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INTRODUCTION:
THE DISCOURSE ON INTERMARRIAGE IN THE HEBREW BIBLE*

Christian Frevel

The topic “mixed marriage” has received much attention in recent publications on Hebrew Bible, History of Israel and Jewish Studies.¹

While the topic had largely been neglected in scholarly discourse and research for most of the last century, interest has been overwhelming during the last two decades. The importance of endogamy, both as a literary feature and as a boundary marker, has been emphasized as critical to the structuring of Second Temple Judaism in the Persian and Hellenistic periods.²

There are several fields of research which amplified this tendency recently, of which three main areas are to be mentioned:

* This introduction, as well as the essays by Christian Frevel and Benedikt Conczorowski, includes results from a research project granted by the DFG (German Research Foundation): “Die Konstruktionen von Gruppenidentität durch religiös begründete Heiratsverbote. Literarhistorische, rechtshistorische und sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte der sog. ‘Mischehenfrage’ in der persischen Provinz Yehûd.”

1. A brief look at the bibliographical references appearing in the essays included in this volume supports this observation.

2. See, for example, the essays by Tamara C. Eskenazi and Eleanor P. Judd, “Marriage to a Stranger in Ezra 9–10,” as well as Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, “The Mixed Marriage Crisis in Ezra 9–10 and Nehemiah 13: A Study of the Sociology of the Post Exilic Community,” both published in Second Temple Studies 2: Temple and Community in the Persian Period (ed. T. C. Eskenazi and K. H. Richards; JSOTSsup 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 242–65, and 266–85, respectively. These studies contribute to the larger context of the debate surrounding the formation of Second Temple Judaism. For a most recent contribution to the discussion, see Joseph Blenkinsopp, Judaism, the First Phase: The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 63–71, 142–45.
1. The growing interest in post-exilic pre-Hellenistic times in literary, archaeological and sociological respects.\(^3\)

2. The growing interest on purity concepts as part of constructing “Israel” in Persian and Hellenistic times, which, as will be shown by the studies by Hannah Harrington, Armin Lange, Jan Clauss and Christian Frevel and Benedikt Conczorowski, is connected to the mixed marriage discourse in several Second Temple texts.\(^4\)

3. Finally, the discussion on the constitution of a Judahite or Jehudite identity in Persian and Hellenistic times as one of the important presumptions of the formation of Early Judaism, where identity construction by separation, exclusion or segregation and the “making of the other” are at stake.\(^5\)


4. To mention some examples one may refer to the question whether aliens are impure as such, the focus on the “holy seed” in Ezra 9 and its connection with purity concepts, or the relevance of purity in the Qumran community. Cf., e.g., the following recent publications: Hannah Harrington, “Keeping Outsiders Out: Impurity at Qumran,” in Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS in Groningen (ed. F. García Martinez and M. Popovic; StTDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 187–203; Christine Hayes, Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identity: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002); Jonathan Klawans, Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Saul M. Olyan, “Purity Ideology in Ezra–Nehemiah as a Tool to Reconstitute the Community,” JSJ 35, no. 1 (2004), 1–16; Ian C. Werrett, Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls (StTDJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2007), and others.

5. See the above-mentioned publications on the history of Persian Period Judaism.
Within all these trains of thought, “mixed marriages” are of pivotal interest. The controversy about them is a poster child of identity construction in post-exilic times and is interwoven with external and internal conflicts.6

Nevertheless, besides some articles addressing the question explicitly, it often seems to be no more than a kind of “sidekick” to be dealt with casually in publications on the history of Second Temple Judaism.

The present anthology tries to fill in that gap by focussing explicitly on biblical and extra-biblical discussions on intermarriage, its practice, ideology, prescription and description in biblical texts and related traditions, thus providing a forum for the diversity of recent approaches. This volume aims at putting forward the discussion on the roots, the development and the reception of the mixed marriages issue.

In what follows I will offer an introduction to the relevant terminology, a heuristic systematization of the main lines of argument against mixed marriage in the Hebrew Bible, a round-up of the most significant questions related to the topic and an overview of the contributions collected in this volume.

