SEMITICA

REVUE
PUBLIÉE PAR L'INSTITUT D'ÉTUDES SÉMITIQUES
DU COLLÈGE DE FRANCE

— 61 —

Édité par Michael Langlois
Sous la direction de Thomas Römer

Peeters
—
2019

Semitica est publié par l'Institut d'études sémitiques du Collège de France. Il paraît depuis 1948 sous la forme de cahiers, sans périodicité régulière ; mais on prévoit au moins un cahier par an. Chaque cahier forme un recueil de travaux originaux, publications de documents ou articles, et se vend séparément.

De même que l'Institut d'études sémitiques, *Semitica* s'étend à toutes les branches des études sémitiques : linguistique, philologie, histoire, archéologie, épigraphie, ainsi qu'à tous les domaines du monde sémitique, ancien et moderne, et aux domaines connexes.

Correspondance :

Semitica
Institut d'études sémitiques, Collège de France
52 rue du Cardinal-Lemoine, 75231 Paris cedex 05
contact@semitica.fr – www.semitica.fr

Pour la vente :

Peeters
Bondgenotenlaan 153
B-3000 Leuven
peeters@peeters-leuven.be – www.peeters-leuven.be

En couverture : bulle hébraïque de Tel ʿEton (voir p. 49).

ISSN 0373-630X
eISSN 2466-6815

Sommaire

Cultural Memory from Israel to Judah[1]

Matthieu Richelle
Faculté libre de théologie évangélique – UMR 7192

***Résumé**. Depuis que Jan Assmann a développé le concept de mémoire culturelle dans son ouvrage* Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*, il s'est révélé un outil pertinent pour affiner les études portant sur la mémoire collective dans les sociétés antiques d'Israël et de Juda. Cet article discute un cas particulier de transmission de mémoire culturelle : l'appropriation de traditions nord-israélites par des scribes judéens. Deux situations où nombre de chercheurs s'accordent pour dire qu'un tel transfert s'est produit sont étudiées : des oracles d'Osée, et les traditions sur l'Exode et les Patriarches. On indique aussi des cas analogues d'appropriation dans les cultures de Mésopotamie et de l'empire romain.*
***Keywords**: collective memory, cultural memory, Israel, Judah*

In his seminal study *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization*, Jan Assmann introduced the distinction between two forms of collective memory. *Communicative memory* "comprises memories related to the recent past. These are what the individual shares with his contemporaries." By contrast, *cultural memory* focuses on figures of memory, whether events or narratives, situated in a remote past; "what counts for cultural memory is not factual but remembered

[1] This article is a revised version of a paper read during the workshop "Collective Memory as Capital in Ancient Levant," organized by I. Koch and T. Römer on February 24th-26th, 2018 with the support of the "Fondation Hugo du Collège de France." I thank the participants for their feedback.

history. One might even say that cultural memory transforms factual into remembered history, thus turning it into myth."[2] Assmann himself analyzed the examples of Exodus and Deuteronomy,[3] and since then this interest in cultural memory has proved relevant for understanding other texts of the Hebrew Bible.[4] The present paper focuses on a peculiar and perhaps less studied aspect of collective memory in the Hebrew Bible: how the appropriation of Israelite traditions and memories in the Judean literary corpus reshaped Judah's (and Yehud's) collective memory. (In this article, for the sake of simplicity, I will use "Judah" as a shorthand for "Judah or Yehud.")

It is widely acknowledged that the Hebrew Bible is a Judean product that integrates a substantial number of Israelite traditions. The traditions that *at least some scholars* regard as coming from Israel include the pre-Priestly story of Jacob (Gen 26-36*), the oldest kernel of Hosea and Amos, some old version of the Exodus narrative, the Elijah and Elisha narratives (to be found in 1 Kgs 17-2 Kgs 13), an old version of Deuteronomy, the Joseph story (Gen 37-50*),[5]

[2] J. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2012 [orig. German version 2007], p. 34-41 (36 and 37-38 for the quotations). In this article, I am using as a definition of the term "myth" the following characterization: "myth is foundational history that is narrated in order to illuminate the present from the standpoint of its origins" (ibid., p. 38).

[3] Ibid., 179-81, 191-200. See also Römer, *La première histoire d'Israël : L'école deutéronomiste à l'œuvre*, Monde de la Bible 56, Genève, Labor et Fides, 2007, p. 134.

[4] For instance, R. Hendel has underlined the role played by foundational myths such as the Abraham story or the Exodus narrative for Israelite and Judean cultural memory (*Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible*, London/New York, Oxford University Press, 2005). Similarly, in a recent study, H. G. M. Williamson has pointed out instances of both communicative and of cultural memory in some prophetic books (« History and Memory in the Prophets », in *The Oxford Handbook of the Prophets*, ed. C. J. Sharp, New York, Oxford University Press, 2016, p. 133-48).

[5] The Joseph story is probably the most disputed item in this list; for a recent defense of the hypothesis of its Northern origins, see E. Blum, « The Joseph Story: Diaspora Novella or North-Israelite Narrative? », *ZAW* 129, 2017, p. 501-21.

royal annals, and some Psalms.[6] The demise of the Northern kingdom, and especially the fall of Samaria ca. 720, may have led to a number of Israelites fleeing into Judah, prior to, during, or after the arrival of the Assyrian army. Granted, the hypothesis of a massive influx of Northerners in the late 8th century Judah is debated,[7] but even the immigration of a very limited number of people bringing with them scrolls (and oral stories) would suffice to explain the importation of Israelite traditions. Alternatively, cultic sites like Bethel might have kept some scrolls that were brought into Judah at a later date. In addition, the role played by the religious authorities of Mount Gerizim in the formation of the Pentateuch has come to the fore in recent research and we may have to reckon with northern traditions preserved there.

