

Authoritative Scriptures in
Ancient Judaism

Supplements
to the
Journal for the Study
of Judaism

Editor

Hindy Najman

Department and Centre for the Study of Religion at the University of Toronto

Associate Editors

Florentino García Martínez

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Benjamin G. Wright, III

Department of Religion Studies, Lehigh University

Advisory Board

J.J. COLLINS – J. DUHAIME – P.W. VAN DER HORST –
A.K. PETERSEN – M. POPOVIĆ –
J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN – J. SIEVERS – G. STEMBERGER
E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR – J. TROMP

VOLUME 141

Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism

Edited by
Mladen Popović



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Authoritative scriptures in ancient Judaism / edited by Mladen Popovic.

p. cm. — (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism ; v. 141)

Includes index.

“This volume is a collection of contributions that reflect on the issue of the authoritativeness of Scriptures in Second Temple period Judaism. They result from a conference that the Qumran Institute organized on 28–29 April 2008”—Preface.

ISBN 978-90-04-18530-2 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Bible. O.T.—Evidences, authority, etc.—History—To 1500—Congresses. 2. Bible—Criticism, interpretation, etc.—Congresses. 3. Judaism—History—Post-exilic period, 586 B.C.–210 A.D.—Congresses. 4. Dead Sea scrolls—Congresses. I. Popovic, Mladen. II. Title. III. Series.

BS480.A96 2010

221.1—dc22

2010014783

ISSN 1384-2161

ISBN 978 90 04 18530 2

Copyright 2010 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	vii
Preface	ix
Introducing <i>Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism</i>	1
<i>Mladen Popović</i>	
Rethinking the Bible—Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond	19
<i>Florentino García Martínez</i>	
The “Apocalyptic” Community, the Matrix of the Teacher and Rewriting Scripture	37
<i>George J. Brooke</i>	
Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture	55
<i>Arie van der Kooij</i>	
From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)	73
<i>Emanuel Tov</i>	
Authoritative Scripture as Reflected in the Textual Transmission of the Biblical Books: The Case of 1 Kings 3–10	93
<i>Julio Treballe</i>	
Quelques observations sur le ‘canon’ des «Écrits»	117
<i>Émile Puech</i>	
Reflections on the Status of the Early Enochic Writings	143
<i>Michael A. Knibb</i>	
Aramaic Texts from Qumran and the Authoritativeness of Hebrew Scriptures: Preliminary Observations	155
<i>Eibert Tigchelaar</i>	

Daniel and the Qumran Daniel Cycle: Observations on 4QFour Kingdoms ^{a-b} (4Q552–553)	173
<i>Albert L.A. Hogeterp</i>	
Pluralism and Authoritativeness: The Case of the S Tradition	193
<i>Charlotte Hempel</i>	
Prophecy and History in the Pesharim	209
<i>John J. Collins</i>	
Prophet, Books and Texts: Ezekiel, <i>Pseudo-Ezekiel</i> and the Authoritativeness of Ezekiel Traditions in Early Judaism	227
<i>Mladen Popović</i>	
Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish <i>Paideia</i>	253
<i>Hindy Najman</i>	
Ancestral, Oracular and Prophetic Authority: “Scriptural Authority” According to Paul and Philo	267
<i>George H. van Kooten</i>	
“The Words of the Prophecy of this Book”: Playing with Scriptural Authority in the Book of Revelation	309
<i>Tobias Nicklas</i>	
From Holy Books to Holy Bible: An Itinerary from Ancient Greece to Modern Islam via Second Temple Judaism and Early Christianity	327
<i>Jan N. Bremmer</i>	
Index of modern authors	361
Index of ancient sources	367

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Jan N. Bremmer is Emeritus Professor of Science of Religion and Comparative Religious Studies at the University of Groningen.

George J. Brooke is Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis at the University of Manchester.

John J. Collins is Holmes Professor of Old Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale University.

Florentino García Martínez is Emeritus Professor of Religion and Literature of Early Judaism, with special attention for the Dead Sea Scrolls, at the University of Groningen and at the Catholic University of Leuven.

Charlotte Hempel is Senior Research Fellow at the Department of Theology and Religion at the University of Birmingham.

Albert L.A. Hogeterp is researcher at the Faculty of Catholic Theology in Utrecht.

Michael A. Knibb is Emeritus Samuel Davidson Chair of Old Testament Studies at King's College London.

Arie van der Kooij is Professor of Old Testament Studies at Leiden University.

George H. van Kooten is Professor of New Testament and Early Christianity and Dean of the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Groningen.

Hindy Najman is Professor of Ancient Judaism and Director of the Centre for Jewish Studies at the University of Toronto.

Tobias Nicklas is Professor of Exegesis and Hermeneutics of the New Testament at the University of Regensburg.

Mladen Popović is Assistant Professor of Old Testament and Early Judaism with special attention for Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls at the University of Groningen.

Émile Puech is Professor at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem and Director of Research at the CNRS in Paris.

Eibert Tigchelaar is Professor of Religion at the Catholic University of Leuven.

Emanuel Tov is Emeritus J.L. Magnes Professor of Hebrew Bible at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Julio Trebolle is Professor at the Department of Hebrew and Aramaic Studies at the Complutense University of Madrid.

PREFACE

This volume is a collection of contributions that reflect on the issue of the authoritativeness of Scriptures in Second Temple period Judaism. They result from a conference that the Qumran Institute organized on 28–29 April 2008. The theme of the conference was *The Authoritativeness of Scriptures in Ancient Judaism: The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. All but one of the presentations held those two days appear in this volume and two papers that for various reasons could not be delivered at the conference have been added.

In autumn 2007, Florentino García Martínez retired from the University of Groningen as Director of the Qumran Institute and as Professor of Early Jewish Religion and Literature, with special attention for the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Qumran Institute was founded by Adam van der Woude in 1961 and was truly put on the map by Florentino García Martínez through his work for the *Journal for the Study of Judaism* and *Revue de Qumrân* and the Brill series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* and *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism*. It therefore seemed fitting not to let Florentino García Martínez's retirement from the University of Groningen pass unnoticed. In honour of his great achievements for the University of Groningen, the 2008 Symposium was intended as the first conference of a biennial series at the Groningen Qumran Institute.

It is with great pleasure that I thank the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies of the University of Groningen, the Groningen Research School for the Study of the Humanities and the Groningen University Fund for the financial support that made the conference possible. I thank Nathalie Lacoste for her editorial comments and Eline Veldt for her help in preparing the indices.

Mladen Popović, Groningen, January 2010

INTRODUCING *AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURES IN ANCIENT JUDAISM*

Mladen Popović

Many scholars of the Second Temple period have replaced the concept of canonization with that of a canonical process. The study of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been crucial for this new direction. Biblical, rewritten biblical and parabiblical manuscripts from Qumran have made us realize that their formation and production was a dynamic process. What is more, this new evidence has led many scholars to consider taxonomic terms such as biblical, nonbiblical or parabiblical anachronistic for the period before 70 C.E., since they impose later canonical categories on texts that predate fixed canons. In addition, some non-biblical texts were apparently as authoritative as the biblical texts, even though they did not end up in the Jewish or Christian canons. The notion of authoritative Scriptures plays an important part in the new paradigm, but it has not yet been sufficiently reflected upon and is in need of clarification. In this volume, the issue of authoritative Scriptures is addressed by focusing on specific texts or corpora of texts.

The issue raises many different questions and they can be approached from sociological, cultural and literary perspectives. There is the question of which specific texts were authoritative and in which respect: for example, regarding halakah or because they address the present and the future. Other aspects relate to how the number of manuscripts found at Qumran is indicative of a text's authoritativeness, or whether specific scribal practices reflect different levels of authority. Why were some texts more authoritative than others? For whom and in what contexts were texts authoritative? And what are our criteria for determining the extent to which a text was authoritative? In short, what do we mean by "authoritative"?

In addition, the issues of tradition and revelation should be raised. First, there is a tension between texts and traditions. There seems to have been no problem with rearranging, adding to, deleting from or rewriting texts. Texts such as *Jubilees* or the *Genesis Apocryphon* combine biblical and nonbiblical traditions. How do these different elements relate to each other? What is authoritative: the text itself or the

tradition of which it is a part? Second, there may also be a tension between authoritative Scriptures and new revelations. To what extent did the notion of authoritative Scriptures leave room for or exclude new revelations? According to the position exemplified by Josephus, prophecy and revelation after the time of Ezra were not trustworthy. At Qumran, new revelations were not only possible but could even be ascribed to contemporary figures such as the Teacher of Righteousness and not to some important figure such as Enoch or Ezra from the distant past. Writing new revelatory texts in the name of ancient figures or attributing them to contemporary individuals who unlock the correct understanding of authoritative Scriptures suggest different strategies for dealing with the tension between authoritative Scriptures and new revelations.

In answering the question of what is meant by “authoritative” we must also ask what made Scriptures authoritative? As many contributions in this volume show, Scriptures are not the only source of authority or authoritativeness. Indeed, Scriptures are not simply in and of themselves authoritative. An important aspect that contributes to the authoritativeness of Scriptures in the late Second Temple period is the presumed antiquity of those Scriptures or of the traditions they contain, in other words, the fact that they are ancient and represent ancestral tradition. Divine inspiration or authorship may be attributed to the Scriptures, but these often seem less important as a source of the authoritative character of these Scriptures than their presumed antiquity.

In addition to this aspect of antiquity or ancestral tradition, the authoritativeness of Scriptures must be understood in relation to those responsible for transmitting, studying and interpreting them. These were the scribes, who presumably had some sort of authority. One might think of Ben Sira, for example. In addition to scribal authority or sapiential authority, there was also royal and priestly authority. This illustrates the obvious fact that the social position of the people behind the Scriptures had a bearing upon the authoritative status that was attributed to them. Being associated with a temple library or archive, for example, would have given books authoritative status. Such a social body of authority presumably transferred some of its authoritative status to the Scriptures it possessed and transmitted. However, what can we say about books that were not directly related to a central social body of power such as a palace, temple or school?

At Qumran, the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness therefore seems to have been a special source of authoritativeness for scriptural interpretations and new writings transmitted within the community. Using the voice of the Teacher was an authority-conferring strategy. This illustrates that an inspired interpretation and the special status of a specific human author could also be a source of authoritativeness for ancient Jewish Scriptures. At the same time, it was not just the Teacher as such but possibly also the idea of a common group history that was an important source of authority in the production of new texts such as the *pesharim*. In the *pesharim* both the voice of the Teacher and the community's history come together as a form of collective memory. Significantly, the memory of the Teacher of Righteousness and the community's history intersect with the construction of that collective memory and contribute to the formation of the group's identity as well as to the production and transmission of old and new texts. Interestingly enough, a document such as the *Rule of the Community* that presumably was a core document does not seem to have recourse to the voice of the Teacher.

This brings us to another important but often overlooked aspect of authoritative Scriptures: the use of and reference to Scriptures often occurs in an argumentative context that shapes positions and identities. Various contributions to this volume stress how a context of conflict between various groups or positions determined strategies for claims to authoritativeness. This may pertain to the creation of new texts that attempt to establish their authoritativeness over that of older, ancestral Scriptures or to the alleged correct interpretation and explanation of ancestral writings.

These are just some of the aspects that the contributors to this volume address. The remainder of this introduction presents the various contributions and also points to the common ground between them. The issues raised in this volume are not only important for understanding the authoritativeness of Scriptures in ancient Judaism but also for further reflection on the transmission of traditions and the production of texts in the late Second Temple period.

Dismissing our idea of "the Bible" as anachronistic for the late Second Temple period, Florentino García Martínez focuses on two issues to understand the matter of authoritative writings in a historical context: (1) pluriformity or uniformity and (2) authority. With regard to the first issue, García Martínez argues that there is not enough

evidence to assume that only one textual type found currency around the temple of Jerusalem but rather that Qumran's textual pluriformity would have been representative for the whole of Palestine. This means that textual standardization is a later phenomenon.

With regard to authority, the second issue, García Martínez discusses two forms of authority-conferring strategies employed in different writings to assert and impose their authority. The first strategy of rewriting can be termed revelatory exegesis. Revelatory exegesis interprets old prophetic texts, adapts their meaning to new contexts and thus introduces new theological ideas. While discussing the so-called Amosh midrash in the *Damascus Document* (CD 7:14–18), García Martínez draws attention to the fact that the “Interpreter of the Torah” appears to be strictly in line with the books of the Torah and the books of the Prophets as authoritative writings. From this he concludes that the process of exegesis—the interpretation of the Torah which this figure represents and exercises—and the results of this interpretation were considered authoritative within the group.

The second strategy in Qumran was “the voice of the Teacher.” García Martínez draws attention to the important role of a figure such as the Teacher of Righteousness when it came to authority-conferring strategies. The voice of the Teacher was authoritative because the true meaning of the prophetic words was directly revealed to him and thus enabled him to act as a prophet.

George Brooke further explores the importance of the Teacher. He argues for a historical framework in the second century B.C.E. against which to understand the practices of scriptural rewriting. This historical context has two main aspects: an apocalyptic matrix and a particular set of Jews seeking a new identity. These two aspects characterize the context in which the collection of rewritings of scriptural antecedents (also called parabiblical texts) as found in the Qumran caves is to be understood.

Brooke suggests that the Teacher of Righteousness was the focus of the group's emerging identity in the second century B.C.E. and that the full range of rewritten scriptural compositions from Qumran is a mirror of the range of interests that he was able to hold together. The rewritten scriptural compositions reflect a wide range of genres with multiple purposes. The Teacher can, likewise, be seen as a notable multitasker, appealing to the various elements in the movement through a complex combination of strategies, literary and otherwise. Just as a rewritten text both receives authority from what it rewrites

and gives authority to it, so the Teacher's interpretative activity was redefined as authoritative inasmuch as it formed the pillar of the nascent movement.

Since the Teacher was a priest, Brooke argues, it was his priestly activity to interpret the tradition and the Law with a prophetic quality and quasi-mantic divinatory tone that would make him a suitable congregation builder. The Teacher thought of himself as an heir to Moses, setting himself up as a teacher or new lawgiver. Moreover, in his role of wisdom teacher he put himself firmly at the intersection between wisdom and the apocalyptic. The Teacher's ability to combine many roles (prophetic interpreter, mantic diviner, priest, poet, lawgiver and wisdom teacher) may typify how he functioned as a figure who could hold a diverse group of people together. For various reasons, the members of his group came to align themselves with the movement that was emerging as one of many responses to the new circumstances in the second century B.C.E. The Teacher's interpretative competence depended upon his ability to engage with and exploit the rewriting activity that was characteristic of the transmission of tradition during that period.

Arie van der Kooij also emphasizes the importance of the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness as a source of authority for new texts and interpretations. He focuses on the relationship between authoritative Scriptures, scribal culture and especially the role of scribes and scholars. Van der Kooij suggests that three elements point to the authoritativeness of books: (1) being ancestral or ancient, (2) being an object of study and (3) being associated with a temple library or archive. The first and third elements may explain why particular books were held in high esteem, but the second element may tell us more about the way, or to what purpose, particular books were employed.

Taking the Teacher of Righteousness and especially Ben Sira as examples, van der Kooij argues that the Scriptures, as a source of authority, were used and interpreted to legitimize leadership or priestly leadership. This interpretative activity was made explicit through the production of new texts. Thus, van der Kooij argues that the authoritativeness of Scriptures cannot be understood properly without paying attention to those responsible for transmitting, studying and interpreting them. The interpretation of Scriptures was, and remained, in the hands of specialists. Scribes represented the appropriate authority required for the interpretation of ancient books, and as leading scholars, they belonged to the elite of their society. The leadership position

of scholar-scribes in Jewish society and communities such as Qumran added to their authority. Van der Kooij concludes that ancient books would not be considered authoritative at all if they were not interpreted and taught by the appropriate authorities. From a sociological perspective, van der Kooij calls attention to the position of the scholar-scribe vis-à-vis the high priest. He argues that the former, someone such as Ben Sira, may be thought of as a counsellor to the latter. The positions of scribes and scholars were ordered in a hierarchical manner. The high priest stood at the top of the pyramid, and the interpretation and teaching of books would have ultimately fallen under his supervision.

In addition to authority-conferring strategies and sources of authority, another important issue is which specific texts were considered authoritative. Emanuel Tov reconsiders the taxonomic criteria for classifying the 4QReworked Pentateuch manuscripts (4Q158, 4Q364–367) from Qumran, which lie right on the boundary between biblical and nonbiblical texts, and argues that they may indeed reflect a group of Scripture texts that carried an authority equal to that of the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther and Daniel. The *Vorlagen* of the latter three books reflect a stage subsequent to that in MT and include major secondary features, but in spite of this, the new texts were considered authoritative Scripture texts, in both their Semitic and Greek forms.

Tov does not actually wish to change the name of the 4QRP manuscripts, but he clearly regards them as 4QPentateuch manuscripts. The issue is, however, whether these manuscripts should be considered regular Torah manuscripts. Discussing the textual and exegetical nature of the five 4QRP manuscripts, Tov addresses the issue of their authoritative status. The textual background of the five manuscripts differs. Two of the manuscripts are close to the sp (4Q158, 4Q364) and three manuscripts are written in accordance with the special Qumran scribal practice (4Q158, 4Q364, 4Q365), while two are not (4Q366, 4Q367). These manuscripts are not simply based on a pre-Samaritan text, since details have been added that reflect exegetical activity not instigated by the context. In spite of their exegetical freedom compared with an earlier text such as MT, Tov argues that the 4QRP manuscripts should be considered authoritative Scripture texts. Although it is not possible to prove in any detail whether this assumption is true, Tov points to the practice of indicating the divine name by using two dots before it (in 4Q364) as circumstantial evidence for the authoritative

status of at least one of the 4QRP manuscripts. The proto-Masoretic texts were presumably authoritative in temple circles, but for Qumran we cannot say that one textual family was preferred to another. Therefore, the default assumption should always be that all scrolls we consider Scripture had an authoritative status.

Julio Treballe addresses the issue of authoritative Scriptures in relation to the different textual forms of biblical books and focuses especially on pericope order in the sense of mobile units. The books in the Torah, Prophets and Writings were considered authoritative especially because they transmitted the lists and traditions which furnished evidence for the succession order of the Israelite priesthood, of patriarchs, judges and kings of Israel and Judah, and of prophets and sages in Israel. Treballe also emphasizes the importance of the real or perceived antiquity of these lists and traditions for their authoritative status. However, the issue of order is paramount in his approach and must be understood on two levels: (1) a literary and (2) a chronological or historical level.

The literary order of units that make up a book and the chronological order of characters and facts presented do not always correspond. The conflict between these two orders may determine the formation of different editions or textual forms, as well as the subsequent interpretation of the texts in them. Treballe illustrates this conflict between the two levels of order with an analysis of 1 Kgs 3–10 and the extensive parallels in Chronicles. 1 Kings 3–10 is marked by many transpositions between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint that affect the chronological order and the sequence of events during the reign of Solomon. These transpositions and other variants, Treballe suggests, seem to reflect a tension between the pericopes about the temple and its cult, those which derive from palatial sources and those which detail Solomon's wisdom as a master of sages and scribes. This corresponds with the three sources of authority for the canonical literature of the Hebrew Bible that Treballe discusses in the first part of his paper: (1) the sacred authority of priests, (2) the royal authority and (3) the wisdom or academic authority of scribal schools. He suggests that these different bodies of authority—religious, royal and scholarly—determined the contents and editorial processes undergone in the production of a book and that, reciprocally, the authority of biblical tradition is grounded on these authorities.

While Tov considers a specific set of Pentateuch manuscripts and Treballe looks at distinct sections of biblical texts, in particular those

that have undergone a transposition or interpolation, Émile Puech approaches the issue of authoritativeness at the level of entire biblical books grouped together in specific collections. More specifically, he considers the evidence for a tripartite division of authoritative, normative books in the second century B.C.E. and also proposes a new reconstruction of the tripartite reference in 4QMMT C 10–11 (= 4Q397 14–21 10). Puech suggests that the lacuna at the end of line 10 had $\text{וּשְׁתַּשְׂמוּ (ו)7}$ and the lacuna at the beginning of line 11 had כּוֹל אֱלֹהִים : “And also] we [wrote] to you that you must study (with care) the Book of Moses and the Books of the [P]rophets and (the book) of Davi[d, and that you must observe all of these,] generation after generation. And in the Book, it is written[.]” Puech argues that by referring to three collections of books the author of 4QMMT, whether or not he was interested in the issue of a tripartite division, at least shows that he wished to base his arguments on normative books.

Puech then discusses which normative books the Qumran community included under the heading of “the Prophets” (the Former Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and the Twelve Minor Prophets) and under the heading of “the Writings” (Psalms, Proverbs and probably Job). He uses, for example, quotation formulae as a criterion for this and notes that we cannot know the exact number, order and textual form within each division as these were less homogenous and unified at the time than the first division of the Pentateuch. Finally, Puech also pays some attention to the deuterocanonical writings that were found among the Qumran texts (Tobit, Ben Sira, Epistle of Jeremiah, *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and Aramaic *Testament of Levi*).

Michael Knibb reflects on the issue of authoritativeness with regard to the specific texts of early Enochic writings (the *Book of Watchers*, the *Astronomical Book*, the *Book of Dreams* and the *Epistle*). Evidence for the authoritative status of the early Enochic writings at Qumran consists of (1) the relatively large number of manuscripts of *Enoch* found there (twelve), (2) the influence of the story of the Watchers in other Qumran texts and (3) the importance of the Enochic calendrical teachings from the *Astronomical Book* as a model for Qumran calendar texts. Evidence also comes from other scrolls, such as 4Q247 (if it is indeed a peshet on the *Apocalypse of Weeks*), 4Q227 and 1QapGen ar 19:25–26, while *Jub.* 7:38–39 and 21:10 indicate the status enjoyed by Enoch and the writings attributed to him. Evidence for the authoritative status of the early Enochic writings in the wider Jewish community also comes from Ben Sira (44:16; 49:14). The fact that they

were translated into Greek and gave rise to other writings linked to the figure of Enoch is further evidence of the acceptance and authority enjoyed by the early Enochic writings outside Qumran.

With regard to the question of in what respect the early Enochic texts were regarded as authoritative, Knibb suggests that *Jub.* 4:17–22 corresponds entirely with the claim to authority made by the Enochic writings themselves about the kinds of knowledge known to Enoch, received either through revelation by the angels or through a vision. The early Enochic writings were considered authoritative with regard to knowledge about astronomy and the calendar, the past and future of humankind until judgement day and about cosmology. Knibb draws attention to a series of colophons that implicitly serve as markers of the text's claim to authority (*1 En.* 36:4; 81:2–3; 83:11; 90:40–42).

In response to recent reconstructions of “Enochic Judaism” that emphasize the absence of references to the Law in Enochic writings, Knibb suggests that too much has been made of this absence of references. He argues that the early Enochic writings were authoritative for what they said about the divine order of the world and about the present and future of humankind but not with respect to the Law. However, this, Knibb says, does not diminish or invalidate the importance of the Law for the authors of these texts.

Eibert Tigchelaar considers Aramaic texts in general, although we cannot generally talk about the Aramaic texts as a single group, and asks to what extent Aramaic texts found near Qumran relate differently to the Hebrew Scriptures than the Hebrew texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In other words, was the authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures for the Aramaic texts and their authors different to that of the Hebrew texts?

Tigchelaar reflects on different aspects of authoritativeness that arise in his discussion of particular Aramaic texts. In terms of sources of authoritativeness, in addition to the Scriptures, he also emphasizes ancestral tradition, supernatural revelations, divine inspiration or authorship and the special status of specific human authors or protagonists. In terms of attitudes towards authoritative Scriptures, Tigchelaar notes that references to Scripture are often argumentative and selective, aiming to legitimize or support one's own positions or interests, or to denounce those of opponents. As to in what respect Scriptures were regarded as authoritative, the scope of authoritativeness may differ and shift over time. Finally, allusions to, or the imitation or even emulation of, the style of earlier literature certainly indicates some

kind of authoritativeness but not necessarily the kind that determines belief or practice.

To assess the relation of the Aramaic texts to the Hebrew Scriptures, Tigchelaar looks at explicit quotations or references to Scriptures in Aramaic texts, at quotations, allusions and the use of Scripture, and at translations, reworkings and parabiblical texts, noting in relation to the so-called Danielic texts that it cannot be assumed, except perhaps for 4Q245, that the biblical book of Daniel actually preceded or influenced the other texts (see the contribution by Albert Hogeterp for a different view, however). Tigchelaar concludes that the parabiblical Aramaic texts affirm the cultural authoritativeness of the traditions incorporated in the Hebrew Scriptures but also challenge the view that those Hebrew Scriptures were the only authoritative traditions. This does not necessarily imply that the Hebrew Scriptures were less authoritative for the authors of the Aramaic texts, only that there were different strategies for authorizing additional elements and that there was a correspondence between language, literary genres and authorizing strategies.

Albert Hogeterp also focuses on Aramaic texts and specifically on the so-called Four Kingdoms manuscripts (4Q552–553). He examines whether and how this composition draws on underlying textual varieties in the Daniel tradition, suggesting that Danielic traditions surrounded the canonization process of the book of Daniel in the late Second Temple period. Hogeterp provides a detailed analysis of the text of *Four Kingdoms*, which shows textual variety, by drawing out the composition's literary shape and character, and he also examines the linguistic features and literary setting of 4Q552–553 in depth. Together with the composition's theological outlook, these features show that *4QFour Kingdoms* may in broader terms be considered a parabiblical work that provides an interpretative elaboration on Danielic themes and exhibits underlying textual variety in the Daniel tradition.

The general points of thematic connection between *4QFour Kingdoms* and the book of Daniel indicate that the parabiblical character of 4Q552–553 should not be perceived in terms of close textual dialogue with a fixed biblical text but rather as an elaboration of Danielic thought as part of a literary tradition that conceived of the idea of Daniel as prophecy. Hogeterp situates *4QFour Kingdoms* on a trajectory of early Danielic tradition that incorporated features of the literary history of Daniel, witnessed by a nonaligned Qumran Daniel scroll (4QDan^a) and LXX Daniel, which is not preserved in the Masoretic

Text. Accordingly, *4QFour Kingdoms* evinces a different picture of authoritativeness, one of Danielic thought that served as a prophetic model in a literary situation that was characterized by relative textual variety in the Daniel tradition.

Following these discussions of various Aramaic texts by Knibb, Tigchelaar and Hogeterp, Charlotte Hempel redirects our attention to a group of texts that are considered Qumran sectarian texts *par excellence*: the manuscripts of the *Rule of the Community* or *Serekh ha-Yahad* and related texts. Recent publications, she argues, have shown that the *Community Rule* was not authored from beginning to end by the Teacher of Righteousness, but rather reflects complex literary developments of the kind frequently proposed with reference to biblical texts. While others in this volume stress that the Teacher of Righteousness was a source of authority for specific compositions, Hempel suggests something different with regard to the Serekh manuscripts.

She discusses the evidence of the Serekh manuscripts and reflects on the function of these manuscripts as authoritative works in the community in light of their literary complexity and pluriformity. A close reading of the manuscript evidence reveals a significant degree of unevenness, contradictions almost, within one and the same manuscript, which indicates fluid traditions within and between different manuscripts. The earliest form of the *Rule* text is therefore best identified in the common material shared by the manuscripts rather than in the earlier of two variants where the manuscripts diverge.

Hempel suggests that the approach that one takes to the textual fluidity of the Serekh material should be similar to current approaches to the “biblical” and “rewritten Scripture” material. The relaxed attitude witnessed by the Qumran collection towards a plurality of what will become biblical texts is paralleled, she argues, by the equally relaxed attitude towards a complex and pluralistic Serekh tradition. As García Martínez and Tov also note in this volume, inconsistencies between manuscripts apparently did not trouble the owners of these texts. Rather than asking which of the Serekh manuscripts was the most authoritative at any given time, one should refrain from establishing its final, authoritative *Endtext*. The plurality of texts indicates that the manuscripts as we have them preserve snapshots of growing, living or evolving texts. They do not bear witness to a desire to produce a systematic final or authoritative document. In other words, what we have is a “changing Serekh text.”

John Collins also focuses on a genre of sectarian texts: the pesharim or formal commentaries on prophetic texts (Psalms included) from Qumran. He examines the role of historical allusions in the rhetoric of the pesharim, focusing on *Pesher Nahum* and *Pesher Habakkuk*. Although the value or appropriateness of the pesharim for reconstructing the history of the Qumran community is debatable, the issue is rather that they do not narrate historical events but merely allude to them.

Collins calls attention to the importance of recent history or the memory thereof as a source of authoritativeness within the Qumran community. Historical allusions to events in the first half of the first century B.C.E. must have made sense to the readers, Collins argues, however tendentious or perspectival they were. They must have referred in a recognizable way to a historical narrative that was accepted in the community. An authoritative account of the recent and current history, probably in oral form, to which the texts would correlate, is thus necessary to the internal logic and rhetoric of the pesharim.

History was taken to corroborate prophecy, either *ex eventu* or as the reassurance of things that will come to pass. According to Collins, this assurance in turn confirmed the community in its way of life and supported the identity of the group. Historical information played an important part in this argument, but it was provided selectively and indirectly, and it was subordinated to the purpose of reassuring the community that history was unfolding as had been foretold by the prophets. Collins argues for the historical value of the pesharim because of their historicizing application of the prophetic text and because the commentators did not always base their interpretation exclusively on the passage commented upon. Since the point of the pesharim was to demonstrate that prophecy was being fulfilled, such a demonstration required close attention to the biblical text, but it also presupposed, Collins concludes, an authoritative account of recent and current history, with which the text is correlated.

Mladen Popović approaches the issue of authoritativeness from the perspective of the relationship between biblical and parabiblical texts, using “Ezekiel” and “Pseudo-Ezekiel” from Qumran as a case study. Concerning the authoritative status of a biblical book in early Judaism, various scholars have suggested that the existence of parabiblical writings may indicate the authoritativeness of the compositions serving as exemplars or pretexts. Popović introduces another perspective by suggesting that the relationship between biblical Ezekiel and parabiblical

Pseudo-Ezekiel was reciprocal in the late Second Temple period, not only in terms of one occasioning the creation of the other, and the latter thereby confirming the former's authoritative status, but also in terms of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* influencing the text of biblical Ezekiel.

More importantly, a parabiblical work could also claim authoritative status as *Pseudo-Ezekiel* does by presenting itself as containing the words of Ezekiel himself. The composition does not portray itself as a secondary, or, as we call it, pseudo Ezekiel text. Assuming that the boundaries between biblical and parabiblical writings were less strong in the late Second Temple period than we now perceive them to have been, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* should not be understood as merely supplementing biblical Ezekiel. Different traditions, texts and books associated with or ascribed to the authoritative prophetic figure of Ezekiel interacted. *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and biblical Ezekiel texts, as witnessed by Papyrus 967 and MT or proto-MT, belong to a trajectory of Ezekiel traditions mutually influencing each other's interpretative emphases and directions during the transmission process and thus shaping the final form and expectations of what was to become the biblical book of Ezekiel in MT. For some people, a parabiblical book such as *Pseudo-Ezekiel* had an authoritative status if not surpassing then at least equal to its literary antecedent of a biblical book of Ezekiel, the text of which was not yet fixed in its entirety.

Hindy Najman turns our attention away from the Dead Sea Scrolls and directs it to the fascinating thoughts of Philo of Alexandria. She focuses on the relationships between authoritative figures and authoritative texts. The relatively new context of the Hellenistic competition of cultures and the even newer political context of Rome's dominance, presented Philo with the challenge of authorizing Judaism itself to both Jews and non-Jews. She suggests that in Philo's thought the authority of Scripture depends on its relationship with exemplary, authoritative figures such as Abraham, Isaac and Moses.

Philo's strategy was to carve the Jewish tradition of Moses and Mosaic law into the school of Plato by reading the Mosaic tradition in light of the Greek concept of *paideia* (education, instruction or even culture). This means that authoritative figures and texts are intertwined in Philo's conception of *paideia*, a reinterpretation that forms part of his strategy of authorizing Judaism in the light of Hellenistic culture and legitimizing Jewish written law in the light of the unwritten law of nature. In Philo's understanding of *paideia*, the conception of perfection as a teleological goal, namely to become soul or mind alone, is

crucial. Najman shows that one of Philo's most Hellenistic aspects is how he combined this with Jewish ideas and texts.

Following the Platonic tradition in which all knowledge is to be found within the human being, Philo understands Torah and Wisdom to be latent within the human being. Najman suggests that three paths to perfection answer the question of how one can be taught what one already knows. She argues that Philo saw three paths of *paideia*: (1) authoritative figures who are self-taught; (2) authoritative figures who can serve as a model for others to emulate; (3) the study of the Mosaic Torah as a perfect copy of the natural law. Philo's specific understanding of *paideia* both Hellenizes aspects of Jewish culture and Judaizes aspects of Greek culture. According to Philo, the goal of becoming mind alone can be attained through a life lived in accordance with a written law—a Scripture—that is nothing less than the embodiment of the law of nature.

Turning to the New Testament, George van Kooten argues that Paul's view of the authoritative Jewish writings is nuanced and subtle, which is somewhat analogous to Philo's views. Paul refers to the authoritative Jewish writings as "holy writings," but this does not imply that they are divinely revealed in their entirety and for that reason authoritative and holy. Like other contributors to this volume (van der Kooij, Treballe, Puech, Tigchelaar), van Kooten first stresses that Paul considers Jewish Scriptures authoritative because they are the ancestral writings of the Jews. This importance of antiquity or ancestral status as a source of authoritativeness for Paul parallels the way in which the ancestral writings of others in the Greco-Roman period were considered authoritative.

Paul did not regard the authoritative Jewish writings as revealed and inspired in themselves. To argue this point, van Kooten refers to Philo's distinction between three kinds of oracles. In addition to the oracles of direct divine speech, spoken by God in his own person, Philo also distinguishes between oracles of a mixed character that allowed room for human-divine cooperation and oracles that presupposed that the prophet, although inspired, spoke in his own person. This shows that Philo's understanding of the Jewish Scriptures is nuanced in the sense that not all oracles are divine to the same degree. Similarly, for Paul some parts of the Jewish writings are more authoritative than others insofar as they contain the direct divine oracles of God. Paul did not identify the Scriptural writings as "the Word of God" but attributed them to human authors, either to Moses, the author of the ancestral

law, or to the prophets who, like Moses, included the divine oracles within their writings and, in doing so, gave them a historical and interpretative context. Paul thus differentiates between ancestral, oracular and prophetic authority.

Van Kooten also discusses the Pseudo-Pauline passage of 2 Tim 3:16 that states that “all Scripture is inspired by God.” He argues that this passage represents a step towards a theology of scriptural inspiration on the level of the Scriptures themselves, but that much also depends on the translation. Although the view of 2 Tim 3:16 was made as a counterclaim against an emerging gnostic way of thinking which denied the authoritative status of particular writings, it is not entirely correct, van Kooten maintains, to say that the view that “only those passages inspired by God are useful” is gnostic. In a sense, it was also Paul’s view that various parts of Scripture had their own degrees of gravity depending on whether their authority was ancestral, oracular or prophetic.

Tobias Nicklas focuses on the New Testament book of Revelation. He addresses the tension or play between, on the one hand, the text’s claim to be God’s and Christ’s unalterable word and, on the other hand, the text’s allusions, images, motifs and structural analogies to Old Testament intertexts such as Isaiah, Zechariah, Ezekiel and Daniel, without, however, explicitly quoting from such texts. Nicklas argues that Revelation uses a threefold strategy to claim authoritative-ness for itself: (1) it refers to the authority of the Torah; (2) it refers to Israel’s prophets; (3) it presents itself as the word of God or Christ’s revelation.

Nicklas points to Rev 22:18–19 as a *Textsicherungsformel* through which Revelation relates its own claim to authority to the authority of the Torah, understood as an “inspired text,” and more specifically to three passages from the book of Deuteronomy in the Old Greek version (4:2; 13:1; 29:19–20), which are all geared towards ensuring its integrity, authority and liability. The emphasis on prophecy was occasioned by conflicts between early Christian prophets. Like Puech, Tigchelaar and Collins, Nicklas points to a context of conflict as a factor that determined strategies of claims to authoritative-ness. By claiming to pass down “words of prophecy,” the seer can put the conflict on a level with controversies of the Old Testament, where the real, God-sent prophets clash with pseudoprophets.

Nicklas argues that it is obvious why Revelation, in order to maintain the fiction of the immediacy of its own revelation as the word of

God or Christ's revelation, does not offer explicit quotations from the Torah or from the Prophets: a person who claims to record a revelation received from God and Christ and who directly envisions heaven does not need to quote Scripture as an authority. Revelation does not gain authoritativeness by having recourse to great human figures from the past but by presenting itself as God's or Christ's word. However, Christ does not only act as an authority of the past. As "Alpha and Omega" he is *the* authority of past, present and future. Even the exposure of the opponents as false prophets (and their connection to the devil) is put into his mouth.

In the final contribution to this volume, Jan Bremmer observes that if a book is a "holy book," it must surely be authoritative. However, he widens the scope of his investigation considerably by addressing not so much the status and meaning of holy books in different cultures but by tracing the origin and development of the expression "holy book" and by investigating when Jews and Christians began to call their authoritative texts "holy." The relevance of this seemingly banal question lies in the common practice of confusing its emic and etic usage in the sense that almost all modern scholars use the expression "holy/sacred book" even when the original culture does not, and that, as a rule, they do not differentiate between the two usages. He argues that the Greeks did not use the expression "holy book" but that the Egyptians did and it was from them that the Jews took the expression and in turn influenced the early Christians.

For the use of the term "holy book" in Second Temple Judaism, Bremmer discusses the evidence from the *Letter of Aristeas*, Aristobulus, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Philo and Josephus. With regard to the issue of canonization or canonical process, he suggests that the fact that ancestral books also acquired the status of "holy books" may well have contributed to the closure of the canon: once a certain number of books have been considered "holy," it must be more difficult to give others that status. With regard to the role of the priestly scribes in the period between Antiochus' defilement of the temple and its destruction in 70 C.E., Bremmer suggests that their declining importance as the traditional producers of authoritative texts is related to the rise of the "holy book," the growing material importance of biblical scrolls and to the observable transfer of authority from the scribes to the texts themselves.

With regard to the early Christians, Bremmer observes that the earliest Christians did not yet have an authoritative writing called the

“Holy Book.” They continued with the Jewish tradition of referring to their authoritative writings in the plural, but they also popularized the qualification *hagios* (“holy”). From the second until the late fourth century there was no uniform terminology, but two forms seem to have become dominant. In addition to the singular form *Hagia Graphê* (Holy Scripture), the term *Theia Graphê* or *Divina(e) Scriptura(e)* (Divine Scripture) was introduced, which in the course of the Middle Ages lost ground to the expression *Sacra Scriptura*. Furthermore, from the second century onwards Christians started to use the codex rather than the scroll for their authoritative writings. This may have been motivated in part by the desire or need to distinguish themselves from the Jews: what could have been safer than having the same appearance as Roman legal documents?

RETHINKING THE BIBLE
SIXTY YEARS OF DEAD SEA SCROLLS RESEARCH
AND BEYOND

Florentino García Martínez

1. INTRODUCTION

I believe that few of my colleagues will have enjoyed the opportunity and the privilege of having the topic of their farewell lecture provided by a young and dynamic successor. And not just the topic, but the title too. I was considering dedicating my valedictory lecture to reflecting on how material factors—such as the move from scroll to codex, from codex to book, and from book to the world-wide-web—have shaped our understanding of texts. Thus, when Mladen Popović sent me an email proposing the present topic and title, I was initially a little hesitant. Not about the topic (the topic of the symposium “The contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the understanding of the formation of the biblical canon” is fascinating) but about the title “Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond.” To me the title sounded a little presumptuous, only really conceivable to an academic in the full vigour of youth, intoxicated with energy and ready to conquer the world. It did not sound quite like the title of a valedictory lecture, where one would expect the mild ruminations of an old man more inclined to look back and to reread Qoheleth than to look beyond sixty years of research. And besides, has our research into the Dead Sea Scrolls not taught us precisely that “the bible” is a totally anachronistic concept for that time?

But after reflection I decided to accept not only the topic but the title as well. I accepted for three reasons—first and foremost out of respect for you, dear colleagues, who have travelled considerable distances to reflect on the topic and who might expect, according to the conventions of our Guild, that I would offer some kind of contribution of my own to the common project. A second reason, more personal, is that the topic suggested would align my farewell lecture with that of my predecessor at the Qumran Institute, my mentor and exemplar in academic work, Adam Simon van der Woude. As you know,

his lecture on “Pluriformity and Uniformity” was also delivered at the closing of a Symposium held in this same auditorium on 3 November 1992, and it also dealt with the contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to understanding the process of formation and transmission of the Old Testament.¹ A third, and even more personal reason, was that no less than ten contributions to the *Flores Florentino* address the topic, and this lecture would provide me with a golden opportunity to react to at least some of them and thus express my appreciation and thanks to their authors.² Therefore, with your permission, let us proceed with “Rethinking the Bible.”

I should first clarify how I understand “Rethinking the Bible.” To me, “Rethinking the Bible” means trying to understand the authoritative religious writings of the Qumran collection not from our perspective but in the way the people who brought together that collection understood them, which means putting these authoritative religious writings in their historical context at the turn of the era.

Sixty years of research into the Scrolls have proved without any doubt that our idea of “the Bible” is a complete anachronism for that period. What we call “the Bible”—be it the Hebrew Bible, the Greek Bible or the Christian Old Testament—was still in the process of formation; at an advanced stage to be sure, but certainly not yet crystallized. Eugene Ulrich succinctly worded the situation: “The first statement to make about the Bible at Qumran is that we should probably not think of a ‘Bible’ in the first century B.C.E. or in the first century C.E., at Qumran or elsewhere.”³ Our idea of “the Bible” supposes an accepted (fixed) number of books and an accepted (fixed) form of the text of each book,

¹ His farewell lecture was published both in Dutch and in English. A.S. van der Woude, *Pluriformiteit en uniformiteit: Overwegingen betreffende de tekstoverlevering van het Oude Testament* (Kampen: Kok, 1992). The English translation by Anthony Runia was published at the same time. A.S. van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament,” in *Sacred History and Sacred texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A.S. van der Woude* (ed. J.N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 151–69. Quotations will be from this English translation.

² A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar, eds., *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

³ E. Ulrich, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 77–93 (77), reprinted in E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 17–33 (17).

whose collection forms “the Bible.” In fact, our idea of “the Bible” assumes that the canonization process was completed and accepted as authoritative by a certain religious group.⁴ However, the collection of manuscripts found at Qumran shows that the canonization process was not yet complete, since it is easy to demonstrate that neither of the two fundamental assumptions is present there. “Canon,” according to the Ulrich’s definition, includes three aspects—it represents a reflexive judgment, it denotes a closed list and it concerns biblical books.⁵ As a reflexive judgment, canon represents a decision by which a communal and hence official agreement is reached that certain books are binding for a community.⁶ As a consequence, it denotes a closed list that specifies which books are included or excluded.⁷ Additionally, of course, it refers to biblical books, not the specific textual form of the books.⁸ At Qumran we do find biblical books, many biblical books—scrolls, strictly speaking—and in many different forms, be it in clearly different textual forms or in different editions, or rewritten in the form of new compositions, and all of them used indiscriminately. We also find some indications that two groups of books, designated as “Moses” (or the Torah) and the “Prophets” were already considered as different and more authoritative than the others, although we do not know for sure which books were included in these two groups, particularly in the group of the “Prophets.” What we do not find at Qumran is any indication of a closed list of authoritative books.