1. Trapped between Anachronism and Precision: Terminological Remarks

Some thoughts on terminology have to be laid out at the outset of these introductory remarks:

First of all, it has to be pointed out that it is problematic to refer to all mixed relationships using the terms “mixed marriage” or “intermarriage.”7 Not every incident concerning mixed couples refers to a “legal” status of marriage. For example, Num 25 does not explicitly mention marriage, but rather refers to cultic issues by using sexualized language (vv. 1–3) and narrates a single incident in exemplary manner (v. 6). Both are linked with the mixed marriage issue. Thus, one could better speak of


7. Both terms are used synonymously here. Spickard notes that recently a distinction between “intermarriage” (= Jewish–Gentile) and “mixed marriage” (= exogamous marriages in general) has been made by some authors, yet this distinction does not really help to clarify the issue; see Paul R. Spickard, Mixed Blood: Intermarriage and Ethnic Identity in Twentieth Century America (Madison, Wis.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 20–21. On marriage in Second Temple Judaism, see also Etan Levine, Marital Relations in Ancient Judaism (BZABR 10; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2009).
“mixed relationships” or “mixed couples” at some points of the debate for the sake of clarity. But where such “relationships” are rejected resp. prevented—as will be demonstrated below by means of a discussion of Num 25:6–18— their message is aimed in the same direction as the explicit mixed marriage texts. Thus, one has to accept those texts into the mixed marriage discourse.9

While the topic is accentuated as an important part of constructing identity in recent discussion, there is some fuzziness in terminology. In other words, “mixed marriage” is a container or umbrella term including several different aspects of marriage practices.

First, the word pair “endogamy” and “exogamy” has to be mentioned. In Biblical Studies the term endogamy is often used either in a narrow sense, denoting marital relations within kinship or extended families (e.g. the family of Jacob), or in a comprehensive way, comprising marriages within a certain social group (e.g. the Israelites). Exogamy forms the corresponding counterpart in both cases. In sociological understanding, both terms are also quite unspecific, as the following definition may illustrate:

Endogamy refers to in-group marriage, or a pattern of marriage in which the partners have a shared group affiliation. Its conceptual counterpoint is exogamy, or a pattern of marriage in which the partners are different in their group affiliation.10

Thus, the range of both terms relates to the specific context they are used in and the specific definition of the in-group.11 Furthermore, although both endogamy and exogamy seem to be the two sides of the same coin, one should be careful to define endogamy only as the positive formulation of marriage prohibitions. As a first step one should understand it as

8. See the co-authored essay by Frevel and Conczorowski in the present volume.
9. It should be noted that the avoidance of mixed marriages even before they become a reality is of great significance for the present discussion.
a positive rule describing a group’s or subgroup’s idea of adequate marriage depending on its idea of self-identity.\textsuperscript{12}

Anthropologists differentiate roughly between kin group endogamy (marriage within a specific range of family), alliance endogamy (marriage within a defined group, which can be specified, for example, as class or religious endogamy) and local endogamy (marriage within a certain geographical range, for instance, village endogamy).\textsuperscript{13}

In the context of class\textsuperscript{14} endogamy/exogamy (marriage within or outside social strata or classes) the word pair isogamy/anisogamy is of

\begin{itemize}
  \item Seymour-Smith, \textit{Anthropology}, 93; Cf. also Robert K. Merton, “Inter-
  \item Seymour-Smith, \textit{Anthropology}, 93. For slightly different categories, cf.