I am interested here in the manner in which the Judean scribes took up such traditions and how this contributed to the recasting of their own cultural memory. After all, incorporating oracles addressed to another people in one's own corpus of literature is not a banal thing to do—especially in view of the fact that these oracles are essentially made up of criticism and threats. Even more striking is the possible integration of foundational myths, since they involve the very origins of a people and its identity.[8] How did Judean redactors manage to blend Northern traditions into their own texts? How did it lead them to reshape their view of their own past? Did it impact the way they envisioned their own future? In this paper, I shall explore two different kinds of Northern traditions and memories that, according to most scholars, were taken up by Judean redactors and embedded in their own literary corpus:

[6] For a detailed and very useful study of Israelite traditions taken up by Judean scribes, see D. Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel in Judah's Bible: History, Politics and the Reinscribing of Tradition*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[7] I. Finkelstein and N. A. Silberman, « Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology », *JSOT* 30, 2006, p. 259-285. Against this hypothesis, and for a gradual growth of Judah, read N. Naʾaman, « Dismissing the Myth of a Flood of Israelite Refugees in the Late Eighth Century B.C.E. », *ZAW* 126, 2014, p. 1-14.

[8] In passing, the phenomenon of cultural appropriation is not limited to texts but encompasses other cultural horizons, including architecture: for a telling illustration, see V. Herrmann, « Appropriation and Emulation in the Earliest Sculptures from Zincirli (Iron Age Samʾal) », *American Journal of Archaeology* 121, 2017, p. 237-74.

the prophetic oracles attributed to Hosea and Amos (with a special focus on Hosea), on the one hand, and two foundational myths of origins, namely the Exodus and the Jacob story, on the other.

Obviously, there is no scholarly consensus in sight as to the date of most of the biblical redactions involved, especially when it comes to the Pentateuch. So when I discuss a given memory or story, I will not necessarily attempt to determine the earliest possible date at which it became part of Judahite traditions. On the contrary, I will focus on a *terminus ad quem* that most scholars would accept, so that we may agree that from that date on, this tradition was liable to influence and reshape Judah's cultural memory.[9]

1. The appropriation of Israelite prophetic traditions into Judah's cultural memory

Let us begin by noting why some oracles coming from the Northern Kingdom did not fall into oblivion but were appropriated and updated by Judean traders.

1.1. The "judeanization" of Israelite prophetic texts

The "judeanization" of Northern oracles, in other words their updating in order to serve Judean interests, is apparent in the book of

[9] In addition, it would probably be naïve to believe that an entire country adopted one and the same cultural memory at the same time; strictly speaking, we should think of multiple traditions and memories favored by various groups and *milieus*. However, we lack the information to map such a variegated picture in the case of ancient Israel and Judah beyond basic distinctions like between Priestly and Deuteronomistic circles. While I will sometimes allude to this complexity, in the framework of this article, I will mainly limit my discussion to a broader description.

Hosea.[10] Most striking are mentions of Judah interspersed in the oracles. Not that any such mention must necessarily be late: a reasonable case can be made that some of them in chapter 5 date from the time of the Syro-Ephraimite war or shortly after.[11] Yet others are likely to be secondary. Some of them draw a lesson relevant for the Judeans from a message first addressed to Israelites. This is the case in Hos 4:15-17, where verses 15 and 16 have been either entirely added or rewritten to make a plea to Judeans not to imitate Israelites:

> *Though you play the whore, O Israel, do not let Judah become guilty. Do not enter into Gilgal, or go up to Beth-aven, and do not swear, "As the LORD lives."*
>
> Like a stubborn heifer, Israel is stubborn; can the LORD now feed them like a lamb in a broad pasture?
>
> *Ephraim is joined to idols -- let him alone.*[12]

Other additions introduce a contrast between Israel and Judah. Some of them underline a difference in their behavior. For instance, in 11:12, that is, at the end of an oracle concerning solely Israel, one finds a sentence that unexpectedly mentions Judah; its function is to point out that the latter is still faithful to God, in contrast to Israel:

> Ephraim has surrounded me with lies, and the house of Israel with deceit;
>
> but Judah still walks with God, and is faithful to the Holy One.

That the main motive of at least one Judean layer in Hosea is the hope that Judah will not meet the same fate as Israel, is apparent in a few verses. Thus 1:7, in the middle of a threatening message concerning the house of Israel, a scribe has added a promise to Judah:

[10] See e.g. K. Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2012, p. 89.

[11] A.A. Macintosh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, ICC, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1997, p. 202-213.

[12] Translations of the Hebrew Bible are from the NRSV.

> [Gomer] conceived again and bore a daughter. Then the LORD said to him, "Name her Lo-ruhamah, for I will no longer have pity on the house of Israel or forgive them. *But I will have pity on the house of Judah, and I will save them by the LORD their God.* I will not save them by bow, or by sword, or by war, or by horses, or by horsemen."

Interestingly, one also finds a possible allusion to Judah's fall in the early 6th century in Hos 5:5[13] (although one cannot entirely exclude the possibility that it is an earlier threat):[14]

> Israel's pride testifies against him;
> Ephraim stumbles in his guilt;
> *Judah also stumbles with them.*

Beyond these interpolations, the name "Israel" has sometimes been replaced by "Judah" in order to include the latter in a condemnation. This may be the case in 12:2:

> The LORD has an indictment against *Judah*,
> and will punish Jacob according to his ways,
> and repay him according to his deeds.

Since the rest of the passage deals exclusively with Israel by way of an extended reference to the story of Jacob, regarded as Israel's ancestor, the mention of Judah does not make any sense here except as an expedient to redirect the oracle to Judeans.

1.2. The appropriation by Judean scribes

What precedes is only a selection of a few examples, but the main point is clear: the "Judean stamp" is apparent in various parts of Hosea. To be sure, some exegetes regard several passages that mention Judah, such as Hos 1, as having first been entirely composed in

[13] Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, 89.
[14] Macintosh, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Hosea*, lxxi.

Judah or in Yehud.[15] If so, what I mentioned above as additions should perhaps be understood as integral part of the passages from the start. Note, however, that even in this case, such mentions of Judah still appear in the middle or at the end of oracles overwhelmingly addressed to Israel on a formal level, and, at any rate, in a book connected to a Northern prophet, which I find highly significant with regards to cultural memory. At any rate, at least a number of the mentions of Judah, especially in what is regarded as the earliest kernel of the book (Hos 4-6*), were originally written in Israel. Besides, the process of appropriation may well have been staggered, each stage corresponding to a specific concern and involving a specific relationship vis-à-vis the cultural memory preserved until then. For the present purpose, it is not necessary to draw a detailed list of revisions spread over several centuries; it will suffice to distinguish between three basic situations.