⁴ This is the reason why Julio Trebolle Barrera could call his best-known book *La Biblia judía y la Biblia cristiana: Introducción a la historia de la Biblia* (Trotta: Madrid, 1993), translated as *The Jewish and the Christian Bible* (Leiden: Brill), and he was able to write a fascinating contribution on the “Canonical Reception of the Deuterocanonical and Apocryphal Books in Christianity,” for *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 587–603.

⁵ E. Ulrich, “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible,” in *Sha’arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane, E. Tov, and W.W. Fields; Winona Lake, Ind.; Eisenbrauns, 1992), 267–91, reprinted in *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 51–78.

⁶ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 272: “The reflexive judgment when a group formally decides that it is a constituent requirement that these books which have been exercising authority are henceforth binding is a judgment concerning canon.”

⁷ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 272: “the reflexive judgment that these books but not those books are binding is a judgment concerning canon.”

⁸ Ulrich, “The Canonical Process,” 273: “It is the literary opus, and not the particular wording of that opus, with which canon is concerned. Both in Judaism and in Christianity it is the books, not the textual form of the books, that are canonical.”

There were of course texts that were accepted as authoritative by the Qumran group, and by other Jewish groups, and this authority appears in the way they are used, quoted, interpreted or rewritten in other compositions. However, these authoritative texts were not identical with, nor limited to, those which later we will find in the Jewish or in the Christian Bible. Many of these authoritative texts were present in very different textual forms (short, long, revised, reworked, abstracted, versions) and even in very different editions. This proves, as Ulrich emphasized, that what was considered authoritative was the book itself, not the concrete textual form of the book, since all these forms and editions were kept harmoniously together in the same library and, to judge from the interpretations, were used indiscriminately.

A well-known example (4Q175) will clarify my point. This manuscript, known as *4QTestimonia*,⁹ is a single sheet of leather, written by the same copyist who penned 1QS and 4QSamuel^c and using the same convention as other Scrolls of replacing the Tetragrammaton with four dots.¹⁰ It contains a collection of four quotations without further commentary or explanation, though each quotation is clearly marked, both by three blank spaces and by marginal marks after each quote.¹¹ The first quotation (in lines 1–8) is taken from Exod 20:18b according to the Samaritan tradition, a text which here brings together Deut 5:28–29 and Deut 18:18–19 of the masoretic Bible and announces the coming of a prophet like Moses, which was used by the Samaritans to foster the expectation of the coming of the Taheb, and which is used here to express the belief in the coming of the eschatological Prophet.¹² The second quote (in lines 9–13) is taken from Num 24:15–17 in a textual

⁹ Edited by J.M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 57–60, pl. XXI.

¹⁰ On this scribe, see E. Tigchelaar, “In Search of the Scribe of 1QS,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 439–52.

¹¹ The manuscript has been very intensively studied. For a select bibliography, see A. Steudel, “Testimonia,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:936–38, to which should be added the new edition by F.M. Cross in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 308–27.

¹² For a complete study of this quote and its relationship to the Samaritan expectations, see M. Vervenne, “Le Taheb samaritain: un mediateur de salut comme Moïse,” in *Congreso Internacional de Historia de las Religiones, Palma 2005* (ed. M.L. Sánchez León, forthcoming).

form similar to the one preserved in the Masoretic Text, but with several differences—not only orthographical but substantial—both with regard to the masoretic and to the Samaritan traditions, such as the use of ויקום instead of וקום, inserted above the line. This second quotation interprets the oracle of Balaam on the Scepter and the Star as referring to the coming of a future messianic figure.¹³ The third quote (in lines 14–20) is taken from Deut 33:8–11 and also included some variants from the Masoretic Text, applying the blessing of Levi to the expected priestly messiah.¹⁴ The fourth quote (in lines 21–30) is taken from a composition that was totally unknown until it was discovered in two Qumran manuscripts (4Q378–379), published under the name of *4QApocryphon of Joshua*,¹⁵ a composition that is a narrative reworking of the biblical book of Joshua, interspersed with prayers and discourses, most of them pronounced by Joshua, like the curse of Jericho, quoted from Josh 6:26.¹⁶

We can logically conclude that these quotations, which are all set at the same level, with the same introductory formulae, were considered as providing proof from authoritative writings of the ideas of the collector and can thus tell us something about the shape of the authoritative writings at that time. Alternatively, as I said, these authoritative sources are either an expanded and harmonised version of Exodus, attested at Qumran in several scrolls,¹⁷ which later came to be the

¹³ For a summary of the studies of this quote, see F. García Martínez, “Balaam in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam* (ed. G.H. van Kooten and J. van Ruiten; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 71–82.

¹⁴ As is generally recognized, except by J. Lubbe, “A Reinterpretation of *4QTestimonia*,” *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 187–97. For a discussion of his arguments, see E.C. Mason, “You are a Priest Forever”: *Second Temple Jewish Messianism and the Priestly Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 105–9. For a study of the quote and a comparison with 4QDeut^b, see J.A. Duncan, “New Readings for the ‘Blessing of Moses’ from Qumran,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 273–90.

¹⁵ Edited by C.A. Newsom in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (G. Brooke et al.; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 237–88, pl. XVII–XXV. As she notes, other manuscripts have been suggested as possibly being examples of the same composition, but there is no conclusive proof.

¹⁶ The latest studies of the quote known to me are D.C. Mitchell, “The Fourth Deliverer: A Josephite Messiah in *4QTestimonia*,” *Biblica* 86 (2005): 545–53 and the chapter “The Succession of High Priests: John Hyrcanus and his Sons in Peshet to Joshua 6:26,” by H. Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 63–89.

¹⁷ For example, 4QpaleoExod^m, edited by P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD 9; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 53–130, pl. VII–XXXII, and 4QExod–Lev^f, edited by F.M.

“Bible” for the Samaritans, and considered by Emanuel Tov as closely related to the “rewritten Bible compositions”;¹⁸ two slightly modified versions of Numbers and Deuteronomy, two books which later become the “Bible” for Jews and Christians; and a composition completely unknown before, very similar to other compositions found at Qumran and which are usually classified as “rewritten Scripture,” but which is considered here as authoritative as the other three writings. Thus the authoritative Scriptures of Qumran were clearly not identical with the Samaritan, Jewish or Christian Bibles of later times, and of course not with “the Bible” as such.

All of this forces us to “Rethink the Bible” in order to understand the authoritative writings not anachronistically but in their historical context, an enterprise which has now been ongoing for sixty years. Sixty years of research is a very long time, and even if we narrow our focus to the contributions of the research exclusively dedicated to “rethinking the Bible” it is impossible to do justice to the variety and importance of the advances made. For this reason, I will concentrate on only two questions: (1) the question of pluriformity or uniformity and (2) the question of authority.

2. FROM PLURIFORMITY TO UNIFORMITY—OR *E PLURIBUS UNUM*

In the already cited farewell lecture of van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” my predecessor and founder of the Qumran Institute focused on an incontrovertible fact—that while the collection of “biblical” manuscripts from Qumran shows a great variety of textual forms, the “biblical” manuscripts from the other Dead Sea Scroll collections (like Masada and Murabba‘at) agree, except for a few almost negligible details, with the consonantal texts which we know from the medieval manuscripts of the Bible and thus offer us a completely uniform textual form.¹⁹ This led him to raise the question of:

how and why was the uniform textual tradition reached which underlies the medieval manuscripts on which our Bible translations are based, in

Cross in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 133–44, pl. XXII.

¹⁸ E. Tov, “Rewritten Bible Composition and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54.

¹⁹ Van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” 155–57.

view of the pluriformity of the textual tradition of the Old Testament in Qumran?²⁰

After reviewing the answers already given to the question, van der Woude concluded that the question was wrongly formulated because it implied that pluriformity made way for uniformity, and that theoretically it was equally possible to assume that alongside a pluriform tradition there could also have been a basically uniform tradition which was passed on in the circles around the Temple of Jerusalem. After surveying the scarce evidence for the rabbinic tradition, the information gleaned from the *Letter of Aristeas*, the way that Chronicles quotes extensively from Samuel and Kings, and the evidence from 4QSam^a, he carefully concluded:

In other words, there is every appearance that since a long time one textual tradition held sway in the Temple of Jerusalem, a tradition which was later revised on a limited scale by priests and Scribes and which formed the basis of the text as we have it today.²¹

Thus for van der Woude there was not a process from the textual pluriformity attested to at Qumran to the textual uniformity attested to in the other collections, but these other collections represent the uniform text already present at the temple of Jerusalem. Or, as he put it:

we should consider the theory that the standardization of the text of the Hebrew Bible was a process within the framework of that one textual tradition and was not based on a selection from a pluriform tradition as we know it from Qumran.²²

Van der Woude would not have said *e pluribus ad unum* I assume, but would rather have suggested *unum cum pluribus*. The plurality of the Hebrew tradition would later disappear, and only the “unum” would remain and develop into our Bible.

Van der Woude’s position has been echoed in debate but I cannot say that it has become the dominant position or even that it has won many supporters. In any case, it escaped the attention of Armin Lange, who devotes his contribution to the *Flores Florentino* precisely to the same topic and reaches a completely different conclusion.²³ To Lange

²⁰ Van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” 158.

²¹ Van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” 167.

²² Van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” 167.

²³ A. Lange, “‘Nobody Dared to Add to Them, to Take from Them, or to Make Changes’ (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.42): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in

the process from pluriformity to unity is very real, started in Alexandria and was due to the influence of textual standardization of the Greco-Roman world, which reached its pinnacle in the critical editions of the Alexandrian library.

Lange's article bears as its title a quote from Josephus' *Against Apion*: "Nobody dared to add to them, to take from them, or to make changes." His basic question is similar to that of van der Woude:

How does Josephus' claim of textual stringency relate to the textual transmission of the individual biblical books as attested by the Dead Sea Scrolls and other ancient manuscripts? The manuscript evidence from the Qumran library seems to argue not for one standard text but for textual plurality.²⁴

The manuscript evidence from the Qumran library seems clearly to argue for textual plurality and reveals the forerunners of the three main medieval textual traditions and other nonaligned texts.²⁵ As we move closer to the time of Josephus the situation changes, since for Josephus: "we do not possess myriads of inconsistent books, conflicting with each other. Our books, those which are justly accredited, are but two and twenty, and contain the record of all time,"²⁶ and the manuscripts from the other caves of the Judean Desert except Qumran "deviate less than 2 percent from the consonantal texts of MT and are thus proto-Masoretic in character."²⁷ The problem is thus the same as that which van der Woude addressed: how did from "the many" become "the one"? However, where van der Woude saw the plurality coexistent with unity, Lange sees plurality overall, and also overall a process towards standardization that also affects the forerunners of MT.

Lange uses three examples to demonstrate this process of standardization in the form of revisions of the Old Greek translation towards the consonantal text of MT: the Greek manuscript of the Minor Proph-

Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigche-laar), 105–26.

²⁴ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 106.

²⁵ See E. Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 139–66.

²⁶ Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.38.

²⁷ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 110.

ets from Nahal Ḥever as a representative of the *kaige* recension;²⁸ 4QLXXNum (which Lange, with John Wevers²⁹ but against the editor Ulrich,³⁰ also consider as a revision of the Old Greek towards the consonantal text of MT);³¹ and the Papyrus Fouad 266b and 266c, the most interesting examples because these revisions towards the MT are older, come from Egypt and prove that the standardization process was not limited to Palestine.³² Another important manuscript for Lange's argument is 5QDeut, an old manuscript copied in a Hasmonean hand, corrected later on with supralinear additions by a Herodian hand which each time harmonized its text towards the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Old Greek, and which would prove that the standardization of the text was a general process, not always directed towards aligning an existing text with the proto-MT.³³ Lange thus concludes that at this time a process of standardization was clearly at hand and can best be seen in the revisions of the Old Greek translation. Based on this fact and on his interpretation of the *Letter of Aristeas*, Lange suggests that the process of standardization started in Alexandrian Judaism, influenced by the Greek practice,³⁴ and later the process was accepted in Palestine, when the opposition to Hellenism was subdued after Judea's conquest by Pompey in 63 B.C.E.³⁵

Can these two positions be somehow reconciled? I do not think so. Which one is the most correct? I am inclined to say that neither is.

I am not convinced that we have enough evidence to prove what van der Woude assumed, that around the temple of Jerusalem only one textual type found currency, the forerunner of our MT. I believe the situation we find at Qumran reflected the situation of all Palestine before the "Great Divide" of which Talmon speaks.³⁶ On the Qumran

²⁸ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 110–11.

²⁹ J.W. Wevers, "An Early Revision of the Septuagint of Numbers," *ErIsr* 16 (1982): 235*–39*.

³⁰ E. Ulrich, *DJD* 9:188–189, and already in his article "The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars, 1992), 49–80, reprinted in *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 165–83.

³¹ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 112.

³² Lange, "Nobody Dared," 113–14.

³³ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 115.

³⁴ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 121–22.

³⁵ Lange, "Nobody Dared," 122–24.

³⁶ S. Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 5–20 (14).

side of the “Great Divide,” in its historical context, this situation of textual pluriformity was not perceived as a problem or an embarrassment, but as a richness that could provide more possibilities for interpretation. There was no need for textual standardization.

I am also convinced that Lange somehow stretches the available evidence, that the phenomenon of standardization is a later phenomenon and that even Josephus can be used to prove the plurality of texts, since he uses different and nonmasoretic textual forms.³⁷ Which leaves us only with the state of textual plurality abundantly attested to by the Dead Sea Scrolls. The problem that both van der Woude and Lange try to solve is a problem posed from an anachronistic understanding of “the Bible,” and in fact is a problem that only exists from the perspective of the canon, but not when we think in historical terms.

I do not think we will ever know all the factors—religious, political, and cultural—that influenced the process which resulted in the different conditions prevalent on either side of the “Great Divide,”³⁸ but if we examine some of the authority conferring strategies employed in different writings to assert and impose their authority, we can fathom some of the reasons why in the historical circumstances of Qumran, textual plurality was the norm. This will be my second point.

3. THE QUESTION OF AUTHORITY—OR REWRITING, REVELATORY EXEGESIS, AND THE VOICE OF THE TEACHER

The first, and perhaps the most obvious way for a writing to establish its own authority in the ancient world, so different from ours, was by referring to other, already accepted, authoritative writing. At the same time, the writings that attracted secondary development, that were modified, interpreted or adapted, by the same token had their

³⁷ See the classical study by E.C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1978), or his more recent “Josephus’ Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel,” in *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (ed. L.H. Feldman and G. Hata; Leiden: Brill, 1989), 81–96, reprinted in *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 184–201; for the Pentateuch, see the monograph by É. Nodet, *La Bible de Josèphe, I: Le Pentateuque* (Paris: Cerf, 1996).

³⁸ Talmon singles out some of the political, societal and religious factors that may have influenced the process in mainstream Judaism, but also signals that “none of these events and developments affected the Covenanters’ community,” “The Crystallization,” 14–15.

authority enhanced and more firmly established. We can say that the intertext is used to authorize the new text, and that the new composition reinforces the authority of the existing text.³⁹

This process of “authorization” was, of course, already in use in the compositions which would later become the “Bible.”⁴⁰ If we consider the Hebrew canon, we see that several books, such as Deuteronomy or Chronicles, which are rewritings of other authoritative writings, have ended as canonical books—for example Deuteronomy rewrites legal materials from Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers, and Chronicles rewrites materials from Samuel–Kings. If we consider the Greek canon, the list of rewritings that became canonical is greatly enlarged. In his contribution to *Flores Florentino*, Tov put in this category 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel with their additions, to which 1 Esdras or 2 Maccabees can be added.⁴¹ Moreover, a look at the Latin canon will add even more books, such as 4 *Ezra*. That this process was very much alive is evident when we consider the compositions found in the Qumran collection.

The example of 4Q*Testimonia*, quoted above, brings to the fore the importance of the so-called “rewritings”⁴² as a key element for understanding the authority of sacred writings at Qumran, since the first and the fourth of the writings which are adduced as authoritative belong precisely to this category—the first quote, from a Samaritan type text, is a revision or a different edition of the source text; the fourth quote is from a more thoroughgoing reworking, in which the reference to the source text (the curse in the book of Joshua) is adduced to authorize the new composition.

³⁹ See G.J. Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 31–40.

⁴⁰ See the classical study by M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).

⁴¹ E. Tov, “3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions,” in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 345–66.

⁴² On the phenomenon of “rewriting,” see the sensible remarks of M. Bernstein, “The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the History of Early Biblical Interpretation,” in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (ed. H. Najman and J.H. Newman; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 215–38, of M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 20–28, and particularly of G.J. Brooke, “Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms.” For a more recent summary of the issues, see S. White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008).

George Brooke has written a very insightful article on the significance of reworking the Bible to understanding the canonical process.⁴³ In it he lists no less than nine forms in which the reworking of the Bible has influenced the canonical process, rendering unnecessary any discussion of the matter here in greater detail. I will quote only his conclusion:

This paper has tried to argue that from many perspectives the reworked scriptural compositions, some of which themselves end up as canonical, are a fundamental part of the transition from authority to canon; within early Judaism scriptural rewriting is an integral part of the process by which a composition moves from being authoritative in a limited way to belonging firmly to a canonical list.⁴⁴

In an article I published in 1991,⁴⁵ which was translated into English in 1995 as “Biblical Borderlines,”⁴⁶ I emphasized that thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls we “are located right inside this organic fabric of traditions which emerge as ‘texts’ and end up being ‘bible,’” since these manuscripts not only blurred the distinction between “text” and “texts,” but also between “biblical” and “nonbiblical” (or not yet, or no more biblical), and that in this situation “our categories of classification turn out to be inadequate for texts still in a state of flux.”⁴⁷ The modern debate on the category of the “rewritten Bible”⁴⁸ has prompted Moshe Bernstein—while noticing that “one group’s rewritten Bible could very well be another’s biblical text”⁴⁹—to develop an anachronistic tripartite typology of “revised Bible texts,” “rewritten Bible texts,” and “parabiblical literature,”⁵⁰ and has led Anders Petersen to retain the etic value of the label—for the sake of taxonomic interest in scriptural intertextuality—but to reject it at the emic level (as a distinct lit-

⁴³ G.J. Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104.

⁴⁴ Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon,” 104.

⁴⁵ F. García Martínez, “Las fronteras de ‘lo bíblico,’” *ScrTh* 23 (1991): 759–84.

⁴⁶ In F. García Martínez and J. Trebelle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 123–38 (all the quotes are from this English translation).

⁴⁷ García Martínez, “Biblical Borderlines,” 137.

⁴⁸ See M. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96, for a summary of the main positions.

⁴⁹ Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible,’” 175.

⁵⁰ Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible,’” 196.

erary genre),⁵¹ fully recognizing the fuzzy character of the evidence but at the same time emphasizing the importance of the relationship to a previous antecedent authoritative text in the process of establishing the authoritativeness of a new composition. It is obvious that all rewriting implies the recognition of the authority of the reference text (the book of Joshua in the case of *4QApocryphon of Joshua*), and it is equally obvious that at the same time it adds something to its authority.⁵² It is also obvious that all rewriting implies a particular interpretation of the reference text in order to adapt it to a new situation or to new ideas—otherwise the rewriting would not be necessary—and is therefore intended more to correct the reference text and to be accepted as its authoritative interpretation than to supplant it. At the same time it is equally obvious that not all rewritings acquired equally authoritative status. This implies that other additional authoritative strategies were needed to achieve this status.

A look at the two best examples of rewritings in the collection from Qumran that we can ascertain were accepted as authoritative in certain groups (*Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*) will prove my point.⁵³ *Jubilees* rewrites Genesis as a mosaic discourse in which the Angel of the Presence reveals the contents to Moses, in a process that Hindy Najman named “interpretation as primordial writing.” She describes the four authority conferring strategies used by *Jubilees* as recourse to the Heavenly Tables: a corpus of teachings kept in heaven, recourse to the Angel of the Presence who dictates the content to Moses, recourse to Moses as the recipient of the revelation, and recourse to the presentation of the new teachings as an interpretation of the Torah.⁵⁴ *Jubilees*, of course, is itself the subject of rewriting in the series of *Pseudo-Jubilees*

⁵¹ A.K. Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?” in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 285–306.

⁵² In the words of Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon,” 98: “Any text worth its salt would naturally be accompanied by a tradition of reworkings.”

⁵³ For the authoritative writings at Qumran in general, see J.C. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSS* 5 (1998): 382–402.

⁵⁴ H. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410. For a more detailed analysis of the significance of writing in the process of conferring authority, see Najman’s book, *Secundo Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) and her contribution “The Symbolic Significance of Writing in Ancient Judaism,” in *Idea of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. Najman and Newman), 139–73.

compositions (4Q225–228).⁵⁵ The authority conferring strategies of the *Temple Scroll*, which rewrites part of Deuteronomy, are different. Although the missing beginning of the scroll has deprived us of essential elements, we can conclude that the main strategy for conferring authority to the composition is the transformation of the reference text on a direct divine speech (in the *Temple Scroll* God gives direct orders, in the first person, without the mediation of Moses), thus making a direct claim on the source of all authority, the divine voice.⁵⁶

A look at other compositions would, without doubt, help us discover other strategies for conferring authority (*1 Enoch* provides a very nice case study), but I will only underline two strategies that are strongly related—one which is shared by many writings of nonsectarian origin and which I will call “revelatory exegesis,” using the terminology of Alex Jassen,⁵⁷ and another which appears in sectarian writings and which I will designate as “the voice of the Teacher.”

After analyzing the biblical precedents of the concept of “revelatory exegesis,” Jassen concludes that in Chronicles and in Ezra “revelation is reconfigured as a process of reading, interpreting, and rewriting ancient prophetic Scripture.”⁵⁸ This authority conferring strategy is employed in many of the compositions found at Qumran which interpret prophetic writings—attesting in this way to their authority—and that seem not to have been produced by the sectarian group. The *Pseudo-Daniel* corpus of writings (4Q243–246),⁵⁹ the *Pseudo-Jeremiah* and/or *Pseudo-Ezekiel* compositions (4Q383–391)⁶⁰ are good examples of this “revelatory exegesis” of prophetic texts, since these compositions

⁵⁵ Edited by J.C. VanderKam in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 141–85, pl. X–XII.

⁵⁶ See L.H. Schiffman, “The Temple Scroll and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E.G. Chazon. M.E. Stone, and A. Pinnick; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 121–31, reprinted in L.H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 163–74.

⁵⁷ A.P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

⁵⁸ Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 211.

⁵⁹ Edited by J. Collins, P. Flint, and É. Puech, *DJD 22:95–184*, pl. IX–XI.

⁶⁰ 4Q384 and 4Q391 were edited by M. Smith in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 137–93, pl. XVI–XXV, the rest by D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001).

interpret the extant prophetic books and use them to introduce new theological ideas and to adapt them to a new context.⁶¹

The value of “revelatory exegesis” as a strategy for conferring authority is clearly proved in my opinion in the following example, an example by the way, which shows the indiscriminate use of different forms of text in the lemmata and in the interpretation.

This example is taken from the Amos midrash that we find in one of the clearly sectarian compositions, the *Damascus Document*.⁶² It is completely preserved in CD A and partially in 4Q266, and is absent from CD B. In CD 7:14–18 the words of Amos 5:26–27 are interpreted thus:

As he said: (Amos 5:26–27) ‘I will deport the Sikkut of your King and the Kiyyun of your images away from my tent to Damascus.’ *Blank* The Books of the Law are the Sukkat of the King, as he said: (Amos 9:11) ‘I will lift up the fallen Sukkat of David.’ *Blank* The King is the assembly. And the Kiyyune of the images <and the Kiyyun of the images> are the books of the Prophets, whose words Israel despised. *Blank* And the star is the Interpreter of the Law, who will come to Damascus.⁶³

You will surely have noticed that the quoted text has only two elements (סכּוּת and כִּיּוּן, whatever these terms may mean in the biblical text), and that the interpretation has three—סוּכַת, כִּינִי, and כּוּכַב. However, if we look at the MT of Amos we find the three terms of the interpretation present because the complete quotation after “and

⁶¹ See, for example, F. García Martínez, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 163–76.

⁶² For the Cairo Genizah text, see the editions by S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910); C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents: Second revised edition* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958); E. Qimron, in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992); F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume 1 (1Q1–4Q273)* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); J.M. Baumgarten and D.R. Schwartz, “The Damascus Document,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995). For the Cave 4 copies, see J.M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273) (DJD 18)*; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996). For a reconstruction of the composite document, using the Genizah copies and those from Qumran, see B.Z. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2007).

⁶³ In the translation of DSSSE 1:561.

the Kiyyun of your images” (ואת כיון צלמיכם) also has “the star of your God” (כוכב אלהיכם). Also in the LXX, which has a somewhat different text that agrees with some elements of the interpretation, the “star” is present: καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, a good translation of the Hebrew כוכב אלהיכם; which allows us to conclude that “the star” was also in the original quote and has been lost by accident in the medieval copy.

This “Amos Midrash” has been much studied,⁶⁴ but what interests me here is the mention of the “Books of the Torah” (ספרי התורה) (7:15), of the “Books of the Prophets” (ספרי הנביאים) (7:17) and, in a strict parallel, the interpretation of the third element “the star” as “the Interpreter of the Torah” (והכוכב הוא דורש התורה) (7:18). Whether the plural of the expression “the books of the Torah” is identical or not to the expression “book of Moses” (ספר מושה) of 4QMMT⁶⁵ as a reference to the Pentateuch, or if it is used here to designate the Pentateuch and the book of *Jubilees*—as suggested by Ben Zion Wacholder⁶⁶—can be disputed, but this is unimportant to me here. What is important is that it constitutes a group of authoritative writings and is acknowledged as such. Equally, the precise contours of the collection designated “Books of the Prophets” is also less important to me now than its authoritative status, clearly reflected in the fact that “Israel” did not follow its words. However, the really surprising element in this quote is the third one, since “the star” is not interpreted as referring to a group of writings, as we would expect, but as alluding to a person and his function. This person is designated with a word from the root דרש, which means “search, inquire, interpret,” and summarizes what we now generally call exegetical activity. דורש is thus the person who realizes this exegetical activity, the Interpreter, and the object of his interpretation is the Torah. The figure that has this function within the group, the “Interpreter of the Torah” is thus placed here strictly in parallel with the two other collections of authoritative writings. This means, at least to me, that the process of exegesis—the interpretation of the Torah which this figure represents and exercises—and the

⁶⁴ The most important studies are collected in S. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 30 n. 66.

⁶⁵ 4Q397 14–21 10, line C 10 of the Composite Text. See E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 59.

⁶⁶ Wacholder, *New Damascus Document*, 239.

results of this interpretation, are considered authoritative within the group.

The last strategy of conferring authority to writings that I want to discuss is what I have called “the voice of the Teacher.” This description was used by van der Woude in his farewell lecture to explain why at Qumran pluriformity was not a problem:

But a pluriform textual tradition is not a problem for the believer *as long as there is an authoritative body within his circle which, besides Scripture, decides on doctrine and life and which, appealing to inspiration by the Holy Ghost, feels justified in adapting the tradition to the current situation.* In that case the norm is not only provided by the prophetic inspiration in the past of which Scripture is the result, but also and not in the last place by the claim of those who feel guided in the present by the Spirit of God... There it was above all the priest, referred to in the Dead Sea Scrolls as the Teacher of Righteousness, who subordinated the doctrine and life of the community to his authority inspired by God’s Spirit.⁶⁷

Van der Woude was thinking (I am sure) of several well-known texts from the pesharim, and more concretely from the Peshar Habakkuk. For example, in 1QpHab 7:1–5 we read:

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the consummation of the era. And as for what he says: (Hab 2:2) ‘So that /may run/ the one who reads it.’ Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made know all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets.⁶⁸

Van der Woude does not quote this or similar texts, but I am quite certain that he was thinking of them because a few years before his farewell lecture, in 1985, on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of his professorship, we organized a conference in his honour, published under the title *Profeten en profetische geschriften*,⁶⁹ to which I contributed with a study, in the beautiful Dutch of Ton Hilhorst, dealing precisely with this and similar texts, and I still keep and treasure the letter van der Woude wrote to me, commenting on my contribution.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” 167–68, italics in the original.

⁶⁸ DSSSE 1:17.

⁶⁹ F. García Martínez, C.H.J. de Geus, and A.F.J. Klijn, eds., *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (Kampen: Kok, 1986).

⁷⁰ F. García Martínez, “Profeet en profetie in de geschriften van Qumran,” in *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (ed. García Martínez, de Geus, and Klijn), 119–32.

We find the recourse to “the voice of the Teacher” as an authority conferring strategy only in the sectarian writings of Qumran, of course, while the recourse to the “prophetic exegesis” is to be found in compositions which do not show clear signs of having been written by the Qumran group. In the article “Profeet en profetie” I expressed the differences between the two strategies as follows

Anderzijds is, zoals we gezien hebben, onder de invloed van de apocalyptische traditie in Qumran het besef levendig dat de goddelijke openbaring aan de Leraar der Gerechtigheid is gegeven, niet alleen als geopenbaarde interpretatie van de profetische geschriften [‘revealed exegesis of the prophetic writings’], maar ook als rechtstreekse openbaring [‘direct revelation’] die de ontvanger in staat stelt op te treden als profeet.⁷¹

Although only attested to at Qumran for this period, I am not sure that this authority conferring strategy belongs exclusively to the Qumran group. In the article quoted, I underlined how this strategy of the pesharim was rooted in the biblical text. And is it not precisely this strategy that was the main one used by the writers of the New Testament to confer authority on their writings? However, this would clearly take us outside the scope of this lecture, and it is good to leave some questions open to work on during retirement.

What about the “beyond” of the title of my lecture? Do not worry. Even if I had “the voice of the Teacher” I would not dare to predict the directions of future research. Certainly, since research does not develop in a vacuum, it would be possible through an analysis of the things currently being published and of the topics whose discussion is planned for the near future to sketch the main lines of future research on the Dead Sea Scrolls. But since I performed precisely this exercise two years ago at the request of the Spanish Semitic scholars, I will not repeat those predictions here.⁷² Besides, the “beyond” is already among us. I see here many young women and men, better formed and prepared than we ever were, and infused with the same passion to explore the Scrolls that we had. As true בני אור and בנות they will extract from these old manuscripts all possible light, and they will tell you in the future the rest of the story.

⁷¹ García Martínez, “Profeet en profetie,” 131.

⁷² F. García Martínez, “Qumrán en el siglo XXI: Cambios y perspectivas después de 50 años de estudios,” *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos, Sección de Hebreo* 55 (2006): 309–34.

THE “APOCALYPTIC” COMMUNITY, THE MATRIX OF THE TEACHER AND REWRITING SCRIPTURE

George J. Brooke

1. APOCALYPTIC: ITS PROBLEMS AND ITS POSSIBILITIES

1.1. *Frey on Apocalyptic*

The purpose of this essay in honour of Florentino García Martínez is to argue that the practices of scriptural rewriting that are evident in so many of the Scrolls from the Qumran caves need to be seen in some kind of historical framework, against some actual historical circumstances. More than most other scholars, García Martínez has been able to combine views on the history of the Qumran community and the wider movement of which it was a part with the analysis of the literary genres and theological or ideological topics apparent in the Scrolls from the caves. His particular approach has been to argue that the manuscripts from Qumran and apocalyptic cast light on each other,¹ both in terms of genre and in terms of the transmission of tradition. Part of the historical framework for such transmission is famously known as the Groningen Hypothesis.² The hypothesis has been widely influential, not so much in terms of the details of its argument, but in terms of the encouragement it has given to what he himself has called an “era of recuperation”³ in which there has been much activity in providing nuance to the cruder analyses of earlier decades.

A helpful survey evaluation of this activity, both of its background from before the publication of the Groningen Hypothesis and of its

¹ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), x.

² F. García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *FO* 25 (1989): 113–36; idem, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 521–41; reprinted as Chapters 1 and 2 in F. García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

³ F. García Martínez, “La Apocalíptica y Qumrán,” in *II Simposio Bíblico Español* (ed. V. Collado and V. Villar; Valencia: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987), 603–13.

significance since then, has recently been provided by Jörg Frey.⁴ Frey has affirmed the widely used distinction between apocalypse as a genre, apocalypticism as possibly defining some groups, and apocalyptic as a set of themes or motifs, in order to address the question again as to whether or not the Qumran community or the Essenes merit the designation apocalyptic. Whilst many prominent scholars of earlier decades of analysis were content to use the label apocalyptic of the Qumran community,⁵ others were not.⁶ The writings of García Martínez and of John Collins⁷ have made the designation of ongoing applicability to various aspects of the phenomena that are both the writings found in the eleven Qumran caves and the community and wider movement which they reflect.

Frey's own position is in my opinion a helpful one: he has argued that whether or not particular items of literature in the Qumran library deserve the label apocalypse, it is clear that the community that collected the manuscripts together was open to the reception of apocalyptic.⁸ For Frey from a textual perspective the label apocalypse applies most obviously to the range of Daniel literature, the preservation of the Enoch traditions (including the so-called *Peshar on the Apocalypse of Weeks*, 4Q247), the book of *Jubilees* and related compositions, the *Jeremiah Apocryphon*, the *New Jerusalem* text, the *Visions of Amram*, and 4Q529 (the *Words of Michael*). He has suggested that none of

⁴ J. Frey, "Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis der Apokalyptik im Frühjudentum und im Urchristentum," in *Apokalyptik und Qumran* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2007), 11–62.

⁵ E.g., F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958), 56: "the Essenes prove to be an apocalyptic community, a Heilsgemeinschaft... they are priestly apocalypticists, not true ascetics." M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jhs v. Chr.* (3d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 395: the Essenes, originating from Hasidism, offer "eine Weiterentwicklung des apokalyptischen Geschichtsdenkens."

⁶ Notably H. Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495–530.

⁷ E.g., J.J. Collins, "Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Movement?" in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 25–51; idem, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997).

⁸ Frey, "Verständnis der Apokalyptik," 23: "[I]ch denke dennoch, daß sich im Blick auf die essenische Gemeinschaft auf dem Wege der *Rezeption* mehr an apokalyptischen Elementen feststellen läßt, als dies Stegemann in seinem programmatischen Vortrag von Uppsala einräumen wollte."

these are Essene compositions, but that the movement that was open to the reception of such texts found its own revelatory media most notably not in the narration of dream visions or heavenly journeys but in the inspired interpretation of Scripture. We shall return to this not uncommon idea later, but it is important to add to the notion of apocalyptic reception Frey's equal insistence on the apocalypticizing of wisdom traditions in the cosmic protology and eschatology of *Mysteries* and *Instruction*. Whether or not this is quite the right way to describe what is happening in such compositions, it is increasingly clear that there are multiple literary backgrounds to what is taking place as the sectarian compositions come to reflect particular sectarian identities.

Alongside the reception of apocalypses proper and "apocalyptic" wisdom, Frey recalls the place of heavenly realities in the community's self-description; in relation to apocalyptic in the Qumran Scrolls this is what García Martínez himself has called "communion with the heavenly world."⁹ This temple orientation underlines the need at least for the ongoing scholarly consideration of a priestly perspective in what characterizes the community.

1.2. *Looking for Alternatives*

However we define apocalyptic and apocalypticism and relate the Qumran data to such definitions, in fact, distinctively in the ancient Mediterranean world the Qumran site and the caves with their fragmentary manuscript remains provide the social historian with an unprecedented opportunity to discern, with some minor qualifications, what a particular group at a particular place at a particular time was reading and thinking. To my mind there has for too long been a tendency in Qumran scholarship to look for the single point answer to many of the problems with which scholars are faced when considering the Scrolls. To suggest that the Qumran community emerged out of a movement which had a single point of origin in the complexities of the third century B.C.E. or even earlier, and that the chief characteristic of that origin was apocalyptic or apocalypticism is to undermine the

⁹ F. García Martínez, "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism, Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.J. Collins; New York: Continuum, 1998), 179–84; reprinted as Chapter 10 in García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I* (ed. Tigchelaar).

complexity of the data and to focus on one aspect alone. To this extent the Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran origins is helpful in its heuristic clarity, but ultimately unsatisfying in providing a single, even if deep, point rather than a broad interpretation of the data.

Certainly, with Frey (and others) the notion of apocalyptic needs to be expanded to include not only much of the cosmological and eschatological material of the apocalypses proper, as those are represented in the library, but also the revelatory dimension of adjusted wisdom traditions and the sense of the immediacy of heaven in the cultic life of the community. These two further aspects permit the construction of a matrix for the movement reflected in the sectarian texts which has a significant place for mantic wisdom and the interpretative role of the priests in the cult. Neither of these matters is discreet from apocalypses and apocalyptic, as has long been recognized,¹⁰ and both share much that in other contexts might just as easily be labelled as prophetic. This broad definition of apocalyptic needs to be juxtaposed with the full range of compositions in the Qumran collection that might be dated to the second century B.C.E. The enormous range of so-called “parabiblical”¹¹ material overlaps in several ways with some elements of the broader definition of apocalyptic that I am working with, but also has some distinctive features of its own, that might broadly be labelled as scribal.

On this basis the collection of rewritings of scriptural antecedents as is found in the Qumran caves is to be understood in a context in which there are revelatory parameters in place but which also is a context in which a particular set of Jews is seeking a new identity. But before turning to a few comments on rewriting and identity formation, we need to consider some views of textuality. We may then be able to ask the question: what difference does consideration of these

¹⁰ On wisdom and apocalyptic see, e.g., B.G. Wright and L.M. Wills, eds., *Conflicted Boundaries in Wisdom and Apocalypticism* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). On the priestly element in apocalyptic see the landmark study of C. Rowland, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982).

¹¹ A. Lange, “From Literature to Scripture: The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library,” in *One Scripture or Many? Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives* (ed. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 51–107 (84); A. Lange and U. Mittmann-Richert, “Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (E. Tov et al.; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 115–64.

extended apocalyptic parameters make to our understanding of the processes of rewriting that are in so many of the compositions that survive in the Qumran caves?

2. NEW VIEWS ON TEXTUALITY

2.1. *Orality*

In relation to our wider topic of rewritten texts, into this second-century mixture, which I will label the matrix of the Teacher, we need to place two reconsiderations of textuality. The first is orality. Since the folklore concerns of nineteenth-century Old Testament scholarship, the study of orality has gone in and out of fashion. It now seems to be widely recognised as an inescapable part of the textual landscape of the Second Temple period. Many studies could be cited, but this has been recently presented in an accessible way in the broad brushstrokes of Richard Horsley: "Careful analysis of scrolls of books, including 'biblical' books of the 'Law and Prophets,' has demonstrated that they existed in multiple versions, which were still developing and not yet standardized in late second-temple times." Apart from the various forms of explicit commentary now found in a few sectarian compositions at Qumran, Horsley continues, "in the book of Sirach or in texts produced at Qumran, quotations of authoritative books are rare, and authoritative texts do not appear to have been studied and particular passages explicitly interpreted. Rather, texts of Torah and others were recited ritually and learned by recitation. It appears that in second-temple times scribes were engaged in oral cultivation, along with written copying, of a wide range of texts and other cultural materials. The cultural repertoire they cultivated included texts of Mosaic Torah, prophetic texts, and historical-legendary texts. It also included a segment of at least four different kinds of wisdom, including mantic and cosmological wisdom as well as the more familiar instructional and reflective wisdom."¹²

A clue to the oral activity of the Teacher can possibly be found in the major *Peshet Psalms*. In 4QpPs^a 4:26–27 we read a citation of Ps

¹² R.A. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2007), 11.

45:2b, “and my tongue is the pen of a skilled scribe (סופר מהיר),” which is interpreted in a very broken context of the Teacher of Righteousness who has worked with “purposeful speech”¹³ or “the reply of the tongue.”¹⁴ The tongue features in the interpretation of the Psalm because the phrase does indeed occur there, but this raises in an indirect way whether the commentator imagined the activity of the Teacher both as scribal¹⁵ and also as oral. Psalm 45 is a love song that presumably could have had some function within the worship of the Second Temple community. Did the Qumran commentator envisage that at least one suitable location for the scribal activity that he associates with the Teacher was in fact the community at prayer and worship when scriptural interpretation in oral form probably played a significant part? If so, we should imagine that not all the activity of rewriting was performed by scribes in their studies, but could have been scribes later writing down what had taken place in a more public and oral forum, a forum where elements of apocalyptic (that is revelation), priestly experience and mantic interpretation all somehow might have been conjoined. We should at least take seriously that the teacher’s tongue is “the pen of a skilled scribe.”

2.2. *Rewriting*

The second aspect of textuality that needs fresh consideration is the whole realm of rewriting in Second Temple Judaism. Since Geza Vermes first applied the term “rewritten Bible” to a group of predominantly narrative texts,¹⁶ it has been widely used, and, some would say,

¹³ Trans. M.P. Horgan, “Psalm Peshier 1 (4Q171 = 4QpPs^a),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 6–23 (21).

¹⁴ Trans. F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 347.

¹⁵ The role of scribe may also have formed a part of the curriculum vitae of the Teacher: see G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumranic Documents,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 91–119 (99); Enoch’s title “‘Scribe of Righteousness/Truth’ is also reminiscent of the Qumran sobriquet מורה הצדק.”

¹⁶ G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1961, 2d ed. 1973).

abused.¹⁷ The label developed for nearly a quarter of a century as a generic category, but the general release of the Cave 4 corpus in the early 1990s caused a change in some quarters such that the label began to be applied much more broadly to a set of literary practices that might be reflected in a very wide range of genres. Anders Petersen has characterized this variation as the difference between genre and textual strategy; he also prefers the designation "rewritten Scripture."¹⁸

A key aspect of much of what can be labelled as rewritten texts in the Qumran collection concerns their status. Most of these compositions sit somewhere between the breadth of use that may be acknowledged for the five books of the Torah and the particularly sectarian compositions that reflect the beliefs and practices of the separated group. It is often stated, for example, that the book of *Jubilees*, a rewritten Bible composition par excellence, belongs to a place and to a period in which some presectarian markers, such as a particular understanding of the calendar, are indeed discernible, but the composition as a whole is not sectarian. To my mind, something similar can be said about the *Temple Scroll*. It has several indicators of what might emerge as sectarianism but these are not developed explicitly with specific linguistic markers.

There is little or nothing that comes from the authorial pen of the Teacher. The compositions that are probably fairly associated with him most obviously are some of the poems amongst the *Hodayot*. What kind of rewriting activity is nurtured here? As with most poetry there is no direct or explicit quotation of texts as can be found in various other genres. Rather, earlier traditions are used to provide both structure and content to a new message. The *Hodayot* are what Gérard Genette might call a pastiche, imaginative and creatively playful imitation,¹⁹ or

¹⁷ See, e.g., M.J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96; Bernstein attempts to rescue the category as a literary genre and to distinguish it from the process of rewriting the Bible. See also the helpful clarificatory discussions in D.K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark International, 2007), 3–17; and in S. White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–18.

¹⁸ A.K. Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon – Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306.