  The term is understood in a wide range of meanings, including social status and caste systems. For an overview on class endogamy, cf. Marco H. D. van Leeuwen and Ineke Maas, “Endogamy and Social Class in History: An Overview,” in \textit{Marriage Choices and Class Boundaries: Social Endogamy in History} (ed. M. H. D. van Leeuwen et al.; IRSH 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005),
certain relevance for sociological research. Isogamy denotes marriage between spouses of equal social status while anisogamy aims at the opposite.\textsuperscript{15}

Anisogamy itself can be differentiated by the terms “hypergamy,” when women marry men of an upper class, and “hypogamy,” when the brides belong to a higher class than the bridegrooms.\textsuperscript{16} Hypergamy is often found in caste systems\textsuperscript{17} or in patrilinear societies, while hypogamy has been observed, for example, in twentieth-century USA, for example, with Afro-American males marrying “up” into white families of a certain social status.\textsuperscript{18}

These anisogamous forms of marriage are mostly irrelevant in discussions of the Hebrew Bible since the idea of marrying up (e.g. between “classes” of Golah-returnees and long-term inhabitants of Yehud in the Persian Period\textsuperscript{19}) cannot be reconstructed without speculation. In contrast, the rationales for endogamy provided by the Hebrew Bible clearly hint at another direction with regards to the difference of in-group(s) and out-group(s). Thus, in the biblical context we struggle with forms of interethnic, intercultural or interreligious exogamy.\textsuperscript{20}

Nevertheless, these terms are themselves imprecise since they imply definite entities of ethnos, culture or religion.\textsuperscript{21} Although for instance

\begin{itemize}
\item 15. Cf. Seymour-Smith, \textit{Anthropology}, 13, 154.
\item 16. Cf. Koschnick, \textit{Standardwörterbuch}, 472–73; Seymour-Smith, \textit{Anthropology}, 13, 142–43, 154. The terms hypergamy and hypogamy do not necessarily denote an anisogamous marriage, as such practices also include the marriage of spouses from the same class, which would be an isogamous connubium. Especially in societies practicing hypergamy, sometimes a shift towards “isogamous circles” is observed. This can be considered a strategy whereby families stabilize their social status by marrying only on a level of equality; cf. Koschnick, \textit{Standardwörterbuch}, 473.
\item 18. Cf. Seymour-Smith, \textit{Anthropology}, 142; Spickard, \textit{Mixed Blood}, passim.
\item 19. Cf. Smith-Christopher, \textit{Crisis}.
\item 20. See, for example, Smith-Christopher, \textit{Crisis}, and the references given there. See further Spickard, \textit{Mixed Blood}, and the overview by Hieke, \textit{Endogamy}, 103–4.
\item 21. Cf. Kibria, “Endogamy,” 4:1404–5, for example, relates the topic of mixed marriage explicitly to ethnogenesis. Thus it does not occur merely between exactly defined ethnic groups, but already in the process of their definition. In this context, cf. the treatment of our topic in Shaye J. D. Cohen, \textit{The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties Uncertainties} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 109–39 and 241–62. See also the essay by Katherine Southwood in the present
\end{itemize}
Deut 7:4 advises against mixed marriages with foreign women “for your son would be seduced from following me into serving other gods,” there is no distinct concept of “religion” in the background of this prohibition. Thus “interreligious” is a bit anachronistic. It is obvious that “culture” is much more aiming at a specific ethos than at relevant cultural differences or a different religious practice. By that, mixed marriage is becoming a moral and “defiling” issue and part of the strongly regulated sexuality of the members of a certain society (complementary to, but not identical with the incest taboos). As a consequence, “cultural” endogamy probably would come closest to what is meant by a majority of Hebrew Bible texts. Yet, since categories such as “religious” or “cultural” cannot be avoided entirely if one aims at a systematization of the texts as well as at the definition of the kind of endogamy addressed by them, we may use these terms in a rather heuristic way.

Finally, another definition of endogamy should not be forgotten: on the narrative level the patriarchal narratives (e.g. Gen 24; 26–28) and later the book of Tobit, too, argue for kin or lineage endogamy. Nevertheless, looking at the mixed marriage texts in the Hebrew Bible as a whole, this kind of marriage rule seems to represent only a small minority.

One has to keep in mind the structural conditions of premodern societies which make it harder to marry exogamously, such as lack of infrastructure which promotes local endogamy or intensive social control by the clan. Thus, many forms of endogamy investigated in modern sociological or anthropological research are improbable in ancient Near Eastern societies and one should be careful not to be “trapped” by anachronism or mere speculation by applying modern sociological approaches too easily. Nevertheless, sociological approaches can also provide helpful analogies and a clarification of terminology for the study of mixed marriage in the Hebrew Bible.

volume. It is a quite common view in recent scholarly debate that “Jewishness,” or, to put it differently, Judaite identity, is in a process of formation during the Persian and Hellenistic periods, a factor which makes terms such as “religion” and “culture” quite fluid.