First, some threats and warnings originally targeting Israelites in the 8th century were redirected towards Judeans in order for them to avoid the same fate as Israel by convincing the Judeans to act differently than their Northern counterparts. Today Hans Wolff's view that an early Judean redaction had to be connected "with the late phase of Hosea's activity, when he looked with hope towards certain circles in Judah,"[16] looks somewhat romantic to many scholars, and Josiah's time appears to be a better candidate. If grounded in history, the tradition of Josiah taking control of northern territories (2 Kgs 23:15-19) would hint at a possible context for this reappropriation of Israelite traditions. Perhaps some Hosea scroll had been kept there until that time. However, the decisive factor is the literary relationship between Hosea and Amos on the one hand, and Judean compositions from the late 8th to early 7th century BCE, more precisely the direction of the literary

[15] E.g. R. Vielhauer, « Hosea in the Book of the Twelve », in *Perspectives in the Formation of the Book of the Twelve*, ed. R. Albertz, J. Nogalski, and J. Wöhrle (BZAW 433; Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2012), 66-69.

[16] H. W. Wolff, *Hosea*, Hermeneia; Philadelphia, Fortress Press, 1974, p. xxxi.

dependence. If the earliest texts in Isaiah and Micah were influenced respectively by Amos and Hosea, as some scholars believe,[17] then we have to reckon with an early reception of the latter books in Judah. If the direction is the other way around,[18] then the "Josiah hypothesis" seems likely.

Secondly, some additions might reflect an awareness of Jerusalem's fall and constitute a reflection on the similar fates met by Israel and Judah, as well as messages of hope. They include at least 5:5 and, in the opinion of many scholars, chapters 13 and 14. Thirdly, some changes occurred when book collections were created. It is conceivable that Amos and Hosea were transmitted together in the 7th century, and that each was revised in light of the other.[19] Moreover, a plausible hypothesis stipulates that Amos and Hosea were collected together with Micah and Zephaniah to form a "Book of the Four" during the 6th century. It is probable then that the superscription, which lists Judean kings, was added or revised. This kind of superscription is characteristic of the four books among the Twelve. Furthermore, adjustments were probably made in Hosea when the Book of the Twelve was created in Yehud.[20]

[17] D. M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 320, 327-331; cf. also Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, p. 94.

[18] J. Vermeylen, « Osée 1 et les prophètes du VIII^e^ siècle », in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, ed. R. G. Kratz, T. Krüger and K. Schmid, Berlin/New York, de Gruyter, 2000, p. 193-206, esp. 201-202.

[19] Jeremias, *Amos: A Commentary* , trans D.W. Stott, OTL; Louisville, John Knox, 1998, p. 7.

[20] See recently R. Vielhauer, « Hosea in the Book of the Twelve », 55-75. In passing, I have chosen Hosea as a case study, but similar remarks could be made for Amos, albeit perhaps in a more limited way. On the other hand, it appears to be easier in Amos than in Hosea to detect possible deuteronomistic additions, which represent another kind of Judean revision (Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, p. 91) (he lists Am 1:1, 9-12; 2:4-5, 10-12; 3:1, 7; 5:25-26).

1.3. Appropriating a traumatic past

The multilayered appropriation just described resulted in important changes in Judah's collective memory. The earliest, northern kernel of the Hosea scroll certainly contained both communicative memory, such as allusions to recent events, for instance concerning the Syro-Ephraimite war, as well as cultural memory, such as references to Jacob, regarded as the national ancestor (more on this later).[21] By taking up this complex of oracles, replete with memories of various sorts, and by embedding references to Judah into it, the Judean scribes extended Judah's own collective memory.

It is worth noting that most of what they appropriated was a deeply traumatic story. Recently, David Carr has stressed the role played by social reactions to traumatic events in the formation of the Bible, including the role played by what happened in Southern Levant in the late 8th century.[22] Since the Assyrian army devastated most of Judah's territory and took a huge tribute before leaving Jerusalem, Israel's fate echoed Judean concerns in a dramatic way. In fact, Israel's fate certainly made a deep impression on Judean elites both before and after the siege of Jerusalem in 701. Prior to this event, the outcome of the Syro-Ephraimite war, notably the takeover of some Northern territories by the Assyrians, must have served as a dramatic illustration of what could happen. After 732, and even more clearly after 720, the obvious threat that a prophet could make consisted in announcing to Judeans that they

[21] A. de Pury, « The Jacob Story and the Beginnings of the Formation of the Pentateuch », in *A Farewell to the Yahwist? The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*, ed. T. B. Dozemand and K. Schmid, Atlanta, SBL, 2006, p. 51-72.

[22] D. M. Carr, *Holy Resilience: The Bible's Traumatic Origins*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2014. Admittedly, some scholars doubt that we are in a position to assess the emotions and sentiments of people in Antiquity, since human sensitivity changes through time (I thank Omer Sergi for orally pointing this out to me). On the other hand, we do have some textual evidence, e.g. in the book of Lamentations that at least some Judeans were deeply affected by the fall of Jerusalem, and it isn't far-fetched to think that some kind of trauma was endured by Israelites when Samaria fell.

would meet the same fate as Israel's if they did not follow the instructions of the god or goddess that spoke through them. Obviously, the fact that Yhwh was worshipped both in Israel and in Judah, and that he had prophets in both countries, was key in this process. If Yhwh had treated Israel in some way, he could do the same with Judah.

But the Judean prophets or scribes did not just level the same kind of threats as Hosea: they also reused his oracles. They gave a second life to texts studded with allusions to recent events relevant to Israel's society, texts that carried along much trauma and distress, and they made them relevant to another people. The fact that Hosea's threats had been retrospectively vindicated by the fall of Samaria probably factored in this decision to "recycle" his oracles, and undoubtedly lent them some credibility. Yet even if we understand the rationale for their reuse in such a way, the striking fact remains that the Judean scribes imported the trauma of another nation into their own. With due caution, we may draw an interesting analogy by reflecting on the concept of *post-memory*, developed by Marianne Hirsch. It designates the fact that the children of parents who experienced a traumatic experience (such as the Shoah) sometimes relate to this experience as if it belonged directly to their own personal memory, even though they were born afterwards. The memory of the traumatic events was transmitted to the "generation after" and affects them so deeply that they "remember" the events as if they had lived them themselves.[23] Of course the situation of Judah inheriting Israel's trauma operates on another level and is not directly comparable, but the point is that in both cases we find a transmission of "extrinsic" traumatic memory.

