exile, Smith-Christopher (2002:125-135) deals with the more universal views in Jonah and Second-Isaiah and he uses these as a canonical corrective to the more xenophobic views of Ezra. Still, what is lacking in the work of Smith-Christopher is the acknowledgement that what he describes as a survival strategy of a group of people whose identity is under threat could often enough be experienced as oppression by other groups. A more contemporary (and disturbing) example from South Africa's past might help:

Hermann Giliomee (2003:447-486) entitles his chapter in which apartheid was developed as a political policy 'The making of a radical survival plan.' He puts it as follows (Giliomee 2003:470):

> Afrikaner nationalists argued that their survival as a volk was inseparable from maintaining racial exclusivity, and that apartheid was the only policy that systematically pursued that end. But apartheid with its racist outcomes was not a goal in itself; political survival was.

To present apartheid as a survival strategy might help us to understand how this ideology developed. It helps us to understand the mentality or world view of the people who produced this system of thought, but it does not offer much comfort to the millions who suffered under that very same 'survival strategy' and it does not acknowledge their suffering and their resultant struggles for survival. So too an understanding of the incident in Ezra 9-10 as being the result of a quest for survival strategies developed during the deportation does not comfort those who were regarded as inappropriate to marry, or those regarded as invisible by Leviticus 26.

I strongly agree with Brett that biblical critics have an ethical responsibility to address this web of questions and to ask whether there are ethical constraints that we should apply to the strategies people develop to survive. Yet I am not sure what these constraints are. It is obvious that power plays a role. The struggle of a dominated group to retain its identity is usually regarded as 'resistance', while the same struggle might be perceived and experienced as racism when that group has the power to dominate. This would mean that what the elite did in Babylon was good, it was resistance. They were surviving. Yet what they did to the people of the land when they returned – and as many scholars argue they had the blessing of the empire and thus were dominant – was undesirable or xenophobic.

The work of Smith-Christopher is excellent at describing the positive outcomes of a struggle for survival and the creative energy that it unleashes, but there is very little engagement with the long term draw-backs of struggling to survive. Could one not say a group's struggle for survival often enough makes them blind to other groups' struggles for survival? Or could one say that what is a survival strategy for one, could later become a recipe for oppression for another?

This leads to other questions: When do victims change into culprits? When they acquire power and have the opportunity to force their newly developed survival strategies unto others? Perhaps. Is that what happened in the case of the elite who returned to Yehud? Probably.

It is furthermore ironic that, although Smith-Christopher (2002:25) is critical of 'our own history of imperial connivances', his own reading of what some scholars would call 'immigrant literature' and his insistence to be sympathetic to this group of immigrants could also be regarded as conniving with an ancient empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Albertz, R. 2001. *Die Exilzeit. 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Berlin: Kohlhammer. (Biblische Enzyklopädie 7.)

Barstad, H. M. 1996. *The Myth of the Empty Land: A Study in the History and Archaeology of Judah During the 'Exilic' Period.* Oslo: Scandinavian University Press. (Symbolae Osloenses 28.)

_____ 2003. After the 'Myth of the Empty Land': Major Challenges in the Study of Neo-Babylonian Judah, in: Lipschits, O. & Blenkinsopp, J. (eds) *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period,* 3-20. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Blenkinsopp, J. 2002. The Bible, Archaeology and Politics; or The Empty Land Revisited. *JSOT* 27 (2), 169-187.

Boyarin, D. 1994. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Brett, M. G. (ed.) 1996. *Ethnicity and the Bible.* Leiden: Brill. (Biblical Interpretation Series 19.)

_____ 1996. Interpreting Ethnicity: Method, Hermeneutics, Ethics, in: Brett, M. G. (ed.), *Ethnicity and the Bible,* 3-22. Leiden: Brill. (Biblical Interpretation Series 19.)

Carroll, R. P. 1992. The myth of the empty land. *Semeia* 59, 79-93.