22. Within the Hebrew Bible especially Ezra 9 links both together by referring to Lev 18. See the co-authored essay by Christian Frevel and Benedikt Conczorowski in the present volume.

23. Regarding the patriarchal narratives, it is doubtful whether family endogamy can be identified as the main focus. Instead of this, the identity of Israel seems to be prevalent for the discourse of these texts.

2. Between Difference, Mélange and Interdependence: Conceptual Remarks

Having stated that a differentiation between intercultural, interethnic and interreligious seems to fail, there are certain differences in the rationale of the denial of mixed marriage in biblical and extra-biblical texts. Within several texts there is an intensive discussion of the subject with very different lines of impact: advocative, vindicative, permissive, conditional, restrictive or antagonistic. These approaches take juridic, narrative, prophetic or sapiential forms. Some texts address the topic explicitly, some more or less implicitly.

In each and every case one has to ask which kind of positive self assessment is in the background or, to put it differently: Who is the “in-group”? What are its defining characteristics and who is described as an “outsider”? And, as a consequence: Who is addressed by a certain text then and how is its position legitimized?

Furthermore, the topic of reception is of great importance in several ways: (1) regarding reception and transformation of biblical tradition within the analyzed text, (2) regarding the inner- and extra-biblical reception of the analyzed text itself and its function within its literary context.

Regarding the anti-exogamous argument, there are three main lines in biblical texts. Clearly identifiable, these lines are distinguishable not only by their rationales, but also by the way they are legitimized.

To give just one example for each line:

When Esau marries the Hittite women Judith and Basemath they “made life bitter for Isaac and Rebekah” (נ毐ים מרת רוח López ליצחק ולברכה, Gen 26:35). Thus Rebekah feels disgust and laments against Isaac in Gen 27:46:

I am weary of my life because of the Hittite women (קעת בעב כי ממונ 받아). If Jacob marries one of the Hittite women such as these, one of the women of the land, what good will my life be to me?

There are no further hints to religious deviance, cultural differences or the like. The emotional bias seems to be sufficient to mark down the exogamous marriages. It is the authority of the ancestors of Israel which provides the foundation for the rationale. This argument can be found in Gen 24:34–35 and 27:46–28:9. Identity depends on belonging to the patriarchal family. The rejected wives are denoted as “Hittite” or “Canaanite.” But what makes them a problem for the community is not explicated further. They simply are the surrounding peoples who are not of Abrahamic descent (in contrast to the Aramaic and Ishmaelilite branches of family; cf. Gen 28:1–5, 6–9).
To the contrary, Judg 3:5–6 emphasizes the religious imperilment of marital confederations with the Canaanites mentioned already in Exod 34:15–16 and Deut 7:2–4:

So the people of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; and they took their daughters to themselves for wives, and their own daughters they gave to their sons; and they served their gods (עֹבְדוֹת אַחֲרַי נִמְשָׁךְ).

According to this view, mixed marriage provokes failure of belief and the renunciation of YHWH and his claim for exclusive adoration. This idea is rooted in the Pentateuch (Exod 34:15–16; Deut 7:3). With the verses from the book of Judges, the references to the topic in Joshua’s speech at the end of his life (Josh 23:7, 12) as well as the narrative on Solomon’s foreign wives (1 Kgs 11:1–8), three important texts in the Deuteronomistic view on history represent this line of argument. All these three “historical” texts try to legitimize the rejection of exogamy by reference to the Pentateuch: Judg 3:5–6 cites from Deut 7:3 and also, since it is one-sided (only “taking women”), seems to be close to Exod 34:15–16. Joshua 23 refers to the divine commandments of the Torah, and it is striking that the topic is addressed at the end of the transition period between desert and land represented by the authoritative figure of Joshua. Even 1 Kgs 11 refers to commandments given to Israel (1 Kgs 11:2), although not citing it explicitly. Thus, the rejection of mixed marriage is understood as a significant part of the worship of YHWH. The Canaanite or foreign (cf. the implementation in 1 Kgs 11) women are dangerous because of their religious otherness, an otherness which would endanger Israel’s faith. The five texts mentioned provide a framework that is quite complex diachronically as well as synchronically.