After 701, the situation was different: Judah's territory had been devastated, but Jerusalem was spared. Hence a mixture of trauma in the countryside, and some relief in the capital. Various texts in biblical historiography and in Psalms indicate that the interruption of Jerusalem siege was interpreted as a divine deliverance. So the comparison with Samaria probably led to a peculiar "tale of

[23] See M. Hirsch's website: https://www.postmemory.net/ (accessed 02/22/2018). Her most well-known book is *The Generation of Post-Memory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2012.

two cities": Jerusalem had been miraculously spared the doom endured by Samaria.

1.4. Impact on the regime of historicity

The redirection of Northern oracles towards Judah and their influence on new oracles composed by Judean prophets resulted in new ways of remembering the past and envisioning the future. Broadly speaking, the present of the 7th century Judeans was "sandwiched" between the demise of the Northern Kingdom and a possible similar fate for the Southern Kingdom. By warning their contemporaries that they should expect a similar doom as that endured by the Israelites, depending on their behavior, Isaiah, Micah and Zephaniah (or the redactors who updated their works) assessed the present in light of the past and they envisioned a future that might resemble Israel's end. It is not only the past that was semioticized but also the potential future, and the semioticization of this potential future was modeled on the semioticized past. Such an intricate relationship between past, present and future defines a peculiar *regime of historicity*, to borrow François Hartog's concept.[24]

Later on, when the kingdom of Judah came to be annexed by the Babylonians in the early 6th century, the Judeans entered yet another regime of historicity that involved two past events, the demises of the Northern and the Southern kingdoms, but also the hope for a return to the land[25] and for the future of the Davidic dynasty. This appears to be reflected in Isaiah 40-55 in various passages, but also in the exilic edition of Kings, since it contains an epilogue concerning the end of Israel (2 Kgs 17) but no equivalent for Judah, and on the contrary ends on a slightly positive note for the exiled king (2 Kgs 25: 27-30). Still later on, during the Persian period, a new situation arose after the return of some of the exiles and the reconstruction of the Jerusalem temple, hence yet another

[24] F. Hartog, *Régimes d'historicité: Présentisme et expérience du temps*, Paris, Seuil, 2012[2].

[25] Carr notes that this kind of hope is typical for displaced populations living in diaspora (*Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 253).

regime of historicity. Scholars often ascribe to this period the addition of eschatological promises to the Hosea scroll.[26]

1.5. The "israelization" of Judean traditions

Finally, I have highlighted the redirection of Israelite oracles towards Judah, but it is worth noting briefly that these northern oracles may also have influenced, perhaps even triggered, fresh oracles directly addressed to Judeans. Indeed, some scholars think that Isaiah and Micah drew some of their inspiration from Amos and Hosea. For instance, according to Konrad Schmid, Isaiah 5; 9-10 contains a web of allusions to Amos; he concludes that "for the early book of Isaiah the threat of judgment against Judah is not a new oracle of judgment by God but an extension of the judgment originally imposed on the Northern Kingdom."[27] Similarly, David Carr notes that Micah 1:2-7 "can be seen as an eighth-century reapplication to Judah of past prophecies to the North." In his view, we may understand "Isaiah and Micah as parallel interpretations of the crises facing late-eighth-century Judah *as seen through the lens of written prophecies from the North*."[28] In short, the judeanization of Israelite oracles was accompanied by some sort of "israelization" of Judean prophecies.

1.6. Analogies

To close this section, let me note that there are analogies to this process of appropriation of a foreign text and its reorientation. In the Hebrew Bible, there is the reuse and adaptation of Amenemope sayings in Proverbs 22:17-23:14. Here the sayings are reoriented

[26] For an overview of Hosea's redaction, see T. Römer, « Osée », in *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, p. 469-475.

[27] Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History*, p. 94. See also Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible,* p. 327-328.

[28] Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, p. 330 (emphasis in original).

from the Egyptians to the Judeans, and the name of Yhwh is substituted to Thoth.[29]

There are also analogies of this phenomenon of appropriation and reorientation at several junctures in the history of Mesopotamian literature. Thus, it is well known that sometime after the fall of the third dynasty of Ur, Old Babylonian scribes copied and adapted many works of Sumerian literature. Later, it was the turn of Assyrian scribes to appropriate Babylonian texts:

> Traditional cuneiform texts associated with the Middle Assyrian royal court and dated in the early 12th century BCE, emphasize the true Babylonian origin of their contents. In the absence of an Assyrian literary heritage proper, Assyrian scribes adopted Babylonian scholarship and made it their own. This strategy was so successful that even today the study of the Babylonian written heritage is called Assyriology. Ninurta-ubalissu, the royal scribe, went even further in trying to anchor the written tradition in geography by linking it to the ancient Babylonian city of Nippur, home to the god Enlil and his son Ninurta. Ninurta-uballissu exploited the identification of the gods Assur and Enlil in order to appropriate Nippur traditions as being essentially Assyrian.[30]

2. Israelite foundational myths and Judah's cultural memory

Let us now turn to another series of traditions and memories that may have passed from Israel to Judah and, if so, must have significantly impacted the latter's cultural memory.

[29] Cf. M. V. Fox, « From Amenemope to Proverbs », *ZAW* 126, 2014, p. 76-91, esp. p. 88-89 (Amenemope 7.19 reused in Prov 22:23).

[30] N. Veldhuis, « Domesticizing Babylonian Scribal Culture in Assyria: Transformation by Preservation », in *Theory and Practice of Knowledge Transfer*, ed. W. S. van Egmond and W. H. van Soldt, Leiden, Nederlands Instituut Voor Het Nabije Oosten, 2012, p. 11.