¹⁹ G. Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (trans. J.E. Lewin; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

what I have elsewhere described as allusory anthologisation.²⁰ But this is also the case with the so-called “rewritten Bible” or “parabiblical” texts themselves. They do not generally cite their sources explicitly, not least because they are presenting themselves in imitation of or in continuity with their sources. If the *Hodayot* are juxtaposed with other rewritten literary texts, then we can suppose that the Teacher is making use of the methods of current scribal practice for his own ends, not least inasmuch as he is interested in forging a group with a strong identity.²¹

Whatever the case with the Teacher’s rewriting activity, when taken together, these two factors, orality and rewriting, create a new textual matrix in which the origins and further establishment of the movement of which the later Qumran community was a part can be set and understood.

3. NOTABLE MULTI-TASKING

3.1. *Expelled Priest*

Although there has been some recent discussion about the dating of the Teacher of Righteousness,²² I am minded to believe with the majority of those associated with the consensus view, as originally stated or as rehearsed with more nuance recently, that he belongs in the second century B.C.E.²³ Three points need to be granted immediately. The first

²⁰ G.J. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:287–319 (309–12).

²¹ The specific role of the Teacher in forming the identity of the Qumran community was a feature of the Groningen Hypothesis; I am arguing here that the Teacher did indeed play a role in community identity formation, but not just as an apocalypticist nor necessarily solely in relation to the group that eventually found itself at Qumran.

²² See, e.g., M.O. Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of His Movement,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 53–87; J.J. Collins, “The Time of the Teacher: An Old Debate Renewed,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P.W. Flint, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 212–29.

²³ This remains the dominant view amongst scholars who present summary assessments of the state of the question: L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia, Pa.: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 90, 117–21; J.C. VanderKam,

is that indeed there is no evidence to suppose that the succession to the high priesthood was the cause of the disputes between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest referred to in some of the pesharim. The second is that the fresh consideration of the archaeology of the Qumran site means that if it was indeed not occupied until the first quarter of the first century B.C.E., then a mid-second-century Teacher probably never went there; there is no evidence to put the Teacher at Qumran in any case. The third point is the somewhat problematic character of the numbers in the *Damascus Document*. Whilst it is widely agreed that the 390 years are a symbolic use of the figure from Ezek 4:5 (CD 1:5–6), those scholars who then declare that they are unable to use the figure for any kind of dating often go on to use the figure of twenty years in the next few lines (CD 1:10) as indicative of an actual time period. My preference is to see the 390 as a symbolic figure, indeed to recognize the way it contributes to a schematic jubilee-based period of 490 years, but at the same to recognize that the symbolism would lose much of its force if there were not some kind of relationship to actual historical circumstances.

From one point of view not a lot depends upon the date of the Teacher, but in the light of what can be proposed about his combination of qualifications, interests, talents and attributed characteristics I want to suggest both that he illustrates much of the new matrix that is represented by the predominance of scriptural rewriting, not least as that is dominant in the second century B.C.E. compositions that have survived in the Qumran collection, and also that he probably deliberately exploited that multi-dimensional matrix for his own ends in acting as a catalytic converter at a key moment in the movement's development.²⁴ My overall point is that the full range of rewritten

The Dead Sea Scrolls Today (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1994), 99–108; J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco, Calif.: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 275–92. M.A. Knibb, "Teacher of Righteousness," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:918–21 (920), writes: "There are good grounds for thinking that the Wicked Priest is to be identified with Jonathan, who held the office of high priest for the period 152–143 BCE, and this fits in with the view that the career of the Teacher of Righteousness should be dated to the second half of the second century BCE."

²⁴ On the role of the appropriation of Scripture in conversion see G.J. Brooke, "Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the*

scriptural compositions found in the Qumran collection is a mirror of the range of interests that the Teacher was able to hold together at a critical juncture in the formation of the group identity of the movement of which he was a part. Just as the rewritten scriptural compositions are in a wide range of genres with multiple purposes, so the Teacher can be seen as a notable multi-tasker, appealing to the various elements in the movement through a complex combination of strategies, literary and otherwise.

The most explicit characteristic of the Teacher is that he was a priest; he had either left the Temple for some reason or had been expelled. In 4QpPs^a 3:15–16 there is a quotation of Ps 37:23–24 in which divine support for the one who delights in the Lord is described. The interpretation identifies such a person as the Priest, the Teacher of [Righteousness], whom “God [ch]ose as the pillar. F[or] he established him to build for him a congregation of [...] [and] his [wa]y is straight to the truth.”²⁵ This well-known passage is widely referred to as confirming the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness as a priest; less is made of the complete context of this identification. Why should the Psalm lemma produce a reference to the Teacher that is concerned to identify him as a priest? The interpretation is concerned to talk about the role of the Teacher as the builder of the community. Herein may lie the clue. Perhaps it was particularly as a priest that the Teacher was remembered to have functioned as community founder.

One can then ask further questions concerning what kind of priestly activities made him a suitable congregation builder. Priests have two principal and explicit roles, as those who offer sacrifice within the cultic system on behalf of individuals and the community as a whole, and as those who interpret the tradition, especially the Law.²⁶ Since it seems as if *Peshier Psalms* comes from a first-century B.C.E. time when the community had probably withdrawn from full participation in the temple cult, it is likely that the dominant image of priesthood that the commentator wished his reader or hearer to appreciate would

Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 73–87.

²⁵ Translation from Horgan, “Psalm Peshier 1,” 17.

²⁶ On the place of priesthood in the structuring of authority in early Jewish and Christian communities see the pertinent remarks of M. Grossman, “Priesthood as Authority: Interpretive Competition in First-Century Judaism and Christianity,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. J. Davila; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 117–31.

have naturally been based on the Teacher's role as a priestly interpreter. In terms of the Law, this activity seems to be associated with revealing the hidden aspects of the Law as is implied in the so-called Amos–Numbers midrash in CD 7:14: "I will reveal the Sikkut of your king' . . . the books of the Law are the Sukkat of the king . . . and the star is the Interpreter of the Law." In terms of the prophets it is the Teacher to whom God makes known all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets (1QpHab 7:4–5). The interpretative activity of the priestly Teacher has a prophetic quality,²⁷ a quasi-mantic divinatory tone.²⁸ The collective memory of the community in the first-century pesharim is that a century or more earlier their Teacher had stood in continuity with scriptural texts and exposed and expounded them in foundational ways. Just as rewriting both receives authority from what it rewrites and gives authority to it,²⁹ so the Teacher's interpretative activity was recalled as authoritative inasmuch as it provided the pillar of the nascent movement, the way straight to the truth. At least part of the matrix of scriptural interpretative rewriting which the Teacher exploits for a varied audience is priestly, scribal, mantic.

3.2. *New Moses*

If the role of interpretation fits naturally with the priesthood of the Teacher, then a consideration of a few phrases in the *Hodayot* illustrate

²⁷ Though nowhere in the extant sectarian fragments is the Teacher called a prophet.

²⁸ On some of the possibilities and impossibilities of mantic wisdom see B.A. Mastin, "Wisdom and Daniel," in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J.A. Emerton* (ed. J. Day, R.P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 161–69; this seems to be leading in the right direction, since Daniel was one of the texts that form the backdrop to some aspects of the thought-world of the movement reflected in the Qumran scrolls, though there is no need to go so far as J.C. Trever in suggesting that the Teacher of Righteousness was the author of the book of Daniel: "The Qumran Teacher—Another Candidate?" in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 101–21. See also A. Lange, "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 377–435; and J.C. VanderKam, "Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 336–53.

²⁹ See G.J. Brooke, "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104 (96); Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon," 287, labels this "the reciprocal relationship that exists between authoritative texts and the writings they occasion."

that he also thought of himself as an heir to Moses.³⁰ In 1QH^a 12:6–13:6 there is a poem that clearly divides humanity into them and us. Some have thought that this poem most closely represents the Teacher's self-understanding. Be that as it may, the poem opens dramatically with a thanksgiving: "I thank you O Lord for you have enlightened my face according to your covenant...like a sure dawn, with perfect light, you have shone for me." Julie Hughes has written of this phraseology: "On the occasion of the giving of the Torah to Moses the skin of Moses' face was said to radiate. The only other place in the Hebrew Bible where light and covenant are linked is Isa 42:6."³¹

The phrase "like a sure dawn" is an allusion to Hos 6:3 which speaks of knowing the Lord whose coming is as sure as the dawn and like rain, a pun that can be exploited as referring to both raining and teaching (ירה). In the poem the Teacher seems to be aligning himself as a new Moses with the experience of the founding figure on Sinai and setting himself up as a teacher or new lawgiver.

With Mosaic ideology the possibilities of drawing out the prophetic role of the Teacher, even his possible prophetic self-understanding, comes into focus.³² The *Hodayot* at several places, not least in echoing the concerns of Deut 18, reflect on true and false teachers and prophets. Although it is possible to suggest that Moses is not a complete ideal for the members of the movement whose literary character is reflected in the sectarian Scrolls,³³ part of the opportunity of aligning oneself with Moses was the option for offering rewritten Torah, the prophetically inspired exposure or exposition of the *nistarot*.

³⁰ J. Cherian has understood one aspect of the Moses typology in the *Hodayot* as aligning the "Teacher" with Moses as "wet-nurse" on the basis of Num 11:12: "The Moses at Qumran: The מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק as the Nursing-Father of the יוֹדֵד," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume 2: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2:351–61 (355–58).

³¹ J.A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 105.

³² Though not explicitly designated as such in any extant fragments, many scholars have considered that the Teacher can be classed as prophet: see, e.g., J. Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 197: "It is tempting to say that the gift of interpreting prophecies is a *higher* gift than that required to deliver them in the first place: one would not be surprised to find someone who had it, such as the Teacher of Righteousness, described as a 'prophet!'"

³³ See G.J. Brooke, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking at Mount Nebo from Qumran," in *La Construction de la figure de Moïse/The Construction of the Figure of Moses* (ed. T. Römer; Paris: Gabalda, 2007), 209–21.

Since the presectarian wisdom tradition in the Scrolls is also concerned with the mediation of the mysteries of existence, one take on this activity could be to suggest how it overlaps with the role of the wisdom teacher. "The Teacher of Righteousness himself can be understood as a wisdom teacher."³⁴ The apocalyptic character of wisdom texts is widely recognized, as we have already noted, particularly in the cosmic and eschatological aspects of *Instruction* which have put it firmly at the intersection between wisdom and apocalyptic.³⁵ In the role of wisdom teacher, sage or *maskil*, the Teacher could have reflected on how he could mediate various traditions to those who found his insights appealing. Part of his activity, for sure, was the exploitation, through rewriting, especially poetic anthologisation, of the movement's scriptural inheritance for informing its emerging identity.

4. IDENTITY AND INTEGRITY

4.1. *The Teacher as Focus of Identity*

In the previous section we have noted briefly that the two most secure aspects of the Teacher's biography were his priesthood and the way he portrayed himself as a Mosaic teacher of some kind. Such roles could easily be associated with others, such as those of the creative scribe, the prophetic interpreter, the mantic diviner, the inspired sage, etc. The ability of the Teacher to act in many roles, even simultaneously, may have been how he functioned as a figure who could hold a diversity of people together as for various reasons they came to align themselves with the movement that was emerging as one amongst several responses to the new circumstances of the second century B.C.E. Some would have recognised his priestly authority, some might have warmed

³⁴ M. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 6; developing ideas of C.A. Newsom, "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the *Maskil*," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.G. Gammie and L.G. Perdue; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 373–82; A.S. van der Woude, "Wisdom at Qumran," in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (ed. Day, Gordon, and Williamson), 244–56 (255–56); and J.J. Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 265–81 (280).

³⁵ See, e.g., J.K. Aitken, "Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature," in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and Millennium. Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (ed. P.J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 181–93.

to his sagacity, some could have been on a spiritual journey which his map fitted best, some were inspired by his own inspired explicit and implicit scriptural interpretations, and so on. Nevertheless, whatever role or function the Teacher had and which enabled the response of those joining the movement, in almost all cases his interpretative competence as priest, lawgiver, prophetic commentator, wisdom teacher or poet depended upon his ability to engage with and exploit the rewriting activity that was characteristic of the transmission of tradition in the Second Temple period. What possibly survives of his own output can be found amongst the *Hodayot* and in their case recent analysis has observed how the poems function to create identity.

In a notable essay Carol Newsom has asked “What do *Hodayot* do?”³⁶ In a wide-ranging answer to her own question she has noted chiefly how the poems construct the moral identity of the reader or hearer by taking them into a language system that “minimizes human agency.”³⁷ Newsom defines the rewriting activity of the poet as follows: “This tendency to ‘perfect’ a notion is not unrelated to the tendency, discussed above, for Qumran discourse to proceed by citing a piece of received tradition and then pairing it with a restatement in sectarian terminology. The sectarian reinterpretation typically either sets the cliché in a wider cosmic scope or in much more absolute terms (e.g., 1QH^a 7:15–17). Such a habit of speech, framed as statement and (re)interpretive restatement, provides a mode by which the inherited moral vocabulary may be reaccented and made to refer to contexts and concepts that were not present in its traditional uses.”³⁸ In this way the particular rewriting activity of the *Hodayot* is a rewriting towards sectarian identity. The *Hodayot* are a remarkably powerful seduction into community fellowship as the self of the reader or hearer is constructed in one very appealing way and the self of the other denied through all manner of stereotypical dehumanisation.

4.2. *Integrity of the Community as Rewriting Scripture*

The further possibility needs to be considered briefly that in fact the community for which the Teacher acts as a focal point is itself, in

³⁶ CA. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 191–286.

³⁷ Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 266.

³⁸ Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 267.

identifying with him, living its life as a particular rewriting of Scripture. The communally integrated existence that the Teacher is associated with, either in fact or in terms of the historical reconstructions of later generations, is an ideological marker. As Jutta Jokiranta has commented, "the teacher of the pesharim represents an ideal community member, who captures some essential characteristics of the group's identity."³⁹

At one level this can be put quite straightforwardly. The movement that the Teacher brings into focus rewrites the notion of exile present in the Deuteronomistic History by insisting that the Sin-Exile-Return model is to be applied to Israel's experiences in a way rather different than the reformed returnees of the late sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. might have supposed. What is commonly noted about the movement that is reflected in the Scrolls is that it seems to think of itself as continuous with Israel, an Israel with a renewed covenant. The overwhelming majority of compositions in the Qumran collection depend in one way or another on scriptural antecedents.⁴⁰ At another level it seems as if, for example, their self-perception as a cultic community caused them to speak of themselves as the representation of scriptural ideals themselves. They are the sanctuary, the **מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם**,⁴¹ they are the **דָּהַר**, the Sinaitic community in the wilderness (whether spiritually or actually) on their way to re-entering the promised land with a purified Jerusalem.⁴² They are the correct interpretation of the text, a communal rewriting.

³⁹ J. Jokiranta, "Qumran: The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social-Identity Approach," in *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in Its Social Contexts* (ed. P.F. Esler; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2006), 254–63 (254).

⁴⁰ As I have suggested in G.J. Brooke, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Biblical World* (2 vols.; ed. J. Barton; London: Routledge, 2002), 1:250–69.

⁴¹ See, e.g., G.J. Brooke, "Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultes im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 285–301.

⁴² On the prophetic character of this view of exile see G.J. Brooke, "The Place of Prophecy in Coming out of Exile: The Case of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 535–50.

5. EXEGESIS AS THE ESSENCE OF COMMUNITY EXISTENCE

5.1. *Necessary Interpretation*

My two concluding points can be presented quite briefly. In the first place comes the recollection that interpretation is a fundamental existential activity. The presence in the Qumran collection of so many compositions that seem to be rewriting Scripture in a wide variety of genres has provoked much interest amongst scholars. There seem to be both presectarian and sectarian rewritings of Scripture. Intriguingly in general the tenor of the collection at Qumran seems to be other than the kind of rewriting that can be found in the Books of Chronicles in relation to Samuel–Kings or some other source.⁴³ It is in general different too from the kind of rewriting that can take place during copying. It is different moreover from the rewriting that is often evident in translation. The *tendenz* in much of the rewriting that one finds at Qumran is apocalyptic, not in the narrow sense of genre, or as a special set of particular motifs, but in the wider sense with which this short paper began. There is a concern with implicitly presenting the rewriting as if it was revealed.

In this it is worth recalling the way in which April DeConick has talked about some early Jewish and Christian mystical texts. She has insisted that the fundamental belief that the sacred could be experienced was supported through engagement with the Scriptures. But many mystical writings, she claims, “freely retell the biblical narratives under the auspices of an alternative revelation from an angelic being or primeval authority.”⁴⁴ These rewritings undermine the need to differentiate between revelation and exegesis. The same can be observed for much of what is preserved in the Qumran library. The quasi-sectarian book of *Jubilees* has a mediating angel, the *Temple Scroll* has a divine voice, the mysteries of existence are available to the sage, and within the community’s own writings the presentation

⁴³ On the contribution of Graeme Auld to how the relationship between Chronicles and Samuel–Kings might be explained see G.J. Brooke, “The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. R. Rezetko, T.H. Lim, and W.B. Aucker; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 35–48 (35–37).

⁴⁴ A.D. DeConick, “What is Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism?” in *Paradise Now: Essays on Early Jewish and Christian Mysticism* (ed. A.D. DeConick; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 1–24 (7).

of the Teacher's insights are described as made known to him by God (1QpHab 7:4–5).

5.2. *Overall Conclusions*

In this short essay I have tried to suggest that some attempt needs to be made to understand why it is that in the second century B.C.E. the emergence of the movement whose literary remains we find at Qumran takes place at a time when the rewriting of Scripture, notably with claims to or in forms of fresh revelation, is also a dominant part of literary activity.⁴⁵ Part of the move towards an answer comes through acknowledging the need to broaden the discussion of the apocalyptic character of the nascent movement to include a wider range of compositions than a strict generic definition of the label apocalypse might allow. Part of the move towards an answer comes in trying to appreciate that the collective memory⁴⁶ within the movement of the Teacher permits the reconstruction of an authoritative and creative voice of a persona whose self-presentation could act as a catalyst in helping to integrate a wide range of people, probably mostly disaffected elites, not all of whom would be seeking apocalyptic solace. In exercising his leadership role this Teacher himself exploited the exercise of rewriting, not only through what might be guessed as his interpretative strategy with regard to the Law and the Prophets, but more ingeniously through his anthological activity as an inspired poet, capable of constructing his inherited tradition so as to encourage his readership or audience to rewrite themselves into his scriptural community.

⁴⁵ It is true that scriptural rewriting continues in Judaism after the second century B.C.E., as in the Targumim and Pseudo-Philo, and can also be observed in Christianity (Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon," 288, even wonders whether the relationships between the Gospels can be described in terms of rewritten Scripture). However, from the first century B.C.E. onwards there is an increasing place given to explicit citation and interpretation, rather than rewriting, a change that is attested by the mixture of interpretative genres in 4Q252: see G.J. Brooke, "4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 385–401.

⁴⁶ See the brief comments by J. Vázquez Allegue, "Memoria Colectiva e Identidad de Grupo en Qumrán," in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 89–104 (91).

AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURES AND SCRIBAL CULTURE

Arie van der Kooij

1

At this conference, which is held in honour of a great scholar, I would like to focus on the relationship between authoritative Scriptures and scribal culture in order to examine whether the role of scribes and scholars may shed light on the theme of our meeting and if so how. Before doing so, I will start by discussing a few notions to be found in the sources of the time, the Hellenistic era, which mark the authoritativeness of particular books.

A most interesting passage can be found in the Prologue to the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira.¹ It reads:

My grandfather Jesus, who had devoted himself for a long time to the reading of the Law, the Prophets, and the other books of our ancestors,
and developed a thorough familiarity with them,
was prompted to write something himself
in the nature of instruction and wisdom (8–12)

This passage, referring to a given set of books, contains a significant feature which deserves attention. The expression “the other books of our ancestors” implies that all the books involved are considered “ancestral” (πάτριος). In antiquity, the notion of being “ancestral” or “ancient” meant that the object concerned was considered authoritative.² Thus, the collection designated here as “the Law, the Prophets and the other books,” has a special position in the sense of worthy of

¹ For another passage that is of interest, see Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.42.

² Cf. H.G. Kippenberg, “Die jüdischen Überlieferungen als patrioi nomoi,” in *Die Restauration der Götter: Antike Religion und Neo-Paganismus* (ed. R. Faber and R. Schlesier; Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann, 1986), 45–60; G.G. Stroumsa, “The Christian Hermeneutical Revolution and its Double Helix,” in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World* (ed. L.V. Rutgers et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 9–28 (11). See also K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 256.

respect and sacrosanct.³ The emphasis here is on the idea of “ancient” in the sense of constituting a basic element of a religion and culture, in this case of the temple state of Judea.

The notion of “ancestral” also marks the difference in status between the ancient books, on the one hand, and the writing of Ben Sira, on the other. It indicates that the Wisdom of Ben Sira, at least in the view of the grandson, does not have the same status as the books of the ancestors, although it is also clear from his Prologue that the new book is considered significant precisely because it is based on a study of the ancestral ones.⁴

This element, the “study” of the books of the ancestors, is just another feature that points to these writings enjoying a position of authority. The grandson praises his grandfather as someone who “devoted himself for a long time to the reading of the ancient books and as someone who developed a thorough familiarity with them.” The terms used here (ἀνάγνωσις and ἔξις) are also found in the *Letter of Aristeas* (§121), where they reflect the standards of Alexandrian scholarship. The “reading” of Scriptures implied study and interpretation, as is clear from other texts, such as 1QS 6:7 and, again, the *Letter of Aristeas* (§305). The figure of Ezra, who will be discussed below, is also of relevance as a priest and scribe who, according to Neh 8:13, explained the law to others, which of course presupposes a reading in the sense of study (cf. Ezra 7:10).

The emphasis on the study of ancient books is attested by other documents of the time, such as the so-called Halakhic Letter (4QMMT), dating from the middle of the second century B.C.E. In C 10 it is stated: “We have [written] to you so that you may study the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (that/those of?)⁵

³ The designation implies a “defined” collection that is not to be confused with the idea of a “definitive” one (in the sense of a closed canon). See A. van der Kooij, “The Canonization of Ancient Books Kept in the Temple of Jerusalem,” in *Canonization and Decanonization* (ed. A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 17–40 (28). This distinction is overlooked by A. Lange, “Pre-Maccabean Literature from the Qumran Library and the Hebrew Bible,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 277–305 (287).

⁴ On the position of the Wisdom of Ben Sira in early Judaism, see V. Koperski, “Sirach and Wisdom: A Plea for Canonicity,” in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 255–64.

⁵ T.H. Lim has argued that “in David” is probably best understood “as an elliptical reference to David’s deeds” (“The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible,” *RevQ* 20/77 [2001]: 23–37 [35]). It is true that the Hebrew verb (קָבַל *hip’il*) can be used in relation to the understanding of the deeds of someone (God, or kings) in Qumran writings, but in the case of 4QMMT C 10 it stands more to reason to interpret the elliptical expression “in David” in light of the preceding terminology,

David.”⁶ The Hebrew verb for “to study” used here (לִיבַּח *hip’il*) also occurs in Dan 9:2, again referring to the reading and interpretation of ancient books—in this case the book of Jeremiah.⁷

A third element can be added to these two elements, namely, the fact that the ancient ancestral books were kept in the temple of Jerusalem. This we know from several sources of the time.⁸ One of the passages that presupposes books being deposited in the temple can be found in CD (7:14–18). It interprets Amos 5:26 by saying that God will remove the books of the Law and the books of the Prophets “from my tent,” that is, from the temple, to Damascus. According to Josephus the highest authorities of the temple—the chief priests—were responsible for taking care of the collection of biblical books (*C. Ap.* 1.29). The fact that books were deposited in a temple is indeed another indication that these books were held to be important, because depositing them in the temple gave them an official status (cf. Deut 31:26; 2 Kgs 22–23).⁹

These three elements—being ancestral, being an object of study and being deposited in a temple library (or archive)—mark the significance of particular writings of the time. The first and third aspects—being ancestral and being kept in the temple—help us understand why particular books were potentially held in high esteem, but they do not tell us anything about the way, or to what purpose, these books were used. As to this question, the aspect of “study” is most interesting and important because without being studied, the ancient books—the Scriptures—would remain silent objects.¹⁰

“in the book, or books of.” In the case of “deeds,” one would have expected an explicit reference in the text. See also the contribution of Émile Puech in this volume.

⁶ The text continues thus: “[and the] [events of] ages past.” The expression used here does not refer to writings (*pace* J.C. VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *DSD* 5 [1998]: 382–402 [388]), as is clear from 4Q270 (see E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma’āšē Ha-Torah* [DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], 59).

⁷ For the root לִיבַח alluding to the study of Scriptures, see e.g. CD 10:6; 13:2; 14:7.

⁸ See A. van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches* (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1981), 332–35; R.T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and Its Background in Early Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1985), 80–86.

⁹ On the significance of libraries or archives in antiquity, see K. van der Toorn, “From Catalogue to Canon? An Assessment of the Library Hypothesis as a Contribution to the Debate about the Biblical Canon,” *BiOr* 63 (2006): 5–15.

¹⁰ In addition to the aspect of study, the “public reading” of Scriptures should be mentioned; see A. van der Kooij, “The Public Reading of Scriptures at Feasts,” in *Feasts and Festivals* (ed. C.M. Tuckett; Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 27–44.

To provide an illustration of the study and interpretation of Scriptures,¹¹ I would like to come back to Jesus ben Sira. According to his grandson, Ben Sira wrote his book, *Wisdom*, on the basis of a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures. If we look at the work itself, however, we need to modify this evaluation. First, there is reason to believe that the sources of wisdom as listed in Sir 39:1–4 imply a wider literary horizon than the ancient books of Israel.¹² Second, the grandfather's book has two parts: the first contains wisdom, in the strict sense of the word (1–43), the second is called the Praise of the Fathers (44–50). As to the issue of the use of Scriptures, there is a great difference between the two sections. There are only a few instances in the first part where passages from the ancient books are alluded to,¹³ whereas the second part is heavily based on them:

Throughout these chapters, Ben Sira manifests an easy and thorough familiarity with the earlier Scriptures—the Pentateuch (the Law), Deuteronomy [sic], Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings, Chronicles, Nehemiah, Psalms, Proverbs, and Job.¹⁴

These chapters (44–50) contain a rather detailed depiction of leading figures of ancient Israel. What did Ben Sira want to make clear in this part of his book? As Alexander Di Lella puts it: “he attempts to show how Israel’s ancestors have something significant to say to believers of his day.” They could be seen as models of righteous behaviour (cf. 44:10: “Yet these also were godly people whose virtues will not

¹¹ The term “Scriptures” is used here both for the late Persian and the Hellenistic periods. There is reason to believe that the literature considered authoritative acquired additional significance after the crisis of the years 169–164 B.C.E. in Jerusalem, as the dramatic events of these years resulted in a stronger emphasis on everything “ancestral,” including the ancient books kept in the temple (van der Kooij, “Canonization of Ancient Books,” 36). For a similar observation, see Lange, “Pre-Maccabean Literature,” 288–90.

¹² See P.W. Skehan and A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 46–50; Van der Kooij, “Canonization of Ancient Books,” 33–35. For a different view as far as 39:1–3 is concerned, see P.C. Beentjes, “*Happy the One who Mediates on Wisdom*” (Sir. 14,20): *Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 118–20.

¹³ For the evidence, see Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 40–44 and Beentjes, *Collected Essays*, 169–86.

¹⁴ Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 500. See also L.L. Grabbe, “The Law, the Prophets, and the Rest: The State of the Bible in Pre-Maccabean Times,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 319–38 (323–27).

be forgotten”) and a source of pride for the contemporary Judeans. There is, however, more to it. The crucial question concerns the role of Sir 50, which contains praise of the high priest Simon. Di Lella considers this chapter to be an appendix,¹⁵ but in recent times many scholars have suggested that the praise of Simon forms an integral part of Sir 44–50. Several features indicate that it is the climax of the whole section.¹⁶ An important structural element in this respect is the agreement between 45:25–26 and 50:22–24.

May his kindness toward Simon be lasting; may he fulfil for him the covenant with Phinehas So that it may be not abrogated for him or for his descendants, while the heaven last. (Sir 50:24)

This statement is closely related to 45:24–25, the passage about the covenant made by God with Phinehas for an eternal high priesthood, which is based on the story about Phinehas in Num 25:6–13 (esp. 12–13). It is striking that, unlike the text in Numbers, Sir 45:24–25 also contains a reference to the covenant with David (concerning kingship). As scholars have convincingly argued, both verses testify to a particular ideology of the time, namely, that the office of high priest was held to include the royal office.¹⁷ Other elements in the writings of Ben Sira support this interpretation of the passage under discussion.

Ben Sira used and interpreted Scriptures, in particular the passage in Num 25, in a way that served political interests. Using and interpreting them in this way helped to legitimize the high priesthood of his day, the office that was held by members of the Oniad family. This was, of course, a matter of major interest since the office of high priest was crucial to the polity of the Jews in the Hellenistic era (see further below).

We know of other examples of the legitimation of leadership on the basis of the Scriptures. An interesting case can be found in the writings (pesharim) from Qumran where the Teacher of Righteousness is presented as the fulfilment of ancient prophecies, such as the prophecies of Habakkuk. This procedure implies that he was seen as the legitimate leader and teacher of the community (in the final days), in contrast to

¹⁵ Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 499.

¹⁶ See J. Corley, “A Numerical Structure in Sirach 44:1–50:24,” *CBQ* 69 (2007): 43–63. Cf. Beentjes, *Collected Essays*, 123–33.

¹⁷ See A. van der Kooij, “The Greek Bible and Jewish Concepts of Royal Priesthood and Priestly Monarchy,” in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (ed. T. Rajak et al.; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2007), 255–64 (259–60).

a figure such as the Wicked Priest, who was considered an illegitimate leader on the basis of Scripture. Legitimation by way of a particular interpretation could thus pertain to a particular person as leader, but it could also apply to a type of leadership. For instance, it is likely that the phrase “royal priesthood” in LXX Exod 19:6 refers to the priests as rulers of the Jewish people, pointing to a political ideology very similar to the one expressed in Sir 45:24–25.¹⁸

The interpretation and application of the books of the ancestors as illustrated by the work of Ben Sira shows that they were used as a source of authority. His reading and understanding of the ancient books made them relevant to his time and to his readers and established the authority of the ancient texts.¹⁹ This is particularly clear when, as argued above, this authority was used to legitimize the priestly leadership of the time.

It needs to be noted that Ben Sira, as well others, made his interpretation explicit by producing a new text. The interpretation offered in writings such as the Wisdom of Ben Sira was presumably taught orally—in the setting of a school—but, for one reason or another, it was also put into writing. Both elements, that of study and teaching in the setting of a school and, more particularly, the production of new books, fit the Hellenistic culture of the time. This period was marked by the appearance of schools and libraries and by a growing reading public (relatively speaking).²⁰ This may shed light on new literary productions such as those that were based in one way or another on the “ancestral” books.²¹ Furthermore, one can imagine that this new climate of book production also had a bearing on the ancient books themselves. It would have stimulated the making of copies for reading and study purposes.²²

¹⁸ See van der Kooij, “Greek Bible and Jewish Concepts,” 258–59.

¹⁹ This procedure includes several uses of Scriptures, such as quotations, allusions, and forms of rewriting. On quotations and allusions in writings from Qumran, see Lange, “Pre-Maccabean Literature,” 288–90.

²⁰ See van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 23–25. On the issue of literacy, see also A.I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 116–17.

²¹ For example, *Jubilees*. See also Lange, “Pre-Maccabean Literature,” 289.

²² Cf. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 26; Lange, “Pre-Maccabean Literature,” 290.

The issue of the study of Scriptures discussed above, however, is only part of the picture because to interpret the ancient books one needed persons who were able to do so—"scribes." In his stimulating study, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*, Karel van der Toorn draws our attention to the role of the scribes, as specialists and people of social standing, in the making of the Hebrew Bible. Similarly, one cannot look at the authoritativeness of Scriptures without paying attention to the role of the scribes—that is to say, to the experts who were responsible for the interpretation of ancient texts. Although, as noted above, a growing number of people were able to read in the Hellenistic period, the interpretation of Scriptures was a matter for specialists.²³ As I will argue, the relationship between the authoritative Scriptures and the role of the scribes is crucial, because the scribes were the appropriate authorities for the interpretation of the ancient books.

This of course raises the question: who were the "scribes"? The answer is too complex to examine in detail here, but the following remarks and observations may suffice to make my point clear.²⁴ Although various terms are used to designate scribes, the word *sofer* is the most well known. It has different shades of meaning. Primarily, it refers to a scribe in the sense of a secretary, but in sources dating to the late Persian and Hellenistic periods it is also used to denote leading scholars of the time, such as Ezra, the priest (Ezra 7:6), and Ahiqar, a wise counsellor at the court of a king (*The Story of Ahiqar* 1.1 [Aramaic]). Interestingly, in both cases the phrase ספר מהיר is used, conveying

²³ Those who were able to read were few in number. Most people learned by *listening* to readings and teachings, particularly as far as the Law was concerned. See, e.g. Neh 8:7–8; the passage of Hecataeus of Abdera quoted above; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.175 (about the Sabbath assemblies). See also Baumgarten, *Jewish Sects*, 120–21.

²⁴ For literature on the subject, see e.g. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (3d ed.; London: SCM, 1976), 233–45; E.J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985), 63–69; D.E. Orton, *The Understanding Scribe: Matthew and the Apocalyptic Ideal* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 39–133; J. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995); C. Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); H.-F. Weiss, "Schriftgelehrte: I. Judentum," *TRE* 30:511–16; Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 51–108.

the notion of an expert scribe.²⁵ Other examples of this usage are to be found in Sir 38:24 and in 11QPs^a 27:2–3 (about David).²⁶ In these two cases as well as in *The Story of Ahiqar*, the scribe is portrayed as a “wise” man.²⁷ Such figures belonged to the intellectual elite of their time and held an important position in society (cf. Sir 38:24–39:11).

Nehemiah 8 contains a story that provides a nice illustration of a scholar-scribe as an authority. The story says that Ezra, “priest” and “scribe,” read the book of the law to the people at a public and official meeting and therefore affirmed “the authority of the written word for the life of the community.”²⁸ The law was thus publicly ratified and brought into force.²⁹ Such a proclamation of the law, however, is only effective if the people recognize the person conducting the ceremony as an authority.

Interestingly, the Levites also appear in the story of Neh 8 because it is they who are said to help the people understand the law by reading it aloud “clearly” and “by giving its sense” (Neh 8:7–8). In other words, they play the role of teacher (see also 2 Chr 17:7–9).

Thus, Ezra the priest is presented as the leading scholar, whereas the Levites, as teachers of the people, have a lower position. Ezra is the prime authority, as is also clear from another passage in this chapter: “On the second day the heads of father’s houses of all the people, with the priests and the Levites, came together to Ezra the scribe in order to study the words of the law” (Neh 8:13). Ezra is the one who explains the words of the law concerning the stipulations for the Feast of Tabernacles to the heads of families (lay people) and to priests and Levites. It should be noted that the term *sofer* is used only for Ezra as the leading scholar and not for the Levites, who are often consid-

²⁵ See also Ps 45:2.

²⁶ See also Enoch, who is designated as a “distinguished scribe” (4Q203 8 4 and 4Q530 2 ii + 6–12 14).

²⁷ Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 101–2, argues that one should distinguish between the “scribe” mentioned in Sir 38:24 and the wise men as referred to, in her view, in Sir 38:32–39:11. This is, however, not plausible since the section 38:24–39:11 is best seen as a unity. See, e.g. Beentjes, *Collected Essays*, 115–22.

²⁸ G.N. Knoppers and P.B. Harvey, Jr., “The Pentateuch in Ancient Mediterranean Context: The Publication of Local Lawcodes,” in *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (ed. G.N. Knoppers and B.M. Levinson; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 105–41 (137).

²⁹ On this aspect, see J. Schaper, “The ‘Publication’ of Legal Texts in Ancient Judah,” in *Pentateuch as Torah* (ed. Knoppers and Levinson), 225–36 (231).

ered to be “the scribes.”³⁰ This is not to deny that the Levites played a “scribal” role, but only that they are not designated *sofer* in the sense of a leading scholar.³¹

Nehemiah 8 is instructive for yet another reason: Ezra is not only depicted as priest and scribe (scholar) but is also presented as the leader of the people. The text of Ezra–Nehemiah contains elements which strongly suggest that Ezra is seen as the legitimate priestly leader of the Judean people. He is said to be the son of Seraiah, son of Azariah . . . son of Eleazar, son of Aaron, “the chief priest” (Ezra 7:1–5) and thus is presented as a descendant of the priests who held the office of high priest (see 1 Chr 6:29–41 [MT; RSV: vv. 3–15]). The underlying claim is therefore that Ezra should be seen as the legitimate priestly leader of the Judean people. Since, as far as we know, others held the office of high priest in the Persian period (Neh 12:10–11),³² this strongly suggests a rival claim. Nevertheless, Ezra is described as the leader of the people as well as the prime expert and interpreter of the law.

This picture of a leading scholar who is also a political leader also arises in other sources of early Judaism. In his description of the Jewish nation, Hecataeus of Abdera (ca. 300 B.C.E.) depicts the high priest as follows:

...authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue. They call

³⁰ See, e.g. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 88–96. A greater distinction than that suggested by van der Toorn should be made between Levi and the sons of Levi in documents such as *Jubilees*, on the one hand, and the Levites in books such as *Chronicles* and *Ezra–Nehemiah*, on the other. Unlike the latter, the former are about priests and priesthood and not about the Levites as officials below the priests, as in the books mentioned.

³¹ See further below. In a few instances the term *sofer* is used for Levites (see 1 Chr 24:6; 2 Chr 34:13; compare the edict of Antiochus III: “scribes of the temple” [Josephus, *A.J.* 12.142]), but in all these cases it does not convey the notion of leading scholar but rather of secretary or administrator. As is clear from Neh 8:7–8 Levites could also teach the law, but here the participle חִפְיָל *hip’il* is used (cf. 1 Chr 25:8; 2 Chr 35:3), not *sofer*. On the scribal Levites of *Chronicles*, see A. Labahn, “Antitheocratic Tendencies in *Chronicles*,” in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Era* (ed. R. Albertz and B. Becking; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003), 115–35 (123–27).

³² On this passage, which seems to present a reliable picture of the high priests in the Persian period, see J.C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2004), 46–49. It is unlikely that Ezra was a high priest in the Persian Yehud. On this issue, see also J.W. Watts, “The Torah as the Rhetoric of Priesthood,” in *Pentateuch as Torah* (ed. Knoppers and Levinson), 319–31 (323 n. 9).

this man the high priest, and believe that he acts as a messenger to them of God's commandments. It is he, we are told, who in their assemblies and other gatherings announces what is ordained, and the Jews are so docile in such matters that straightway they fall to the ground and do reverence to the high priest when he expounds the commandments to them.³³

According to Hecataeus' source of information, priests under the supreme direction of the high priest ruled the Jewish nation. The latter is said to have assumed authority over the people and to have been the authoritative interpreter of the law.³⁴ Another example can be found in the *Letter of Aristeas*. Here the high priest Eleazar is described both as the head of the Jewish temple state and as the interpreter of the law (§§128–169).³⁵ This reminds one of the דורש התורה in Qumran documents (CD 6:7; 7:18; 4Q174 1–2 i 11–12)—“the Interpreter of the Law”—who presumably is also to be seen as a high-priestly leader.³⁶ In this case we are also dealing with a scholar who, due to his position as leader, is the main authority as far as the interpretation of the law is concerned. All these examples pertain to the interpretation of the law, but we also know of a leading figure and priest who is said to have the wisdom to interpret the words of the prophets—the Teacher of Righteousness.

All in all, “scribes” as scholars were those people who were able to read and interpret the Scriptures and who were therefore specialists who belonged to the intellectual elite of Jewish society. They were men of authority, as they were not only leading scholars but also people who held a high position in the Jewish temple state or in a given Jewish

³³ M. Stern, ed., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, Vol. I: From Herodotus to Plutarch* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974), 28.

³⁴ Cf. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 120–22. See also M. Brutti, *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period: History, Ideology, Theology* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 138–41. The idea of priestly rule of the Jewish nation is also known in other sources; see van der Kooij, “The Greek Bible,” 258–60.

³⁵ On Eleazar in the *Letter of Aristeas*, see VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas*, 157–67; Brutti, *High Priesthood*, 141–47. For other texts about the leading priests as interpreters and teachers of the law, see, e.g. Deut 33:10; Sir 45:17; *Jub.* 31:15. For Qumran, see F. García Martínez, “Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultes im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 303–19 (309–11).

³⁶ See J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 114. For another example, see 1 Macc 14:14 (Simon, the high priest, studying the law).

community (such as the Qumran community). As has become clear from the examples given above, the high priest was seen as the highest authority, both as a political leader of the people and as an interpreter of Scriptures, a situation that clearly implies a hierarchy of positions (e.g. Ezra above the Levites; see also below). The fact that scholars were part of the leadership added, of course, to their authority. All this may help us understand the authoritativeness of the Scriptures as they were read, interpreted and taught by the appropriate authorities—leading scholars who were also important officials in society.

In relation to this, a remark on terminology regarding scholars and scribes may be in order. As stated above, the term *sofer* is the best known word for designating a scholar-scribe, but it is not attested in all the writings referred to above. It is found in Ezra-Nehemiah (for Ezra, the priest), in *The Story of Ahiqar* (for Ahiqar, the wise counsellor), in Sir 38:24 (for the wise scribe), in 11QPs^a 27:2 (for David) and in 4QEnGiants (for Enoch; see note 26).³⁷ In all these instances, the term is employed for scholars who are assumed to hold a very high, or even the highest, position in society.

This usage of the term seems to be typical of sources dating from the Persian and Hellenistic periods. In Jewish texts dating from Roman times, the term conveys, among other meanings, a more specific connotation referring to teachers of the written law.³⁸ Their position was below that of the priests³⁹ or the wise (the sages). As to the latter, a passage in the Mishnah, *m. Soṭah* 9:15, is illustrative:

R. Eliezer the Great says: Since the day that the temple was destroyed the sages (*hakamim*) began to be like the teachers (*soferim*), and the teachers like the servants, and the servants like the people of the land.

Unlike the usage in earlier days, these texts clearly distinguish the wise (sage) from the scribe who comes after him. Rabbinic sources show an awareness of the difference in meaning, as is clear from the well-known statement in *b. Qidd.* 30a: “the early (sages) were called *soferim*.”⁴⁰ In earlier days, the title *sofer* was applied to the wise—sages

³⁷ An additional instance is to be found in 1 Chr 27:32 (about Jonathan, counsellor of David).

³⁸ See van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 199; Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 239–51.

³⁹ For “scribes” below the priests (i.e. the position of the Levites), see e.g. *Tg. 2 Kgs* 23:2. On this issue, see van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*, 199–201.

⁴⁰ This usage is also found in the Mishnah (e.g. *m. 'Or.* 3:9; *m. Yebam.* 2:4; 9:3). See Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom*, 68.

(like Ezra)—but this was no longer the case in Tannaitic times, since scholars of the highest rank were called “sages” (*hakamim*) not *soferim* because this latter term was now only used for scribes whose position was below the sages.