A third pattern of rejection occurs in Ezra 9–10 where the reproach claims for (genealogical) purity. In Ezra 9:1–2 Ezra is informed that

the people of Israel and the priests and the Levites have not separated themselves (לא נפרדו) from the peoples of the lands with their abominations (הֲוֹאֵמִים). For they have taken some of their daughters to be wives for themselves and for their sons; so that the holy seed has mixed itself with the peoples of the lands (הֲוֹאֵמִים וּרְאֵי הַקָּדוֹשׁ בְּעָם אֱוָנִים).

This pattern will also be of great significance in extra-biblical literature such Jubilees, 4QMMT and the Levi literature (e.g. the Testament of Levi). It applies priestly terminology to the topic, combines it with further tradition from the Pentateuch (Deuteronomistic laws, patriarchal narratives) and thus constructs an exclusive ideal of the community as holy and pure. The centrality of the sanctuary cannot be underestimated in this context. This paradigm also gives witness to the significance of
Torah exegesis as well as a growing priestly authority in the developing Second Temple Judaism.

Thus, three lines of argument have here been identified in what has been, necessarily, the briefest of surveys: an emotional one focusing on endogamy found in the patriarchal narratives, a religious rationale focusing on monolatry and religious identity which might be labeled “Deuteronomistic,” and a cultic line focusing on purity and genealogy. Although in any case Israel as an “in-group” is separated from an “out-group,” the self-assessment of the community and the evaluation of identity markers differ. Thus, it can be observed that the identity of the Israelite resp. Yehudite community is by no means static, but rather dynamic and developing within the frame of biblical and especially Pentateuchal tradition.

A closer look, as provided in this volume, will raise questions regarding the three lines’ literary relation, which at several points seems to be quite obvious, and of course has to include further positions which maybe are not represented so prominently (e.g. possible counter texts).

In recent discussions about mixed marriage differences such as those demonstrated by our examples have been mentioned, but until now there has not been systematic research on this subject. Methodologically, in this volume we opt for a multi-perspective approach. Why a diachronic approach on mixed marriages texts is as necessary as a synchronic study of the intertextual web of references may be shown by a brief consideration of some crucial questions that have arisen in the recent debate.

a. Regarding a Synchronic Analysis of Mixed Marriage

Is there a discourse of different opinions traceable in biblical and extra-biblical tradition, and is there an outcome, a result or a main line at the end? How is the endogamous narrative tradition in Gen 26–28 or Gen 24 to be related with Ezra 9–10, or with the prohibition in legal texts like Exod 34 and Deut 7 and others?

If there were positive statements such as the book of Ruth, or positive sanctioned examples such as Keturah, the second wife of Abraham, Joseph’s wife Asenath, among others—what makes the restrictive position dominant in the end?

Were there views that included the possibility of proselytism or conversion of the foreign wives? (Or, to be more specific, without the required seven-year abstinence from cultic affairs set out in the Temple Scroll’s version of Deut 21:10–14 in 11Q19 63:14–15?)
b. Regarding a Diachronic Analysis of Mixed Marriage

Has the concept of matrimonial politics and practice undergone a significant development from clan-based endogamy (perhaps to be noticed in the ideal described by Gen 27:46–28:9) to a radical segregation of society with a stopover in only religious demarcation, or was it all the same before and since Ezra?

How are the concepts of moral, ritual, genealogical and physical purity and the issue of mixed marriage interrelated diachronically? Are they combined not before Hellenistic times in post-biblical traditions, or is the same concept of defilement attested in biblical texts?

Is the early post-exilic society really the starting point of the mixed marriage topic, or was the trouble of amalgamation with “the nations” a much later phenomenon, one arising when the identity of post-exilic Israel had already been constituted? If so, had there been prohibitions and rejections of mixed marriages before?