2.1. The Exodus and the Jacob story in Israel's cultural memory

At least two foundational myths apparently played a role in the Northern kingdom during the 8th century (and possibly earlier): the Exodus and Jacob's story. This conclusion rests mainly on two kinds of evidence. First, there are numerous parallels between the Exodus narrative and the account of the beginnings of the Northern kingdom in 1 Kgs 12.[31] It is common today to regard the Exodus as a "charter myth" for the Northern Kingdom.[32] Moreover, the geographical setting, or better, to use Assmann's vocabulary,[33] the *mnemotope* of the Jacob story is firmly anchored in the territories of the Northern kingdom. Furthermore, at least some[34] of the references to the Exodus and to Jacob in Hosea (and perhaps Amos) are plausibly dated to the 8th century. With Albert de Pury, I think that Hos 12 alludes to some earlier Jacob story; this is precisely why

[31] Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 477. In particular, the account of the beginnings of the Northern kingdom in 1 Kgs 12 seems to indicate that Israelites worshipped Yhwh as the God of the Exodus in the temples of Dan and Bethel. This connection clearly underlies the Judean polemical account that puts into Jeroboam I's mouth an identification of the golden calves with "the gods who brought you up out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kgs 12:28). Perhaps originally the text had "God" and the plural is a later polemical correction. On this and the Northern connection of 1 Kgs 12, see T. Römer, *Moïse en version originale : Enquête sur le récit de la sortie d'Égypte (Exode 1-15)*, Paris/Genève, Bayard/Labor et Fides, 2015, p. 23-27. Some scholars think that Jeroboam I is a fictional, back projection of Jeroboam II, or that the account of the former has been colored by features actually pertaining to the latter, but that would not change my point since it would still fit an 8th century setting. The same connection between the golden calf and the god of the Exodus appears in Exod 32 with identical words (Exod 32:4). The etiologies concerning the sanctuary of Bethel (Gen 28) suggests that some Jacob stories may have been preserved there.

[32] See the nuanced discussion in N. Naʾaman, « Out of Egypt or Out of Canaan? The Exodus Story Between Memory and Historical Reality », in *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. T. E. Levy et al., New York, Springer, 2015, p. 530.

[33] Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization,* p. 44-45.

[34] Some scholars believe that *all* these references betray an awareness of later Pentateuchal sources and were not part of the earliest kernel of Hosea, but I find it unlikely. At least some of the verses referring to Exodus, notably in Hos 4-9*, must have been present in the earliest Hosea scroll.

v. 2-12 contain some obscure allusions and blind motives. Furthermore, Hos 12:9-13 draws a comparison between the two figures associated with these myths of origins, that is, Moses and Jacob, with a clear preference given to the former. With de Pury, I conclude that both myths were already known in Israel in the 8th century.[35]

In such circumstances, it is plausible that some versions of the Exodus narrative and the Jacob story were imported from Israel into Judah sometime after the fall of Samaria. The main question is whether the Judeans already had their own traditions about the same topics or whether these stories were entirely new to them: the impact on their cultural memory would not be the same.

2.2. The Exodus and Judah's cultural memory

Regarding the Exodus, various scholars have hypothesized that the cultural memory of a bondage *in* Egypt might stem from an experience of bondage *to* Egypt *in* Canaan during the Late Bronze Age or Iron Age I. In local cultural memory, the withdrawal of Egypt from Canaan in the 12th century was, according to this theory, narratively transformed into a liberation from Egyptian slavery in Egypt. According to Ronald Hendel,[36] this does not exclude the possibility that the experience of some Canaanites slaves having fled from Egypt to Canaan played a role in the constitution of the cultural memory of the Exodus. On the contrary, their own memories might have been joined to the memories of natives previously subjected to Egyptian rule, and maybe these former slaves' memories provided the "allochthonous ingredient" that helped all this to be

[35] A. de Pury, « The Jacob Story and the Beginnings of the Formation of the Pentateuch ». Note that according to another hypothesis, the Moses story was not connected to the Exodus narrative yet, since poetic references to the Exodus do not mention Moses (Römer, *Moïse en version originale*, p. 33-34).

[36] R. Hendel, « The Exodus as Cultural Memory: Egyptian Bondage and the Song of the Sea », in *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective*, ed. T. E. Levy et al., p. 65-77.

subsumed under the history of an escape from Egypt.[37] Scholars generally think that it is the central hill country, that is, the territory of the future Northern Kingdom, that was the most affected by the Egyptian rule. Since the settlement of the hill country of Judah essentially took place later, Naʾaman argues that this peripheral region probably did not preserve a memory of the Egyptian rule and withdrawal. In his view, it might be only in the late 8th century, after the fall of Samaria, that this cultural memory was transferred into Judah.[38]

In this scenario, the appropriation of the Exodus myth must have led to a powerful recasting of Judah's cultural memory, at least in the circles who accepted it. For them, Yhwh was now regarded as the God who had delivered the ancestors of the Judeans from the Egyptian bondage: this was an important addition to his *résumé*. To use Assmann's categories, the Exodus became a *foundational* myth with regard to the theology of Yhwh worshippers, since it reconfigured the way they thought of the origins of their relationship with Yhwh. But it also became a *mythomotor* for them: the presence, in their remembered past, of such a story of divine deliverance gave an impetus to their hopes. Moreover, in the context of Assyrian vassalage, the Exodus probably served as a *contrapresent* myth: the ancestors had been liberated from a foreign bondage, while the descendants were subjected to an imperialist rule and all its practical consequences. It was a story to which the Judeans could relate, and that might help them envisage a different future.

That said, it is not possible to be categorical with regard to the list of ethnic groups whose cultural memory included the Exodus myth during the early Iron Age, and perhaps we should not exclude

[37] Perhaps also some other "traces of memory" were incorporated in what finally resulted in a common narrative and a collective memory (Römer, *Moïse en version originale*, p. 27-34).

[38] Naʾaman concludes: "It is thus inconceivable that the tradition [of the Exodus] was unknown in the Kingdom of Judah before the seventh century BCE and suddenly played such an important role in the consciousness of the Late First Temple period's ruler and elite. We should better assume that the Exodus tradition was known in both kingdoms but occupied a more important role in the historical memory of the Northern Kingdom" (« Out of Egypt or Out of Canaan? », p. 528).