To return to our main topic, the term *sofer*, however, does not occur in the other writings referred to above—Hecataeus of Abdera, *Letter of Aristaeus* and Qumran documents. These sources do refer to leading scholars, literate people and interpreters of Scriptures among the Jews but without making use of the word *sofer*. This also applies to other writings, such as the book of Daniel. In 1:17, Daniel and his three friends are presented as scholars and literates (“God gave them knowledge and proficiency in all literature and wisdom”) who were admitted to the service of the king and were his counsellors, but the term *sofer* is not employed in this verse, nor in the rest of the book. Similarly, the term *sofer* occurs only twice in Qumran documents, 11QPs^a being one of two instances.⁴¹ There is, however, an interesting case that makes clear that the term was understood in the same way—in the sense of leading scholar—as in the sources dealt with above. In 4QpPs^a (4Q171), “the skilled scribe” of Ps 45:2 seems to have been identified with the Teacher of Righteousness.⁴²

4

Two figures play an important role in this contribution—Ben Sira and the high priest of his time (Simon in Sir 50). In the final section, I would like to deal with the question of how Ben Sira as scholar-scribe was related to the high priest, who, as argued above, was considered the prime authority both as a leader and as a scholar/interpreter. In view of the close link between scholarship and leadership this demands some comments on the form of government of the Jewish nation.

⁴¹ Also see 4Q461 2, where the plural *soferim* is found without any context. See E. Tov, “Scribes,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:830–31 (831).

⁴² Cf. G.J. Brooke, “Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 134–57 (142). The conclusions drawn by Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 260, with regard to the Qumran evidence (“lack of reference to scribes... scribes were not part of the leadership”) are difficult to accept as they are based too much on the usage and non-usage of *sofer* alone.

In the Hellenistic era, the polity of the Jews in Judea was that of a temple state that developed into a national state under Maccabean rule.⁴³ The government of the Jewish nation consisted of two elements—first, the ruling priesthood and, second, the council of the elders or the senate (γερονσία).⁴⁴ A few passages may illustrate this. According to 1 Macc 7:33, some of “the priests from the temple” and some members of the senate (“elders of the people”) came out from the holy place to extend a friendly welcome to him, that is, Nicanor. In 1 Macc 14:28 a large assembly consisting of “priests,” also called “rulers of the nation,” and “the people,” also designated as “elders of the land,” met in the temple area. This form of government is reflected in the twofold designation of “Aaron and Israel” in the writings from Qumran (e.g. CD 1:7; 6:2; 1QS 5:21–22; 8:5–6; 9:6; 1QSa 2:13–14). The passage CD 6:2–3 is interesting as it speaks of “men of knowledge” (גבונים) from Aaron and “wise men” (הכמים) from Israel. The officials, the leading priests and the representatives of the lay people are depicted here as scholars. Another passage that is of interest is to be found in Josephus, *A.J.* 11.329–339. It tells the story of a meeting between Alexander the Great and the leaders of Jerusalem: “When he (i.e. Jaddus, the high priest) learned that Alexander was not far from the city, he went out with the priests and the body of citizens” (*A.J.* 11.329). This story, whatever its historical reliability or plausibility, also testifies to the leadership being composed of the ruling priesthood—with the high priest at its head—and the body of citizens, the senate.

The ruling priesthood consisted of the priests whose permanent function was in the temple—that is, the deputy priest and the chief priests under the supreme direction of the high priest.⁴⁵ The senate, the council of the elders, was formed by the representatives of what was called “the people” // “Israel” (in the sense of the lay people, not the people as a whole; cf. “the heads of the father’s houses” in Neh 8:13).

⁴³ For this change taking place in the 140s B.C.E. due to the policy aimed at the acquirement of the territories (“inheritance”) of the ancestors (cf. 1 Macc 15:33–34), see D. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 83, 134. It should be noted that the temple state of the Jews in the pre-Maccabean period was of a modest nature as far as its territory was concerned, see e.g. the wording of Polybius (quoted in Josephus, *A.J.* 12.136): the Jews “living around the temple.”

⁴⁴ For literature on this subject, see e.g. D. Goodblatt, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).

⁴⁵ On these high-ranking priests, see Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, 147–82.

To return to Ben Sira, where to position him in the society of his day is disputed. Was he a priest, one of the “scribes of the temple” (Levites), or a member of the senate, the body of elders?⁴⁶ Going on the assumption that the picture of the wise scribe in Sir 38–39 also applies to the author himself,⁴⁷ there is an element in this passage which may help us further. According to Sir 38:33, the scribe was supposed to be a member of the βουλή, the council of the people. As we know from the writings from Qumran, the council was composed of priests and “men of Israel” (i.e. elders) (see 1QS 8:1; 1QSa 2:11), hence Ben Sira can be regarded as a priest or one of the elders but not a “scribe of the temple” (Levite). Scholars have criticized the view that he might have been a priest. “Ben Sira a pu aimer la liturgie, vénérer les prêtres et la Torah sans être prêtre.”⁴⁸ There are indications that suggest that Ben Sira was a lay person, presumably a member of the senate, rather than a priest. Firstly, the passages 38:24–39:11 do not contain any specific element that would point to him being a priest;⁴⁹ on the contrary, the perspective of the whole section is that of the lay people of Jewish society of the time and not of the temple and its priesthood. Secondly, the notion of the scribe as wise man fits the idea of being one of the “wise men” of Israel (CD 6:2), that is, a representative of the lay people. Thirdly, passages such as 6:34 and 7:14 strongly suggest a great familiarity with the assemblies of the body of elders. In short, as a scholar and member of the βουλή he was a most influential person, a man of great prestige.

As to how Ben Sira was related to the high priest, Otto Mulder has suggested that he be thought of as a counsellor of the high priest.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ For Ben Sira as priest, see e.g. H. Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1980), 222; as belonging to the scribes of the temple, see e.g. T. Middendorp, *Die Stellung Jesu ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 84; and as a lay person, see e.g. L. Schrader, *Leiden und Gerechtigkeit: Studien zu Theologie und Textgeschichte des Sirachbuches* (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1994), 303.

⁴⁷ Cf. Beentjes, *Collected Essays*, 119.

⁴⁸ M. Gilbert, “Siracide,” *DBSup* 12:1389–1437 (1405). See also, P.C. Beentjes, “Recent publications on the Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus),” *Bijdragen* 43 (1982): 188–98 (191–93); H.-J. Fabry, “Jesus Sirach und das Priestertum,” in *Auf den Spuren der Schriftgelehrten Weisen: Festschrift für Johannes Marböck* (ed. I. Fischer, U. Rapp, and J. Schiller; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 265–82 (272–73).

⁴⁹ Cf. Weiss, “Schriftgelehrte,” *TRE* 30:511–20 (512).

⁵⁰ O. Mulder, *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira’s Concept of the History of Israel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 253.

This makes good sense, the more so since, as noted above, Ben Sira supported and defended the office of high priest. If this was the case, his position and role may be compared to that of scholars serving at the court of a king, such as Ahiqar, or Daniel and his friends.

Leadership was organized hierarchically.⁵¹ The high priest, together with the chief priests and other priests formed the ruling body of the Jewish nation,⁵² with the elders and council of elders at the next level of leadership, whereas the Levites occupied a position below the priests within the temple. As sources of the time indicate, priests, Levites and elders (wise men) were authorized to interpret and teach Scriptures.⁵³ The hierarchy involved, however, would make it reasonable to assume that they did not have the same competences when it came to the interpretation of Scriptures, but this is an issue to be dealt with elsewhere.⁵⁴ As indicated in Neh 8:13, this was all carried out under the supervision and guidance of the high priest as the authoritative interpreter. This picture is also implied in the writings of Ben Sira. The relationship between the hymnic passages in Sir 24 (on wisdom) and in Sir 50 (on the high priest) indicates that the high priest was seen as the main authority as far as wisdom and law were concerned.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Passages in Qumran documents that are of interest in this regard are 1QM 2:1–4; 1QS 2:19–23; 6:8–9; 1QSa 2:11–21; CD 14:3–5.

⁵² This does not mean to say that everyone at the time agreed upon this form of government. We know of circles that were strongly in favour of a king as leader of the nation (see, e.g. Diod. Sic. 40.2), whereas Qumran documents testify to the model of diarchy.

⁵³ The priests were the most important experts and scholars, but lay persons (elders/wise men) also played an important role as scholars (such as, presumably, Ben Sira). It is often assumed that non-priestly scholars came to the fore in the wake of Hellenism, but this is not plausible since texts such as Neh 8:13 and 2 Chr 17:7–9 indicate that lay persons (elders) were involved in the study and instruction of the law at an earlier date.

⁵⁴ There is reason to believe that leading priests were authorized to interpret dreams and visions. See A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 107–8; G.J. Brooke, “Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 151–65 (162–63).

⁵⁵ Both wisdom (Law) and the high priest are depicted as “ministering before God” (24:10 and 50:11–15). On the specific link between Sir 24 and Sir 50, see J.-C.H. Lebram, *Legitimitéit en charisma: Over de herleving van de contemporaine geschiedschrijving in het jodendom tijdens de 2e eeuw v. Chr.* (Leiden: Brill, 1980), 9; A. Fournier-Bidoz, “L’arbre et la demeure: Siracide xxiv 10–17,” *VT* 34 (1984): 1–10 (9); J. Marböck, “Der Hohepriester Simon in Sir 50: Ein Beitrag zur Bedeutung von Priestertum und Kult im Sirachbuch,” in *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom*:

Consequently, one can easily imagine that the interpretation of Scriptures offered by the scholars above would be in line with the ideas of the high priest. It is therefore understandable that in the case of polemics the study of Scriptures served the interests of leadership. Sir 45:24–25 is an interesting example in this regard. It may well be that the explanation of Num 25:12–13 by Ben Sira in this passage was not a novel account by the scholar-scribe, but actually part of the priestly or high-priestly ideology of his day.

5

Let me summarize and conclude with the following statements.

1. A given set of books were considered authoritative because they were ancestral/ancient, were kept in the temple and were worthy of study.
2. Study of these books is the clearest indication that they really were used as an authoritative source. They were considered significant during the interpreter's time. They could be used, for example, to legitimize leadership, thus serving political interests.
3. Study was not only important for teaching purposes, but it also resulted in the production of new books which were based, in one way or another, on the ancient ones. The book of Ben Sira is a good example, but one can also think of parabiblical texts or writings known as the "rewritten Bible." The phenomenon of book production is best understood against the background of the Hellenistic culture of the time.
4. It should be noted, however, that the ancient books, Scriptures, would not have been seen as carrying any authority if their teachings had not been brought into force and if they had not been studied by the appropriate authorities—the scholar-scribes. Interpretation of books that were considered authoritative required authoritative and authorized persons to bring the ideas into effect.
5. Scholarship and leadership were closely related in the *ethnos* of the Jews or in a given Jewish community within Judaism of the time

(e.g. the Qumran community). This situation greatly enhanced the authority of the scholars as interpreters of Scriptures.

6. In line with the way the polity of the Jews was organized, the positions of scholars and scribes were ordered in a hierarchical manner. This aspect, the hierarchy of scholarship, should be taken into greater account in research on the scribal culture of early Judaism. The high priest, as the prime authority, stood at the top of the pyramid. He was not only the leader but also a scholar. The interpretation and teaching of the ancient books was under his supervision. It therefore is fully understandable that the interpretation of Scriptures could, if deemed appropriate, serve political interests.
7. This statement about the high priest brings me to my final remark: it really is a great pleasure for me to provide this contribution to a volume in honour of Florentino, precisely because he is such a top scholar.

FROM 4QREWORKED PENTATEUCH TO 4QPENTATEUCH (?)

Emanuel Tov

1. BACKGROUND

The name “4QReworked Pentateuch” was conceived in 1992 when I was working on this composition at the Annenberg Institute for Advanced Studies, at first alone, and later together with Sidnie White Crawford.¹ The texts were assigned to me in the 1980s by John Strugnell, who had identified the manuscripts and had done some work on them. Beyond Strugnell’s initial philological work on these texts, we are indebted to him for assembling the fragments that he assigned to the four manuscripts of 4Q364–367 from among the many thousands, identified by their handwriting and content. This was not an easy task because of the great similarity of the assumed text of this composition to the canonical books of the Torah. As a result, doubts remained as to whether specific fragments assigned to 4QRP indeed belonged to that composition, or were part of a regular biblical manuscript. In addition, the following six fragments or groups of fragments, although given different names, could have been part of 4QRP: 2QExod^b (containing several exegetical additions), 4QExod^d (omitting the narrative section of 13:17–22 and all of chapter 14), 6QDeut? (possibly to be named 6QparaDeut because of its unclear character), 4QDeut^{k2} (containing a mixture of chapters) and 11QT^b 11:21–24 (previously described as 11QDeut [Deut 13:7–11] by Johannes van der Ploeg, but identified as part of 11QT^b by Adam van der Woude and Florentino García Martínez).²

¹ The texts were published as: E. Tov and S. White, “363–367: 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-c} and 365a: 4QTemple?” in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–351, 459–63 and pl. XIII–XXXVI.

² For details, see my study “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents,” *RevQ* 16 (1995): 647–53 (649).

At that early stage, when Strugnell was still collecting the fragments, he named this composition “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase.” Its genre was considered as related to 4Q158, published in *DJD* 5 (1968) by John Allegro as “4QBiblical Paraphrase.”³

The analysis of the so-called “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase” was determined by that of 4Q158 even though a genetic connection between the two had not been recognized. 4Q158 was published by Allegro in his characteristic nonchalant system, as with all other texts in *DJD* 5. The number of textual notes was absolutely minimal, and there was no introduction explaining the literary genre of 4Q158, although it was novel at the time of its publication. Further, the transcription included many wrong details; the line numbering is incorrect in fragments 10–12, and the close connection between 4Q158 and the Samaritan Pentateuch (sp) was not recognized. In due course, Strugnell corrected many of Allegro’s mistakes in his book-length review of *DJD* 5.⁴

It is important to remember the history of the analysis of these texts and the genre names given to them. Since 4Q158 had been published as “4QBiblical Paraphrase,” Strugnell used the same name for 4Q364–367, which he presumed to belong to the same genre. Its first name therefore was “4QPentateuchal Paraphrase” (4QPP), a name we inherited from Strugnell. However, we realized that the term “paraphrase” was not appropriate, since a paraphrase usually involves a more extensive type of editing than that presumably performed by the author of this composition. After all, the manuscripts included long stretches of text unaltered by the author of 4QPP. Looking for a more general term that reflected the nature of these manuscripts, we opted for 4QReworked Pentateuch. The thought behind this change was that “reworking” is more general than “paraphrase” and would allow for long stretches of unaltered text. The first identity crisis of 4Q364–367 thus was its name change from 4QPP to 4QRP. In our conception, 4QRP included 4Q158, which I had identified as belonging to the same composition as 4Q364–367.⁵

The second identity crisis was to come much later. In the meantime, when naming the composition 4QPP or renaming it as 4QRP, we were

³ J.M. Allegro, “158: Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus,” in *Qumrân Cave 4.I* (J.M. Allegro; *DJD* 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1–6.

⁴ J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du Volume V des ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,’” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276 (168–75).

⁵ See my analysis in Tov and White, *DJD* 13:189–91.

much influenced by Strugnell. At the same time, I had a strong internal conviction that 4QRP could not represent a biblical text. Nevertheless, I did not know exactly what was the genre of this composition, described as a reworked Bible composition⁶ similar to 11QT^a 51–66. In my introduction to 4QRP, I described its character as follows:

The five manuscripts of 4QRP share important characteristics. These five groups of fragments should therefore be seen as copies of the same composition, rather than, in more general terms, of the same literary genre. This composition contained a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical additions and omissions. The greater part of the preserved fragments follows the biblical text closely, but many small exegetical elements are added, while other elements are omitted, or, in other cases, their sequence altered. The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several exegetical additions comprising half a line, one line, two lines, and even seven or eight lines. The most outstanding examples of this technique are the expanded Song of Miriam in 4Q365 6a ii and c and possibly also frg. 14 of 4Q158.⁷

A third fragment, namely 4QRP^c (4Q365) 23, deviates in a major way from the other biblical texts. The first four lines of this fragment quote the last two verses of the instructions for the *Sukkot* festival in Lev 23:42–43, as well as a summarizing verse (23:44), and Lev 24:1–2. However, in frg. 23 the beginning of Lev 24 now serves as the introduction to a list of additional laws concerning offerings. These laws are based on material found either in the Bible or elsewhere, such as the

⁶ For studies on this literary genre, see G.J. Brooke, “Rewritten Bible,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:777–81; idem, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 31–40; D.D. Swanson, “How Scriptural is Re-Written Bible?” *RevQ* 21/83 (2004): 407–27; M. Segal, “Between Bible and Rewritten Bible,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–29; M.J. Bernstein, “‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?” *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–96. See also E. Tov, “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–34; D.J. Harrington, S.J., “Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies,” in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpretations* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 242–47.

⁷ Tov and White, *DJD* 13:191. Frg. 14 of 4Q158 provides an unknown exegetical addition or commentary mentioning “Egypt,” “I shall redeem them,” “the midst of the sea in the depths.” This fragment, written in the same hand as the remainder of 4Q158, reflects a rather long addition, relating to the story of Exodus.

Festival of Fresh Oil (4Q365 23 9). Lines 10 and 11 probably refer to the Wood Festival, also known from Neh 10:35, 13:31 and 11QT^a.⁸

4QRP is also characterized by several deviations from the text sequence of MT and all other texts.⁹ Thus, the *Sukkot* laws of Num 29:32–30:1 and Deut 16:13–14 were combined in 4QRP^b (4Q364) 23a–b i. In this case, one does not know where this fragment was placed in 4QRP, in Numbers or Deuteronomy.

The extensive additions in the Song of Miriam in 4QRP^c 6a ii and c, in the additional laws concerning offerings (4Q365 23), and in frg. 14 of 4QRP^a (4Q158) differed so much from the biblical manuscripts I knew that I could not imagine that 4QRP contained a biblical manuscript. Obviously, determining the relation between the new text 4QRP and the scriptural manuscripts depends on one's definition of what is a Scripture text. The more extensive one's definition of the biblical texts, for example when including the Qumran Psalter texts and excerpted texts, the greater the chances that one would be inclined to include 4QRP among the biblical texts. However, my own definition of the biblical texts was and is not so encompassing as to include these texts. As a result, we did not consider 4QRP a biblical text. The extended Song of Miriam adds an exegetical dimension to the text that was not equaled in any biblical text I could think of. The seven lines of added text recreated the Song of Miriam that in the canonical text consists of only one verse. The new creation is based on that verse and on the wording of the Song of Moses. The list of biblical and extrabiblical festivals in 4QRP^c 23 involves a similar exegetical dimension. True, such exegetical additions are found also in the Targumim, but they are not biblical manuscripts.

I did not recognize any parallel to this expanded Song in the LXX of other books because, in my view at the time, most major LXX deviations from MT reflect elements *anterior* to MT, such as the LXX texts of Samuel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel; hence, they did not parallel the Song of Miriam, since that Song is clearly secondary. I say this as a justification for my view, since in my textual outlook of the 1990s there was no room for major post-MT exegetical expansions among the authori-

⁸ For both festivals, see Tov and White, *DJD* 13:295.

⁹ In *DJD* 13:191, I noted: "The sequence of the individual elements of 4QRP cannot be reconstructed. In one instance, a fragment juxtaposing a section from Numbers and Deuteronomy (4Q364 23a–b i: Num 20:17–18; Deut 2:8–14) probably derives from the rewritten text of Deuteronomy, since a similar sequence is found in SP."

tative Scripture texts in the LXX. I also did not consider the many *sp* additions to be valid parallels to the Song of Miriam since the *sp* does not add any *new* material to the proto-MT text. It only repeats sections in an immediate or remote context.¹⁰ By the same token, I did not know of any authoritative Hebrew biblical manuscript from Qumran or elsewhere that included such large exegetical additions. This statement is subjective, since the Psalms scrolls, especially 11QPs^a, would have provided a parallel to a biblical scroll 4QRP, but I do not consider these Psalms scrolls to be Scripture texts. The modern names of these scrolls are misleading, since in my view these are liturgical scrolls that alter authoritative Scripture texts.¹¹ Like 4QRP, the Psalms scrolls reflect major sequence deviations from MT. They also contain a major exegetical addition, if we characterize the list of David's compositions in 11QPs^a 27 in such a way, but otherwise they are not comparable to 4QRP. At the time, we did not compare 4QRP with the greatly deviating Canticles scrolls 4QCant^{a,b} since they had not yet been published. But even had we known them, we would not have considered them valid parallels for 4QRP as Scripture texts, since we consider these Canticles scrolls to be abbreviated texts, and hence not regular Scripture texts.¹²

This brief apologetic explanation should explain why in the 1990s I did not consider 4QRP a Bible text, the main reason being that in my textual *Weltanschauung* there was no room for Scripture texts that contained such major deviations from MT as those in 4QRP.

4Q364–367 thus entered the world as a nonbiblical text and although the majority of its components were scriptural, it was not included in lists of biblical manuscripts such as my list in the introduction volume

¹⁰ See my study "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54. For an exception, see Exod 23:19b.

¹¹ This view is based on S. Talmon, "Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs^a," *Textus* 5 (1966): 11–21; M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a): A Problem of Canon and Text," *Textus* 5 (1966): 22–33; M. Haran, "11QPs^a and the Canonical Book of Psalms," in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. M.Z. Brettler and M.A. Fishbane; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 193–201. A different view is presented by P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

¹² For a different view, see E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls: The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 67–87 (78).

to *DJD*.¹³ Paradoxically, that list of Scripture manuscripts numbering 200–201 items thus included many texts we did *not* consider Scripture but which carried biblical names (most of the thirty-six Psalms scrolls, 4QCant^{a,b} and several additional texts), while it excluded 4QRP (4Q158, 4Q364–367), since they were published as nonbiblical scrolls. Anthologies of Qumran texts behaved in various ways. The *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*¹⁴ and its electronic revision in *DSSEL*,¹⁵ both listing only nonbiblical texts, contained the complete text of 4QRP. The Qumran concordance likewise covered all these texts.¹⁶ On the other hand, the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*¹⁷ and the translation of Wise, Abegg and Cook¹⁸ include a mere selection of the exegetical additions to the MT texts. The only culprit of this inconsistency is the *DJD* edition of Tov and White.

The main focus of our present study is the second identity crisis of 4QRP. Six years after its publication, 4QRP was described as a biblical text by two scholars, who were not influenced by Strugnell as we were, and who also knew more parallel texts than we did in 1993 when the volume went to the press. Eugene Ulrich and Michael Segal independently claimed in 2000 that some or all of the 4QRP manuscripts contain regular Scripture. Without any specific argument relating to 4QRP, Ulrich stated: “It is arguable that the so-called ‘4QRP’ (4Q364–367 plus 4Q158) is mislabelled and should be seen as simply another edition of the Pentateuch. There is still insufficient analysis to determine whether it should be considered an alternate edition of

¹³ E. Tov in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (E. Tov et al.; *DJD* 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 165–83.

¹⁴ D.W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Parts 1–6* (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005).

¹⁵ *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, Brigham Young University, Revised Edition 2006, part of the Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library of E.J. Brill Publishers (ed. E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006) <All the texts and images of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls with morphological analysis and search programs>.

¹⁶ M.G. Abegg, Jr., with J.E. Bowley and E.M. Cook, in consultation with E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Volume I: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

¹⁷ F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

¹⁸ M.O. Wise, M.G. Abegg, and E.M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005). This edition contains 4Q158 (inappropriately named “A Reworking of Genesis and Exodus”) as well as a few selections from 4Q364–367 named “An Annotated Law of Moses.”

the Pentateuch or a post-Pentateuchal para-Scriptural work.”¹⁹ In general terms, Ulrich suggested that Scripture texts circulated in many shapes, all of them authoritative (SP, LXX, paleo-Hebrew and other scrolls from Qumran, 4QRP, the large Isaiah scroll, some abbreviated texts, etc.). In the same year, Segal stated: “If these scrolls are classified as parabiblical texts, as they were by the editors, it is difficult to understand why the scribe felt the need to copy the text of the entire Pentateuch.”²⁰ Segal makes this claim for 4Q364–365, which he named 4QPentateuch and for 4Q367, which he named “4QLeviticus,” in his view being an excerpted Leviticus text.²¹

I changed my own views on 4QRP in 2005, not because of the claims by Ulrich and Segal, but in the wake of my analysis of the LXX versions of 1 Kings (3 Kingdoms), Esther, and Daniel (especially Dan 4–6), unrelated to 4QRP.²² I suggested that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books reflect a stage subsequent to that in MT. All three books were based on underlying Semitic texts that rewrote texts resembling MT, adding and changing major sections in these books. We also found several characteristic features in these three LXX compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. Upon

¹⁹ Ulrich, “The Qumran Biblical Scrolls,” 76. Elsewhere, Ulrich named this text “yet another variant literary edition of the Pentateuch, parallel to the traditional MT.” See “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery, 1947–1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 51–59 (57). Lange likewise asserted (without arguments) that 4QRP was “regarded as the word of God,” see A. Lange, “The Status of the Biblical Text in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 21–30 (27). At the end of his very detailed and insightful analysis, Falk remains undecided: “Whether 4QRP was intended to be read as a new edition of Mosaic Torah, or as some sort of interpretative account alongside Scripture is perhaps impossible to answer with confidence.” See D.K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 107–19 (119).

²⁰ M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?” in *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years* (ed. Schiffman, Tov, and VanderKam), 391–99 (394).

²¹ Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 395, 399.

²² The papers themselves were published later: “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–93; “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday* (ed. A. Lange, M. Weigold, and J. Zsengellér; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009), 11–28.

discovering these features, I realized that they have implications for our understanding of the LXX, several Qumran scrolls, and canonical conceptions in general. The three books, which I named “Three strange books,” include major secondary features, and in spite of these features the new texts were considered authoritative Scripture texts. After all, the Greek canon includes 3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel, which in my view constitute rewritten versions of earlier compositions similar to those now included in MT. The three rewritten books were considered authoritative in their Semitic and Greek forms, although by different communities. SP, likewise a rewritten version of MT, as well as its pre-Samaritan forerunners, enjoyed similar authority. Rewritten versions, as well as the earlier ones on which they were based (for example, the MT of 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel), were considered equally authoritative, by different communities and in different periods. In that study, I suggested that some of the rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran may likewise have enjoyed an authoritative status. We do not know if or how well these compositions were accepted at Qumran or elsewhere, but it is probable that at least some of the “noncanonical” books were accepted as authoritative by that community.

Keeping in mind that the LXX includes exponents of major rewriting that have become authoritative Scripture, we should thus be open to the possibility that 4QRP is a regular Scripture text that carried authority equal to that of the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX. While at a previous stage I did not recognize any parallels for the large exegetical additions, omissions, and changes of 4QRP, we have now found perfect parallels for that Qumran composition. This logic urged me, against my own expectations, to change my mind regarding 4QRP. I now consider 4QRP a Scripture text, or more precisely, a group of Scripture texts. Not everyone will accept this view, so that we should avoid introducing a new name such as 4QPentateuch. Indeed, in a recent paper, Moshe Bernstein does not go as far as naming these texts Scripture, although he entertains the possibility that 4Q364 is a biblical text.²³ His main argument is that “its [4QRP’s] radically free and

²³ M.J. Bernstein, “What Has Happened to the Laws? The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 24–49 (48): “Are the 4QRP manuscripts biblical? My response after all this is ‘which ones?’ As I noted above, 4Q364 might very well be, but regarding the others I suggest ‘probably not.’”

highly idiosyncratic handling of legal material must be acknowledged to be possible in a pentateuchal manuscript.”²⁴

Changing names in published Qumran texts is never a good idea, and therefore we should hold on to the name 4QRP. By the same token, we have to live with the name *11QTemple* (better: *11QTemple^a*), suggested by Yigael Yadin, rather than the possibly better name *11QTorah*, suggested by Ben Zion Wacholder.²⁵ In the case of 4QRP, we should do away with the term “Reworked,” as the five manuscripts of 4QRP probably are simply five Torah manuscripts. By changing the name *4QPentateuchal Paraphrase* to *4QReworked Pentateuch* and then to *4QPentateuch*,²⁶ although we do not suggest the actual use of this name, we move on to the third stage of its existence. We now turn to the question of whether these five manuscripts may indeed be considered regular Torah manuscripts.

Since we are no longer bound by the assumption that 4QRP was a nonbiblical *composition*, we should now regard these manuscripts as five separate Scripture *manuscripts* (4Q158, 4Q364–367), related or not.²⁷ When doing so, we need not refer to the question whether 4Q158 belongs to the same group as 4Q364–367²⁸ since all the texts

²⁴ Bernstein, “The Treatment of Legal Material in 4QReworked Pentateuch,” 33.

²⁵ B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati, Conn.: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983); idem, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 257–81 (273–74).

²⁶ This name was suggested by Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 398.

²⁷ If these manuscripts are taken as exponents of a single composition, we lack evidence for Gen 1–20, Lev 1–10, Num 18–26, and Deut 21–34. In the case of Genesis, two fragments may present material from these chapters: (1) In his publication of 4QGen^b, frg. 5, James Davila quotes Strugnell who suggests that this fragment actually belongs to 4Q158, and hence to 4QRP. This assumption is based on paleographical considerations, and since the fragment is very small, its provenience cannot be established easily. The text of this fragment deviates slightly from MT. See J.R. Davila in *Qumran Cave 4. VII: Genesis to Numbers* (E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 12; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 75–78 (75); (2) Davila suggests that 4Q8b (Gen 12:4–5), written in the same handwriting as the other fragments of 4QGen^b, possibly belongs to 4QRP or another rewritten text of Genesis. The text of this small fragment deviates slightly from MT. See Davila, *DJD* 12:62.

²⁸ Several scholars have suggested that 4Q158 needs to be separated from 4Q364–367: M. Segal, “Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre,” *Textus* 19 (1997): 45–62; M.J. Bernstein in his review of *DJD* 13 in *DSD* 4 (1997): 102–22 (103–4); G.J. Brooke, “4Q158: Reworked Pentateuch^a or Reworked Pentateuch A?” *DSD* 8 (2001): 219–41.

now reflect individual manuscripts. If these fragments are taken as individual manuscripts, the five manuscripts contain fragments of the following chapters:²⁹

4QRP^a (4Q158): Gen 32 and Exod 19–24, 30;

4QRP^b (4Q364): Gen 2, 25–48, Exod, 19–26, Num 14 and 33, and Deut 1–14, but not Leviticus;

4QRP^c (4Q365): Gen 21, Exod 8–39, Lev 11–26, Num 1–36, and Deut 2, 19;

4QRP^d (4Q366): Exod 21–22, Num 29, and Deut 14, 16;

4QRP^e (4Q367): Lev 11–27.³⁰

These manuscripts possibly contained merely some of the Torah books, as suggested by Segal,³¹ while others may have contained the complete Torah. Thus, 4QRP^c contains fragments of all five books, 4QRP^b lacks only Leviticus, 4QRP^d lacks Genesis and Leviticus, while 4QRP^a contains only Genesis and Exodus, and 4QRP^e contains only Leviticus. The other Torah scrolls from the Judean Desert provide samples of both single-book manuscripts and combinations of two or three Torah books,³² and therefore the presumed coverage of some of our five manuscripts is wider.³³

²⁹ For details, see Tov, “4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis.”

³⁰ It is not impossible that 4Q367 belongs to the same scroll as 4Q364, since 4Q367 contains only Leviticus, while no fragment of that book has been preserved in 4Q364. If that is so, the two groups of fragments would have been produced by different scribes.

³¹ Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 393–98 suggested that 4QRP^a does not belong to the same unit as 4QRP^{b–c} and that 4QRP^e contained merely a single biblical book, Leviticus.

³² For details, see E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 75.

³³ The inclusion of more than one biblical book in a scroll is evidenced for four, five, or six Torah scrolls: 4QGen-Exod^a (36 lines; evidence unclear), 4QpaleoGen-Exod^d (55–60 lines), 4QExod^b (= 4Q[Gen-]Exod^b; ca. 50 lines), and possibly also 4QExod-Lev^f (ca. 60 lines), 4QLev-Num^a (43 lines), and Mur 1 (ca. 60 lines), the last possibly containing Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers (see *DJD* 2:75–78). In all these cases, the spaces between the two books have been preserved together with some letters or words of the adjacent book, but in no instance has the full evidence been preserved. The large column size of several of these scrolls confirms the assumption that they indeed contained two or more books, since a large number of lines per column usually imply that the scroll was long. On the basis of the large parameters of these scrolls, it may be assumed that other Torah scrolls likewise contained two or more books: 4QGen^e (ca. 50 lines), 4QExod^c (ca. 43), MasDeut (42), SdeirGen (ca. 40), 4QGen^b (40).

2. TEXTUAL AND EXEGETICAL NATURE

The textual background of the five manuscripts differs.³⁴ Beyond the small textual differences between the five Qumran manuscripts and the other textual witnesses, we note that two of the manuscripts of 4QRP are close to the *sp* (4QRP^a, 4QRP^b), while the other three are not. These two texts and 4QRP^c are written in the special Qumran scribal practice, while 4Q366 and 4Q367 are not.³⁵

4QRP^a, more than the other 4QRP texts, reflects the major editorial features of *sp* in frgs. 6–8 as well as small details of *sp* in all fragments. Thus frg. 6 includes the divine command (Deut 18:18–22) to establish a prophet like Moses. Likewise, 4Q158 7–8, like *sp*,³⁶ interweaves sections from the parallel account in Deut 5:28–31 into the description of the Mount Sinai theophany in Exod 20. The Qumran text and *sp* thus follow the same sequence of the verses. More precisely, *sp* was based on 4QRP^a or a similar pre-Samaritan text.

4QRP^b, like 4QRP^a, is close to *sp*.³⁷ This closeness is shown in two editorial additions that are characteristic of *sp* (Gen 30:26 and Deut 2:8), and in many small details. One of these small details is especially noteworthy, viz., 4Q364 11 2 *Binyamin* is consistently represented thus in this way in *sp* (MT: *Binyamin*).

4QRP^c is not as close to *sp* as was thought previously³⁸ since it does not reflect the editorial manipulations of *sp*.³⁹

What are the implications of the fact that two of the 4QRP manuscripts reflect the *sp*? As long as 4QRP was considered a nonbiblical

³⁴ For a detailed analysis, see my studies “The Textual Status of 4Q364–367 (4QPP),” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1.43–82; “Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (ed. Ulrich and VanderKam), 111–34.

³⁵ See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, Appendix 1 and passim. R.S. Nam, “How to Rewrite Torah: The Case for Proto-Sectarian Ideology in the *Reworked Pentateuch* (4QRP),” *RevQ* 23/90 (2007): 153–63 recognizes in 4QRP traces of Qumran sectarian ideology, but in my view the proofs are not convincing.

³⁶ The two are not identical. See E. Tov, “The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts,” *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29.

³⁷ See Tov and White, *DJD* 13:192–93.

³⁸ Tov and White, *DJD* 13:194.

³⁹ Thus A. Kim, “The Textual Alignment of the Tabernacle Sections of 4Q365 (Fragments 8a–b, 9a–b i, 9b ii, 12a i, 12b iii),” *Textus* 21 (2002): 45–69. Kim studied only some of the sections of this manuscript, but her conclusions seem to be valid.

text, we could say that it was based on a pre-Samaritan text in the same way that other nonbiblical texts were based on that text in part or in full, such as *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) in major details and *Jubilees* in minor details. Since the five manuscripts of 4QRP are now considered Scripture texts, the agreements of two manuscripts with SP in minor and major details may be problematic since the nature of 4QRP differs completely from that of SP. SP added many verses and sections to its underlying text, always by repeating Scripture verses occurring elsewhere. It also inserted contextual changes, almost always based on the context. On the other hand, the five manuscripts of 4QRP added details reflecting exegetical activity not instigated by the context. These two different tendencies cannot be reconciled, but nevertheless a solution is in sight. The five manuscripts of 4QRP are exegetical, and as such, they are based on different earlier sources. In this case, these earlier sources were pre-Samaritan texts.

The feature that characterizes all five manuscripts is their common *exegetical* character. Because of this feature, the texts were bundled together since there are no significant overlaps between the manuscripts.⁴⁰ Some of the major exegetical features (disregarding possible textual variations) are:

4QRP^a. See Segal's detailed analysis.⁴¹

4QRP^b. Before the Scripture text of 3 ii 7–8 (Gen 28:6), 4QRP added at least six lines of text not known from other sources. This exegetical addition expanding the biblical story seems to contain material relating to Rebecca's address to the departing Jacob and Isaac's consolation of her.

In 4Q364 14 1–2, at least two words from Exod 19:17 appear before Exod 24:12 instead of the text of v. 11 LXX, SP, MT. The most likely explanation for the evidence is that the fragment does not present a sequence of Exod 19:17 and 24:12, but constitutes a freely rewritten text using elements of 19:17 before 24:12.

The two lines of additional text after Exod 24:18 (4Q364 15 3–4) may have described what God showed Moses during the forty days and forty nights, prior to his speech (Exod 25) at the end of that period.

⁴⁰ See Tov and White, *DJD* 13:188.

⁴¹ Segal, "Biblical Exegesis."

Further exegetical additions and changes appear in 4Q364 3 ii, 5b ii.⁴² 4QRP^c 6a ii and 6c contains the largest preserved addition in 4QRP reflecting a hitherto unknown poetical composition (Song of Miriam), preserved in part, following the Song at the Sea (Song of Moses) in Exod 15.⁴³

A similar case of juxtaposing laws dealing with the same topic pertains to the narrative and laws regarding the daughters of Zelophehad. 4Q365 36 (Num 27:11, 36:1–2) combines these two texts referring to the daughters of Zelophehad. 4QNum^b likewise fused Num 36:1–2, though in a different way, with the contents of Num 27.

The first three lines of 4Q365 28 present Num 4:47–49, the last verses of the chapter, pertaining to the census of the Levites, followed by a blank line and the first verse of Num 7 (“On the day when Moses had finished setting up the Tabernacle”). The miscellaneous laws that appear between these sections in MT (concerning lepers, adultery, etc. in Num 5 and Nazirites in Num 6) have been left out in this context, probably due to their irrelevance to the topic, which may be defined as the temple service.

4QRP^d. The different sequence of the *Sukkot* laws is mentioned above in §1. Likewise, 4Q366 2 (Lev 24:20–22 [?], 25:39–43) adduces the text of Lev 25:39–43, referring to the freeing of slaves, immediately after the end of the *lex talionis* (Lev 24:20–22 is preserved).

4QRP^e. In 4Q367 2, several chapters of Leviticus are omitted between Lev 15:14–15 and 19:1–4, 9–15. The identification of the text adduced in these fragments is not without problems and, furthermore, the internal sequence of the components of the text remains difficult to understand. The missing chapters of Leviticus were not in fact omitted but adduced elsewhere, since Lev 18:25–29 occurs in 4Q367 22.

3. AUTHORITATIVE TEXTS?

When we still considered 4QRP to be a rewritten Bible composition we said that we had little information regarding its possibly authoritative status. White Crawford struggled with this issue in 2000, after our

⁴² For a discussion, see Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 393–94.

⁴³ See G.J. Brooke, “The Long-Lost Song of Miriam,” *BAR* 20/3 (1994): 62–65.

DJD publication.⁴⁴ While discussing the “authoritative status” of this composition, she drew attention to the possibility that *Jubilees* quotes from 4QRP^b 3, that 11QT^a quotes from 4QRP^c 23 and that these quotations may imply the authoritative status of 4QRP. However, at the end she leaves the question open,⁴⁵ although she leans towards the view that 4QRP was a “commentary.”⁴⁶

There is no new evidence bearing on 4QRP’s status as an authoritative Torah version at Qumran beyond what was known ten or twenty years ago. However, if we conceive of the five 4QRP manuscripts as separate Scripture texts, the questions asked are somewhat different. Were these manuscripts considered authoritative⁴⁷ in spite of their exegetical freedom compared with an earlier text like MT? If White Crawford is correct in assuming that *Jubilees* and 11QT^a quote from 4QRP^{b,c}, this may indeed be a reason for assuming the latter’s authoritative status. However, the data do not corroborate such an assumption; it is more likely that *Jubilees*, 11QT^a and 4QRP^{b,c} reflect a common exegetical tradition.⁴⁸ But if we have no stable arguments for assuming the authoritative status of the Scripture manuscripts previously named 4QRP, it does not preclude the possibility that these five manuscripts nevertheless had such a status. In that case, the doubts regarding the five manuscripts are shared with the other biblical Qumran manuscripts. Phrased positively, we believe that all the Qumran Scripture manuscripts had an authoritative status. When making such a statement, we move the problem one stage back, since we now have

⁴⁴ S. White Crawford, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman and VanderKam), 2:775–77 (777); eadem, “The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume One: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:131–47 (142–44).

⁴⁵ White Crawford, “4QReworked Pentateuch,” 777: “The Reworked Pentateuch may have been accepted by the inhabitants at Qumran as another version of the authoritative Torah or it may have been considered a rewritten version that did not carry the same authority. The question remains unanswered.”

⁴⁶ S. White Crawford, “The ‘Rewritten’ Bible at Qumran: A Look at Three Texts,” *ErIsr* 26 (1999): 1–8* (4*): “4QRP was perceived not as a biblical text, but as a commentary, an inner-biblical commentary on the text of the Torah.”

⁴⁷ When using this term, we refer to the status of a text as inspired Scripture with the implication that its contents were considered binding for the community that espoused that text.

⁴⁸ The evidence is not compelling. 4QRP^b 3 ii 2 shares an expression with *Jub.* 27:17: “and we see him in peace.” 4QRP^c 23 10–11 shares the tribal order with 11QT^a 24; this order is not found elsewhere in Jewish literature.

to ask ourselves: “What is a Scripture manuscript?” We believe that the great majority of the 200 manuscripts listed as “biblical” (Scripture) in *DJD* 39 are indeed biblical. Much depends on each scholar’s individual beliefs; I myself exclude from this list the Qumran Psalter texts, which I consider liturgical, as well as excerpted texts such as 4QCant^{ab}. There is no need to address this issue in this study, since the individual manuscripts of 4QRP belong to a group different from these problematical texts, and in a way they are closer to the other manuscripts that we name proto-MT, SP-like, LXX-like, and independent. The default for all these manuscripts is that they were authoritative Scripture manuscripts. There are few criteria for assuming the authoritative status of Qumran Scripture manuscripts. Among the few criteria for the authoritative status of a Judean Desert scroll, we mention the following three:

1. A Judean Desert scroll forms part of a manuscript tradition or family that subsequently was known to have been authoritative. This argument, based on inference and not on sound proof, pertains to the MT family, either as reflected in the texts found at the Judean Desert sites other than Qumran, being identical to the medieval tradition, or as found in the Qumran manuscripts that are somewhat more distant from the medieval tradition. In other words, since the medieval MT tradition was authoritative, the proto-Masoretic manuscripts also must have been authoritative. This also pertains to the manuscripts that are closely related to the LXX and the SP, both of which were authoritative in different communities. In all three cases, the forerunners of MT, LXX and SP must have been authoritative as well since their later representatives were authoritative in different communities. Some such early manuscripts were authoritative only in certain circles. Thus the proto-Masoretic texts presumably were authoritative in the temple circles, to the exclusion of other texts. Only after the destruction of the second temple was a single textual family authoritative throughout Israel; before that time, many different manuscripts were considered authoritative. As for Qumran, we have no reason to believe that one textual family was preferred to another at Qumran. Thus, all Scripture texts must have been equally authoritative in the Qumran compound, probably also in the Essene quarters elsewhere in Israel. The fact that the proto-MT texts prevail among the Torah texts and the independent texts among the other books makes no difference for this understanding.