If a diachronic development can be established, we might naturally ask: Why and exactly when does the paradigm of rejection change from fear of apostasy in Exod 34, Deut 7 and 1 Kgs 11 to the “holy seed” in Ezra 9 or the purity issue in Jubilees, where any sexual relation to non-Israelites is defiling as such?

c. From a Socio-Historical Perspective

Who were the foreign wives who were divorced in Ezra? Were they part of the nations, part of the golah or part of the “people(s) of the land,” that is, segments not fully integrated into post-exilic society? And, of course, who is Israel resp. the group of golah-Yehudim, then? The mixed marriage issue is without doubt a gender issue in several respects. What is the literary and social background for the gender-biased evaluation of women in intermarriage context? It is mostly foreign women, not men, who are said to be dangerous (Num 25:2, 6; 1 Kgs 11:3, 33; Ezra 9:2 etc.). Yet, on the other hand, women are also explicitly shown as pious examples in potential counter-narratives (cf. Ruth or Zipporah). Thus, the question of women’s social status in post-exilic Yehud has to be raised.

Furthermore: How is the social and economic situation in Persian and Hellenistic Period Yehud related to the topic in general?

Is the question of inheritance law an issue here, since Num 27 and 36 seem to connect marital policy with it? Possibly some of the treaties from Elephantine could hint in the same direction.25

25. Cf. the contribution by Sebastian Grätz to the present volume.
The wide range of issues mentioned here outlines the necessity of an approach affording similar plurality. The complexity of the literary development and the remaining necessity for further discussions become obvious if one takes a closer look to the Ezra–Nehemiah discourse on intermarriage. Thus Ezra–Nehemiah will serve as a “point of departure” for several of the investigations provided in this anthology.

3. A Multi-Perspective Approach: Overview of the Essays

Finally, a brief overview on the present volume will be given. Essentially, the present volume is the result of the discussion started during a panel on mixed marriage at the SBL International Meeting 2009 in Rome. Most of the papers delivered in Rome are included in this anthology, with supplementary essays added to broaden the debate’s perspective.

As has been shown, the discourse on mixed marriage texts in Ezra–Nehemiah is significant, for it is here that the final point of biblical discussion is reached here. Ezra–Nehemiah provides a kind of base for the investigation of the wide range of biblical material, as well as an example of the application of Pentateuchal law in later times. Thus, several of the essays presented here deal with those texts offering different perspectives which help to enlighten the topic from different angles. The essay by Christian Frevel and Benedikt Conczorowski, “Deepening the Water: First Steps to a Diachronic Approach on Intermarriage in the Hebrew Bible,” tries to shed light at the complexity within the diachronic development of the anti-mixed marriage rationale by investigating Ezra–Nehemiah and Num 25 in particular. Katherine Southwood’s essay, “An Ethnic Affair? Ezra’s Intermarriage Crisis against a Context of Self-Ascription and Ascription of Others,” focuses on the functional aspects of the mixed marriage debate within society. Ralf Rothenbusch (“The Question of Mixed Marriages between the Poles of Diaspora and Home-land: Observations in Ezra–Nehemiah”) offers an investigation of the repercussions of Diaspora experience on post-exilic community, while Juha Pakkala (“Intermarriage and Group Identity in Ezra–Nehemiah”) correlates the texts from the composition of “Ezra–Nehemiah” with a diachronic perspective. To clarify how Ezra 9–10 develops the position of the Pentateuch, the essay by Benedikt Conczorowski (“All the Same as Ezra? Conceptual Differences between the Texts on Intermarriage in Genesis, Deuteronomy 7 and Ezra”) compares the positions of the patriarchal texts (Gen 24; 26:34–35; 27:46–28:9), of Deut 7:3 and of Gen 34.