Judah too fast.[39] Besides, some scholars still believe that some Northern and Southern territories belonged to a same polity during a limited window of time in the 10th century. If so, traditions and memories might have been shared. Of course, such a United Monarchy, even in a low-key version deprived of the biblical hyperboles, looks old-fashioned today and is rule out categorically by many scholars. But some competent historians[40] and archaeologists[41] still consider that it may contain a kernel of historical truth.[42] Interestingly, according to N. Na'aman and O. Sergi, Judah controlled the Benjamin Plateau (between Bethel and Jerusalem) already in the 10th century.[43] Whatever the case, if Judah already

[39] We cannot determine precisely how the Egyptian rule in the Southern Levant impacted the hill country of Judah, however sparse its settlement was, and however peripheral it was. And even if this impact was minimal, we cannot rule out the possibility that the Exodus myth diffused into this region. Nor can we exclude the possibility that some Judeans were taken into Egypt as labor force and escaped to come back home.

[40] A. Lemaire, « The United Monarchy: Saul, David and Solomon », in *Ancient Israel: From Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple*, ed. H. Shanks, Washington, Biblical Archaeology Society, 2013, p. 85-128.

[41] A. Mazar, « Archaeology and the Biblical Narrative: The Case of the United Monarchy », in *One God – One Cult – One Nation. Archaeological and Biblical Perspectives*, ed. R.G. Kratz and H. Spieckermann, Berlin/New York, de Gruyter, 2010, p. 29-58; W. G. Dever, *Beyond the Texts: An Archaeological Portrait of Israel and Judah*, Atlanta, SBL Press, 2017, p. 259-390; A. Faust, « An All-Israelite Identity: Historical Reality or Biblical Myth? », in *The Wide Lens in Archaeology: Honoring Brian Hesse's Contributions to Anthropological Archaeology*, ed. J. Lev-Tov, P. Wapnish, and A. Gilbert, Atlanta, Lockwood Press, 2017, p. 169-190.

[42] None of these possibilities necessitates that an Exodus account was already put into writing in the 10th or 9th century, although I think it was materially possible: M. Richelle, « Elusive Scrolls: Could Any Hebrew Literature Be Written Prior to the Eighth Century B.C.E.? », *VT* 66, 2016, p. 556-594. Frank Polak has convincingly shown that a great part of the Exodus narrative is characterized by a linguistic register that "preserves an underlying oral-epic substratum," so we probably have to reckon with a period of oral transmission (« Storytelling and Redaction – Varieties of Language Usage in the Exodus Narrative », in The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America, ed. J. C. Gertz, B. M. Levinson, D. Rom-Shiloni, and K. Schmid, FAT 111, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2016, p. 443-475, esp. 443).

[43] N. Na'aman, « Saul, Benjamin, and the Emergence of "Biblical Israel" », *ZAW* 121, 2009, p. 211-224, p. 335-349; O. Sergi, « The Emergence of Judah as Political Entity Between Jerusalem and Benjamin », *ZDPV* 133, 2017, p. 1-23.

had an Exodus story prior to 720, the appropriation of the Northern version of this myth had a less important impact on Judah's cultural memory than in the former scenario. It must have been significant nonetheless, since it certainly involved the addition of new episodes and traditions that were then merged with the Judean version.

2.3. The linkage between Abraham and the Exodus in Judah's cultural memory

According to a wide scholarly consensus, the Abraham cycle constitutes a myth that was originally distinct from the Exodus story. However, the scope of the traditions about Abraham known to the Judeans in the monarchic period is debated. Recently, Thomas Römer (along with Oded Lipschits and Hervé Gonzalez) identified pre-Priestly narratives in the Abraham traditions (Gen 13*; 18-19*) and dated their first literary form to the 7th century.[44] In view of Frank Polak's conclusions regarding an oral substratum behind these narratives,[45] I think that this would allow for an oral prehistory at least in the 8th century.[46] My point is that it is reasonable to think that some Judeans already had their own local myth, centered on the figure of Abraham, when a North-Israelite version of the Exodus story reached them. That said, T. Römer has also argued out that, contrary to former widespread opinion, "Abraham was a figure remembered in the south of Judah, but not as the patriarch

[44] O. Lipschits, T. Römer, H. Gonzalez, « The Pre-priestly Abraham Narratives from Monarchic to Persian Times », *Semitica* 59, 2017, p. 295.

[45] F. Polak, « Oral Platform and Language Usage in the Abraham Narrative », in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, p. 405-441.

[46] Maybe the Judeans had some Isaac stories too, although there are few traces of them in the extant texts. Erhard Blum thinks that "the figure of Isaac was of peculiar significance for the northerners, at least in the later eighth century BCE", because in Amos Israel is named "Isaac" (7:9) and "the house of Isaac" (7:16), and he is warned not to go to Beersheba (5:5) (« The Jacob Tradition », in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. C. A. Evans, J. N. Lohr, D. L. Petersen, VTSup 152, Leiden/Boston, Brill, 2012, p. 209). But could not these intriguing references be late Judeans updates? Everything in the Isaac narratives hints at a southern setting.

of the kingdom of Judah." The Abraham stories are anchored in the south of Judah, not in Jerusalem, and "he is not the ancestor of the different tribes of clans that form Judah," but "an autochthon figure of several tribes and groups that settle in the area of Hebron."[47] Accordingly, there was no real symmetry between Jacob in Israel and Abraham in Judah. Nevertheless, I note that Abraham came to be regarded as a reference figure on a wider scale during the Neo-Babylonian period at the latest, since he serves as a figure of legitimation of the people that remained in the land during the Exile, as is evident in some polemics reflected in Ezekiel (Ezek 33:23-24).

For our purposes, the main question is when the Exodus narrative and the Abraham stories were joined at the latest, as well as how this impacted Judah's cultural memory. The prevailing opinion among scholars seems to be that P was the first to link them,[48] although some still defend the view that it was J[49] or some other pre-Priestly redactor.[50] From a linguistic point of view, the relevant texts are written in Classical Biblical Hebrew, which was used during the royal period and until about the middle of the 6th century.[51] The Neo-Babylonian period may be regarded as a probable *terminus ad quem*.[52] Now, how was the Exodus connected to the Abraham stories and received in Judah's cultural memory?

[47] Lipschits, Römer, Gonzalez, « The Pre-priestly Abraham Narratives », p. 275, p. 290.

[48] E.g. K. Schmid, « The So-Called Yahwist and the Literary Gap Between Genesis and Exodus », in *A Farewell to the Yahwist?* p. 29-50, esp. p. 35-47; E. Blum, « The Literary Connection Between the Books of Genesis and Exodus and the End of the Book of Joshua », in ibid., p. 89-106.