2. A manuscript may be considered authoritative by a community if it was quoted in a composition written by that community. Thus, if we can prove that a Qumran composition quotes 1QIsa^a and not, for example, 1QIsa^b, the former source must have been considered authoritative. This would be very difficult to prove in the case of these two manuscripts, because the differences between them are insufficiently clear and orthography and morphology alone cannot establish such a relation. Only rarely can a dependence be proven. Thus, while the first biblical quotation in the sectarian composition *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) is close to sp,⁴⁹ the third one, from Deut 33:8–11, is very close to 4QDeut^h, and may have been based on that scroll or a similar one.⁵⁰ These two quotations show that the author of 4QTest quoted from at least two Scripture scrolls of a different character, a pre-Samaritan text and 4QDeut^h, a textually independent text. In a completely different case, rabbinic literature almost exclusively quotes from the proto-MT, a text that must have been considered authoritative by the rabbis.⁵¹

3. One could claim that the mere fact that a composition was revised shows that its revisers considered it to be authoritative, but this is not a conclusive argument.

We do not really know what the members of the Qumran community thought about the textual variety among the Scripture manuscripts found in the various caves. Whether we assume that all the aforementioned texts were written at Qumran, or that only some were written there, while others were brought from elsewhere, the coexistence of the different categories of texts in the Qumran caves is noteworthy. The fact that all these different texts were found in the same caves reflects textual plurality not only at Qumran but also throughout Israel, probably for the period between the third century B.C.E. and the

⁴⁹ The nature of the first excerpt creates a somewhat unusual impression as it seems to quote from two pericopes in Deuteronomy (Deut 5:28–29; 18:18–19). However, in fact it contains merely one text that, as in sp (Exod 20:21), is composed of two pericopes that occur in different places in MT. For the same juxtaposition of texts, see 4QRP^a 6.

⁵⁰ See E. Tov, “The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Understanding of the LXX,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (ed. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 11–47, esp. 31–35; J.A. Duncan, “New Readings for the ‘Blessing of Moses’ from Qumran,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 273–90.

⁵¹ See E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 33–35.

first century c.e.⁵² Within that textual plurality, the large number of proto-Masoretic texts (in the Torah scrolls found at Qumran) probably indicates their importance, while the large number of independent texts (in the scrolls of other books) underlines the special condition of the transmission of the biblical text. Since there is no evidence concerning the circumstances surrounding the depositing of the scrolls in the caves or the different status of scrolls within the Qumran sect, no solid conclusions can be drawn about the approach of the Qumranites towards the text of Scripture. But it is safe to say that they paid no special attention to textual differences. This question probably never arose among the Qumranites, since they simply assembled different types of scrolls and used them on the same or different occasions.

If my own view about some of the Qumran scrolls is correct, a Qumran scribal school copied one-third of the Qumran Scripture scrolls, such as 1QIsa^a, at Qumran or elsewhere. How can we prove the authoritative status of that particular Isaiah scroll? This should not be an unusual question when comparing the scroll with a rather precise proto-MT scroll, 1QIsa^b. The long scroll is full of omissions, mistakes, erasures, and supralinear additions and it is written in a very inconsistent and extremely full orthography. Judging by the rules written down at a later period in rabbinic literature, there was no room for such a sloppy scroll in protorabbinic circles, and it would not have been accepted in a synagogue because of the number of corrections in each column.⁵³ When Jesus opened an Isaiah scroll in a synagogue

⁵² In recent years, the terms “pluriformity” and “uniformity” have appeared frequently in the scholarly discussion. See A. van der Kooij, “The Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible before and after the Qumran Discoveries,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 167–77 (170–71). All agree that at a certain point there was uniformity, but scholars disagree as to how this uniformity was obtained. The term itself, as well as “stabilization,” may be misleading, as these terms presuppose a certain movement towards that unity, which actually did not take place. When the archeological evidence shows us that MT is the sole force in power in the first century c.e., this situation does not reflect a *Kulturkampf* between different texts, but resulted from the fact that other texts simply ceased to exist after the destruction of the second temple.

⁵³ For example, *Sop.* 3:8–9: “A scroll [some of whose letters] are faded may not be used for the lections.... A scroll of the Torah in which a whole line is faded may not be used for the lections. If the greater part of a line is faded and the smaller part intact, the use of the scroll is permitted. If a Torah scroll contains an error, it may not be used for the lections. How many? One in a column, is the view of R. Judah. R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says: Even if there be one error in three columns the scroll may not be used for the lections.” *Sop.* 3:14 “A scribe may not put upon the written part [of a Torah scroll] a reed-pen with ink on it.” *Sop.* 3:17 “It is obligatory to make beautiful *zizith*,

in Nazareth, he would not have opened one resembling the large Isaiah scroll.⁵⁴

We cannot really prove the authoritative status of the large Isaiah scroll to the Qumran community. But it stands to reason that this scroll was considered authoritative at Qumran and elsewhere. The fact that this scroll was very well preserved is due to the fact that it was carefully stored in a jar.

In accordance with this analysis, if we are unable to prove the authoritative status of the five manuscripts of 4QRP with detailed arguments, neither are we able to prove such a status for most other Qumran Scripture scrolls. I believe that the default in our argumentation should always be the assumption that all scrolls we consider Scripture had an authoritative status.

Is there nevertheless some circumstantial evidence for the assumption that at least one of the 4QRP manuscripts was considered authoritative? The practice of indicating two dots before the divine name in 4QRP^b may imply that this manuscript was considered authoritative. A dicolon (:), followed by a space, is systematically placed before the Tetragrammaton (written in the square script) in 4QRP^b, written in the Qumran practice of orthography and morphology, e.g. 14 3 (Exod 24:17). This practice is not known from other sources, and it may be compared with other systems of reverential treatment of the Tetragrammaton, viz., the writing of that name in paleo-Hebrew characters, the use of four dots (“Tetrapuncta”), and the employment of a different color of ink in 11QpaleoUnidentified Text (11Q22).⁵⁵ The fact that the song in Exod 15 in 4QRP^c 6a ii and 6c is written in a special layout may imply that its scribe considered this composition a biblical text. This practice is used only for biblical texts.⁵⁶

4. CONCLUSION

In sum, the four manuscripts 4Q364–367 analyzed in the shadow of 4Q158, “4QBiblical Paraphrase,” were first named 4QPentateuch

beautiful *mezuzoth*, to write a beautiful scroll of the Torah with choice ink.” Chapters 4 and 5 of *Soperim* deal with the writing and erasure of divine names.

⁵⁴ According to Luke 4:16–21, Jesus entered the synagogue in Nazareth, a scroll of Isaiah was handed to him, he unrolled it, read the text, and then rolled the scroll back after use.

⁵⁵ See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 218–21.

⁵⁶ See Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 167.

Paraphrase or 4QPP. Their first identity crisis was the change from 4QPP to 4QReworked Pentateuch, or 4QRP. The second identity crisis occurred when it was realized that this nonbiblical composition might actually reflect a group of Scripture texts, possibly to be named *4QPentateuch*. In 2005, I reached this understanding when analyzing three completely different texts, the Greek translations of 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel. I suggested that the *Vorlagen* of these three LXX books reflect stages subsequent to those in MT. All three books were based on underlying Semitic texts that rewrote texts resembling MT, adding and changing major sections in these books. We also found several characteristic features in these three LXX compositions that are shared with rewritten Bible compositions from Qumran. Upon discovering these features, I realized that they have implications for our understanding of 4QRP. Keeping in mind that the LXX includes exponents of major rewriting that have become authoritative Scripture, we should be open to the possibility that 4QRP constitutes a group of Scripture manuscripts that had the same level of authority as the Hebrew texts underlying the LXX. The main focus of our study was the second identity crisis of 4QRP. We sketched the textual and exegetical nature of the five manuscripts of 4QRP, and argued that these manuscripts enjoyed authoritative status even if this assumption cannot be proven in detail.

AUTHORITATIVE SCRIPTURE AS REFLECTED IN THE
TEXTUAL TRANSMISSION OF THE BIBLICAL BOOKS:
THE CASE OF 1 KINGS 3–10

Julio Trebolle

In the meaningfully-titled book, *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World*, William Hallo classifies ancient Near Eastern literature in three great blocks: literature about gods, about kings and about individuals. The last one would be more or less equivalent to wisdom literature.¹ Generally speaking, biblical literature may also be ascribed to the three large spheres of temple, palace and prophets' and sages' schools.² Canonical literature of the Bible receives its authority from these three sources: the sacred authority of priests, the royal authority and the wisdom or academic authority of scribal schools. A comparative model for the study of the relationship between canon and textual transmission in the Bible is that of "canonical" literature of the Ancient East.³

In the Mesopotamian world a royal *nihil obstat* was a precondition of canonization.⁴ Not only religious authority, but also imperial Persian authority during the period of Ezra–Nehemiah⁵ and that of

Professor Florentino García Martínez has acquired from many the authority as *amicus et magister*. Let this be my testimony of homage and gratitude.

I would like to thank Dr Andrés Piquer Otero, researcher at Universidad Complutense de Madrid, for the translation of the Spanish original.

¹ W.W. Hallo and K.L. Younger, Jr., *The Context of Scripture: Canonical Compositions from the Biblical World* (3 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–2002).

² E.A. Knauf, *Die Umwelt des Alten Testaments* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), 221–37.

³ S.J. Lieberman, "Canonical and Official Cuneiform Texts: Towards an Understanding of Assurbanipal's Personal Tablet Collection," in *Lingering over Words: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Literature in Honor of William L. Moran* (ed. T. Abush, J. Huehnergard, and P. Steinkeller; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990), 305–36; P.Y. Hoskisson, "Emar as an Empirical Model of the Transmission of Canon," in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective: Scripture in Context, IV* (ed. K.L. Younger, Jr., W.W. Hallo, and B.F. Batto; Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 1991), 21–31.

⁴ K. van der Toorn, "Theodicy in Akkadian Literature," in *Theodicy in the World of the Bible* (ed. A. Laato and J.C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 57–89 (76).

⁵ L.S. Fried, *The Priest and the Great King: Temple-Palace Relations in the Persian Empire* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2004).

Ptolemaic kings in the case of the version of the Seventy Sages,⁶ and, similarly, the Roman imperial power in the Christian councils, had a word to say on the authority of books acknowledged as sacred and official. But the process of writing, edition and textual transmission of authorized books was a matter of scribes, of specialized staff or of true scholars. It would be enough to remember the figure of Erasmus and his crucial role in the establishing of the *textus receptus* of the New Testament, independently of any political or religious authority. The same happened with the Alcalá Polyglot, produced by Hebrew and Greek scholars and sanctioned by papal and royal authority only in a later phase.

The books in the Torah, Prophets and Writings were primarily seen as authoritative since a given moment in the Second Temple period, especially because they transmitted the lists and traditions which furnished evidence—in many cases creating the impression of going back to the earliest days of Israelite history—for the succession order of the Israelite priesthood, of patriarchs, judges and kings of Israel and Judah and of prophets and sages in Israel. The many genealogical lists and Israelite historiography altogether followed in this the models of Sumerian and Akkadian kings lists and *apkallū* lists. The books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah further extended the lists, genealogies and traditions of Israel into the Persian period. Soon after, sacred character was accorded to books which could prove a Mosaic or prophetic origin, going back to a period before “the failure of the exact succession of prophets” (*C. Ap.* 1.37–43).

Nevertheless, the Jewish tradition attested in *ʿAbot* 1:1 continued to state an unbroken transmission of authoritative tradition from Moses to Joshua to the elders, the prophets, and thence to the immediate predecessors of the rabbis. Similarly, Christian tradition acknowledged canonical authority for New Testament books when they could be traced back to the authority of an apostle or one of his associates. At the same time, succession after the apostles implied authority in the apostolic centres of the Christian church. Both synagogue and church established a closed canon of sacred books, thus acknowledging a cut in the tradition of prophets or apostles, but at the same time they gave the utmost importance to the legitimate succession of rabbis or popes

⁶ G. Veltri, *Libraries, Translations, and ‘Canonic’ Texts: The Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Cristian Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 225: “[The Septuagint] was (only) a written text for the King Ptolemy.”

and bishops who continued that very same prophetic or apostolic tradition.

In the scribal schools of the Ancient East, sacred and secular texts were redacted and transmitted, that ultimately would constitute the “education canon” or the ensemble of normative and literary traditions of the ancient Near Eastern peoples. Mesopotamian classical texts were stabilized some time before the eleventh century B.C.E. in a form that lasted for over a millennium as the mainstream scribal curriculum. The techniques of standardization characterize also the biblical canon, such as the arrangement of poetry in verses or lines, glosses identifying variant readings, colophons, and catalogues. Besides the neo-Assyrian standard or “canonical texts” there were also texts known as “extraneous,” that were collected, organized, and transmitted although they may have been less authoritative than “good texts.”⁷ The status of parabiblical texts, apocrypha or pseudepigrapha—“exterior books” in biblical tradition—and other Jewish literature could be somehow comparable to that of these “extraneous” texts that appeared together with the canon of Akkadian literature.

The Gilgamesh Epic provides us with an unrivalled illustration not only of the final fixation of a traditional text, but also of the evolution of such a text from its Sumerian beginnings. The creation of the standard epic around 1250 B.C.E. was the last major step in a millennium-long oral and literary scribal tradition, and even after this, later editors made subtle changes to the text. Certain Near Eastern laws as the law codes from Gortyn, Hatti, and Middle Assyria, reflect a lively process of editorial emendation in order to adjust the legislation for changing social and political circumstances. The canonicity of ancient lyrical texts was generally the result of usage in communal liturgies and private ritual settings. Later on they were copied and recopied by scribes who attempted to compile collections accessible for study. Also the omen compendia were canonical texts that reflect a long and arduous process of composition and editing.

In Israel sacred character was accorded to books which could prove an origin going back to a period before the time when the continuous succession of prophets was finally broken. Nevertheless, the authority of biblical texts is not only based upon their origin prior to king Artaxerxes (465–423 B.C.E.), or Simon the Just (*terminus ad quem*), but also and specially upon the fact of their going back to more remote

⁷ F. Rochberg-Halton, “Canonicity in Cuneiform Texts,” *JCS* 36 (1984): 127–44.

origins, which start out with the authority of Moses, of the kings, prophets and sages of ancient Israel (*terminus a quo*).

Thus, the very structure of biblical books, with their *incipits* and colophons, attempts to join old (eighth–seventh centuries) and recent (sixth–fifth centuries) writings, what indicates an inner-biblical awareness of an emerging Scripture. Such is the case, especially, of the books of Isaiah, Minor Prophets and Psalms. First Isaiah (Isa 1–39), Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah and Micah as well as the books I–II/III of Psalms were rooted in the monarchic period; in postexilic times they passed to form the first(s) section(s) of the respective final books. Second and Third Isaiah (Isa 40–55; 56–66), Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi and the last third of the Psalter were composed during or after the exile; they came to integrate the final sections of the corresponding books.⁸ Some of the Psalters found at Qumran show the greatest textual fluidity precisely in the final sections of Psalms.⁹

The *incipit* which opens the fifth part of the book of Proverbs (25–29), “These are other proverbs of Solomon that the officials of King Hezekiah of Judah copied,” traces this collection back to the last years of the eighth century B.C.E., whereas the final redaction of the book must have been concluded in the fourth or third centuries. The historical books also join materials from the monarchic era with considerations from the postexilic period based on laws and strictures from the Mosaic tradition. The Pentateuch itself is above all an anthological compendium of ancient Israelite tradition that includes not only laws and wisdom but also ritual and cultic regulations. Unlike their Near Eastern counterparts the biblical laws include a broader range of forms and address a much broader range of topics; they are also not collected in a single code but in separate collections (Exod 20:22–23:33, the Deuteronomic Code, the Holiness Code, and the Priestly Code); inasmuch they were influenced by Israel’s wisdom tradition in ways that Near Eastern texts were not.¹⁰ The repetitions, tensions and differences within the laws

⁸ J. Nogalski, *Literary Precursors to the Book of the Twelve* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993); idem, *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1993); E. Zenger, “Der Psalter als Buch: Beobachtungen zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Funktion,” in *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (ed. E. Zenger; Freiburg: Herder, 1998), 1–57.

⁹ P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 227; G.H. Wilson, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), 139–228.

¹⁰ K.L. Sparks, *Ancient Texts for the Study of the Hebrew Bible: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2005), 429–32.

of the Pentateuch imply that it in fact contains several law codes that originated in different times and situations. The compilation, arrangement and edition work of all these materials implies an inner-biblical awareness of an existing “Mosaic” tradition and authority. Also, the long and multifarious character of the Hebrew prophetic books can be attributed to a canonical process similar to that of the Near Eastern omen compendia.

The word canon had in antiquity a nonreligious meaning. According to Nahum Sarna, the model followed by rabbis for the constitution of canon was that of the Alexandrine canon, more than that of the later Christian one. The Alexandrian and the rabbinic impulse to the ordering of the canon owed much to the needs of storage and retrieval in a library setting. Sid Leiman disputes this notion, arguing that the rabbinic impulse came rather from the equally practical question of the order in which to inscribe two or more biblical books on a single scroll.¹¹ The order of classification of books is a decisive element in the constitution of a canon.

An example of this is the classical model of five-book collections, as (in the Bible), the Pentateuch, Megilloth or Psalter. A distribution of five books per codex is very frequent in Greek and Latin historiography. Of Polybius books I–V have been preserved, of Diodorus I–V, XI–XV and XVI–XX. Tacitus’ *Histories* and Curtius Rufus’ *History of Alexander the Great*, also present this distribution. The five short speeches called *Symbouleutikoí* have a single heading, as they were part of a single roll. The manuscript of Dionysus of Halicarnassus’ *Ancient History of Rome* (tenth century C.E.) contains books I–X, which, in uncial script, spanned two manuscripts. This is the conclusion to be extracted from the final annotation in the *Chigiano* R VII 60 manuscript, which makes an allusion to the “end of the second codex,” and also from the distribution of the ten books which make up this work, two groups of five copied in two manuscripts. Pamphylus of Caesarea wrote his *Apology* in defence of Origen in five books, like Sextus Iulius Africanus’ *Chronicles*.¹² The five small books that compose the Megilloth collection were transmitted in the beginning as independent scrolls until the moment in which they became a collection copied in

¹¹ S.Z. Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence* (Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1976), 62 n. 258.

¹² J. Quasten, *Patrología. I: Hasta el concilio de Nicea* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 2001), 444, 451.

a single volume. The book of 2 Maccabees is a summary of Jason of Cyrene's work written in five volumes. Also, *1 Enoch* is made up of five independent books. Consequently, from the point of view of canonical authority it does not seem to make sense to speak of the existence of a Tetrateuch or Hexateuch, although they could have existed before the Pentateuch. Only the latter could enjoy the authority implied by this distribution in five books.

The criteria by which to define a [cuneiform] text as standard or canonical are text stability and fixed sequence of tablets within a series. The text in question must also have stayed "stabilized some time [but not much!] before the XIth century in a form that lasted for over a millennium in Mesopotamia."¹³ Also, according to Sarna, the emergence of a recognized corpus of classical literature manifests itself in the tendency to produce a standardized text, a fixed arrangement of content and an established sequence in which the works were to be read or studied.¹⁴ Thus, together with the order of classification of books, also the fixing of the order of tablets or a fixed arrangement of the literary units within a book, as well as the text stability or the production of a standardized text—the whole subject of Bible-scrolls—are part of the process of canonization of biblical books.¹⁵

The succession of biblical characters is related to biblical books. A Judaeo-Christian tradition transmitted in Pseudo-Cyprian's *Adversus Iudaeos*, a late second-century C.E. book, offers a list of biblical couples in opposition arranged in chronological order as Aaron-Abiram;

¹³ M. Civil, ed., *Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon 14: Ea A=nâqu, Aa A=nâqu, with their Forerunners and Related Texts* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1979), 168–69; W.W. Hallo, "The Concept of Canonicity in Cuneiform and Biblical Literature: A Comparative Appraisal," in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective* (ed. Younger, Hallo, and Batto), 1–20 (6).

¹⁴ N.M. Sarna, "The Order of the Books," in *Studies in Jewish Bibliography, History and Literature in Honor of I. Edward Kiev* (ed. C. Berlin; New York: Ktav, 1971), 407–13 (411, 413 n. 15); Hallo, "The Concept of Canonicity."

¹⁵ E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); M. Haran, "Book-Scrolls in Israel in Pre-Exilic Times," *JSS* 33 (1982): 161–73; idem, "Bible-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins," *HUCA* 44 (1983): 111–22; idem, "Bible-Scrolls in Eastern and Western Jewish Communities from Qumran to the High Middle Ages," *HUCA* 56 (1985): 21–62; idem, "Book-Size and the Device of Catch-Lines in the Biblical Canon," *JSS* 36 (1985): 1–11; idem, "Book-Size and the Thematic Cycles in the Pentateuch," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff* (ed. E. Blum, C. Macholz, and E.J. Stegemann; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 165–76.

David-Saul; Elijah-Ahab; and, in number 25, Jeremiah-Ananiah and Isaiah-Manasseh. The order Jeremiah-Isaiah also appears in Melito of Sardis (*Hom.* 62–64), as well as in Origen (*Comm. Matt.* 28) and Tertullian (*Scorp.* 8.3).¹⁶ According to the testimony of Elias Levita, manuscripts of German and French Jews present the order Jeremiah-Ezekiel-Isaiah for those biblical books, whereas for Spanish and Portuguese Jews it was Isaiah-Jeremiah-Ezekiel.¹⁷ The Babylonian Talmud treatise *B. Bat.* 14b, the Midrashic compilation *Yalqut Šimoni*, composed around the thirteenth century C.E. and lists of the Masoretic work *‘Oklah we-‘Oklah* attest the order Jeremiah-Ezekiel-Isaiah.

The Talmudic text also transmits the order of *Ketubim* according to a chronological criterion: Ruth-Psalms-Job-Proverbs-Ecclesiastes-Song of Songs-Lamentations-Daniel-Esther-Ezra-Nehemiah-Chronicles. Nevertheless, precedence of Jeremiah to Isaiah does not reflect a chronological criterion, but an editorial one. Already Frants Buhl noted that contact points between the book of Jeremiah and the last chapters of Kings motivated the juxtaposition of both books, thus having Isaiah precede the Twelve Prophets, given that Isaiah was Hosea’s contemporary and the respective books present the same *incipit* (Isa 1:1; Hos 1:1).¹⁸

The end of Jeremiah according to the edition transmitted in the Greek version (LXX 44–52) presents the same text, with small variants, as the end of Kings (2 Kgs 24–25), in the same way that 2 Kgs 18:13–20:19 and Isa 36–39 (with the exception of 38:9–20) reproduce the same text. Probably these repetitions indicate two traditions of arrangement of those books: one that linked Kings to First Isaiah and another that linked Kings to Jeremiah. This second linking option is confirmed by the end of Chronicles, taken from Kings (2 Chr 36:20). The last verses (2 Chr 36:22–23), constitute an anticipated repetition of the opening lines of Ezra–Nehemiah, which contain the same reference to the words spoken by Jeremiah (Ezra 1:1–2). This reference is not only chronological—the seventy years of exile announced by the prophet—but also editorial. It indicates that between Kings and Chronicles, which speak of the times before the exile, and Ezra–Nehemiah, which

¹⁶ D. Van Damme, *Pseudo-Cyprian: Adversus Iudaeos (gegen die Judenchristen), die älteste lateinische Predigt* (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1969), 54–55, 89.

¹⁷ W. Bacher, “Elija Levita’s wissenschaftliche Leistungen,” *ZDMG* 43 (1889): 206–72 (236).

¹⁸ F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testament* (Leipzig: Faber, 1891), 38.

refers to the times after it, one has to place and read the book of Jeremiah. The relationship or sequencing between Kings and Jeremiah is also confirmed by the fact that both of these books have undergone a similar Deuteronomistic redaction. This redaction has been studied regarding its beginning from Deuteronomy, but not much in its continuation from Kings to Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

If, for one moment, we turn our attention to the New Testament, its oldest manuscripts exhibit a remarkable consistency in order and content of books, as well as in their titles, a fact that, according to David Trobisch, proves the existence of an early canonical edition. The New Testament would not be then the product of a long process of formation, but it would constitute a unique and unitary book, the fruit of a "canonical edition" developed in the beginning of the second century C.E., which was immediately accepted in Asia Minor and Rome.¹⁹ Other lines of research underscore that, throughout the second century, the Gospels were subject to a long and dynamic process of textual transmission. This was caused by various forces in the linguistic, codicological,²⁰ social, liturgical and theological spheres. This implied deliberate changes to the text, like additions such as the different endings of Mark and John 21 or the story of the adulterous woman (John 7:53–8:11). Consequently, at the end of the second century, the Gospels were being transmitted in diverse textual forms and with more than a few corruptions. The textual types which can be identified in the textual tradition of the following centuries (Alexandrine, Western, "neutral" and others) seem to have their roots in this situation of textual fluidity which was a trademark of the second century. As David Parker writes, "primitive Christianity may have developed lists of authorized books, but there are no authorized *copies* thereof."²¹

The best reflection of the difference in situation between the second half of the first century C.E. and the second half of the second century C.E. is offered by polemics between Jews and Christians. These polemics moved around the practice of Jewish legal strictures (*halakah*) or the "tradition of the ancients," as well as Christological matters around Jesus-Messiah and his resurrection. At the end of the first century C.E., the Gospel of John is already addressing issues on the interpretation

¹⁹ D. Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments: Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).

²⁰ See also the article by Jan N. Bremmer in this volume.

²¹ D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 188.

of Scripture. The *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*, attributed to Arison of Pella and certainly used by Justin—a lost work that has been only transmitted in some fragments—, condenses the issues raised among Jews and Christians.²² Basically, these issues included the extension of the canon, the hierarchy of books within it, textual variants, the method of interpretation and the exegesis of meaningful passages, especially those susceptible of a messianic reading by Christians. Polemics on this sort of issues stayed alive until the eighteenth century.

In the first dialect frays, Christians were already alleging alterations or mutilations of passages or interpretative mistakes by Jews. Arguing with Tryphon, Justin accused them of having “totally suppressed many passages of the version of the seventy sages who were with King Ptolemy, which show that this very crucified Jesus was explicitly predicated as God and man” (καὶ ὅτι πολλὰς γραφὰς τέλειον περιεῖλον, *Dial.* 71:2;²³ see also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2.21.1–2, and Jerome, *Epist. Marc.* 32.1). Such accusations were very imprecise and the supposedly mutilated passages were not part of the Hebrew text used by Jews. Such was the case of passages attributed to Ezra (*Dial.* 72:1) and Jeremiah (*Dial.* 72:4), as well as the story of the martyrdom of Isaiah, which were nothing but Christian midrashim, the latter extracted from the *Ascension of Isaiah*. At times they were interpolations introduced by Christians in the Septuagint version, like the words “from the wood” (ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου), which make Ps 95:10 say “The Lord reigned from the wood,” which allowed for a Christological interpretation of the biblical text.

All in all, the discussion revolved around the opposition between the LXX version and Aquila’s translation. Thus, Justin rebuked Tryphon because it was the Jewish masters themselves who declared that the first Jewish translation of the Septuagint was not authentic in some passages.²⁴ It is a remarkable fact that, already at the time of the Second Jewish Revolt (132–135 C.E.), both of them ignored the starting point of the situation, which came to be known only after the discovery of the Qumran library. Differences between the texts used by Jews and Christians were not due to deliberate deformations, but they echoed the existence of different Hebrew texts in times before the appearance

²² *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca* (ed. J.-P. Migne; Paris: Garnier, 1857–1866), 5:1277–86.

²³ D. Ruiz Bueno, *Padres apologistas Griegos (s. II)* (Madrid: Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, 1954), 431.

²⁴ J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme* (Tournai: Desclée, 1958), 111.

of Christianity, so that some biblical books, like Jeremiah and Daniel, were transmitted in different editions. This explains that the New Testament cites the Hebrew Bible in very different forms, preferably the Septuagint, although also that of the traditional (or Masoretic) Hebrew text, and others which obey to *ad hoc* modifications operated according to the exegetical methods of the time.

At the end of the Second Temple period there could have been already lists of authorized books, but there were no authorized copies thereof, although proto-Masoretic texts seem to progressively displace those closer to the Hebrew original of LXX or unaligned or independent texts. The importance of pericope order in the Hebrew Bible becomes clear with a mere comparison of “some sequence difference between the Masoretic text and the Septuagint” in the books of Numbers, Joshua, 1 Samuel, 1 Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. They are not to be attributed to the Greek translators. They are rather related “to late additions of sections whose position was not yet fixed when the archetypes of these texts were composed.”²⁵

A case of a “movable” pericope from one context to another is Josh 8:30–35, framed by two *vacats* or *petuhot*. In 4QJosh^a this pericope appears before 5:2–7. Thus, the first altar in the newly entered land was built by Joshua at Gilgal immediately after the crossing of the Jordan (after Josh 4), not later on Mount Ebal (cf. 8:30–35 MT and 9:3–8 LXX).²⁶ Josephus could have known this edition, because he mentions the construction of an altar after the crossing of the Jordan (A.J. 5.16–20) and, after the end of the conquest, describes again the construction of an altar and the reading of the Torah (5.59, 68–70).

I would like to note that the Old Latin text (OL) presents two textual forms of 9:1–2, each of them located in a different context. The first one follows the order of LXX; it appears between 8:1–29 (the account of the conquest of Ai) and 8:30–35 (the narrative about the sacrifice

²⁵ E. Tov, “Some Sequence Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint and their Ramifications for Literary Criticism,” *JNSL* 13 (1987): 151–60 (151) = E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 411–18 (411).

²⁶ E. Ulrich, “4Q47: 4QJosh^a,” in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (E. Ulrich et al.; DJD 14; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 143–52. For an up-to-date detailed study of this passage, with discussion and critique of the different scholarly positions (E. Tov, A.G. Auld, A. Kempinski, E. Ulrich, A. Rofé, E. Noort), cf. M.N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 479–522.

on Mount Ebal).²⁷ The second form is located, according to the MT, between 8:30–35 and 9:3–27 (the narrative about the treaty with the inhabitants of Gibeon).²⁸ The repetition of OL frames the text of the pericope 8:30–35 and in this way it fulfils an editorial role. It underscores the “mobile” character of this literary piece, which is out of place in its present context in the MT and can appear either after the report of the conquest of Ai (MT); or after 9:2, before the story of the Gibeonites (LXX), or before 5:2–7, the account of the circumcision at Gilgal (4QJosh^a). The ceremony at Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal fulfils the commandment of Deut 11:26–30. Deut 27:2 commands that the ceremony be performed “on the day you cross the Jordan.” For this to be possible it had to be celebrated on the actual day that the people crossed the Jordan, during the events described in Josh 3–4, as it is the case in the order followed by 4QJosh^a. The editorial addition in this manuscript, “after crossing the Jordan,” confirms that this edition located both mountains around Gilgal.

R. Yishmael (*y. Soṭah* 7:3 // 21c) represents a new alternative when compared to those represented in the manuscript tradition. It implies that the covenant at Gerizim and Ebal (8:30–35) occurred after the conquest and the distribution of the land. Instead of positing that the people moved from Gilgal to Shechem and back to Gilgal, the people remained at its base in Gilgal throughout the conquest and the distribution of the land, and only thereafter, in Josh 24, Joshua brought the people to Shechem for the covenant that occurred there at the end of his life. In fact Alberto Soggin in his commentary on Joshua rearranges the text, placing 8:30–35 after 24:27.²⁹

From a chronological point of view, other passages in the book of Joshua also seem to be out of place. Thus, the episode in Josh 2 on the spies sent by Joshua to Jericho interrupts the flow of the narrative. Joshua commands the officers of the people to cross the Jordan in three days, which is accomplished in 3:1–5. In between, the spies need

²⁷ *Ut autem audierunt reges Amorrei qui erant ultra Iordanum, in montaniis et campis qui erant in fine maris magni et qui erant ab Anteliba(nu)m et Chettei et Amorrei et Channanei et Ferezei et Euchaoi et Gergessaei et Iebussaei et conuenerunt in unum expugnare Iesum et Istrahel simul omnes.*

²⁸ *Et factum est ut audierunt omnes reges qui erant trans Iordanum in monte et in Secelat et in omnibus litoribus maris magni contra faciem Libani Chettaeus et Ferezaeus et Euchaeus et congregauerunt se in unum ut belligerarent cum Iesu et cum Istrahel ore uno.*

²⁹ J.A. Soggin, *Joshua: A Commentary* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Westminster, 1972), 94, 220–22.

an extra day to return and then hid three more days before returning to the camp (2:16, 22). Assuming that Josh 1 and 2 are not in chronological sequence, some commentators in the rabbinic tradition state that Joshua sent the spies prior to chapter 1: Rashi (on 2:1), R. David Kimchi (on 3:1), R. Isaiah of Trani (2:22), Abarbanel (on 1:10) and (haggadah of) Malbim (on 1:10). In this case there are no alternative textual traditions to the agreement between MT and LXX.

The rabbinic axiom *ên mûqdām û-me'ûhār ba-Tōrā*, “there is no chronological order [lit., earlier and later] in the Torah” (*Pesah.* 6b; *Mek.* 7; *Sipre Num.* 64; *Qoh. Rab.* 1:12, *et passim*) may have a different meaning if it is applied to a single text, as it was the case of MT in the rabbinic era, or to a plurality of texts or editorial forms, with a different order of pericopes, such as the situation was in the Qumran period up to 70 C.E.³⁰

According to R. Aqiba, the order of pericopes was something established and essential for interpretation. For R. Yishmael it was something accidental, because there is no before and after for interpretation. Thus, R. Aqiba could attribute to Balaam Israel’s idolatry, given that the text of Num 25:1, according to which “the people began to have sexual relations with the women of Moab,” follows immediately after chs. 22–24, about Balaam’s activity in Moab. R. Yishmael, and also Aqiba’s disciple, R. Meir, did not admit the possibility of getting to that conclusion from a mere succession of pericopes.

It seems that R. Yishmael, sage of the generation before Bar Kokhba, thinks in the sphere of a textual situation prior to the definitive fixing of the proto-MT and the elimination of textual forms which presented a different order of pericopes, as it was the case of the independent or “unaligned” texts of Qumran (such as 4QDeut^{b,c,h,k}, 4QJosh^a or 11QPs^a). It is stimulating to relate the different opinions presented in the schools of Aqiba and Yishmael with the previous textual situation, at the end of the Second Temple period. Aqiba seems to be representing the new situation of fixing an authorized text, of protorabbinic roots, whereas Yishmael represents a situation in which there was not a single authorized text yet, but a degree of textual plurality, which

³⁰ *Pesah.* 6b, I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Mo'ed II* (London: Soncino, 1938), 24–25: “Now, let [the events of] the first month be written first, and then that of the second month—Said R. Menasia b. Tahlfifa in Rab’s name: This proves that there is no chronological order in the Torah. R. Papa observed: ‘This was said only of two subjects; but in the same subject what is earlier is earlier and what is later is later.’”

allowed for a different order of pericopes in the manuscripts of some books.

Our present knowledge on the plurality of textual forms and the existence of different ways of ordering the text in some books beckons us to think that the question of chronological order is in fact a question of literary order. One often finds cases, even in Hebrew poetry,³¹ where something, which logically should go after, is anticipated. In order to re-establish the chronological order, ancient editors did already resort to textual amendment and to the suppression or transposition of words or phrases, as modern critics also do at times. The different order of pericopes between MT and LXX is reflected in the Hexaplaric recension, which rearranges the OG text according to MT. Thus, Origen's text in Josh 8:30–35 appears in the MT place, against the Septuagint's order.

The first book of Kings is marked by the many transpositions between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint in chs. 3–10. This different literary order of pericopes affects the chronological order and the sequence of events of the reign of Solomon. These chapters also present extensive parallels in Chronicles; therefore they are especially open to a study like the one proposed in the series *Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity*. In the words of Marjo Korpel, "Unit division, both of small units (like cola, [verse-]lines, and strophes or verses) and pericope division, is extremely old and may well go back to the earliest 'authoritative' copies of a literary work in Classical Hebrew."³² In Mishnaic times, the introduction of changes in the *petuḥot* and *setumot* system in Torah manuscripts for liturgical usage was forbidden. Qumran manuscripts attest the existence of such divisions in far earlier times. Their origin is to be related not only to

³¹ E. Zurro Rodríguez, "El *hysteron-proteron* en la poesía bíblica hebrea," *EstBib* 58 (2000): 399–415.

³² M.C.A. Korpel, "Introduction to the Series Pericope," in *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship* (ed. M.C.A. Korpel and J.M. Oesch; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2000), 1–50 (22); E. Tov, "Sense Divisions in the Qumran Texts, the Masoretic Text, and Ancient Translations of the Bible," in *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (ed. J. Krašovec; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 121–46; E. Ulrich, "Impressions and Intuition: Sense Divisions in Ancient Manuscripts of Isaiah," in *Unit Delimitation in Biblical Hebrew and Northwest Semitic Literature* (ed. M.C.A. Korpel and J.M. Oesch; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003), 279–307; M.C.A. Korpel and J.M. Oesch, eds., *Studies in Scriptural Unit Division* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2002).

liturgy, but also to the process of edition and affirmation of authority of biblical books.³³

The following tables present a series of pericopes from 1 Kgs 3–10, some of them marked with the *petuḥah* or *setumah* indications, which signal open or closed sections.³⁴ Transpositions of units between MT and LXX (*in italics* and with the sign = = in both of their respective locations) help us delimitate the extension of each of them, an extension which can be at times very short. A verse or a group of verses that appears in one position in MT and in another one in LXX constitutes in principle a “mobile” unit, which may appear in either context. The Hexaplaric text reproduces them according to the MT composition order, omitting the OG text in its original position in the LXX. Thus, the unit of MT 3:1b, about Pharaoh’s daughter, appears in LXX after MT 5:11–14 joined with MT 9:16–17a. The Hexaplaric Greek text reproduces these phrases according to the MT position.

A V marks *vacats* or blank spaces featured in the three editions of the *Biblia Hebraica* (Kittel’s, Kahle’s and the *Stuttgartensia*). They are found after 3:3; 4:20; 5:26; 6:1; 6:36; 7:14; 7:22; 9:15; 9:16–17a; 9:17b–19; 9:23; 9:24b; 9:25 and many other passages throughout these chapters, as the reader will be able to see by himself. For some time I thought that those *vacats* appeared in Hebrew manuscripts and I even marvelled at the coincidence of those blank spaces with operations in modern criticism. Only later I realized that they do not appear in the manuscripts, except at times in very meagre spaces that are not easy to interpret. Only the first Kittel edition (1905) tries to justify these *vacats*, indicating that in the new edition it was necessary to proceed according to the state of the discipline at the time.³⁵ The *Stuttgartensia* edition presents even more *vacats* than the previous Kittel-Kahle editions. It is interesting to compare this datum with Korpel’s obser-

³³ J.M. Oesch, *Petucha und Setuma: Untersuchungen zu einer überlieferten Gliederung im hebräischen Text des Alten Testaments* (Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1979), 45–54, 71–79, 102–3, 263–64.

³⁴ Already in Ugarit single or double horizontal lines might indicate the borders between larger units. See J.C. de Moor, “Narrative Poetry in Canaan,” *UF* 20 (1988): 149–71.

³⁵ R. Kittel, ed., *Biblia Hebraica* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1905–1906), VI: “... *in nova editione secundum nostri temporis scientiam textum dividi opus erat. Quoties incisio sive maior sive minor sine litteris 𐤁 et 𐤂 scriptis aut nullum aut minimum spatium intermissum est, silentio alia ac masoretica discriptio supposita est, qua in re non omitendum est codicem B iterum atque iterum exigua spatia relinquere, quae num solum typographiae gratia interiecta sint, non semper facile est diiudicare.*”

vation, according to which “the more ancient manuscripts contain a larger number of major text dividers.”³⁶

The *vacat*-marked divisions (Ⲑ, Ⲕ, V) often coincide with LXX transpositions and with operations of modern criticism. Thus, a note in the BHS indicates that 1 Kgs 9:16, 17a should probably be transposed with 3:1 after 5:14, following in this the Old Greek text. Such textual divisions obey to the intervention of scribes and editors in the process of canonical or scholarly fixing of a text. This puts forward the question of the relationship of an authorized edition within a religious tradition and a scholarly edition, always conditioned by the development of scholarship itself.

A “mobile” unit can be and often is an element which has entered into the main text late. In 1 Kings these movable elements accumulate before and after the materials about the construction of Solomon’s temple and palace and Hiram’s activities, which constitute the more stable text, attested both in Kings (MT and LXX) and Chronicles. The pericopes of this triple tradition with coincidences of order span almost the whole text of 1 Kings, which had as a central topic the building and furnishing of the temple (1 Kgs 3–9) and the figure of Solomon as a wise king (1 Kgs 9–10).³⁷

1 Kings (MT and LXX)	2 Chronicles	
3:4–15	1:3–13	The vision of Gibeon
5:15–26	2:1–15	Hiram (I)
5:27, 29–30	2:16–17	Workmen
6:2–3, 15–36	3:1–14*	The temple
7:13–14	(2:12–13*)	Hiram (II)
7:15–51	3:15–5:2*	Cultic objects
8	5:3–7:10	Dedication
9:1–9	7:11–22	Second vision
9:10–14	8:1–2	Hiram (III)
9:26–28	8:17–18	The fleet, Hiram
10:1–13	9:1–12	The queen of Sheba
10:14–29	9:13–28	Solomon’s riches

³⁶ Korpel, “Introduction to the Series Pericope,” 23.

³⁷ A.G. Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible’s Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994).

It is not surprising that Chronicles reflects a literary form of Kings prior to the present editions of Kings, MT and LXX; or that its text preserves a text of Samuel–Kings similar to that attested by 4QSamuel^a (4Q51), the Old Greek of Samuel–Kings; and Josephus. The fact that the quoted passages compose a unity transmitted in a stable order and attested in a triple tradition may be considered as evidence of it enjoying greater authority than other passages of a more reduced extension which were also dispersed throughout the composition according to a different order in MT and LXX Kings. These passages regarding the temple, together with others about the queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:1–13 // 2 Chr 9:1–12) are the most quoted in later traditions, both Jewish and Christian, and those endowed with the greatest authority. The case may be compared with the pericopes which belong to the triple synoptic tradition of the New Testament and that, because of it, had more weight in gospel tradition than those transmitted by a single gospel writer.³⁸ The next table presents the sequence of the common passages in Kings and Chronicles about the building of the temple, framed by references to Hiram of Tyre. It also presents the pieces which have a different placement in MT and LXX (5:31–32a; 6:37–38a; and 7:1, 12), as well as those which are only present in MT (6:1b; 6:11–14; and 6:38b) which correspond to Hexaplaric additions in LXX.