26. This was followed by a panel on the same topic at the SBL International Meeting 2010 in Tartu.
with the mixed marriage narrative found in the Ezra story. Certain lines of argument with a prohibitive stance are identified and their progression within the Pentateuch and beyond is outlined in that study. Complementary to that, the essay by Jan Clauss focuses on the conceptual cohesion and correlation of three perspectives: temple, (holy) city and mixed marriages in the Ezra–Nehemiah composition (“Understanding the Mixed Marriages of Ezra–Nehemiah in the Light of Temple-Building and the Book’s Concept of Jerusalem”).

The Pentateuchal discussion mentioned above is the center of attention in Karen Winslow’s contribution, “Mixed Marriage in the Torah Narratives.” The related question of the depiction of Midianite women in the Pentateuch is outlined by Yonina Dor (“From Jethro’s Tent to Ba’al Pe’or: Different Attitudes to Intercourse of Israelites with Midianite Women”). Gary Knoppers illuminates mixed marriages in the book of Chronicles (“Married into Moab: The Practice of Exogamy by the Descendants of Judah in the Judahite Lineages”), a work which provides further support for the acceptance exogamy and which raises questions regarding the Chronistic position towards it.

Focusing on Elephantine, Sebastian Grätz (“The Question of ‘Mixed Marriages’: The Extrabiblical Evidence”) supplements the biblical debate with an investigation of the topic’s significance outside those texts.

Armin Lange’s essay, “Mixed Marriages and the Hellenistic Religious Reforms,” by including further apocryphal material from Second Temple Period Judaism, highlights a plurality of voices that is not limited to the biblical perspectives. This is further corroborated by the study of Christian Frevel, who considers the reception of the story of Dinah in the book of Jubilees and the development of the scriptural substantiation of the absolute rejection of intermarriage in early Hellenistic Judaism in Jerusalem (“Separate Yourself from the Gentiles” [Jubilees 22:16]: Mixed Marriages in the Book of Jubilees”).

Hannah Harrington takes Ezra–Nehemiah as her point of departure for analyzing “Intermarriage in Qumran Texts: The Legacy of Ezra–Nehemiah.” Harrington thus expands the focus to a further field of Second Temple Judaism and reception of the biblical rationale. The repository of an interesting voice in the chorus of the discussion on exogamy, namely, the texts regarding Moses’ foreign wives, will be investigated in an additional study by Karen Winslow (“Moses’ Cushite Wife: Tora, Artapanus and Josephus”).

Claudia Camp’s essay (“Feminist- and Gender-Critical Perspectives on the Biblical Ideology of Intermarriage”) deals with the topic within the context of a gender resp. feministic approach, highlighting the fact
that it is mostly about women who are said to be the “dangerous” partner in a mixed couple.

In sum, Ezra–Nehemiah will serve as an Archimedean point to the anthology, bringing into focus past and future developments in the attitude(s) towards mixed marriages. Thus a diachronically as well as synchronically differentiated notion of the topic is the objective. From that point, there are several approaches which, in a variety of ways, attempt to shed light on this highly differentiated subject. As has been shown above, there are a number of critical issues regarding mixed marriages which have to be included for the formation of an overall picture. Most of these will be addressed within the following essays, all of which aim to develop and clarify recent scholarly debate in that field.

Appendix:

A List of Hebrew Bible Texts Potentially Related to the Topic of Mixed Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Verses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leviticus:</td>
<td>21:7, 9, 13–15; 24:10–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers:</td>
<td>12:1; 25:1–18; 31:9–18; 36:1–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuteronomy:</td>
<td>7:1–6; 21:10–14; 23:2–9; 25:5–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joshua:</td>
<td>23:7, 12–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges:</td>
<td>3:5–6; 8:31; 12:9; 14–16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth:</td>
<td>1–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Samuel:</td>
<td>11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings:</td>
<td>11:1–8; 14:21; 16:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra:</td>
<td>2:59–62; 6:21; 9–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chronicles:</td>
<td>2:1–55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther:</td>
<td>2:5–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms:</td>
<td>106:28–36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah:</td>
<td>2:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah:</td>
<td>29:6–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezekiel:</td>
<td>16:3; 44:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosea:</td>
<td>5:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malachi:</td>
<td>2:10–16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>