[49] C. Levin, « The Yahwist and the Redactional Link Between Genesis and Exodus », in *A Farewell to the Yahwist?*, p. 131-141; J. van Seters, « The Report of the Yahwist's Demise Has Been Greatly Exaggerated! », in ibid., p. 143-157. Note, however, that these authors have quite different views on J.

[50] T. B. Dozeman, « The Commission of Moses and the Book of Genesis », in *A Farewell to the Yahwist?*, p. 107-129.

[51] J. Joosten, « Diachronic Linguistics and the Date of the Pentateuch », in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, ed. J. C. Gertz et al., Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2016, p. 327–344.

[52] For those, like Blum, who think that P is responsible for the junction and date it to the Exile, this is evident.

Recent research seems to point in two opposite directions. On the one hand, according to T. Römer, the formation of the Pre-Priestly Abraham tradition included a layer (Gen 12:10-20; 16*) that contains a discreet polemic against the "Deuteronomistic" Exodus tradition. Indeed, in Gen 12 the encounter between Abraham and the Pharaoh is modeled on the encounter between Moses and the Pharaoh, except that the king of Egypt appears in favorable light and respects God. In addition, Gen 16 echoes the story of the oppression of the Hebrews in Egypt but reverses the roles, since it is the Hebrew mistress, Sarah, who oppresses the Egyptian servant, Hagar. Accordingly, "both narratives adapt the Exodus tradition in a 'counter history'."[53] If so, the Exodus theology met some Judean resistance and prompted an extension of the Abraham narrative with a "countermemory," that is, "a deliberate recasting of memories of the past" in order to "refute, revise, and replace a previously compelling or accepted memory of the past".[54]

At the same time, this implies that the redactors behind these narratives felt compelled to respond to the "dtr" Exodus theology, which is an indirect testimony to the importance of the latter as an accepted memory of the past. Moreover, Gen 12:10-20 and 16* cast a bad light on Abraham and it is puzzling that the price for reacting to the Exodus theology would have been to criticize the figure that served as a rival myth. Also, "the fact that Genesis 12:10-20 was put before Genesis 13 may be understood as a message that Abraham should not live in Egypt but in the land that Yhwh did promise to him".[55] This seems to reflect some degree of agreement with the Exodus logic. All in all, one of the effects of these stories is to assimilate the Exodus by embedding it in Abraham's biography.

Besides, an important feature of this linkage in terms of cultural memory is the presence of an overarching and positive theme: the promise to the ancestors. In the Neo-Babylonian period at the latest (some would say in the Persian period), the Judeans were in possession of a combination of ancestral and Exodus narratives

[53] Lipschits, Römer, Gonzalez, « The Pre-priestly Abraham Narratives », p. 292.

[54] Hendel, *Remembering Abraham,* p. 41.

[55] Lipschits, Römer, Gonzalez, « The Pre-priestly Abraham Narratives », p. 293.

that served as a mythomotor particularly fitted to help them live through the trials of the times. Many scholars have already highlighted the relevance of the Abraham story and of the Exodus for the Exiles and later for the returnees. The travel made by Abraham, the "national" ancestor, from Babylonia to Canaan, served as an archetype for them.[56] Similarly, the narrative of the liberation of Egyptian bondage served to model the return from Babylonia as a New Exodus, as is evident in Isaiah 40-55. As already noted, references to Abraham in Isaiah and Ezekiel also show that this patriarchal figure served as a foundational myth for the people who remained in the land during the Exile.

Be that as it may, it is worth noting that the Exodus does not seem to have been judged a relevant reference in any context and/or by every redactor during the Persian period / early Hellenistic period. While Ezra-Nehemiah seems to draw on this tradition in order to present the return of the Exiles as a Second Exodus,[57] Chronicles seems to avoid such references and focuses on an autochthonous model.[58]

2.4. The integration of Jacob in Judah's cultural memory

At first, the Jacob story seems less promising than the Exodus myth for the Judean interests. After all, this story is mainly anchored in the Northern mnemotope and involves an ambivalent figure; it is difficult to see how the Judeans could relate to him and his "biography." In fact, Albert de Pury believes that the Deuteronomistic tradition discredits Jacob, who is not named (*damnatio memoriae*!) but alluded to as an "Aramean wanderer" in Deut 26:5. The Jacob story really became part of the Judeans's cultural memory only

[56] Liverani, p. 354.

[57] See K. Koch, « Ezra and the Origins of Judaism », *JSS* 19, 1974, p. 184-189, although part of the evidence is now read differently by M.D. Knowles, « Pilgrimage Imagery in the Returns in Ezra », *JBL* 123, 2004, p. 57-74.

[58] See P. Abadie, « Comment entendre le livre des Chroniques ? Une histoire écrite sous la forme d'un plaidoyer des lévites au temple de Jérusalem », *SemClas* 11, 2018, p. 179-188. I would note a possible exception: in 1 Chron 20.

when Jacob was integrated in their family tree. Even then, according to de Pury, this was done by P but leaving aside all the negative old Jacob cycle, which was only incorporated in the storyline later.[59] At any rate, for the Jacob story to be relevant to the Judean mnemohistory, more was needed than a simple antiquarian interest. Recent research suggest that various dynamics were at play.

David Carr certainly reflects a wide current consensus in stating that the Judeans appropriated the Jacob story by *subordinating* it to their pre-existing storyline. He writes that "certain parts of the Jacob story narrative appear to be secondary adaptations of it to Southern interests," such as "a series of additions to the Jacob story that prepare for the proclamation later in Genesis of the disqualification of Jacob's older sons—Reuben, Simeon, and Levi—from being his heirs and the resulting promotion of Judah to eternal rule (Gen 49:3-12)."[60] Accordingly, the Jacob narrative, that is, one of Israel's foundational myths, became in the hands of Southern scribes a *foundational myth* for Judah, in fact a *teleological* story in which Judah's rule was regarded as the *telos* of an ancestral blessing or prediction. After all, Jacob was Abraham's grandson, not the other way around; Abraham was the ancestor's ancestor, the first to receive God's promise. That said, there are various ways of explaining the connection between Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. To mention but one dissenting view, let me quote Daniel Fleming:

> the roles of Isaac and Abraham in the Jacob cycle need not be removed automatically as reflections of the combined Abraham-Isaac-Jacob narrative in something close to our current book of Genesis, from a Judahite and postmonarchic setting. It is possible that Abraham and Isaac are first of all Jacob's antecedents, and their interest lies in how they relate Jacob to the peoples of Aram and Edom. If these had a place in Israelite thought, they would indicate that the genealogical approach to identity could explain relationships beyond the immediate family of associated tribal peoples. The multigenerational scheme of Israel's ancestry may therefore be more than a literary

[59] De Pury, « The Jacob Story and the Beginnings of the Formation of the Pentateuch », p. 72.