	2 Chronicles	LXX Kings Main text	MT Kings	LXX Kings Supplement
Hiram (I)	2:1–15	5:15–26	5:15–26	V
Workmen	2:16	5:27	5:27	
		5:28	5:28	Ⓛ
	2:17	5:29–30	5:29–30	2:35d(h)
		5:31–32a ==	5:31–32a ==	
Temple		5:32b	5:32b	Ⓛ
		6:1a	6:1a	
			6:1b	V
		5:31–32a == 6:37–38a ==		
	3:1–4	6:2–3	6:2–3	
		6:4–10	6:4–10	Ⓛ

³⁸ K. Aland, *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968).

Table (cont.)

	2 Chronicles	LXX Kings Main text	MT Kings	LXX Kings Supplement
			6:11–13	Ⓛ
			6:14	
	3:4b–14*	6:15–36	6:15–36	V
			6:37–38a ==	
			6:38b	2:35c ^b
Palace			7:1–12 ==	Ⓛ
Hiram (II)	(2:12–13)	7:13–14	7:13–14	V
Cultic objects	3:15–17*	7:15–21	7:15–21.22	V
	4:1–5:2	7:22–51	7:22–51	Ⓛ
		7:1–12 ==		
Dedication	5:3–7:10	8	8	
Vision 2	7:11–22	9:1–9	9:1–9	Ⓛ
		9:24a == (<i>infra</i>)		
Hiram (III)	8:1–2	9:10–14	9:10–14	

Together with the previous triple-tradition pericopes, those that appear both in MT and LXX Kings but not in Chronicles represent the text of an edition of Kings on which both texts depend. These pericopes are: 1 Kgs 3:2–3, the high places; 3:16–28, Solomon’s judgement; 4:1–19, lists; 5:7–8, provisions; 5:9–14, Solomon’s wisdom; 5:28, 32b, which together with 5:31–32a forms a unit about Solomon’s and Hiram’s workmen; and 6:1a, 4–10, on the building of the temple.

The movable pieces between MT and LXX and others added to MT differentiate the edition represented by each text. These pieces placed in one place or another are: 3:1b, 9:16–17a and 9:24a, which, together with 9:23 (5:30), are part of the series of references to Pharaoh’s daughter; 9:15, 17b–22, about Solomon’s building program and the imposition of the forced work; 5:2–4, which, together with 5:7–8, constitutes the unit about Solomon’s provisions; 6:37–38, a chronological note; and 7:1–12, the building of the palace.

The brief references present in MT and unknown to the main text of the Greek original version are: 3:1a; 4:20; 5:5, 6; 9:23; 9:24b; 9:25.

	LXX Kings Main text	MT Kings	LXX Kings Supplement
Pharao's daughter "and brought her..."		3:1a 3:1b ==	2:35c ^a
The high places	3:2-3	3:2-3	V
The vision of Gibeon	3:4-15	3:4-15	Ⓛ
Solomon's judgment	3:16-28	3:16-28	Ⓛ
Solomon king over Israel	4:1	4:1	Ⓛ
List of high officials	4:2-6	4:2-6	Ⓛ
List of officials	4:7-19	4:7-19	Ⓛ
"Judah and Israel..."		4:20	V 2:46a
"was sovereign over..."		5:1a ==	2:46b ^a / k
"they brought tribute..."		5:1b	Ⓛ 2:46b ^b
Provisions "for one day"		5:2-4 ==	2:46efg ^a
Judah and Israel in safety		5:5	Ⓛ 2:46g ^b
Stalls and chariots		5:6 // 10:26	2:46i
Officials and provisions	5:7-8 5:2-4 ==	5:7-8	Ⓛ
Solomon's wisdom	5:9-14 3:1b ==	5:9-14	Ⓛ
Pharao's daughter: dowry	9:16-17a ==		2:35c ^a
Hiram and Solomon: the building of the temple (<i>supra</i>)	5:15-9:14 (<i>supra</i>)	5:15-9:14 (<i>supra</i>)	
Pharaoh's daughter	9:24a ==		
Hiram (II)	9:10-14	9:10-14	Ⓛ
Solomon's buildings		9:15a.b ==	V 2:35k*.i
Pharaoh's daughter		9:16-17a ==	V
Solomon's buildings		9:17b-18* ==	2:35i
		9:19 ==	V
Slave labour		9:20-22 ==	Ⓛ
Solomon's officials		9:23 (5:30)	V 2:35h
Pharaoh's daughter		9:24a ==	2:35f
"then he built the Millo"		9:24b	V 2:35f
Altar and sacrifices		9:25	V 2:35g
The fleet—Hiram	9:26-28	9:26-28	Ⓛ
Queen of Sheba	10:1-13	10:1-13	Ⓛ
Solomon's riches	10:14-22 9:15a.b == 9:17b-18 == 9:19 == 9:20-22 ==	10:14-22	
	10:23-25	10:23-25	Ⓛ
	10:26	10:26 (5:6)	2:46i*
	5:1a ==		2:46k (46b)
	10:27-29	10:27-29	Ⓛ

The previous table shows how the movable elements or those exclusive to MT accumulate before and after the materials about the construction of Solomon's temple and Hiram's activities (5:15–9:14), which constitute the central and longest body of chapters 3–10.

The ensemble of movable and MT-exclusive elements in 4:20–5:6 (Hexaplaric text in LXX) interrupts the sequence of units 4:7–19 and 5:7–8 (list of officers supplying provisions for the kings), which would correspond to the most original version of the text, as the majority of scholars acknowledge. The same ensemble of 4:20–5:6 has matches in the so-called supplement of LXX 2:46a.b.e.f.g.k*.i.h.f.g (in inverse order).

But it is not only the MT order, but also that of the main LXX text what seems to be also dislocated by the insertion of the movable passages which may be placed at either location in MT and LXX. Thus, the unit of 5:2–4, "Solomon's provision for one day was" in its MT placement after 5:1 "Solomon was sovereign over all the kingdoms...; they brought tribute and served Solomon all the days of his life," is stating the fact that all these kingdoms supplied Solomon with provisions, as confirmed by the end of the unit: "For he had dominion over all the region west of the Euphrates..., over all the kings." This arrangement of materials, 5:2–4 followed by 5:5, is also present in the LXX supplement 2:46e.f. In the LXX order, on the other hand, the 5:2–4 pericope is placed after 5:7–8. It attributes to the rulers of Israel's districts the provisioning of Solomon's palace. The placement of 5:2–4 seems to be secondary both in MT and in the main LXX text.

The disperse materials of 3:1b, 9:16–17a and 9:24a form a unity of references to Pharaoh's daughter, related with 9:23 (> OG, Solomon's officers) and with the construction of the Millo, 9:24a (> OG). Their placement in diverse contexts both in MT and in LXX seems totally secondary, as it interrupts in different occasions the sequence of units. In the MT arrangement, these references are framing an arch which goes from the beginning of Solomon's reign almost to its ending; in LXX they frame more specifically the building of the temple. The LXX supplement contains these materials too, yet in a different order: 2:35c^a.i.f.h.

The 9:15.17b.22 piece, about Solomon's building program and the imposition of the forced work, is part of the total of secondary materials inserted between 9:10–14 and 9:26–28. Its placement in the context of LXX is also secondary: it interrupts the unit of 10:14–19 on Solomon's riches, which has a parallel in 2 Chr 9:13–28. This piece also has

a partial correspondence with the LXX supplement 2:35k*.i, although without the interpolation brought about by MT 9:16–17a.

MT and LXX seem to represent two editions that differ in the order in which they integrate materials which were not part of the base text. In chapters 9–10, this text was basically the one common to Kings and Chronicles: 9:10–14; 9:26–28; 10:1–13; 10:14–22; 10:23–25; 10:26–29 (*supra*). In chapters 3–5 it was the main text of LXX without the movable pieces mentioned above, which find matches in the supplement. This base text is made of 3:2–3; 3:4–15; 3:16–28; 4:1–19; 5:7–30, almost the totality of the text of those chapters. The edition represented by LXX collected the material from the supplement before the beginning of the main text, at the start of the book. The literary and textual tradition knew three different points which mark possible endings of 2 Samuel and beginnings of 1 Kings: 1 Kgs 2:12 “Solomon sat on the throne” (end of the *kaige* recension text); LXX 2:35 “the kingdom was established”; and MT 2:46b “the kingdom was established” (// 2 Chr 1:1), which is matched in LXX by the verse of supplement 2:46l “Solomon was king over,” after which both in MT and in LXX begins the text of chapters 3–10. The supplement of LXX begins after 2:35 and ends at 2:46l, and it includes a continuous text of the Shimei episode, which in MT and LXX appears as divided in two contexts (2:8–9, 36–46). The usual numbering gives the impression of it being two supplements, but the same expressions in 2:35a and 2:46a give the same title for an ensemble, no matter how heterogeneous its contents seem: “God gave Solomon very great wisdom, discernment,” the same expression which appears in 5:9.

It is not possible to go here into further details nor, especially, into the discussion about important recent studies which express different points of view to those that I present here.³⁹ It is especially important to acknowledge that it is not possible to give a full and satisfying

³⁹ Special attention should be granted to the work by P.S.F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). See also Z. Talshir, “The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles,” *VT* 50 (2000): 233–49; F.H. Polak, “The Septuagint Account of Solomon’s Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension,” in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (ed. B.A. Taylor; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 2001), 139–64; A. Schenker, *Septante et texte massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (Paris: Gabalda, 2000); recently and with very meaningful ramifications for other writings and the canon issue, E. Tov, “3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Composition,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea*

explanation for each text, of their favourable and unfavourable points, less of all of the process of formation for each of them. The problem does not so much lie in elucidating whether MT turned into LXX or the other way round, but in explaining how those two editions were formed from a previous and different form of the book, which could be hinted at by Chronicles and some other available materials.

A last consideration takes us back to the initial topic: authoritative Scripture as reflected in the textual transmission. Transpositions and other variants in 1 Kgs 3–10 seem to obey to a tension between the pericopes about the temple and its cult, those which derive from palatial sources (Pharaoh's daughter, Solomon's provisions, buildings and riches) and those which detail Solomon's wisdom as a master of sages and scribes (as 1 Kgs 5:9–14, 10:23–25 and the LXX supplement, put together around the topic of Solomon's wisdom). Chronicles focuses on cult and selects therefore materials about the temple, although it includes after it extensive materials on Solomon's wisdom and riches. It does not leave out references to Pharaoh's daughter in 8:11–12, connected with sacrifices at the temple, in a notice which matches LXX 2:35f, a fact that indicates that among Chronicles' sources, materials from the LXX supplement were available (also 2 Chr 9:25–26 has a match in LXX 1 Kgs 2:46i*–k.)

The edition of Kings represented by LXX collected the materials from the supplement and integrated others also about the king's government activities and his wisdom. The MT edition does the same, but it includes the materials from the supplement in the main composition of chapters 3–10. The LXX edition may deserve the merit of having preserved the composition units (supplement and main text) almost without elaboration, with an order in the main text that produces a smooth sequence of pericopes. The MT edition would deserve, in turn, the merit of having integrated the whole into a more elaborate structure, in a new concentric order, and, through some particular additions, all of it in a better agreement with Jewish exegesis of the times, regarding, for instance, the residence of Pharaoh's daughter and the building of the temple. The different bodies of authority, religious, royal and scholarly, determined in different measures the contents and

Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–66.

edition processes of a book, endowing it with authority in one sense or another.

In the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings the *Vorlage* of LXX and MT reflect two final stages of an editorial process. The “corrected and augmented” edition of MT acquired the status of authorized edition, whereas that represented by LXX was progressively unauthorized or de-canonized both in Judaism and in Western Christianity. In Catholicism the Vulgate replaced the Old Latin; and Protestantism operated a return to the Hebrew canon and text. The history of versions reflects that substitution of the edition represented by LXX with the edition of the proto-Masoretic tradition, which progressively imposed itself as the most authorized. Thus, the Hexaplaric recension based on the previous work of Theodotion and Aquila filled in the minuses of the Old Greek text and rearranged its text according to MT. The same happened with the Vulgate regarding OL. The Syriac, Armenian and Georgian versions also knew recensions which adapted the old text, based on the Greek version, to the Hexaplaric text based on the Masoretic tradition, considered more authorized.

The process undergone by the versions reflects the history of the Hebrew text itself. Passages in MT that gave rise to Hexaplaric additions and transpositions are late incorporations into the Hebrew text. Such is the case with the short MT plusses that do not appear in the main body of LXX, but do show up in the LXX supplement (of whose Hebrew *Vorlage* or a similar text originally proceed). Such is also the case with the short mobile units, as, for instance, the one formed by 1 Kgs 9:15a,b and 9:17b–18 (Solomon’s building), interrupted in MT by 9:16–17a (Pharao’s daughter). Besides the two different placements in MT and LXX, it has a third placement in the supplement, 2:35k*.i, and a fourth one, albeit partial, in 1 Chr 8:3–6*.

The textual authority of this passage is very important for the historical study of Solomon’s building program in Jerusalem and in other towns of the kingdom. The present discussion about the dating of these buildings in the tenth or ninth centuries B.C.E. does not take into consideration or give importance to the fact that the Old Greek does not know the base text in MT 9:15–18.⁴⁰ It appears, nevertheless,

⁴⁰ I. Finkelstein and N.A. Silberman, *The Bible Unearthed: Archaeology’s New Vision of Ancient Israel and the Origin of Its Sacred Texts* (New York: Free Press, 2001), 135–38.

in LXX 2:35i, according to a continuous text, which lacks the interpolation of MT by 9:16–17a: καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν τὴν Ἀσσοῦρ καὶ τὴν Μαγδω καὶ τὴν Γαζερ καὶ τὴν Βαιθωρων τὴν ἐπάνω καὶ τὰ Βαλλαθ (2:35i). The supplement contains other references to Solomon's constructions (2:35c.k), which offer a different text from MT. The supplement should be studied as a historical source at least at the same level than MT. Thus, the list of high officers of LXX 2:46h presents an independent an older text than MT 2:4–6.⁴¹ David Gooding acknowledges that several differences between MT and the two LXX lists “are occasioned by variations in the underlying Hebrew text” and that “the most important arise from debate over the meaning and implication of the original Hebrew text.”⁴² The Hebrew material of the supplement, as it is the case with other passages specific to LXX or MT, may have historical antiquity and reliability, independently of their late entrance into the book of Kings. Modern perspective, which tends to give a main value to the historical sense and to chronological order, vindicates the value of an edition such as the one represented by LXX, at times older than that represented by proto-MT.

Literary criticism in the last decades, from Martin Noth's work onwards, has focused on the study of the history of redaction in the historical books. It has abandoned, at the same time, the study of composition or arrangement of the units that make up a book and also, in a large measure, the study of textual criticism, located in a wide scenario of textual history such as offered now by biblical Qumran texts. Since Qumran studies began, the analysis of pericope order, not only in the historical books, but also in Deuteronomy, Jeremiah or Psalms and others, is a field in which several disciplines converge, and one where the issue of authority of the different texts—MT, LXX, independent or nonaligned—is at stake, together with the authority of those mobile units which make them different.

The literary order of units that compose a book and the historical or chronological order of characters and facts presented are not always in consonance. The conflict between these two orders, literary—topical

⁴¹ M. Rehm, “Die Beamtenliste der Septuaginta in 1Kön 2,46h,” in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler: I, Beiträge zur Septuaginta*, (ed. J. Schreiner; Würzburg: Echter, 1972), 95–101 (99): “dass in 2,46h eine selbständige Liste der Beamten Salomos vorliegt und dass die in ihr beschriebenen Verhältnisse zeitlich der Liste 1Kön 4,2–6 vorausgehen.”

⁴² D.W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 92.

or theological—and chronological, may determine the formation of different editions or textual forms, as well as the subsequent interpretation of the texts in them. The issue of authority of a text is posed, therefore, in a different way if it refers to the whole of a text (MT or LXX) or to concrete sections, in particular those who have undergone a transposition or interpolation.

The issue of order—earlier or later in time and after or before in the text—is, therefore, of prime importance not only in textual criticism, in the study of literary composition of biblical books and in consideration of Scriptural authority of their texts, but also because, from the very beginning, the authority of biblical tradition is grounded on “authorities” and their order of succession. *Traditio* relies on *tradentes*. The succession order of biblical “authorities,” of kings, priests, prophets and sages is a basic constituent of biblical tradition: of the Pentateuch, of the historical—mainly about kings—, prophetic and wisdom books. *Seder* or *ordo* is the “order” word not only in Jewish and Christian liturgy, but also in their respective Scriptures and in matters which affect their authority: order of traditions, order of tradents, order of books and their texts and order in their interpretation.

QUELQUES OBSERVATIONS SUR LE 'CANON' DES «ÉCRITS»

Émile Puech

1. INTRODUCTION

Parmi les milliers de fragments découverts dans les grottes de Qumrân au milieu du XX^e siècle, ont été identifiés quelque 216 manuscrits comme des restes de manuscrits dits 'bibliques', puisque inclus dans le canon biblique. Parmi eux figurent un nombre important de manuscrits du Pentateuque, soit 88 copies,¹ et un nombre un peu moindre de ce que la *Biblia hebraica* appelle les «Écrits prophétiques», soit 56 copies,² les autres fragments étant classés par la même *Biblia hebraica* parmi les manuscrits du troisième groupe, les «Écrits» ou *Ketûbîm*, soit 64 copies, au premier rang desquels figurent les Psaumes (34 copies).³ A ce groupe il faut encore ajouter les traductions grecques, 5 copies pour le Pentateuque, et les traductions araméennes ou Targum, une pour le Pentateuque et deux pour les «Écrits». Toutefois, il faut garder en mémoire que, pour un certain nombre de ces 'copies' dont il ne subsiste qu'un ou quelques petits fragments, il pourrait s'agir d'une

¹ Étudiant le livre des Proverbes à Qumrân, j'ai noté que deux fragments en bas à droite sur PAM 43.563 doivent être identifiés à Dt 12:31-13:1, 3 et à 14:29 ou 16:14. Comme ils ne semblent pas appartenir à un des manuscrits du Deutéronome déjà identifiés, on devrait donc leur donner le sigle Dt^r (= 4Q44a), voir É. Puech, "Qumrân et le livre des Proverbes," dans *Il Libro dei Proverbi. Tradizione, Redazione, Teologia* (ed. G. Bellia et A. Passaro; Casale Monferrato: Piemme, 1999), 169-89 (170).

² Dans la même étude (citée note 1) n. 3, j'ai relevé que le fragment en bas à gauche de PAM 43.563, devrait être identifié à 1 R 7:14: ligne 1:]'t ht[et ligne 2:]wy's kwll[, sans le 't du Texte massorétique, ce qui porte à 2 le nombre de manuscrits des Livres des Rois de la grotte 4; le fragment ne pouvant se ramener à 4Q54, il devrait recevoir le sigle 4Q54a.

³ La raison d'être ou finalité de 4Q89-90 (4QPs^{g-h}) et de 5Q5 n'apparaît pas clairement; utilisation liturgique particulière ? Mais on ne peut inclure dans ce nombre de manuscrits 11QPs^a ni 4Q522 comme le fait P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 38, 42-47, suivi par d'autres auteurs: même main, même cuir que les autres fragments. Que Jérusalem ne soit pas encore conquise par David n'est pas un motif suffisant pour s'opposer à l'insertion de ce Psaume davidique dans un passage (prophétique) centré sur David comme auteur de la conquête et sur Salomon comme bâtisseur du temple projeté par David.

citation, même un peu longue (un Psaume inséré dans une autre composition par exemple), ou de *lemmata* de Commentaires ou Pesharîm, mais pour lesquels nul indice ne permet une quelconque décision.

Toutefois, pour avoir une plus juste idée de la richesse de la bibliothèque de Qumrân, on doit tenir compte du piètre état de conservation des rouleaux dans la plupart des grottes, deux mille ans après leurs dépôts, et du fait que nombre d'entre eux furent emportés par les derniers occupants fuyant devant l'arrivée des soldats romains, dont quelques uns ont pu être retrouvés à Masada par exemple. On ne doit pas oublier non plus les grandes découvertes du III^e et du VIII^e siècles, parmi lesquelles figuraient évidemment nombre de manuscrits, bibliques y compris, comme en témoignent les *Hexaples* d'Origène d'après Eusèbe de Césarée⁴ et la lettre du Patriarche Timothée I à Serge, métropolitain d'Élam,⁵ qui, tous, relèvent les différences d'avec les textes des Bibles hébraïque, grecque et syriaque (la Peshitta).

Les manuscrits 'bibliques' qui feront partie du Canon rabbinique dès le II^e siècle après J.-C., reflètent l'état des Écritures dans le judaïsme palestinien aux derniers siècles avant J.-C. et au I^{er} siècle de notre ère. Ils ne peuvent en aucune façon être qualifiés de compositions esséniennes, même si la plupart d'entre eux ont été recopiés à Qumrân, leurs copies originales provenaient certainement du temple de Jérusalem avant la séparation du groupe vers le milieu du II^e siècle av. J.-C. De ce fait, ils sont les plus anciens et les plus authentiques témoins de la diversité et des différents états des textes de l'Écriture, à l'époque hellénistique, à côté des traductions grecques de la Septante, avant la fixation des formes du texte et du nombre des livres du canon rabbinique.

⁴ Voir G.J. Norton (with the coll. of C. Hardin), *Frederick Field's Prolegomena to Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta. Translated and annotated* (Paris: Gabalda, 2005), 83-84 (*Quinta*). Eusèbe de Césarée (*Hist. eccl.* 6.16.3) raconte que « Dans les Hexaples des Psaumes, (Origène), ayant placé après les quatre principales éditions (LXX, Aquila, Symmaque, Théodotion) non seulement une cinquième version mais encore une sixième et une septième, avait noté sur l'une d'elles qu'elle avait été trouvée à Jéricho, dans un tonneau, au temps d'Antonin (Caracalla), fils de (Septime) Sévère ».

⁵ Voir O. Braun, "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9 Jahrhunderts," *OrChr* 1 (1901): 299-313 (305s), et R. Duval, "Une découverte de livres hébreux à Jéricho," *Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'histoire ancienne* 10 (1902): 174-79: «... et trouvèrent des livres de l'Ancien Testament et d'autres écrits en caractères hébreux... Nous avons trouvé dans ces livres-là que (le Psautier de) David contenait plus de deux cents Psaumes ».

que, au cours du II^e siècle de notre ère, bien après la chute de Qumrân en 68 par l'armée romaine.

Il importe avant tout de se faire une idée plus précise du statut mis en évidence par les dernières découvertes de Qumrân, aux deux derniers siècles av. J.-C. et au I^{er} siècle de notre ère, des livres rangés habituellement dans le troisième ordre, qu'ils soient en langue originale ou en traduction, avant les révisions ultérieures dans les milieux juifs palestiniens et de la diaspora. Car les copies, des générations durant, de ces rouleaux emportés du temple montrent l'importance que les Qumrano-esséniens leur attachaient, comme livres normatifs et utiles pour leur connaissance et leur vie.

2. LES TROIS GROUPEMENTS DE LIVRES NORMATIFS

Cette diversité et ces différents états des textes affectent aussi bien les deux premiers groupements, que ce soit le Pentateuque avec les variantes importantes de 4QEx^m ou les citations en 4Q175 par exemple, ou les « Écrits prophétiques » avec 4QSam^a ou 4QJér, groupements qui passent cependant pour les plus anciens constitués et pour des textes normatifs, comme l'attestent plusieurs témoignages à une haute époque.

Vers 132 av. J.-C., le traducteur grec, petit-fils de Ben Sira, répète par trois fois dans son 'Prologue' une division tripartite de l'Écriture dont les deux premiers éléments sont, chaque fois, « la Loi et les Prophètes » (vv. 1–2, 8–10 et 24–25), mais la présentation du troisième élément varie quelque peu dans sa formulation : « et les autres écrivains qui leur ont succédé » (v. 2), « et les livres des ancêtres » (v. 10), « et les autres livres » (v. 25). Et déjà 2 M 15:9 cite « la Loi et les Prophètes » comme « livres saints » d'encouragement dans leur lutte (voir 1 M 12:9 : « ayant pour consolation les saints livres qui sont entre nos mains »). Mais « ces livres saints » comprennent bien plus de livres que ceux des deux groupements connus par ailleurs, ainsi que le rappelle 2 M 2:13–15, livre rédigé en grec vers 124 av. J.-C. et passant pour le résumé de l'œuvre de Jason de Cyrène :

Néhémie, fondant une bibliothèque, y réunit les livres qui concernaient les rois, les écrits des Prophètes et de David, et les lettres des rois au sujet des offrandes. Judas pareillement a rassemblé tous les livres dispersés à cause de la guerre qu'on nous a faite, et ils sont entre nos mains...

Mais auparavant, au plus tard en 164, l'auteur du livre de Daniel rapporte que son héros, Daniel, scrutait «les Écritures (*bsprym*), alors qu'il comptait les années d'après ce qu'avait révélé la Parole de Yhwh au prophète Jérémie» (Dn 9:2), confessant ensuite la trahison des commandements et ordonnances divines et de la parole des serviteurs les prophètes (Dn 9:4-6). Il est donc vraisemblable que la suite classique «Loi, Prophètes et David (et autres livres)» était déjà chose faite depuis longtemps à l'époque où ces (deux ou trois) auteurs écrivaient, avant le milieu du II^e siècle av. J.-C. (pour Daniel et Judas vers 164 au plus tard).

Une même séquence de livres normatifs se retrouve dans la *Règle de la Communauté* dans la deuxième moitié du II^e siècle av. J.-C.⁶ (1QS 1:1-3):

Pour [l'instructeur, pour enseigner à tous les ho]mmes ses frères le li]v[re de la Rè]gle de la Communauté pour chercher Dieu de [tout (leur) cœur] et de [toute (leur) âme et pour faire ce qui est bon et juste devant Lui selon ce qu'il a prescrit par l'intermédiaire de Moïse et de tous ses serviteurs les prophètes....

Et plus loin l'interprétation d'Is 40:3 (8:14-16):

'Dans le désert, préparez un chemin pour YHWH, tracez droit dans la steppe une route pour notre Dieu' est interprété: C'est l'étude de la Loi qu'il a prescrite par l'intermédiaire de Moïse, afin qu'on agisse selon tout ce qui a été révélé, époque par époque, et selon ce qu'ont dévoilé les prophètes par son Esprit de sainteté.⁷

Ainsi apparaît-il clairement que la lecture des Prophètes, soit dans la liturgie ou comme méditation en des périodes plus ou moins troublées, se comprend fort bien dans la perspective de lecture que souligne Ben Sira (48:14-15) au sujet d'Isaïe disant:

Par la puissance de l'esprit il vit la fin des temps et il consola les affligés de Sion, il annonça les événements à venir jusqu'à l'éternité et les choses cachées avant qu'elles n'advinsent.

⁶ Si la *Règle* comme telle peut dater du dernier tiers du II^e siècle, le noyau de fondation, colonne 8, est le plus ancien, du troisième quart du II^e siècle.

⁷ 4QS^c (= 4Q259) arrête l'interprétation avec «Moïse» pour continuer avec 1QS 9:12. Cette copie qui est plus récente que 1QS, ne différencie pas «la Loi et les prophètes», Moïse étant l'un et l'autre à la fois! En 1QS 5, la Loi et son application sont l'affaire des prêtres fils de Sadoq.

Dans ces milieux de pieux, les écrits des Prophètes passaient pour Parole de Dieu, classés au rang de livres saints. Et c'est ainsi que dans la première moitié du I^{er} siècle av. J.-C., les Esséniens ont essayé de comprendre les livres des Prophètes et des Psaumes en les commentant. Et il ne serait pas impossible que les compositions attribuées à David et Salomon aient été reçues à côté de la Loi et des Prophètes. En effet, 1 S 16:13 dit que l'Esprit de Yhwh s'empara de David à partir du jour où Samuel lui donna l'onction, et le Livre des Rois (1 R 5:9–13) attribue des sentences et des cantiques à Salomon, suite à la sagesse et à l'intelligence dont Dieu le gratifia. De même, 11QPs^a 27:2–4 et 11 rappelle que Dieu ayant donné à David un esprit de prophétie et de discernement, il écrivit 4.050 psaumes et cantiques, chiffre comparable à celui des sentences de Salomon (1 R 5:12–13).⁸

Une situation comparable transparait dans un passage de 4QMMT C 10 (= 4Q397 14–21 10) qui passe pour être une lettre du Maître à ses opposants, et d'abord à leur chef de file, les invitant à revenir à l'observation et à la pratique des préceptes divins. La ligne 10 de 4Q397 est composée des fragments 18 ii + 17 + 16 + 15 à lire très probablement ainsi:⁹

10 כתבנו אליכה שתבין בספר מושה [ו] בספרי [הנ] ביאים ובדויה [ד]

⁸ Sur ce sujet, voir É. Puech, "Les deux derniers Psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme, 11QPsAp^a IV 4 - V 14," dans *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant et U. Rappaport; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 64–89 (64–65).

⁹ Les éditeurs, J. Strugnell et E. Qimron, *Qumran Cave 4.V. Miqṣat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 27 et 58, ne lisent pas le *yod* du pluriel en *w]bspry[hn]by'ym* dont les restes de la haste sont pourtant bien visibles sur les photographies, PAM 41.762, etc., mais ils ont raison de lire *mwšh* auparavant, cette lecture est certaine en alignant correctement les lignes de ces fragments déformés par des plis du cuir. Ensuite le placement du fragment 17, sans être certain (il le serait si on pouvait restaurer correctement les lignes 9 et 10), paraît de loin acceptable, malgré E. Ulrich, "The Non-Attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14, qui n'estime pas correctement le joint entre des morceaux du fragment 18 et l'espace entre les lettres conservées, proposant une lecture *bspr mdrš [mwšh* (mais *šin* est impossible et *he* certain), une séquence hébraïque inconnue, comme le note justement K. Berthelot, "4QMMT et la question du canon de la Bible hébraïque," dans *From 4QMMT to Resurrection. Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel et E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1–14 (3). Dans l'état actuel du déchiffrement de 4Q398 14–17 i 2 et 4, on ne peut rien tirer pour le texte en question, variante ou pas.

La difficulté porte sur la finale *wbdwy*[*d*¹⁰ ou *wbdwr*]¹¹ (*wbdwr*[š s'adapterait mal à *štbyn* qui précède). Une solution pourrait s'imposer si une restauration de la suite était acceptable dans ce contexte. Les éditeurs proposent de lire ainsi la ligne 11: *bm'sy]dwr wdwr wbspr ktwb*[, en invoquant le parallèle de CD 5:5 et 4Q270 2 ii 21: «and (the writings of) David [and the events of] ages past».¹² Toutefois, il apparaît que cette reconstruction est un peu trop courte au début de la ligne 11 dont la distance à la marge est connue. Aussi a-t-on proposé une autre solution en lisant *šnwt* au début de la ligne 11, renvoyant à Dt 32:7 *zkwr ymwt 'wlm bynw šnwt dwr wdwr* («Souviens-toi des jours d'autrefois, considérez le cours des années, de génération en génération»), qui emploie le verbe *byn*,¹³ d'autant que le Deutéronome est au centre de cette finale.¹⁴ Cette restauration étant elle aussi bien trop courte, l'alignement demanderait un mot supplémentaire, *kwl* par

¹⁰ Avec les éditeurs et la plupart des auteurs.

¹¹ Voir Ulrich, "The Non-Attestation," qui signale ce même mot à la ligne suivante.

¹² Suivis par T. Lim, "The Alleged Reference to the Tripartite Division of the Hebrew Bible," *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 23–37, mais passage compris différemment: «We have written to you, so that you will consider the book of Moses, the prophetic books, and (the deeds of) David» (37). Mais les éditeurs ont restauré, ligne 11: [*bm'sy]dwr wdwr* et traduit «[and the events of] ages past» en introduisant ainsi une quatrième division (bien que *bm'sy* soit restauré sans *waw* !), à laquelle serait favorable J.C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 382–402 (387–88), ainsi que G. Dorival, "L'apport des Pères de l'Église à la question de la clôture du canon de l'Ancien Testament," dans *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers et H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 81–110 (92–93), qui estime que «seul le Prologue de Si atteste l'existence de la tripartition à date haute. Mais il s'agit d'un texte lié à un milieu juif particulier. Rien ne prouve que les autres milieux juifs l'aient reçue, ni les qumrâniens, ni Philon, ni les chrétiens». On peut en discuter.

¹³ Voir M.J. Bernstein, "The Employment and Interpretation of Scripture in 4QMMT. Preliminary Observations," dans *Reading 4QMMT. New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen et M.J. Bernstein; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), 29–51 (49 et n. 47), qui suggère cette lecture, suivi par Berthelot, "4QMMT," 7. Dans la recension de *DJD* 10 en *JSS* 40 (1995): 334–42, G. Brin, lui-même favorable à une quatrième catégorie, propose de lire *qwrwt*, trop court lui aussi. Dernièrement, G.J. Brooke suit aussi cette division quadripartite, "Canon' in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls," dans *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Le canon des Écritures dans la tradition juive et chrétienne* (ed. P.S. Alexander et J.-D. Kaestli; Prahins: Zèbre, 2007), 81–98 (85–86, 95–96). C.A. Evans, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Canon of Scriptures in the time of Jesus," dans *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. P.W. Flint, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 67–79 (71), traduit: «We [have written] to you, so that you will understand the Book of Moses [and] the book[s] of the Pr[o]phets and of Davi[d], along with the chronicles of every] generation.», comme s'il comprenait une quatrième catégorie, tout en étudiant une forme tripartite du canon !

¹⁴ Comme le soulignait encore dernièrement H. von Weissenberg, "4QMMT – Towards an Understanding of the Epilogue," *RevQ* 21/81 (2003): 29–45.

exemple. Mais comme il faut encore restaurer un autre mot à la fin de la ligne 10 pour une longueur acceptable de la ligne à la marge de gauche, je propose de comprendre par exemple: *wštšm(w)r // kwl 'lh* (« et tu dois les garder tous »), verbe très fréquent en Deutéronome et les Psaumes en particulier pour 'garder/observer les commandements de la Loi', ce à quoi renvoient C 27–28 par les formules *mqt m'sy htwrh... hbn bkl 'lh* et C 30 *mqt dbrynw*. L'expression est encore à restaurer, ligne 9, en lisant *ky 'l [kwl 'l[h]'nhnw nwtnym*.¹⁵ En définitive, je lis et comprends ainsi cette phrase:

9
 10 כתב]נו אליכה שתבין בספר מושה] ו]בספרי] הנ]ביאים ובדו]י]ד
 ושתשמ(ו)ר
 11 כול אלה] דור ודור ובפסר כתוב]

Et aussi] nous t'[avons écrit] que tu dois étudier (avec soin) le Livre de Moïse [et] les Livres des [P]rophètes et (le livre) de Davi[d, *et que tu dois les garder tous,*] de génération en génération. Et dans le Livre, il est écrit[

Cette manière de lire ces lignes a des conséquences importantes d'autant que la Lettre devrait dater des tout débuts du mouvement essénien, vers 152 av. J.-C. ou peu après la séparation, Lettre à laquelle semble bien renvoyer le Peshet du Psaume 37:32–33 = 4Q171 1–10 iv 8–9:¹⁶

8 פשרו ע]ל הכוהן הרשע אשר צ]פה למור]ה הצד]ק ויבקש ל]המיתו
 [על דברי החו]ן ק והתורה
 9 אשר שלח אליו

Son interprétation concerne le Prêtre Impie qui a ép[rié le Maî]tre de Justi]ce et a cherché à]le faire mourir [à cause du contenu des précept-]tes et de la Loi qu'il lui avait envoyés.

Non seulement cette lecture de 4QMMT C 10 par le Peshet du Psaume 37:32–33 et encore par 1QpHab 8:3–13 date les débuts du mouvement Esséno-qumranien, le Prêtre Impie devant être identifié à Jonathan Maccabée, et le Maître de Justice au prêtre sadocide expulsé du

¹⁵ Les éditeurs, *DJD* 10:58, ne lisent pas *kwl* ni les restes du pied du *lamed* sur le fragment 17 1. Je présenterai ailleurs une reconstruction des lignes 8 à 15 de la finale 4QMMT C.

¹⁶ Avec les éditeurs de 4QMMT, *DJD* 10:120. On ne suit pas F. García Martínez, "4QMMT in a Qumran Context," dans *Reading 4QMMT* (ed. Kampen and Bernstein), 15–27, = F. García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora I. Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 91–103, pour qui 4QMMT n'est ni une lettre ni une composition qumranienne.

temple en 152,¹⁷ mais encore elle corrobore une datation haute pour une division tripartite de l'Écriture, «la Loi, les Prophètes et David», déjà signalée (voir ci-dessus) vers cette même époque, et même un peu auparavant (avant 164).

Si le contenu de la Loi ne fait aucune difficulté (voir par exemple une même formulation dans un contexte comparable, Ne 13:1-2 et 2 Ch 25:4 renvoyant à Deutéronome), «les Livres des Prophètes» ne sont pas ici précisés et l'expression peut désigner une liste différente de celle attestée par la Bible hébraïque (voir *infra*), mais étant donné la suite de l'épilogue de la Lettre, les livres historiques de Samuel et des Rois faisaient certainement partie de la liste des «Prophètes».

Quant à *wbdwyd* «et dans (le livre de) David», l'expression est sujette à différentes interprétations. Signalons d'abord que la formulation *bdwyd* n'est pas isolée; elle correspond à *byrmyh* en 4Q163 1 4 strictement parallèle à *bspr yrm[yh* en 4Q182 1 4, à ἐν Δαυὶδ de la Lettre aux Hébreux (He 4:7) où elle introduit les versets du Ps 95:7b-8a, comparer aussi Rm 9:25 ἐν τῷ Ὡσηέ, citant Os 2:23. Mais l'expression *wbdwyd* renvoie-t-elle uniquement au seul livre des Psaumes, et avec quel contenu ? Comme prolongement des «Prophètes», ou celui-ci est-il à rattacher à d'autres livres dont la série commencerait par les Psaumes ? Une copie de la Règle de la Guerre (4Q491 17 4) porte la plus ancienne attestation de l'expression]*bspr hthlym* («]dans le livre des Psaumes»), composition devant dater de la fin du II^e siècle avant J.-C.¹⁸ Cette expression¹⁹ donnerait à penser que la séquence des cinq

¹⁷ Pour cette hypothèse, voir É. Puech, "Le grand prêtre Simon (III) fils d'Onias, le Maître de Justice ?" dans *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum. Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold et A. Steudel; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 137-58. Les éditeurs de 4QMMT, *DJD* 10:109-21, passent en revue plusieurs possibilités et suggèrent une date de préférence avant le pontificat de Jonathan en 152. On ne peut suivre la proposition d'É. Nodet, "ASIDAI OI and Essenes," dans *Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech et E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 63-87 (69), pour la succession des grands prêtres de cette période et ses conclusions sur les Esséniens.

¹⁸ Voir É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future. Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle ? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien, II. Les données qumraniennes et classiques* (Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 447-48, où sont donnés les arguments en faveur de cette datation.

¹⁹ Lim, "The Alleged Reference," 31, voudrait restaurer cette séquence en 4Q177 5-6 et 8 ligne 9, sous prétexte que le singulier ne paraît pas possible en *bspr h[nby'ym* restauré par Steudel sur une proposition de Strugnell, mais on pourrait aussi bien lire *bspr h[nby' mykh* («dans le livre du [prophète Michée]»), restauration tout à fait acceptable dans ce passage.

livrets du Livre des Psaumes est déjà connue, sans qu'on puisse s'assurer de l'ordre des Psaumes dans chacun d'eux ni du nombre exact, 150 ou 151 (LXX ?) ou plus. En effet, 11QPs^a 27:4–5 attribuée à David la composition de 3.600 psaumes et cantiques, et 4Q448 A 4b–10,²⁰ manuscrit qui connaît Jonathan comme « roi », atteste une partie du Ps 154:1–4 et 17–20 (version courte), Psaume connu de 11QPs^a 18 (version longue),²¹ manuscrit qui porte aussi le Psaume 155. Pour le titre « et les Psaumes » comme début d'une série de livres,²² on peut au moins évoquer un parallèle en Lc 24:44 :

Puis il leur dit: « Telles sont bien les paroles que je vous ai dites quand j'étais encore avec vous: il faut que s'accomplisse tout ce qui est écrit de moi dans la Loi de Moïse, les Prophètes et les Psaumes' (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς).²³

En effet, bien que plusieurs Psaumes renseignent sur la conversion de David après sa faute, tels par exemple Pss 41:5; 51, ou sur le salut que Dieu lui accorda, Pss 40:1–4; 144:10, ou sur la droiture de David, Pss 17:3–4; 18, etc., il est probable que *wbdwyd* renvoie directement au Livre des Psaumes, sans qu'on puisse en préciser le contenu exact. Mais à première vue rien ne permet de dire que l'expression vise ici d'autres

²⁰ Pour la datation de cette composition et l'attribution à Jonathan Maccabée, voir É. Puech, "Jonathan le Prêtre Impie et les débuts de la Communauté de Qumrân. 4QJonathan (4Q523) et 4QPsAp (4Q448)," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 241–70. Je maintiens l'identification de Jonathan à cet hasmonéen et non à Alexandre Jannée comme il a été proposé par la suite, voir 258–63 où je signale les fonctions du stratège qui juge, mène les guerres, gouverne, avec droit à la pourpre et à la couronne d'or, voir aussi l'emploi de στρατηγός, βασιλεύς—*mlk* au sens de « roi, archonte » en Dn 10:13 et Jb 15:24. 4QMMT C 18–35 semble bien revêtir le Prêtre Impie des attributs de roi en l'encourageant à revenir et à suivre les exemples de David et de Salomon! En outre, la présence de ce manuscrit à Qumrân s'opposerait à une composition pharisienne, malgré A. Lemaire, "Le Psaume 154. Sagesse et site de Qoumrân," dans *From 4QMMT to Resurrection* (ed. García Martínez, Steudel et Tigchelaar), 195–204 (197–98); la troisième et dernière étape de la composition du Ps 154 serait qumranienne.

²¹ Voir A. Lemaire, "Attestation textuelle et critique littéraire. 4Q448 col. A et Psalm [sic] 154, dans *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery, 1947–1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov et J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 12–18.

²² Il ne peut être question des « actes » de David, comme le suggère Lim, "The Alleged Reference," 35–37, suivi par D. Schwartz, d'après Berthelot, "4QMMT," 4.

²³ Voir Lc 24:27: « Et, commençant par Moïse et parcourant tous les Prophètes, il leur interpréta dans toutes les Écritures ce qui le concernait » pourrait avoir un sens plus large que le seul livre des Psaumes, à moins de comprendre « les Psaumes » comme le premier d'une série (non définie ni close sans doute). Lc 16:16, 29, 31; Act 26:22; 28:23 ne signalent que la Loi et les Prophètes, même si ces livres citent aussi des Psaumes.

livres parmi les « Écrits ». ²⁴ Toutefois, l'association de Salomon à David ensuite pourrait laisser envisager d'autres livres comme les Proverbes, mais les deux rois étant déjà associés dans les livres historiques, l'expression pourrait aussi bien suggérer que Salomon est compris dans le groupe précédent. Quoi qu'il en soit, même si l'auteur de 4QMMT, voulant à tout prix fonder son propos sur des livres de référence ou normatifs, reçus de tous, par ceux de son groupe ainsi que par son opposant et son groupe, ne s'intéresse pas d'abord à la tripartition de livres normatifs, il n'en atteste pas moins lui aussi son existence de fait, à cette haute époque. En revanche, 4QMMT n'est certainement pas un témoin de quatre groupements de livres normatifs, ainsi qu'il a été proposé. De son côté, Philon d'Alexandrie semble aussi connaître une division tripartite de l'Écriture dans le *De vita contemplativa* §25 :

ils n'y apportent rien...mais des lois, des oracles recueillis de la bouche des prophètes, des hymnes et tout ce qui permet à la piété de grandir et d'atteindre leur plénitude.