_____ 1998. Exile! What Exile! Deportation and the discourses of Diaspora, in: Grabbe, L. L. (ed.), *Leading Captivity Captive. 'The Exile' as History and Ideology,* 62-73. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 278.)

Clines, D. J. A. 1984. Ezra and Nehemiah. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. (NCBC.)

Davies, P. R. 1998. Exile? What Exile? Whose Exile? in: Grabbe, L. L. (ed.) *Leading Captivity Captive. 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*, 128-138. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 278.)

Eskenazi, T. C. & Judd, E. P. 1994. Marriage to a Stranger in Ezra 9-10, in: Eskenazi, T. C. & Richards, K. H. (eds), *Second Temple Studies 2. Temple and Community in the Persian Period*, 266-287. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 175.)

Eskenazi, T. C. & Richards, K. H. (eds) 1994. *Second Temple Studies 2. Temple and Community in the Persian Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 175.)

Fried, L. S. 2003. The Land Lay Desolate: Conquest and Restoration in the Ancient Near East, in: Lipschits, O. & Blenkinsopp, J. (eds) *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, 21-54. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Giliomee, H. 2003. *The Afrikaners. Biography of a people*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Grabbe, L. L. (ed.) 1998. *Leading Captivity Captive. 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 278.)

_____ 1998. Triumph of the Pious or Failure of the Xenophobes? The Ezra-Nehemiah Reforms and Their Nachgeschichte, in: Jones, S. & Pearce, S. (eds), *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Greco-Roman Period*, 50-65. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSPS 31.)

Jones, S. & Pearce, S. (eds) 1998. *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Greco-Roman Period*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSPS 31.)

Keshgegian, F. A. 2000. *Redeeming memories. A theology of healing and transformation.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Lipschits, O. & Blenkinsopp, J. (eds) 2003. *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Lipschits, O. 2005. *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem. Judah under Babylonian Rule*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Meyer, E. E. 2005. *The Jubilee in Leviticus 25: A Theological Ethical Interpretation from a South African Perspective.* Münster: LIT Verlag. (Exegese in unserer Zeit 15.)

Oded, B. 2003. Where is the 'Myth of the Empty Land' to be Found? History versus Myth, in: Lipschits, O. & Blenkinsopp, J. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*, 55-74. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Scott, J. M. (ed.) 1997. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, & Christian Conception*. Leiden: Brill. (JSJS 56.)

Smith, D. L. 1989. *The Religion of the Landless. The Social Context of the Babylonian Exile*. Bloomington: Meyer-Stone.

Smith-Christopher, D. L. 1994. The Mixed Marriage Crisis in Ezra 9-10 and Nehemiah 13: A Study of the Sociology of Post-Exilic Judaean Community, in: Eskanazi, T. C. & Richards, K. H. (eds), *Second Temple Studies 2. Temple and Community in the Persian Period*, 243-265. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 175.)

_____ 1996. Between Ezra and Isaiah: Exclusion, Transformation and Inclusion of the 'Foreigner' in Post-exilic Biblical Theology, in: Brett, M. G. (ed.) *Ethnicity and the Bible*, 117-142. Leiden: Brill. (Biblical Interpretation Series 19.)

_____ 1997. Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587-539 BCE), in Scott, J. M. (ed.), *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, & Christian Conception*, 7-36. Leiden: Brill. (JSJS 56.)

_____ 2002. *A biblical theology of exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. (Overtures to Biblical Theology.)

Washington, H. D. 1994. The Strange Woman of Proverbs 1-9 and the Post-Exilic Judean Society, in: Eskenazi, T. C. & Richards, K. H. (eds.), *Second Temple Studies 2. Temple and Community in the Persian Period*, 217-242. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. (JSOTS 175.)

Willi, T. 1995. *Juda – Jehud – Israel. Studien zum Selbstverständnis des Judentums in persischer Zeit.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. (FAT 12.)

Williamson, H. G. M. 1985. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Waco: Word. (WBC 16.)

Esias E. Meyer, Department Old and New Testament, University of Stellenbosch. E-mail: eem@sun.ac.za