[60] Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible,* p. 473.

> construct designed to piece together characters and storied from completely isolated origins.[61]

Whatever the case, it is not that the Judeans identified themselves with Abraham in a straightforward manner: Judah is one of *Jacob*'s sons. There are signs that the Judeans, in time, related to Jacob: notably, Jacob is unabashedly identified with Judah in Obadiah. The family tree subordinates Jacob to Abraham, but the system of Jacob's twelve sons is remarkably integrative of northern and southern tribes. In addition, Abraham appears as an "ecumenical" father, an umbrella-figure whose multifold offspring spreads over various groups and territories, reflecting a peaceful cooperation. Overall, the Patriarchal stories in Gen 12-36 were able to accommodate the interests of several groups, especially during the Persian period: returnees and natives, northerners and southerners, people worshipping in Jerusalem or not.[62]

What is certain is that the inclusion of the Jacob stories in the Judean storyline entails dimensions of subordination and integration. However one understands the process leading to this state of affairs, the result is a mixture of cultural memories that the Judeans regarded as their own remembered past.

2.5. A literary analogy

In closing, I would like to note that there exists an analogy to this linkage of foundational myths in Latin literature. Probably the most well-known of such Roman legends are, on the one hand, the story of Romulus and Remus, and, on the other, the story of Aenaes. Both were subjected to many variations during their manifold transmission, but their basic plots are quite clear. Romulus and Remus were two brothers who founded Rome in 753 BCE. This is an "autochthonous" myth of origins. As for Aeneas, believed to be the

[61] Fleming, *The Legacy of Israel*, p. 85.

[62] This is why some scholars think that these features of the texts result from a collaboration between religious authorities from Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim, and also between leaders from Jerusalem and Hebron (Lipschits, Römer, Gonzalez, « The Pre-priestly Abraham Narratives », p. 295-296).

founder of Rome, he fled from the city of Troy at the end of the war between Greeks and Trojans. In other words, this myth makes the Romans the descendants of a "foreigner," a Trojan hero. From the 3rd century BCE on, Roman literati attempted to connect both myths of origins, and the solution (as found in its classical version in Livy) was to link the founders by a dynasty. In Mary Beard's vivid words:

> Aeneas became seen as the founder not of Rome but of Lavinium; his son Ascanius was said to have founded Alba Longa—the city from which Romulus and Remus were later cast out before they founded Rome; and a shadowy and, even by Roman standards, flagrantly fictional dynasty of Alban kings was constructed to bridge the gap between Ascanius and the magic date of 753 BCE.[63]

The linkage between Aeneas and Romus by way of a dynastical succession parallels the linkage between Abraham and Jacob by way of a genealogical succession (Isaac representing the intermediary generation).[64] It also parallels the linkage between the Patriarchs on the one hand, Moses and the Exodus on the other, with a chronological gap of 430 years according to Exod 12:40. The recasting of Rome's cultural memory is interesting for a further reason: seen from another angle, the Roman amalgamated story combines a myth of *allochthonous* origins (Aeneas escaping from Troy) and a myth of *autochthonous* origins (Romulus and Remus being indigenous). All other things being equal, this parallels the linkage of Exodus and the Patriarchal stories in the Pentateuch. Furthermore, as Aeneas now appears as a unifying figure, ancestor to both Greeks and Romans, so, similarly, Abraham was regarded as the ancestor of several peoples.

[63] M. Beard, *SPQR: A History of Ancient Rome*, London: Profile Books, 2016, p. 77. See Dionysius of Helicarnassus, *Roman History* 1.53-71, 2.2; Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.272; 6.756; Livy, *Roman History* 1.1-2.

[64] M. Weinfeld already noted this parallel between the biblical and the Roman story, but only to note that there is a chronological gap between the remote ancestor and the "national" ancestor, a gap that the Chronicler tried to fill by way of a ten-generation genealogy between Ephraim and Joshua (1 Chron 7:25-27) (*The Promise of the Land: The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993, p. 4-7).

In sum, the analysis of Roman legends shows that the linkage of foundational myths might involve two distinct ancestors (Aeneas and Romulus; cp. Abraham and Jacob) or an allochthonous origin and an autochthonous one (Troy and Rome; cp. Egypt and Canaan). This is not to say that the connection between those biblical traditions is necessarily the result of the same kind of process as for the Roman myths, but the similarities are worth noting.

Conclusion

The concept of cultural memory has already proved a useful tool to analyze the ways in which Israel and Judah shaped their remembered past in previous studies. This paper has addressed an aspect of Judah's mnemohistory that may have been less studied: how the appropriation of some of the Northern Kingdom's traditions and memories by Judean redactors led to a recasting of Judah's (and Yehud's) own cultural memory. I have explored two different kinds of Northern traditions and memories that Judean redactors may have embedded in their own literary corpus: the prophetic oracles attributed to Hosea and Amos (with a special focus on Hosea), on the one hand, and two foundational myths of origins, namely a Northern version of the Exodus and the Jacob story, on the other. I have pointed out two difficulties in dealing with this subject. First, there will always be divergences among scholars about the dates of the relevant texts, and therefore about the time when Northern traditions reached the Judean scribes. Second, it is not always possible to be sure that a tradition was entirely new to the members of a society when some foreign version of it reached them: for instance, it would be imprudent to state that the Judeans did not have any tradition about the Exodus previous to the 8th century, or that the Northern Israelites did not know any story about Abraham. Nevertheless, it is possible to determine a plausible *terminus ad quem* for the appropriation of a given Northern tradition by Judean scribes, and to study how, from that time on, it contributed to reshape their own cultural memory.