3. LES PROPHÈTES

Les formules d'introduction employées permettent de reconnaître que la Communauté de Qumrân cite formellement comme Écriture ou Livres saints, outre les cinq livres de la Loi, et les Psaumes, les livres des prophètes Isaïe, Jérémie, Ézéchiel, Daniel et les Douze Petits Prophètes. Ainsi, contrairement à l'ordre tardif du canon de la *Biblia hebraica*, Daniel est cité distinctement comme prophète à l'instar des autres livres prophétiques dans le Midrash eschatologique (4Q174 1–2 ii 3) : 'š]r ktwb bspr dny'l hnby' introduisant Dn 12:10 + 11:32b, 35, et dans 11QMelk 2:, 11QMelk 2:18 : k'sr 'mr dn[y'l introduisant Dn 9:25. Avec des restes de 8 copies retrouvées parmi les fragments découverts au XX^e siècle, ²⁵ il est même en meilleure position que Jérémie et Ézéchiel, avec 6 copies chacun, et à égalité avec le livre des Douze Petits

²⁴ Avec Berthelot, "4QMMT," 5–6, mais l'auteur fait la même observation pour « les livres des Prophètes » comme ne désignant peut-être qu'un seul livre, Jérémie (11–12), sans pouvoir exclure « les Psaumes » comme texte prophétique (13).

²⁵ Mais on n'a pas retrouvé de reste des suppléments du livre, comme les Cantiques (suppléments en Dn 3:24), Suzanne ou Bel et le Dragon (Daniel 13 et 14), malgré J.T. Milik, "Daniel et Susanne à Qumrân ?" dans *De la Tôrah au Messie. Mélanges Henri Cazelles pour ses 25 années d'enseignement à l'Institut Catholique de Paris* (octobre 1979) (ed. J. Doré, P. Grelot et M. Carrez; Paris: Desclée, 1981), 337–59.

Prophètes (8 ou 9 copies). Le livre des Douze Petits Prophètes, déjà connu par Ben Sira 49:10, est attesté dans l'ordre de l'hébreu par deux manuscrits, 4Q77 et 4Q82, (qui n'est pas exactement l'ordre chronologique), mais le plus ancien rouleau, 4Q76, fait connaître une séquence unique: Zacharie-Malachie-Jonas.²⁶ La Septante qui place ce dernier rouleau avant les grands prophètes, classe elle aussi Daniel avec les grands prophètes, tout comme le Nouveau Testament (Mt 24:15) et Flavius Josèphe (*A.J.* 10.266–269, 245–249, et *C. Ap.* 1.38–43).²⁷ Chez les Pères de l'Église, Daniel est encore classé parmi les Prophètes, à l'exception de Jérôme qui est témoin de deux traditions différentes.²⁸ Il en résulte que Daniel a d'abord fait partie du groupement des Prophètes, quelle que soit la séquence dans ce groupement, et que les rabbins ont tout simplement déclassé Daniel parmi les « Écrits », lors de la fixation de leur canon au II^e siècle de notre ère, bien après les écrits de Flavius Josèphe. Vers 160–170, Mélicon de Sardes a transmis un bien plus ancien ordre des livres saints, celui qui avait encore cours en Palestine à cette époque, comptant parmi les prophètes: « Isaïe, Jérémie, les Douze en un seul livre, Daniel, Ézéchiël, Esdras ». ²⁹ Et comme ce déclassement rabbinique ne peut être dû à des motifs liturgiques, on ne peut qu'invoquer le côté apocalyptique du livre avec ses révélations secrètes, et surtout son utilisation par la jeune église chrétienne où elle y lisait la figure messianique du Fils de l'Homme qui, couplé avec les données numériques des prophéties et la chute de Jérusalem en 70,

²⁶ Pour l'ordre de la Septante, voir B. Botte et P.-M. Bogaert, "Septante et versions grecques," *DBSup* 12:536–693 (543). Il est possible que la présence de Jonas en finale reflète une étape de la mise en ordre du rouleau, Jonas relevant avant tout du 'roman' et du récit didactique.

²⁷ *C. Ap.* 1.40: «...les Prophètes qui vinrent après Moïse ont raconté l'histoire de leur temps en treize livres. Les quatre derniers contiennent des hymnes à Dieu et des préceptes moraux pour les hommes». Il ressort que Daniel est classé parmi les Prophètes, cela est clairement exprimé dans les Antiquités.

²⁸ Dans le prologue *galeatus*, Jérôme classe Daniel dans l'*ordo hagiographorum*, suivant l'ordre de la Bible hébraïque, mais dans le prologue de sa traduction du livre, il qualifie Daniel de « prophète » et dans la Lettre 53 à Paulin 8, il en fait « le dernier parmi les grands prophètes », c'est dire qu'il est témoin de deux traditions divergentes. Pour Cassiodore décrivant la Bible de Jérôme divisée en Loi, Prophètes et Hagiographes, Daniel fait toujours partie des Prophètes, voir Dorival, "L'apport des Pères de l'Église," 98–99.

²⁹ Voir Eusèbe de Césarée, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.13–14. Mélicon dit s'être rendu en Palestine pour « connaître avec précision le nombre des anciens livres et l'ordre dans lequel ils sont placés ».

fragilisait grandement le courant du judaïsme qui avait survécu.³⁰ C'est aussi un des motifs de la révision des traductions grecques de la Septante utilisée par les chrétiens.³¹

Il est clair que les Qumrano-esséniens incluait les 'Prophètes antérieurs' dans le groupement des Prophètes, comme le prouve 4Q174 1-2 ii 7-13 citant 2 S 7:11-14 comme Parole de Dieu au même titre que l'Exode, livre sans doute même identifié à un écrit prophétique.³² Mais dans ce groupement, ne sont connus ni le nombre ni l'ordre des livres³³ ni la forme de leur texte, voir les variantes importantes de 4QSam^a par exemple.³⁴ Leur transmission est moins homogène ou unifiée que dans le premier groupement ou Pentateuque, ce que la traduction grecque de Jérémie par exemple montrait déjà.

4. LES ÉCRITS

Le premier d'entre eux est certainement le Livre des Psaumes dont il a déjà été question ci-dessus. Dans l'éloge des ancêtres, Si 47 loue David

³⁰ L'explication qu'en donne D. Barthélemy, "L'état de la Bible juive depuis le début de notre ère jusqu'à la deuxième révolte contre Rome (131-135)," dans *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament. Sa formation et son histoire* (ed. J.-D. Kaestli et O. Wermelinger; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1984), 9-45 (24), ne paraît pas acceptable: ce classement « nous montre qu'au moment où l'on 'retrouva' ce livre, les transmetteurs de la Bible pré-pharisenne considéraient la liste des Prophètes comme déjà close. Cependant, faisant confiance à l'attribution du livre à un visionnaire antérieur à la cessation de la prophétie, ils l'admirent dans la fin du groupe complémentaire des Écrits. » Pour des motifs théologiques et apocalyptiques invoqués par des chrétiens et déjà par les Esséniens, voir dernièrement A.J. Tomasino, "Oracles of Insurrection: the Prophetic Catalyst of the Great Revolt," *JJS* 59 (2008): 86-111.

³¹ Voir S.W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews. Volume 2* (2d rev. and enl. ed.; New York, N.Y.: Columbia University Press, 1952), 144-45.

³² Avec 4Q177 + 4Q174, voir Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 576.

³³ Pour des indications sur les « Prophètes » chez les Pères, voir Dorival, "L'apport des Pères de l'Église," 100-101.

³⁴ En 4QSam^a 1:[11], 12, Anne veut consacrer au Seigneur son fils Samuel comme *nazîr* pour toujours, de même en Si 46:13 (héb B), Flavius Josèphe, *A.J.* 5.347, comparer 5.285 au sujet de Samson, et *m. Naz.* 9:5. Cette tradition est manifestement citée comme écriture par Mt 2:23, expliquant le jeu de mot « Nazaréen - Nazôréen (avec la confusion fréquente des *waw-yod nzy/wr* par un traducteur grec donnant Nazôréen) pour accomplir les oracles des Prophètes ». Il en ressort que Matthieu classe le Livre de Samuel parmi les Prophètes et que là se trouve la réponse à la question posée par le Patriarche Timothée I, lors de la découverte des manuscrits au VIII^e siècle, demandant « s'il y a dans les Prophètes ceci: Pour qu'il fut appelé Nazaréen (*hy dnşry' ntqr*) », voir n. 5.

compositeur des Psaumes (47:8–10), ce que reprend à son tour le passage de 11QPs^a 27:2–11 faisant de David le sage lettré à qui Dieu donna l'esprit de discernement et qui écrivit 4.050 psaumes et cantiques grâce au don de prophétie dont Dieu l'avait gratifié.³⁵ Dans cette ligne, vers le milieu du II^e siècle, s'inscrit aussi le passage de 4QMMT C 10, où *wbdwy[d]* se réfère au livre des Psaumes, rejoignant par là les indications de 2 M 2:13–14 à l'époque de Judas Maccabée, et annonçant les titres « Livre des Psaumes »]*bspr hthlym* d'une copie de la Règle de la Guerre (4Q491 17 4) ou encore « Cantiques de David » en 11QM^l 2:9–11: *k'sr ktwb 'lyw bšyry dwyd 'šr 'mr*, citant Pss 82:1–2 et 7:8–9. Le Midrash eschatologique qui cite des versets de Psaumes (Pss 1:1; 2:1–2) et les interprète (4Q174 1–2 i 14–ii 3), ainsi que les Pesharîm des Psaumes (1Q16, 4Q171 et 4Q173) montrent par là l'autorité dont jouissait le « Livre des Psaumes » dans la Communauté. Mais les 34 copies retrouvées témoignent d'une certaine fluidité dans l'ordre des psaumes à l'intérieur des trois derniers livrets, postexiliques, et elles ne permettent pas de se faire une idée claire du nombre des psaumes, en particulier dans les deux derniers livrets,³⁶ que devaient pourtant recouvrir les appellations: *wbdwy[d]*,]*bspr hthlym* et *bšyry dwyd*.³⁷ Un usage liturgique et de prière personnelle, vu le nombre élevé de copies retrouvées, serait-il à l'origine de l'introduction d'autres compositions dans une séquence des Psaumes, voir 11QPs^a ? Or 11QPs^a 27 écrit que David composa les 4.050 psaumes et cantiques par l'esprit de prophétie, voulant de la sorte attribuer à chacune d'elles, Si 51:13–30, Pss 151 A–B, 154–155 (et autres séquences hymniques de 11QPs^a en particulier), une certaine autorité 'scripturaire', par l'attribution à David le psalmiste.

³⁵ On ne doit pas oublier d'autres rouleaux de psaumes attribués à David, par exemple les quatre psaumes à fredonner sur les possédés, 11Q11, voir É. Puech, "Les Psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme (11Q11)," dans *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (ed. D. Falk, F. García Martínez et E. Schuller; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 160–81, ni les autres Hymnes de 11Q5.

³⁶ Voir un aperçu du *status quaestionis* dans P. Flint, "The Contribution of the Cave 4 Psalms Scrolls to the Psalms Debate," DSD 5 (1998) : 320–33, avec la bibliographie. Ainsi certains auteurs modernes évoquent la possibilité de ranger le Livre des Psaumes parmi les « Prophètes », d'autant que des Psaumes ont fait l'objet de *pesharim* au même titre que des livres prophétiques (mais pas exclusivement, voir aussi Genèse), voir Flint, *Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 218–19, et Dorival, "L'apport des Pères de l'Église," 101.

³⁷ Le Talmud Babli, *B. Bat.* 14b, place le Livre des Psaumes que David écrivit parmi les « Hagiographes » mais après Ruth, bien qu'il signale plus loin que « Samuel écrivit le livre qui porte son nom et le Livre des Juges et Ruth » à ranger alors parmi les « Prophètes » ?

Mais cette première place parmi « Les Écrits » a parfois été disputée par Job.³⁸ En effet, la copie en paléo-hébreu de Job (4Q101) pourrait témoigner d'une tradition juive ancienne faisant de Job un contemporain de Moïse,³⁹ tradition connue encore de Jérôme où, dans le prologue *galeatus*, il revient à la tradition hébraïque rangeant parmi les Hagiographes: « Job, Psaumes, Proverbes, Ecclésiaste, Cantiques, Daniel, Chroniques, Esdras, Esther ».⁴⁰ Si le Prologue de Ben Sira ne permet pas de trancher de l'antiquité de cette tradition, 4QMMT C 10 est témoin, vers le milieu du II^e siècle, du premier rang occupé par les Psaumes, ce que Ps 1:1–3, démarquant le prologue de Jos 1:7–8, semble confirmer en voulant rattacher, à son tour, ce troisième groupement à la Loi de Moïse.⁴¹ De son côté, Si 49:9 mentionne « le prophète Job » juste après Ézéchiël et avant les Douze Petits Prophètes.⁴² Le Targum de Job, 11Q10, très probablement d'origine essénienne vers le milieu ou la deuxième moitié du II^e siècle av. J.-C.,⁴³ confirme l'ordre du texte hébreu ainsi que la finale,⁴⁴ et de même les restes des 3 autres manuscrits hébreux, contrairement à la traduction plus courte et paraphrastique de la Septante.

Les Proverbes de Salomon sont parfois mis en relation avec les Psaumes de David. Et de fait, ils sont eux aussi considérés comme un livre normatif par les Esséniens. Ainsi Pr 15:8 est cité en CD 11:20–21 par

³⁸ Cyrille de Jérusalem signale après les livres historiques cinq livres en vers (στυχηρά): Job, Psaumes, Proverbes, Ecclésiaste, Cantiques des Cantiques, séquence que connaît encore Épiphané dans son groupement en « Pentateuques ».

³⁹ Cette écriture à Qumrân est principalement réservée au Pentateuque et à Josué en dehors de quelques autres fragments non encore identifiés (4Q124–125 et XQ [RevQ 19/75 (2000): 441–47 et 449–51]). Cette tradition semble avoir survécu dans la place de Job après le Pentateuque dans la Bible syriaque et dans le Talmud, *B. Bat. 14b*, qui se fait l'écho d'une opinion: « que Job aurait vécu du temps de Moïse... Moïse écrivit ses propres livres et une partie de Balaam et Job ». La tradition massorétique use d'acronymes pour la séquence des trois livres: 'mt versus t'm = 'ywb-mšlym-thlym versus thlym-'ywb-mšlym du Talmud.

⁴⁰ Voir É. Dhorme, *Le Livre de Job* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1926), VII–XI.

⁴¹ Voir à ce sujet, J.-M. Auwers, « Les voies de l'exégèse canonique du Psautier, » dans *Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers et de Jonge), 5–26 (20–21).

⁴² Lecture du texte hébreu ms B: wgm hzkyr 't 'ywb hnby' hmkkl kl d[rky s]dq (« et encore il se souvint du prophète Job qui accomplit toutes les v[oi]es de jus[t]ice »).

⁴³ Sur ces manuscrits et le targum, voir É. Puech, « Le Livre de Job à Qumrân, » dans *Il Libro di Giobbe. Tradizione, Redazione, Teologia. V convegno di studi biblici, 7–8 aprile 2006, Facoltà Teologica di Sicilia «San Giovanni Evangelista» – Palermo* (ed. G. Bellia et A. Passaro, à l'impression).

⁴⁴ Voir É. Puech et F. García Martínez, « Remarques sur la colonne XXXVIII de 11QTgJob, » *RevQ* 9/35 (1978): 401–7, où est montrée la présence d'une finale quelque peu remaniée comparée au TM.

la formule *ky ktwb*.⁴⁵ En CD 1:19–20, Pr 17:15 est repris dans une suite de citations 'bibliques' (Osée, Isaïe, Psaumes et Amos). Par ailleurs les compositions qumraniennes fourmillent d'emprunts de vocabulaire et d'images au livre des Proverbes pour faire passer leurs idées. Mais les manuscrits connaissent un texte hébreu peu différent du TM.⁴⁶

Les restes de deux copies de Qohélet, 4Q109 et 4Q110,⁴⁷ couvrant quatre des douze chapitres exigent une composition du livre au moins dans le III^e siècle av. J.-C. et confirment le TH reçu dont une traduction grecque devait être antérieure à celle d'Aquila.⁴⁸ Qohélet semble connu et même cité par une composition pré-qumranienne: Le Livre des Mystères. En effet, 1Q27 1 ii 3 paraît citer Qo 6:11 de préférence à 6:8, sans formule d'introduction, mais le contexte est lacuneux.⁴⁹ En outre, 1Q27 6 2–3 pourrait aussi faire allusion à Qo 5:5. Des passages des Hymnes font allusion aux Proverbes par des emprunts de vocabulaire: 1QH^a 8:26 [=16:8] à Qo 11:5. 4Q299 3a ii 3–4 pourrait avoir emprunté des expressions à Qo 8:14 et 9:1. Quoi qu'il en soit, ces citations et allusion à Qohélet dans le Livre des Mystères (connu au moins par trois copies, 4Q299 et 300) et dans les Hymnes confirment l'intérêt porté au livre de Qohélet par les Qumraniens et déjà par leurs prédécesseurs, à défaut d'une indication formelle comme livre normatif, le livre se présentant comme une composition salomonienne. Or *Jub* 2:23, dont la composition date du milieu du II^e siècle av. J.-C., mentionne 22 livres, au nombre desquels Qohélet devait sans doute

⁴⁵ Sur les formules introductives de citations dans les textes qumraniens, voir VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature," 391–95, et C.D. Elledge, "Exegetical Styles at Qumran. A Cumulative Index and Commentary," *RevQ* 21/82 (2003): 165–208 (177–86).

⁴⁶ Sur ce livre, voir Puech, "Qumrân et le livre des Proverbes." J'en profite pour signaler l'identification du fragment 15 de 4Q103 à Pr 10:30–32 en lisant ainsi: *rs'lym* et *t]krt š[pty*.

⁴⁷ Le manuscrit 4Q110 comprend trois fragments de la première colonne du rouleau, voir É. Puech, "Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit^b de l'*Ecclésiaste* (4Q^aQohélet^b ou 4Q110)," *RevQ* 19/76 (2000): 617–21.

⁴⁸ Rm 3:10 et 8:20 et 2 Co 5:10 paraissent bien connaître une traduction grecque. D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 21–33, 81–88, 158–60, attribue à Aquila la première traduction grecque de Qohélet comme dernier livre biblique, thèse reprise dans "L'état de la Bible juive," 20–21, mais disputée par K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (Lund: Gleerup, 1977), 99.

⁴⁹ En lisant *mnkslyhnh]mnw mh hw' hywtr l'dm*, voir É. Puech, "Qohélet a Qumran," *Il Libro del Qohélet. Tradizione, Redazione, Teologia* (ed. G. Bellia et A. Passaro; Milano: Paoline, 2001), 144–70 (165–66), à compléter par É. Puech, "Le livre de Qohélet à Qumrân," *Ho Theológos* 18 (2000): 109–14.

prendre place, Babli, *B. Bat.* 14b, le compte au cinquième rang parmi les Hagiographes.⁵⁰

Les livres de Ruth, du Cantique des Cantiques et des Lamentations, chacun représenté par 4 copies (respectivement 2Q16, 2Q17, 4Q104, 4Q105; 4Q106, 4Q107, 4Q108, 6Q6; 3Q3, 4Q111, 5Q6, 5Q7), feront partie du groupement tardif des cinq *Megillot* à lire lors de fêtes juives, la fête des Semaines, de Pâque et du «9 de Ab» respectivement. Mais rien ne transparait à ce sujet à Qumrân. Le Cantique, rattaché à Salomon, a pu être lu et recopié comme produit de la sagesse que Dieu lui avait donnée. Selon les listes de 22 ou 24 livres, Ruth est rattaché ou pas aux Jugés et les Lamentations à Jérémie.⁵¹ Mais rien dans les copies qumraniennes ne permet de ranger ces livres dans un quelconque groupement. Si les identifications de trois manuscrits de la grotte 4 (4Q179, 4Q501 et 4Q282^{h-1}) comme «Lamentations apocryphes» étaient assurées, on pourrait penser que les Qumraniens ont tenu ce livre en grande estime pour s'en inspirer dans de nouvelles compositions avec des citations.⁵²

Une seule copie (4Q117) porte des restes du livre d'Esdras (et de Néhémie ?) sans qu'on puisse savoir si les deux étaient déjà réunis en un seul livre ou pas. Mais une seule copie des Chroniques a été identifiée dans la grotte 4 (4Q118) recouvrant 2 Chroniques.⁵³ Dans le prologue *galeatus* Jérôme rappelle que pour «la plupart» des Hébreux, il y a cinq livres doubles: 1-2 Samuel, 1-2 Rois, 1-2 Chroniques, 1-2 Esdras et Jérémie avec les Lamentations. Un tel groupement pouvait avoir une origine ancienne, mais rien ne permet de répondre dans un

⁵⁰ Ruth, Psaumes, Job, Prophètes, Ecclésiaste, Cantiques des Cantiques, Lamentations, Daniel et le rouleau d'Esther, Esdras et Chroniques. Il sera lu à la fête des Tentés après la décision de Jamnia, voir Barthélemy, "L'état de la Bible juive," 29-30.

⁵¹ Flavius Josèphe, *C. Ap.* 1.38-40, en compte 22, de même Origène et Cyrille de Jérusalem, alors que Jérôme dans le prologue *galeatus* donne les deux chiffres: d'abord 22, puis 24, puisque pour Jérôme, Ruth et Lamentations ont d'abord fait partie des Prophètes, de même Babli, *B. Bat.* 14b-15a, écrit que «Samuel écrivit le livre qui porte son nom et le livre des Jugés et Ruth... Jérémie écrivit le livre qui porte son nom, le livre des Rois et les Lamentations».

⁵² 4Q501 passe aussi bien pour une «Prière apotropaique». Les Hymnes contiennent des réminiscences des Lamentations 2:16 et 3:46 en 1QH 13:19 [= 5:17]; 2:18 et 11 en 1QH 17:5 [= 9:5]; 3:17 en 1QH 17:11 [= 9:11].

⁵³ Depuis l'édition de 4Q118, Julio Treballe qui a publié ce manuscrit, émettrait des réserves sur son identification comme copie de 1 Chroniques. Quoi qu'il en soit, les Chroniques connaissent manifestement le texte de la copie de 4QSam^a.

sens ou dans l'autre. Ces deux livres faisaient-ils partie à Qumrân du groupement des Prophètes⁵⁴ ou des Écrits ?⁵⁵

En revanche, les découvertes du XX^e siècle n'ont révélé aucun fragment du rouleau d'Esther, ce qui ne saurait surprendre, sans avoir trop à insister sur une absence accidentelle.⁵⁶ Par ailleurs on ne peut retenir l'hypothèse d'un Proto-Esther dans les fragments de 4Q550.⁵⁷ En l'état présent de la recherche, c'est le seul livre de la Bible hébraïque à ne pas avoir fait surface.

De ce groupe des Écrits, il ressort que les Psaumes et les Proverbes étaient certainement reçus comme livres normatifs à Qumrân, et très probablement encore Job, que Ben Sira (TH)⁵⁸ qualifie de prophète juste, et dont l'importance mérita une traduction araméenne. Qohélet cité mais sans la formule introductive, y est connu et apprécié.⁵⁹ Ce pouvait être le cas pour les autres livres, mais on n'a pas d'éléments

⁵⁴ Pour les Pères de l'Église témoignant de cette appartenance, voir Dorival, "L'apport des Pères de l'Église," 100-101.

⁵⁵ Comme c'est le cas de Babli, *B. Bat.* 14a, qui les range dans l'ordre des Hagiographes.

⁵⁶ D'une part le livre n'est pas ancien, voir le substitut probable du tétragramme en Est 4:14, et, d'autre part, il a fait difficulté même dans le judaïsme, voir Babli, *Ber.* 7a: « R. Simon (vers 150) disait: « Ruth, le Cantique et Esther ne souillent pas les mains », de même *Meg.* 7a: « Esther ne souille pas les mains » d'après R. Samuel (mort en 254). Le livre manque dans la liste de Méliton de Sardes qui s'est informé sur la liste des livres hébreux reçus, de même chez Grégoire de Nazianze, Léonce de Byzance, mais il est considéré comme « livre extérieur » par Athanase, etc., voir P. Rüger, "Le Siracide. Un livre à la frontière du canon," dans *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament* (ed. Kaestli et Wermelinger), 47-69 (53). S. Talmon, "Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 249-67, pense que l'existence du livre était connue des Qumraniens mais que son absence parmi les manuscrits reflète son statut non canonique dans le judaïsme plutôt qu'un rejet idéologique.

⁵⁷ J.T. Milik, "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RevQ* 15/59 (1992): 321-406, hypothèse acceptée par F. García Martínez et E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume 2 (4Q274-11Q31)* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 2:1096-1101, où le titre reste inchangé, même si F. García Martínez est plus réservé sur la filiation directe entre ces manuscrits et Esther, voir "Las fronteras de lo 'Bíblico,'" *ScrTh* 23 (1991): 759-84, repris dans "Les manuscrits de Qumrân et les « frontières » de la Bible," dans *Recueil de travaux de l'association des études du Proche-Orient Ancien* (Faculté de théologie; Montréal: Université de Montréal, 1995), 63-76. Voir l'*editio princeps*, É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII. Textes araméens, deuxième partie (4Q550-4Q475a, 4Q580-4Q587)* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 1-46.

⁵⁸ Le livre de Ben Sira est connu à Qumrân en hébreu, et les copies de la geniza du Caire doivent avoir pour sources des rouleaux qumraniens provenant de la découverte de la fin du VIII^e siècle. La copie de Job en paléo-hébreu comme pour les livres de Moïse devrait à sa manière traduire une idée de son importance.

⁵⁹ L'hésitation des rabbins (école de Shammaï opposée à celle de Hillel) à admettre Qohélet dans le canon n'est pas nécessairement transposable dans le milieu qumranien.

suffisants pour conclure dans un sens ou dans l'autre. Toutefois, ils font certainement partie de ces « autres livres » de l'héritage des écrivains dont parlent Si 39:1 et ensuite le traducteur grec du 'Prologue'.

5. LES DEUTÉRO-CANONIQUES⁶⁰

Il n'est pas question ici de traiter de tous les livres ou suppléments connus par la Septante, la Peshiṭta ou la Vulgate,⁶¹ mais uniquement de ceux dont les manuscrits ont révélé leur présence à Qumrân.⁶²

Parmi ces livres, figure en tête, à Qumrân, le livre de Tobie dont 4 copies en araméen et une en hébreu ont été retrouvées. L'araméen, la langue originale de la composition, est encore celle que traduit Jérôme en latin avec l'aide d'un 'traducteur' juif. Comme le dernier chapitre du livre est attesté par le plus ancien manuscrit qumranien (4Q199) vers 100 av. J.-C., la question d'une addition tardive ne se pose plus.⁶³ Le texte qumranien appuie la recension longue de la version grecque attestée par la Vetus Latina et le codex Sinaiticus. Le nombre de manuscrits dans la grotte 4 copiés sur un siècle environ (vers 100 av. J.-C. et le début de notre ère) laisse deviner l'estime dont y jouissait le livre.

Le livre de la sagesse de Jésus Ben Sira, composé en hébreu dans les premières décennies du II^e siècle, et traduit en grec par son petit-fils une cinquantaine d'années plus tard, vers 130, était connu et recopié à Qumrân comme le prouve 2Q18. La copie retrouvée à Masada (MasSi = Mas 1^h), datant d'un siècle après l'original, provient très probablement elle-même du milieu essénien, tout comme la copie des *Širôt 'olat haššabbat*, emportées dans le dernier nid de résistance par des

⁶⁰ Les exégètes catholiques dénomment ainsi un groupement de livres bibliques que les Protestants appellent Apocryphes et les englobent dans un 'intertestament' qui ne fait pas de sens, puisque plusieurs d'entre eux sont antérieurs à Daniel par exemple, et d'autres postérieurs au Nouveau Testament. Il serait plus approprié de parler de péritestament ou d'écrits péritestamentaires.

⁶¹ Pour un aperçu récent sur le sujet, voir P.-M. Bogaert, "Les compléments deutérocanoniques dans la Bible. Un 'intertestament' canonique," *RTL* 38 (2007): 473-87.

⁶² Parmi les livres non attestés figurent Judith, le livre de Baruch 1-5, Sagesse, les suppléments à Daniel 3 (Cantiques, Suzanne, Bel et le Dragon), 1-2 Maccabées, 3 et 4 Esdras.

⁶³ Voir C.A. Moore, "Scholarly Issues in the Book of Tobit before Qumran and After. An Assessment," *JSP* 5 (1989): 65-81.

rescapés lors de la chute de Qumrân en 68.⁶⁴ Un rouleau des Psaumes de la grotte 11 (11QPs^a 21:11–22:1) contient un poème alphabétique en écriture continue sur la recherche de la sagesse qu'on lit aussi en Si 51:13–30 et qui avait dû sans doute 'circuler' d'abord indépendamment. Enfin, les nombreuses copies retrouvées dans la geniza du Caire ont dû recopier un ou des manuscrit(s) qui devai(en)t faire partie des découvertes de la fin du VIII^e siècle dans des grottes de Qumrân. Ces découvertes ont ainsi permis de retrouver plus des deux tiers du livre en hébreu.⁶⁵ Et les découvertes du XX^e siècle confirment en général le texte des copies de la *geniza* et, ainsi, la forme la plus ancienne du texte hébreu traduite en grec non sans difficulté par le petit-fils (Gr 1).

Le Prologue dû au petit-fils insiste sur l'utilité profitable du livre pour le lecteur juif pour acquérir la sagesse et apprendre à vivre conformément à la Loi. Comme le livre de Ben Sira vient après « la Loi, les Prophètes et d'autres livres des ancêtres » dans cette énumération qui semble bien reprendre celle déjà de l'auteur lui-même, Si 39:1, on peut se demander quel était son statut comme livre de sagesse dans le judaïsme ancien et à Qumrân ? Fit-il partie du troisième groupement à la suite d'autres livres, voir Si 39:2–3 ?⁶⁶ Une traduction syriaque

⁶⁴ Voir É. Puech, "Ben Sira and Qumran," dans *The Wisdom of Ben Sira. Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology* (ed. A. Passaro et G. Bellia; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 79–118, ou "Ben Sira e Qumran," dans *Il Libro del Siracide. Tradizione, Redazione, Teologia* (ed. A. Passaro et G. Bellia; Roma: Città Nuova, 2008) où sont donnés des arguments (substitutions du tétragramme) en faveur de la provenance de la copie MasSi, alors que la copie traduite par le petit-fils ne les comporte pas.

⁶⁵ Pour les rares citations rabbiniques, voir S. Schechter, "The Quotations from Ecclesiasticus in Rabbinic Literature," *JQR* 3 (1891): 682–706: 24 citations, A.E. Cowley et A. Neubauer, *The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus (XXXIX.15 to XLIX.11) Together with Early Versions and an English Translation, Followed by the Quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1897), XIX–XXX: 79 citations. Mais seuls 19 hémistiches sur 106 correspondent à la terminologie des manuscrits hébreux du Caire, les 87 autres sont des paraphrases plus ou moins libres, sans grande correspondance de vocabulaire, probablement à cause de la seule tradition orale, hors de quelque copie. Saadiyah Gaon cite 26 hémistiches pratiquement dans la forme du Ms A du Caire et un autre *ad sensum*, voir A. Di Lella, *The Hebrew Text of Sirach. A Text-Critical and Historical Study* (La Hague: Mouton, 1966), 95–96, et M.R. Lehmann, "11QPs^a and Ben Sira," *RevQ* 11/42 (1983): 239–51 (242–46), mais P.C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew. A Text of All Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of All Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1997) n'en signale nulle trace.

⁶⁶ M. Gilbert, "L'Écclesiastique. Quel texte ? Quelle autorité ?" *RB* 94 (1987): 233–50, se prononce pour l'inspiration des deux formes du texte. V. Koperski, "Sirach and Wisdom. A Plea for Canonicity," dans *Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers et de Jonge), 254–64 (261–62), rapporte que le Talmud et d'autres écrits juifs citent parfois Sira avec la formule « it is written », normalement réservée aux écrits canoniques, mais J. Leemans,

a été faite d'après l'hébreu vers le III^e siècle et vers la fin du IV^e siècle, Jérôme en a encore connu une copie en hébreu⁶⁷ avant qu'elle ne tombe dans l'oubli, car le livre n'a pas été retenu dans le canon rabbinique au II^e siècle de notre ère. Toutefois, certains rabbins l'ont considéré comme «souillant les mains», et le Talmud Babli arrive à le citer par «car il est écrit», formule réservée à des livres «canoniques».⁶⁸ Si la communauté juive de langue grecque de Palestine et de la diaspora l'a reçu comme «Écriture» dans la Septante, c'est que le livre faisait autorité jusqu'à l'époque de la révision textuelle qui le laissera de côté ensuite, lors de la formation du canon rabbinique. C'est dire aussi que Ben Sira a dû être déclassé à Jamnia et même exclu, sans doute à cause de son utilisation par les chrétiens comme prophétie du retour d'Élie, le prophète eschatologique (Si 48:10), figure que Jean-Baptiste a remplie, et du fait qu'il évoque des mystères cachés,⁶⁹ alors qu'il n'appartient manifestement pas à la tradition prophétique comme Isaïe (Si 48:25), la chaîne des prophètes étant interrompue depuis plus de deux siècles avec Malachie, au dire de Flavius Josèphe (*C. Ap.* 1:38–41). En effet, l'attente du retour d'Élie était bien vivante dans le milieu juif de Palestine, comme le rappelle entre autre 4Q558 51 ii 4, un manuscrit araméen pré-essénien.

A Qumrân, Ben Sira était non seulement copié mais encore cité dans un passage lacuneux des Béatitudes (4Q525 25 4 [Si 18:33]),⁷⁰ et peut-être encore en 4Q521 2 iii 1–2 avec une allusion à *Ml* 3:24 et/ou à *Si* 48:10. Quant à l'hymne de *Si* 51:13–30 copié en 11QPs^a 21:11–

“Canon and Quotation. Athanasius’ uses of Jesus Sirach,” dans *Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers et de Jonge), 265–77, montre que le sujet est discuté.

⁶⁷ Voir la préface de Jérôme aux livres salomoniens, *Biblia Sacra iuxta Vulgatam versionem, Vol. II: Proverbia–Apocalypsis, Appendix* (ed. R. Weber; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1969), 957.

⁶⁸ Voir A.C. Sundberg, “The ‘Old Testament’. A Christian Canon,” *CBQ* 30 (1968): 143–55 (151–52), le Talmud Babli, *Hag.* 13a et *Yebam.* 63b, le cite deux fois par son nom et une fois comme appartenant aux «Écrits» – *ketûbim*, *B. Qam.* 92b cite 27:9 et 13:5b et *Nid.* 16b cite *Si* 21:23, voir aussi P.W. Skehan et A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987), 20. Pour sa part, P.W. Flint, “Noncanonical Writings in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Apocrypha, Other Previously Known Writings, Pseudepigrapha,” dans *Bible at Qumran* (ed. Flint), 80–123 (121), estime que Ben Sira apparaît avoir eu peu d’impact à Qumrân.

⁶⁹ Jésus Ben Sira lui-même paraît se ranger parmi les bons scribes qui pénètrent, cherchent et s’intéressent aux secrets des proverbes et des paraboles, voir *Si* 39:2–3.

⁷⁰ Voir Puech, “Ben Sira at Qumran,” où sont rappelés les motifs pour une composition essénienne de ce manuscrit, et nombre de contacts de vocabulaire, d’allusions et de parallèles dans la littérature qumranienne.

22:1, il est compris comme une 'composition davidique' écrite sous l'inspiration prophétique, ne faisant aucune difficulté. Cette réception du livre par les Esséno-qumraniens⁷¹ rejoint celle d'autres juifs qui le lisaient en traduction grecque, mais eux n'avaient pas de motifs pour l'exclure du nombre des livres qui font autorité, comme 4QInstruction, une composition de sagesse assez proche bien attestée à Qumrân et mentionnant aussi les mystères. Le livre y jouit de la même autorité que dans le Nouveau Testament qui cite Ben Sira.⁷²

Parmi les manuscrits grecs de la grotte 7, l'éditeur a identifié une copie de la Lettre de Jérémie (7Q2 = pap4QEpJr 6:43-44), généralement connue, avec la Vulgate, comme Baruch 6. La Lettre dont la copie est datée vers 100 av. J.-C., est un document à part dans les LXX où elle suit Baruch et Lamentations et où elle précède Ézéchiel. On a sans doute à faire à une traduction de l'hébreu, sans qu'on puisse connaître quoi que ce soit sur son statut à Qumrân. Était-elle copiée à la suite de Baruch ? En revanche, la traduction grecque pourrait laisser supposer une certaine importance de l'écrit dans la Communauté, comparée aux traductions grecques de livres du Pentateuque: Exode, Lévitique (2 copies), Nombres et Deutéronome.⁷³ En effet, ont été retrouvées des empreintes de papyrus grec portant la mention] ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς (7Q19 1) faisant allusion à des livres normatifs ou « Écritures », très probablement en traduction grecque, sans qu'on puisse affirmer davantage ni comprendre les raisons invoquées par les rabbins pour l'exclure du canon ensuite.

⁷¹ En éditant le manuscrit 4Q525 (*Qumrân grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux* (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579) [DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998]), j'avais daté cette composition de sagesse vers le milieu du II^e siècle ou peu après, en soulignant la parenté de vocabulaire et d'idées avec non seulement Proverbes et Ben Sira mais aussi avec des compositions typiquement esséniennes comme 1QS, 1QH, CD, etc. 4Q525 2 ii reprend la structure des makarismes de Si 14:20-27, emploie l'expression *twrt lywn* bien connue de Si 9:15; 19:17; 23:23; 24:23; 39:1; 41:4, 8; 42:2; 44:20; 49:4, mais non attestée dans l'AT, etc. Dans une étude du vocabulaire et du contenu, J.C.R. de Roo, "Is 4Q525 a Qumran Sectarian Document?" dans *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S.E. Porter et C.A. Evans; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 338-67, conclut aussi à un document qumranien, en particulier au sujet de la nature humaine, l'élection, la responsabilité individuelle et l'eschatologie (noter la numérotation différente de plusieurs fragments).

⁷² Si 4:1 en Mc 10:19, Si 17:26 en 2 Tm 2:19, et Si 5:11 en Jc 1:19. Origène le tiendra pour canonique et non pour marginal, voir A. Cacciari, "Origene e il libro del Siracide," dans *Origeniana octava. Origen and the Alexandrian Tradition* (2 tomes; ed. L. Perrone; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 1:579-92.

⁷³ Respectivement 7Q1, 4Q119 et 4Q120, 4Q121, 4Q122.

Dans cette même grotte 7, a été retrouvée une série de fragments à identifier à une copie de la Lettre de *1 Hénoch* traduite en grec⁷⁴ mais dont plusieurs copies du « Pentateuque » hénochien en araméen ont été identifiées dans les fragments de la grotte 4 en particulier : *Livre des Veilleurs*, *Livre astronomique*, *Livre des Songes*, *Lettre d'Hénoch* (et le *Livre des Géants*).⁷⁵ Le nombre de copies et leur ancienneté (entre 200 environ av. J.-C. et le tournant de notre ère) montrent l'importance de cette composition dans le judaïsme ancien et pour les Qumraniens, tout comme le *Livre des Veilleurs* en a eu aussi pour l'Épître de Jude qui le cite comme prophétie, Jude 14–15 citant *1 Hén* 1:9 : « C'est ainsi qu'a prophétisé en ces termes Hénoch le septième patriarche depuis Adam ». ⁷⁶

La découverte de 18 copies⁷⁷ du livre des *Jubilés* en hébreu dans 5 grottes, sans compter des manuscrits identifiés à des Pseudo-Jubilés, et des copies à Masada, livre composé probablement un peu avant le milieu du II^e siècle, prouve l'importance de l'œuvre pour les Qumraniens. En effet, CD 16:2–4⁷⁸ cite les *Jubilés* par leur titre « Le livre des

⁷⁴ 7Q4 1–2, + 7Q12 + 7Q14 + 7Q8, 7Q11, 7Q13, voir É. Puech, « Sept fragments de la Lettre d'Hénoch (1 Hén 100, 103, 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (= 7QHéng), » *RevQ* 18/70 (1997) : 313–23.

⁷⁵ Voir J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). L'éditeur estime que le *Livre des Géants* y tenait la place qu'occupèrent les *Paraboles*, bien plus tardives. 4Q201–202, 204 à 207, 212, *1 Hénoch astronomique*: 4Q208 à 211, et le *Livre des Géants*: 1Q23–24, 2Q26, 4Q203, 206a, 530 à 533, 6Q8, soit 7 + 4 + 10 copies en araméen, et une en grec. Mais rien ne prouve que le *Livre des Géants* aient appartenu à un Pentateuque hénochien, voir É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII. Textes araméens, première partie. 4Q529–549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 111–13, à propos de 4Q206 3 = 4Q206a.

⁷⁶ Des Pères de l'Église citent *1 Hénoch* comme Écriture Sainte, Tertullien, Irénée, Clément. Vers 229, dans le *Princ.* 1.3.2 et 4.4.8, Origène cite *Hénoch* au même titre que des ouvrages scripturaires. Vers 234, dans le *Comm. Jo.* 6.217, il s'y réfère en précisant : « comme il est écrit dans le *Livre d'Hénoch*, si l'on veut regarder ce livre comme saint ». Vers 240, dans ses *Hom. Num.* 28.2, il signale que les livres d'*Hénoch* ne paraissent pas avoir d'autorité « chez les Hébreux » et qu'il faut donc éviter de les citer. Enfin, vers 249, dans le *Cels.* 5.54, il déclare que le livre intitulé *Hénoch* n'est généralement pas tenu pour divin dans les Églises. On voit donc une influence croissante du judaïsme et d'autres pratiques sur Origène, sans que toutefois ce dernier ne le désigne jamais comme apocryphe, voir E. Junod, « La formation et la composition de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Église grecque des quatre premiers siècles, » dans *Le canon de l'Ancien Testament* (ed. Kaestli et Wermelinger), 103–51 (123). Le livre appartient au canon des livres bibliques de l'Église éthiopienne. Sur *1 Hénoch* et *Jubilés* comme livres faisant autorité à Qumrân, voir VanderKam, « Authoritative Literature, » 395–402, sans doute parce que l'esprit de prophétie ne s'était pas éteint avec Malachie.

⁷⁷ Voir É. Puech, « Une nouvelle copie du *Livre des Jubilés*. 4Q484 = pap4QJubilés, » *RevQ* 19/74 (1999) : 261–64, 4Q483 est à identifier à 4QGn° (259–60).

⁷⁸ Passage partiellement préservé en 4QD^c 2 ii 5 et 4QD^e 10 ii 17.

divisions du temps selon leurs jubilés et leurs semaines» *spr mhlqwt h'tym lywblyhm wššbw'wtyhm* (voir *Jub* 1:4, 26; 50:13 et Prologue), comme ouvrage de référence pour expliquer les aveuglements d'Israël dans sa manière d'observer et de pratiquer la Loi de Moïse (16:1–2). CD 3:12–16 semble faire aussi allusion à *Jubilés* 1:14 ou 6:34 au sujet de l'égarément d'Israël sur les fêtes, sabbats, etc. De même, dans un passage très lacuneux de 4Q228 1 i 2 et 9–10, une citation du livre des *Jubilés* (peut-être *Jub* 1:9 aux lignes 9–10) est introduite par la formule *ky kn ktwb bmhlqwt [h'tym* («Car ainsi il est écrit dans les *Divisions [des temps]*»), formule que l'auteur utilise pour introduire Lv 23:38 en CD 11:18, et de même IQS 5:15 citant Ex 23:7.⁷⁹ Un autre manuscrit, 4Q384 9 2 dans un passage très lacuneux, réfère encore «au livre des d]ivisions des temp[s]» (*bspr m]hlqwt h't[ym*). C'est dire combien les Qumrano-esséniens tenaient les *Jubilés* pour un ouvrage de référence au même titre que les livres de Moïse, ce que le nombre de copies semble bien appuyer. Dans le même sens, le livre sera retenu comme *1 Hénoch* par l'Église éthiopienne.

Il est possible que le livre des *Jubilés*, de composition plus récente et avec ses copies dans l'ensemble plus abondantes que celles de *1 Hénoch*, à l'époque hérodienne, ait pris le relais prétendant rapporter une révélation des tablettes célestes faite par des anges à Moïse, et ait fini par le supplanter. Mais les deux livres ont fait autorité, alors que le Rouleau du Temple, promoteur lui aussi du calendrier solaire et où Dieu parle à la première personne, n'est pas cité comme Écriture, sans doute parce qu'il est une composition essénienne.⁸⁰

Enfin, CD 4:15–19 semble bien citer le *Testament de Lévi araméen* (Bodléienne b 16–17) pour l'interprétation (*pšr*) d'Is 24:17 introduit par la formule *'šr 'mr*:

Ce sont les trois filets de Bélial dont a parlé Lévi fils de Jacob par lesquels il attrape Israël et auxquels il donne l'apparence de trois espèces de justice: le premier c'est la luxure, le second la richesse/présomption, le troisième la profanation du sanctuaire.⁸¹

⁷⁹ Voir Elledge, "Exegetical Styles at Qumran," 184s, pour d'autres emplois de l'expression.

⁸⁰ E. Tov, "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," dans *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech et Tigchelaar), 345–66 (365), serait porté à considérer le Rouleau du Temple comme écrit faisant autorité à Qumrân, mais rien ne l'indique dans les autres compositions. Il est une composition essénienne et cela suffit pour ses lecteurs, surtout s'il peut revendiquer l'autorité du Maître.

⁸¹ Lévi araméen: «Tout d'abord garde-toi, mon fils, de toute fornication et impureté et de toute prostitution», ce que précisent les lignes suivantes sur le mariage dans

6. CONCLUSION

Dans l'état actuel de la documentation des manuscrits retrouvés et identifiés, il résulte d'abord de ces observations que ne sont cités directement comme Écritures ou livres faisant autorité que des compositions pré-qumraniennes, qu'elles appartiennent à la classification tripartite connue ou à la « troisième » partie, dite « les Écrits », mais liste non définie comme telle, autrement dit rassemblant les « autres livres des ancêtres » du Prologue de Ben Sira. Mais Daniel ne figure pas dans le troisième groupe, il fait encore partie du deuxième, celui des « Prophètes », comme il en sera jusqu'à la fin du I^{er} siècle (voir encore Flavius Josèphe). En revanche, les Psaumes, bien que composés par David rempli de l'esprit de prophétie, appartiennent au troisième groupe, où *wbdwy*[d « (et dans [le livre de] David; 4QMMT C 10) introduit une autre division. Si Esther paraît absent ou inconnu, d'autres livres qui seront éliminés plus tard, en font manifestement partie. Les données qumraniennes confirment la tripartition en cours, au plus tard dans la première moitié du II^e siècle avant la séparation du groupe, tripartition reçue dans les autres courants du judaïsme, à l'exception du courant sadducéen. Dans ce milieu Qumrano-essénien, les livres de référence sont ceux des ancêtres, qu'ils soient en hébreu ou en araméen ou même traduits : la littérature mosaïque, daniélique,⁸² hénochienne, davidique, salomonienne, ou des prophètes, et tout spécialement sans doute les livres de la tradition sacerdotale, comme les *Testaments* de la trilogie sacerdotale ; en effet, les *Testaments de Lévi, de Qahat et d'Amram* rappellent à leurs descendants de les lire, de les garder et de les transmettre fidèlement (4Q542 1 ii 9–13, voir « les trois livres » de la *Naissance de Noé*, 4Q534 1 i 5). Ce sont toutes des compositions antérieures à 150 av. J.-C. Ne figurent pas dans leur bibliothèque ni les Livres des Maccabées, ni les Psaumes de Salomon, ni la Sagesse. Les compositions qumraniennes tiraient, elles, leur autorité d'abord du Maître, et elles n'ont pas eu de postérité hors du cercle essénien. On comprend mieux alors l'existence de nombreuses copies,

le clan, la pureté et la sainteté de la race pour pouvoir officier dans le sanctuaire, voir aussi *Jub* 30–32. Les trois sujets de mise en garde comportent quelques variantes, telle une citation libre, comme il arrive bien des fois dans des citations bibliques, mais pas au point de refuser l'identification du passage.

⁸² Cette littérature est vaste et difficile à identifier dans les manuscrits araméens retrouvés. Plusieurs mentions du « prophète » dans les manuscrits pourraient être identifiées à Daniel, 4Q242, 4Q550, etc.

même avec des variantes textuelles importantes, de livres normatifs, de leurs 'commentaires' ou de la réécriture de certains d'entre eux (4Q158, 4Q364–367), ou des compositions pseudépigraphiques anciennes des livres prophétiques, et des traductions en grec ou en araméen.

On retrouve un même traitement de la littérature juive héritée de la Septante dans le Nouveau Testament au sujet des livres considérés comme normatifs, ne distinguant pas entre ceux qui seront reçus dans le canon rabbinique et les Apocryphes, qu'ils aient été composés en hébreu ou en araméen, ou traduits en araméen et en grec. Sont cités « la Loi et les Prophètes et les Psaumes » en Lc 24:27, 44, mais aussi bien d'autres livres, y compris Ben Sira et *1 Hénoch*. De même, la variété textuelle n'y fait aucune difficulté, par exemple Mt 2:23 cite 1 S 1:22 selon le texte conservé par 4QSam^a, tradition connue aussi par Flavius Josèphe.⁸³ Il est clair que le déclassement de livres et la clôture du canon rabbinique va de pair avec l'exclusion de la synagogue et la persécution des judéo-chrétiens. Il n'y avait pas de 'canon' au sens strict, au temps de Jésus, comme il n'y en avait pas pour les Esséno-qumraniens. Les uns comme les autres avaient reçu de la tradition des collections de livres composant la Loi, les Prophètes et d'autres Écrits religieux, dont les Psaumes, au groupement non défini, mais dont la lecture était bénéfique pour la vie juive. Ils contenaient la Révélation des mystères divins au peuple de Dieu et constituaient un canon en devenir, ce dont peuvent témoigner aussi la Septante, Philon d'Alexandrie, Flavius Josèphe et les traditions recueillies par les Pères de l'Église.

⁸³ Voir supra, et E. Ulrich, "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls—the Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism," dans *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim et al. ; Edinburgh : T&T Clark, 2000), 67–87 (78s). De même à propos d'un épisode en 1 S 11:1, 4QSam^a a conservé un récit connu du seul Flavius Josèphe, *A.J.* 6.69–70. Voir aussi J. Trebolle Barrera, "Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts," dans *Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Lim et al.), 89–106.

REFLECTIONS ON THE STATUS OF THE EARLY ENOCHIC WRITINGS

Michael A. Knibb

My aim in this study is to try to address in the case of *1 Enoch* some of the questions raised by Mladen Popović in his prospectus for this symposium and to consider what evidence exists for the view that the early Enochic writings (the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of Watchers*, the *Book of Dreams* and the *Epistle*) were regarded as authoritative by the community at Qumran and by other Jews,¹ in what respects they were so regarded, and what are the implications.

Evidence for the status of the early Enochic writings at Qumran has been outlined by James VanderKam, who has suggested that the commonplace claim made within the Enochic writings that their contents were divinely revealed was in this case—as in the case of *Jubilees*—apparently accepted by the community at Qumran as is indicated by the relatively large number of manuscripts of *Enoch* found there, the influence in other Qumran texts of the central Enochic story of the Watchers, and the importance of its calendrical teachings as a model for Qumran calendars.² The number of copies of the individual sections of the book taken in isolation is perhaps not that great: the *Book of Watchers* is attested by six manuscripts (4QEn^{a-e}, XQpapEnoch), the *Astronomical Book* and the *Book of Dreams* by four each (4QEnastr^{a-d}; 4QEn^{c-f}), and the *Epistle* only by two (4QEn^{c-g}). But the total number of manuscripts (twelve) is impressive. These range in date, in the case of the *Astronomical Book*, from the end of the third or the beginning of the second century B.C.E. (4QEnastr^a) to the turn of the era (4QEnastr^b) and, in the case of the other sections, from the first half of the second century B.C.E. (4QEn^a) to the last third of the first century B.C.E.

¹ In this short study I have deliberately not attempted to consider the Christian evidence that bears on this subject.

² J.C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5 (1998): 383–402 (396–402). See also G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think about," in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113.

(4QEn^{c,d}). The dates of 4QEnastr^b and of 4QEn^{c,d} indicate that the early Enochic writings continued to be regarded as sufficiently important as to be worth copying throughout much of the time that the Qumran site was occupied, and Józef Milik's suggestion of a declining interest at Qumran in the writings attributed to Enoch seems unconvincing.³ There can in any case be no doubt about the influence of the story of the Watchers in a wide range of other Qumran writings⁴ or about the importance of the calendar attested by the *Astronomical Book*.

Evidence from other scrolls also supports the view that the early Enochic writings were regarded as authoritative texts at Qumran. VanderKam himself refers to the suggestion made by Milik and adopted by Magen Broshi, the editor of the text, that the fragment known as 4Q247 is a kind of commentary or pesher on the *Apocalypse of Weeks*. If true, this would imply that the *Apocalypse*—but presumably not just the *Apocalypse*—enjoyed a status similar to that of the prophetic books and the Psalms for which pesharim were otherwise composed.⁵ In addition, in *Jub.* 7:38–39 Enoch's instructions to Methuselah, and in *Jub.* 21:10 what was found “written in the book of my ancestors, in the words of Enoch and the words of Noah,” are mentioned as an ultimate source of authority in halakic matters,⁶ and although these are clearly not references to the Enochic books themselves, they point to the status of Enoch and the writings attributed to him.⁷ An implicit claim to an authoritative status for Enoch's writings is also made in 4Q227 (4QPseudo-Jubilees^c) 2 1–4, which records that

³ J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 7. Cf. Nickelsburg, “Books of Enoch at Qumran,” 104, who is critical of Milik's view.

⁴ For a survey of the Qumran texts that make use of the story of the Watchers or of other Enochic traditions, cf. Nickelsburg, “Books of Enoch at Qumran,” 104–9.

⁵ VanderKam, “Authoritative Literature,” 398; cf. Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 256; M. Broshi, “247: 4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (S.J. Pfann et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 187–91.

⁶ *Jubilees* 7:38–39 comes at the end of a passage concerning the growing and eating of fruit, *Jub.* 21:10 deals with the eating of meat offered in sacrifice.

⁷ Similarly, although the references to a “writing of Enoch” in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* cannot be taken as an allusion to the Enochic books themselves, they do provide a further indication of the authority attributed to Enoch and the writings attached to his name—but in this case in relation to the future; see *T. Sim.* 5:4; *T. Levi* 10:5; 14:1; 16:1; *T. Jud.* 18:1; *T. Dan* 5:6; *T. Naph.* 4:1; *T. Benj.* 9:1; cf. H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 122.

it was after being taught by the angels that Enoch gave witness against the sons of men and the Watchers, and that “he wrote everything”; the passage can be compared with the passage about Enoch’s writings in *Jub.* 4:17–23 to which we must return. A different kind of claim to authority occurs in 1QapGen ar 19:25, where “the [book] of the words of Enoch” is associated with “knowledge, wisdom and truth.”⁸

There is, however, also good evidence that the early Enochic writings enjoyed an authoritative status amongst Jewish circles other than the community at Qumran. Perhaps most striking in view of the supposed opposition between on the one hand Ben Sira and the priestly classes he supported and on the other the authors of the early Enochic writings⁹ are the references to Enoch at the beginning and end of Ben Sira’s *Praise of the Fathers* (44:16; 49:14).¹⁰ It is of course not clear whether these passages are based on what is said about Enoch in Genesis or on knowledge of the Enochic writings;¹¹ but because Ben Sira otherwise appears in the *Praise of the Fathers* to be working his way through an authoritative collection of texts—texts that ultimately were to be included more or less in the same order in the Hebrew Bible—it is not impossible that the inclusion of the passages about Enoch, particularly the second, does reflect an acceptance of some kind of authoritative status for the early Enochic writings.

The fact that the early Enochic writings were translated into Greek, and that they spawned other writings linked to the figure of Enoch, particularly the *Book of Parables* and *2 Enoch*, is further evidence of the authority they enjoyed. On the first point, we do not of course know when or where the Enochic writings were translated into Greek,

⁸ Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (3d ed.; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004), 98–99, 191.

⁹ Cf. e.g. B.G. Wright, “‘Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest’: Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood,” in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference 28–31 July 1996*, Soesterberg, Netherlands (ed. P.C. Beentjes; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 189–222.

¹⁰ See the discussion of these passages in J.C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 104–7. The textual status of 44:16 is disputed; the verse is attested by ms B and the Greek, but does not occur in the Masada ms or the Syriac, and it is sometimes regarded as an addition. It may be, as VanderKam suggests, that 44:16 was omitted from the Masada ms by haplography, but even if it is an addition, the fact that it is included in the Greek suggests that it was added to the text by the end of the second century B.C.E., the time when the Greek translation was made; cf. VanderKam, *Enoch*, 105–6.

¹¹ Cf. E. Ulrich, “Canon,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:117–20 (118).

although we do have James Barr's preliminary conclusion, on the basis of his study of the Greek translation of the *Book of Watchers* and the *Epistle* in comparison with the Aramaic evidence, that the translation belonged in the same general milieu as the Septuagint translation of Daniel.¹² But in any case, notwithstanding the identification of some of the tiny fragments in Greek from Cave 7 as fragments of the Greek Enoch, it seems very unlikely that the translation into Greek was made at Qumran, and we must assume that the manuscript (7QpapEn gr) was brought to Qumran from outside. On the other hand, the fact that the Enochic writings were translated into Greek points to the acceptance of these writings in the wider Jewish community and the ascription to them of an authoritative status.

The continuing influence of the early Enochic writings is also evident in the fact that new writings were composed in dependence on them that were also attributed to Enoch. The influence of the *Book of Watchers* in particular can be seen in the fact that the *Book of Parables* is dependent on it and can to a considerable extent be understood as a reinterpretation of some of its leading themes and ideas in response to the circumstances of a later historical situation.¹³ It is, however, well known that no fragments of the *Book of Parables* were found amongst the Scrolls, and there is nothing in the *Parables* themselves to connect them with Qumran. Rather, the composition of the *Book of Parables* provides further evidence of the standing of the *Book of Watchers* in Jewish circles apart from those connected with Qumran.

Similar comments could also be made about *2 Enoch*, whose literary form—an apocalypse in the shape of an account of an ascent to heaven and a heavenly journey combined with a testament—and contents have been heavily influenced by the *Book of Watchers* and the *Epistle* (particularly *1 En.* 12–36, 81, 91–105). The apocalypse and testament (*2 En.* 1–66) are cast in the first person and attributed to Enoch himself, but the remainder of the book (*2 En.* 67–73) is a narrative in the third person describing the taking of Enoch up into heaven and the events that followed; in this narrative the account of the miraculous

¹² J. Barr, "Aramaic-Greek Notes on the Book of Enoch," *JSS* 23 (1978): 184–98; 24 (1979): 179–92 (191).

¹³ Cf. M.A. Knibb, "The Structure and Composition of the *Book of Parables*," in *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids, Mich.; Eerdmans, 2007), 48–64 (64); reprinted in *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 124–42 (142).

birth of Melchizedek (2 *En.* 71–72) parallels the account of the birth of Noah in 1 *En.* 106–107.¹⁴ The influence of the *Book of Watchers* is also evident in the *Book of Giants*, but there is no evidence in the surviving fragments of this work that it was attributed to Enoch.¹⁵

If it may be accepted in the light of this evidence that the early Enochic writings were regarded as authoritative texts both at Qumran and in the wider Jewish community, the question may be asked in what respects they were so regarded. Notwithstanding the appeal to the name of Enoch as an ultimate authority concerning the Law in *Jub.* 7:38–39; 21:10, it hardly needs to be said that the early Enochic writings are not authoritative in matters of halakah. But elsewhere, in 4:17–22, *Jubilees* does provide a clear indication of the respects in which the Enochic writings were regarded as authoritative, and the picture it provides is amply borne out by the Enochic books themselves. The evidence of *Jubilees* is of particular interest because of the way in which Enochic traditions have been integrated within it, and because it represents one of the earliest stages in the reception-history of the Enoch literature.

Jubilees 4:17–22 has frequently been exploited for what it reveals about the sections of 1 *Enoch* that were known to the author of *Jubilees*; there is general agreement that this passage presupposes the existence of the *Astronomical Book*, the *Book of Dreams* and the *Book of Watchers*, but the further claim that has been made that it also presupposes knowledge of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* or the *Epistle* seems to me unconvincing.¹⁶ For present purposes it is of greater interest for what it reveals about the respects in which authority is implicitly claimed for what Enoch wrote, whether the authority of a revelation

¹⁴ Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed.; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2005), 221–25.

¹⁵ Cf. L.T. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 24–28; É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 13–14. Contrast, Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 57.

¹⁶ Cf. J.C. VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers, Vol. 1* (ed. P.J. Achtemeier; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 229–51 (231–36, 241); idem, *Enoch*, 112–16; M.A. Knibb, “Which Parts of 1 *Enoch* were known to *Jubilees*? A Note on the Interpretation of *Jubilees* 4.16–25,” in *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J. A. Clines* (ed. J.C. Exum and H.G.M. Williamson; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 254–62.

by the angels or the authority of a vision. Thus Enoch is said to have written about astronomy and the calendar and about cosmology as he had been shown by the angels (4:17–18, 22). He is also said to have written a testimony after he had seen in a vision during sleep the past and future of mankind until the day of judgement (4:19). (It is incidentally of interest that the story of the Watchers is, in this context in *Jubilees*, only mentioned briefly right at the end [4:22].) The picture provided by *Jubilees* of concern with astronomy and cosmology, the past and future of mankind corresponds entirely to the picture that emerges from the early Enochic writings themselves in which Enoch is presented as a scribe (*1 En.* 12:4; 15:1) and as the wisest of men (4Q212 1 ii 23 [92:1]; cf. *Jub.* 4:17), and as a seer who experienced an ascent to the divine throne room (14:8–25), was led around the heavens by the angels and saw everything (cf. 17–36; 72–80), but who also saw visions concerning the past and future of mankind (cf. 85–90), and whose knowledge relates both to judgement and salvation and to cosmology and astronomy.

In this connection it is of interest that within the early Enochic writings there are a series of colophons in which Enoch blesses the Lord, and which highlight the significance of what he has just seen:

And when I saw, I blessed, and I will always bless the Lord of Glory who has made great and glorious wonders that he might show the greatness of his work to his angels and to the souls of men, that they might praise his work and his creation, that they might see the work of his power and praise the great work of his hands and bless him for ever. (*1 En.* 36:4)

And I looked at everything in the tablets of heaven, and I read everything which was written, and I noted everything. And I read the book and everything which was written in it, all the deeds of men, and all who will be born of flesh on the earth for the generations of eternity. And then I immediately blessed the Lord, the eternal king of glory, in that he has made all the works of the world, and I praised the Lord because of his patience, and I blessed (him) on account of the sons of Adam. (*1 En.* 81:2–3)

And when I went out below, and saw heaven, and the sun rising in the east, and the moon setting in the west, and some stars, and the whole earth, and everything as he knew it at the beginning, then I blessed the Lord of Judgement, and ascribed majesty to him, for he makes the sun come out from the windows of the east, so that it ascends and rises on the face of heaven, and sets out and goes in the path which has been shown to it. (*1 En.* 83:11)

And this is the vision which I saw while I was asleep, and I woke up and blessed the Lord of righteousness and ascribed glory to him. But after this I wept bitterly, and my tears did not stop until I could not endure it, but they ran down on account of that which I had seen, for everything will come to pass and be fulfilled; and all the deeds of men in their order were shown to me. That night I remembered my first dream, and because of it I wept and was disturbed, because I had seen that vision. (*1 En.* 90:40–42)

These passages occur at significant points within the text: at the end of the *Book of Watchers* (36:4) and of the *Vision of the Animals* (90:40–42); after Enoch has been commanded to look at the “book of the tablets of heaven” (81:2–3; see 81:1), and after he has seen the first dream vision (83:11). They are concerned with God’s marvellous ordering of creation and with the fulfilment of the predetermined course of human history, and they implicitly serve in the text to highlight the importance of these themes and, more generally, of the revelations attributed to Enoch.

If it seems clear that the early Enochic writings were regarded as authoritative, both amongst the circles that lie behind the scrolls and also more widely in Jewish society, and if it seems clear that their authority is concerned with cosmology and astronomy, present and future, judgement and salvation, it is much less clear what this will have meant in practice. The difficulty arises because of the way in which the early Enochic writings have been used by Gabriele Boccaccini and others in the construction of a model of Judaism in the last few centuries B.C.E. that is dominated by a sharp opposition between “Enochic Judaism” and “Zadokite Judaism.” Characteristic of reconstructions of “Enochic Judaism” has been an emphasis on the absence of references to the Law in Enochic writings, and thus in a recent restatement of his views Boccaccini has spoken of the conspicuous absence of the Mosaic Torah in the early Enochic literature. He further commented:

It would be incorrect, however, to talk of Enochic Judaism as a ‘Judaism without the Torah.’ The problem was not the Mosaic Torah; ‘at no point is there any polemic against the Mosaic Torah’ (Collins). The concern of the Enochians was rather their own victimization, which they took as a paradigm of the victimization of the entire humankind. A group of priests who felt excluded from, or marginalized within, the Zadokite priesthood, gave cosmic dimension to their exclusion. From their self-understanding they derived the impossibility of following any laws (including the Mosaic Torah) in a universe that had been disrupted by

the presence of evil. In my opinion, this is the reason why there is no explicit anti-Mosaic polemic and, as Kvanvig says, 'there is no Enochic purity code, no Enochic Torah.' The wisdom the Enochians received prevented them from developing any competing halakha. Their revelation was telling them the world was not what it should have been.¹⁷

And Andreas Bedenbender, in his contribution to *The Early Enochic Literature* entitled "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enochic Literature" has stated: "the halakic silence of Enoch should be taken as a warning not to minimize the differences between later Enochism (or Essenism) and other forms of Judaism."¹⁸ My concern in what follows is to consider whether too much has not been made of the absence of references to the Torah, this "halakic silence."¹⁹

The first point to be noted is, as others have remarked, that in view of the literary genre of the early Enochic writings, we perhaps should not really expect a concern with the Law. The Enochic writings belong to the apocalyptic genre, but increasingly connections with the wisdom writings have been observed, particularly with *4QInstruction*,²⁰ and it has been suggested that the description "revealed wisdom" best fits them. In his commentary George Nickelsburg has aptly described *1 Enoch* as embodying "divinely revealed wisdom about the workings of the cosmos and the course and end of history."²¹ From this perspective it may be wondered whether we should expect much explicit concern with the Law, certainly with specific laws. The existence of the Mosaic Torah was a given for the authors.

¹⁷ Quoted from the paper given by Gabriele Boccaccini at the Enoch Seminar held in Camaldoli in 2007. Published as "From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism: The Heavenly Tablets in Jubilees as the Foundation of a Competing Halakha," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 193–210.

¹⁸ A. Bedenbender, "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (ed. G. Boccaccini and J.J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 65–79 (79).

¹⁹ On this topic, see also the article by G.W.E. Nickelsburg, "Enochic Wisdom and its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah," in *The Early Enoch Literature* (ed. Boccaccini and Collins), 81–94.

²⁰ Cf. M.A. Knibb, "The *Book of Enoch* in the light of the Qumran Wisdom Literature," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 193–210 and the references there to other literature.

²¹ G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2001), 6.

But it should also be said that the view that the “Enochians” believed that it was impossible to follow any laws (including the Mosaic Torah) in a universe that had been disrupted by the presence of evil seems to me not to do justice to the evidence of the Enochic writings. It discounts the evidence of chapters 1–5 in which there is some reference to law and commandments and there is certainly no suggestion that humans are not responsible for their actions. It also discounts evidence in the *Apocalypse of Weeks* and in the *Epistle* as a whole.

The importance of *1 En.* 1–5 lies in the fact that it provides a context for the way in which the following material in the *Book of Watchers* is to be read. Chapter 1 foretells the coming of God in judgement, to bring salvation to the righteous and to destroy the wicked for their impious deeds and blasphemous words. The explicit mention of Mount Sinai in 1:4 as the place to which God comes suggests that the judgement is to be on the basis of the Law revealed at Sinai, and the passage is in any case more naturally translated “the eternal God will tread on (πατήσσει ἐπὶ) Mount Sinai” than “will trample upon Mount Sinai.” This latter translation underlies an alternative interpretation suggested by Nickelsburg: “God descends and tramples on Mount Sinai, thus symbolizing and confirming Israel’s breaking of the covenant;”²² but this interpretation seems to me unlikely. *1 Enoch* 2–5 then draw a sharp contrast between the obedience of the works of creation to the order imposed on them by God and the complete failure of the wicked to obey: “But you have not been steadfast, nor observed his commandments, but you have transgressed and spoken proud and hard words with your unclean mouth against his majesty” (5:4). The introduction concludes by reverting to the theme of judgement for the wicked and salvation for the righteous, which was announced in *1 En.* 1, and again there is no hint that humans are not responsible for their actions.

The *Apocalypse of Weeks* also refers explicitly to the giving of the Law—or the covenant, as the Ethiopic *ṣərʾat* could also be translated—to Moses (93:6), and although the *Apocalypse* does refer to the spread of wickedness in the time before the flood, and of impiety and apostasy in the preexilic and the postexilic periods, it is not suggested that the sinners were in the grip of an evil they were powerless to resist, or that they did not deserve the judgement that had come or would come upon them. According to the main body of the *Epistle*, quite

²² Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 145.

the contrary was the case: “sin was not sent on the earth, but man of himself created it, and those who commit it will be subject to a great curse” (98:4). In the *Epistle* a woe is pronounced against those who set at naught “the foundation and the eternal inheritance of their fathers” (99:14), and in the light of the parallel in CD 1:15–17 it seems clear that what is denounced is giving a false interpretation of the Torah. Other passages speak of the perversion of “the words of truth” (99:2; 104:9), or the distortion of “the eternal covenant” (99:2), while 99:10 pronounces a blessing on those who fulfil “the commandments of the Most High,” and formulations like these seem most obviously to be references to the Mosaic law.²³

It is the case that the giving of the Law and the covenant is not mentioned in the *Animal Apocalypse* in its account of the Sinai event (89:29–35), and it may be wondered why this is the case. But it is misleading to suggest that the entire course of the history of the nation is presented as the outworking of the sin of the Watchers, or that the wicked Israelites, whose punishment is described in 90:26–27 were thought to be incapable of obeying the Law because of the sin of the Watchers.

It has, however, been argued that references to the Law in the present form of the Enochic writings reflect the coming together of the Enochians and the Zadokites in response to the events of the second century, particularly the Antiochene persecution. Thus Bedenbender, who aim is to provide what he describes as “an historical explanation for the literary rapprochement between Enoch and the Torah in the second century,”²⁴ argues that we must distinguish between the “really old” Enochic traditions that stem from the fourth and third centuries (and probably with even older roots) and the “not quite so old traditions” that date from 200 B.C.E. onwards, and mostly from after the persecution under Antiochus. To the former belong the older parts of the *Book of Watchers* collected in *1 Enoch* 6–36 and the bulk of the *Astronomical Book*, to the latter *1 Enoch* 1–5, the *Book of Dreams*, the *Epistle* (including the *Apocalypse of Weeks*), and later additions to

²³ Cf. M.A. Knibb, “The *Apocalypse of Weeks* and the *Epistle of Enoch*,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 213–19 (218); contrast Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 489, who takes a somewhat different view of these passages.

²⁴ Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 76.

the *Astronomical Book*.²⁵ Thus, for example, he would explain the concern with the Law in *1 Enoch* 1–5 as a result of the coming together of Enochic and Mosaic Judaism, perhaps already in the decades before the Antiochene persecution.²⁶ He would also date not only the *Animal Apocalypse*, but also the *Apocalypse of Weeks*—of which the former does not mention the giving of the Law, the latter explicitly does—to after 167 B.C.E. and explain them in terms of his reconstruction of events at that time.²⁷ Boccaccini has similarly explained differences within the Enochic writings in terms of his reconstruction of the history of Enochic Judaism,²⁸ and he has further argued that we must distinguish between a version of the *Epistle*, a *Proto-Epistle*, that lacked the whole of 94:6–104:6 and dates from the mid-second century B.C.E., and the *Epistle* itself (including the reference in 98:4 to human responsibility for sin), which he believes to be of a later date (the first century) and to contain specific anti-Qumranic elements.²⁹

It must, however, be asked whether the literary-critical analyses on which these reconstructions are based are plausible. It is certainly the case that a number of different traditions have been brought together in the *Book of Watchers*, but we have no evidence that the text ever existed without *1 En.* 1–5, just as we have no convincing evidence to justify the view that a version of the *Epistle* ever existed without 94:6–104:6.³⁰ It must also be doubted whether the dating proposed for the *Apocalypse of Weeks* and the *Epistle* in the period after the persecution of Antiochus is plausible. There is no reference to the persecution in the *Apocalypse*, and there is much to be said for the view—as Florentino García Martínez has argued—that it and the *Epistle* as a whole belong in the pre-Maccabean period.³¹

There clearly is much less concern with the Law in the early Enochic writings as compared, say, with *Jubilees* or with other writings preserved at Qumran with a marked halakic interest. But it does seem

²⁵ Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 66–67.

²⁶ Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 75–76, 78.

²⁷ Bedenbender, “Place of the Torah,” 76–77.

²⁸ G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 68ff. Cf. also his recent paper, “From a Movement of Dissent to a Distinct Form of Judaism” (see above, n. 17).

²⁹ Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 104–13, 131–38.

³⁰ Cf. Knibb, “The *Apocalypse of Weeks* and the *Epistle of Enoch*,” 215–17.

³¹ Cf. F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 90–92.

to me there is a danger of making too much of this difference.³² If the *Apocalypse of Weeks* sees the beginning of the new era occurring when the chosen ones are given sevenfold wisdom and knowledge (93:10), and if the prophecy in *Jub.* 23:16–32 places it when the children “begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way” (23:26), this certainly reflects a difference of approach,³³ but there is no reason to think that the author of the *Apocalypse* would not also have been concerned about the observance of the Law.

We come back to the question of what the authoritative status of the early Enochic writings meant. They were authoritative for what they say about the divine ordering of the world and about the present and future of mankind, not in respect of the Law. But this is far from saying that the Law was not important to the authors of these writings, or that they believed that it was impossible to obey the Law.

³² Cf. the comments of Seth Schwartz (*Imperialism and Jewish Society 200 B.C.E. to 640 C.E.* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001], 8–10) on the dangers of treating each literary work from ancient Judaism in isolation as the product of a separate community.

³³ For this difference of approach, see the comments by Nickelsburg, “Enochic Wisdom and its Relationship to the Mosaic Torah,” 88–94.

ARAMAIC TEXTS FROM QUMRAN AND THE
AUTHORITATIVENESS OF HEBREW SCRIPTURES:
PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS

Eibert Tigchelaar

1. INTRODUCTION

During the last fifty years it has been held broadly that the Aramaic texts found at Qumran form a distinct group within the Dead Sea Scrolls corpus.¹ From Józef Milik on, it has been commonly asserted that, perhaps with some exceptions, the Aramaic texts are non-Essene or presectarian.² Another prevalent view is that the *Aramaic Testament*

¹ See, chronologically: J.T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes dans le Désert de Juda* (Paris: Cerf, 1957), 95–96; idem, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM, 1959), 139–40; S. Segert, “Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrängemeinschaft,” in *Qumran-Probleme: Vorträge des Leipziger Symposiums über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. Bis 14. Oktober 1961* (ed. H. Bardtke; Berlin: Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1963), 315–39 (though in this contribution he pays more attention to the distinct use of Hebrew); idem, “Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu einigen aramäischen Texten von Qumrân,” *ArOr* 33 (1965): 190–206 (192, 205–6); J.T. Milik, “Écrits préesséniens de Qumrân: d’Hénoch à Amram,” in *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot, 1978), 91–106; K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 157; B.Z. Wacholder, “The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 257–81; D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. eadem and L.H. Schiffman; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 22–58 esp. 32, 35; eadem, “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume Two: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 447–67; eadem, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197–205; E. Tigchelaar, “The Imaginal Context and the Visionary of the Aramaic New Jerusalem,” in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 257–70 (261); J. Ben-Dov, “Hebrew and Aramaic Writing in the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Ancient Near Eastern Background and the Quest for a Written Authority,” *Tarbiz* 78 (2008–2009): 27–60 [Hebrew], vi [English summary]. I saw Ben-Dov’s article only at the final stage of writing this paper.

² Thus already Milik, *Dix ans*, 95–96 and *Ten Years*, 139–40, even though the hypothesis of the nonsectarian provenance is often ascribed to Stanislav Segert or

of *Levi* or *Aramaic Levi Document*, as well as most other Aramaic Testaments of the Patriarchs are older than *Jubilees*.³ These two assumptions are generally correlated to larger hypotheses, such as the revival of Hebrew under the Hasmonaeans,⁴ the sectarian use of Hebrew as an antilanguage,⁵ or a non-Judaean provenance, like Samaria,⁶ Upper-

Ben Zion Wacholder. See, more recently, for example, C. Hempel, "Kriterien zur Bestimmung 'essenischer Verfasserschaft' von Qumrantexten," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. J. Frey and H. Stegemann; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71–85 (78 n. 34); A. Lange, "Kriterien essenischer Texte," in *Qumran kontrovers* (ed. Frey and Stegemann), 59–69 (64): "Ein aramäischer... Text ist... mit einiger Sicherheit nichtessenisch"; D.K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 29: "There is wide agreement among scholars that the community at Qumran did not compose new works in Aramaic." As for the possible exceptions, J.T. Milik, " 'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel," *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15, ascribed 4Q245 (4QPseudo-Daniel^c) to a Qumran author (415), and in "Écrits préesséniens," 105 he allows for the possibility that the *Epistle of Enoch* as well as Abraham section of the *Genesis Apocryphon* might not be pre-Essene, but Essene works. As possible candidates for Essene or sectarian authorship have also been considered the Aramaic *New Jerusalem* text and the *Visions of Amram*. Cf., e.g., F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 149 (*Pseudo-Daniel*), 213 (*New Jerusalem*); idem, "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," reprinted in *Qumranica Minora I: Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism* (ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 195–226 (205: *Visions of Amram*).

³ See especially Milik, "Écrits préesséniens"; see also the dates given in É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD 31; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 126, 173, 193, 258–59, 287. The most fervent opposition to the pre-*Jubilees* dating of the *Aramaic Levi Document* comes from J. Kugel, "How Old is the Aramaic Levi Document," *DSD* 14 (2007): 291–312. D.M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (Atlanta, Ga.: SBL, 2008), 177, assumes that the *ALD* is presectarian and pre-*Jubilees*, but allows that subsequent Aramaic texts in the same tradition could be later than the *Rule of the Community* and *Jubilees*.

⁴ See the brief discussion in S. Weitzman, "Why Did the Qumran Community Write in Hebrew?" *JAOS* 119 (1999): 35–45 (36); W.M. Schniedewind, "Aramaic, The Death of Written Hebrew, and Language Shift in the Persian Period," in *Margins of Writing, Origins of Cultures* (ed. S.L. Sanders; Chicago, Ill.: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2006), 137–47, who states that the Hebrew language began to flourish again in the third century B.C.E. (143).

⁵ See, e.g., W.M. Schniedewind, "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage," *JBL* 118 (1999): 235–52; idem, "Linguistic Ideology in Qumran Hebrew," in *Diggers at the Well: Proceedings of a Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 245–55.

⁶ Milik, "Écrits préesséniens," 96, 101; see also R. Kugler, "Some Further Evidence for the Samaritan Provenance of Aramaic Levi (1QTestLevi; 4QTestLevi)," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 351–58; Puech, *DJD* 31:287; E. Eshel and H. Eshel, "Toponymic Midrash in 1 *Enoch* and in Other Second Temple Jewish Literature," *Henoch* 24 (2002): 115–30.

Galilee,⁷ or even the Eastern Diaspora,⁸ of some Aramaic compositions. It is also observed that the genre, style and content of the Aramaic texts contrast with that of the Hebrew texts found in the same corpus.⁹ Most of the Aramaic texts are pseudepigraphic, related to or associated with pre-Mosaic figures or to persons connected with the Eastern Diaspora. The genres can be described as apocalyptic, aggadic, and testamentary. Of specific interest for the topic of this volume are those suggestions that discuss the relation between the Aramaic compositions and the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus, Devorah Dimant asserts that while Hebrew parabiblical texts stay closely to the biblical text and elaborate or comment on it, Aramaic parabiblical texts treat the biblical materials more freely, or use biblical figures or events as “a peg on which large chunks of aggadic non-biblical expansions are hung.”¹⁰ George Brooke argues that the Qumran community used Hebrew as a result of the canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures.¹¹

The basic question that informs this essay is to what extent Aramaic texts found near Qumran relate differently to the Hebrew Scriptures than Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls, and whether differences are connected to date, to genre, or to provenance. This query can be related to different theories, in particular to that of the canonical process. Following the reasoning of Brooke (Hebrew was used as a result of the canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures), one could hypothesize that Aramaic texts stem from a period reflecting an earlier stage in the canonical process. In other words, was the authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures different for (the authors of) the Aramaic texts, than for the Hebrew texts?

⁷ G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Enoch, Levi and Peter: Recipients of Revelation in Upper Galilee,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 575–600; Eshel and Eshel, “Toponymic Midrash.”

⁸ Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” 204–5.

⁹ Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” 198.

¹⁰ Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” 202. See more in detail, Dimant, “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran.”

¹¹ G.J. Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104 (91–94: “Language and Script”). In a sense, Brooke takes up the suggestions of Segert and Wacholder, but in a more sophisticated manner.

2. ARAMAIC TEXTS FROM QUMRAN

The list of manuscripts from Qumran contains a large amount of items written in Aramaic.¹² However, some of these are documentary,¹³ and many have received no specific name, since they consist of unidentified or unclassified fragments.¹⁴ Also, some manuscripts with specific names are so fragmentary that one cannot say very much about them at all.¹⁵ For all practical purposes, one may identify the following compositions written in Aramaic in the corpus: Targums of Leviticus (4Q156) and of Job (4Q157, 11Q10); *Biblical Chronology* (4Q559); the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen/1Q20); *Books of Enoch* (4Q201–4Q202, 4Q204–4Q207, 4Q212); *Astronomical Book of Enoch* (4Q208–4Q211); *Book of Giants* (1Q23–1Q24, 2Q26, 4Q203, 4Q206 frags. 2–3, 4Q530–4Q533, 6Q8); *Birth of Noah* (4Q534–4Q536); *Testament of Jacob?* (4Q537); *Testament of Judah/Benjamin* (4Q538); *Testament of Joseph* (4Q539); *Aramaic Levi Document* (1Q21, 4Q213, 4Q213a, 4Q213b, 4Q214, 4Q214a, 4Q214b); *Apocryphon of Levi?* (4Q540–4Q541); *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542); *Visions of Amram* (4Q543–4Q549); *Testament* (4Q587+XQ6); *New Jerusalem* (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q554, 4Q554a, 4Q555, 5Q15, 11Q18); *Words of Michael* (4Q529, 4Q571, 6Q23); *Tobit* (4Q196–199); *Jews at the Persian Court* (4Q550); *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242); Aramaic parts of *Daniel* (1Q71–1Q72; 4Q112–4Q113; 4Q115); *Pseudo-Daniel* (4Q243–245); *Apocryphon of Daniel* (4Q246); *Four Kingdoms* (4Q552, 4Q553, 4Q553a); *Prophecy* (4Q556, 4Q556a, 4Q566, 4Q568; probably different compositions); *Vision* (4Q557, 4Q558, 4Q565; probably different compositions); *Account/Story* (4Q551); *Wisdom Composition* (4Q563); *Proverbs* (4Q569); *Magical Booklet*

¹² The figures would differ, depending on whether one counts items such as 4Q584a-x (4QUnid. Fragments A) as one item or twenty-four items. Note also that some lists, such as Emanuel Tov's list of Aramaic Texts in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (ed. E. Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 221–26, omit 3Q14 frags. 4–9. In addition, the attribution of some fragments to specific manuscripts is disputed.

¹³ 4Q342, 4Q345–4Q347, 4Q351–4Q352a, 4Q353–4Q359, 4Q360a.

¹⁴ 1Q63–1Q68; 3Q12–3Q13; 3Q14 4–9; 4Q490; 4Q558a; 4Q562, 4Q564, 4Q567, 4Q570, 4Q572–4Q574, 4Q575a, 4Q584a-x, 4Q585a-z, 4Q586a-n, 5Q24; 11Q24. One should note that “unidentified” can mean several different things. It can mean that fragments could not with certainty be attributed to a specific manuscript (Unidentified Fragments), or that fragments can be attributed to a specific manuscript, but that the genre or nature of that manuscript could not be identified (Unidentified Text).

¹⁵ For example, 4Q488 (4QApocryphon), 4Q489 (4QApocalypse), 6Q19 (Text Related to Genesis).

(4Q560); *Horoscope* (4Q561); *Zodiology and Brontology* (4Q318); *List of False Prophets* (4Q339).¹⁶

In 2007 Dimant divided those works into six different groups: I. Works about the Period of the Flood; II. Works Dealing with the History of the Patriarchs; III. Visionary Compositions; IV. Legendary Narratives and Court Tales; V. Astronomy and Magic; VI. Varia.¹⁷ A few years earlier, Lange had classified all the nonbiblical Dead Sea Scrolls in fifteen categories (of which the first nine were the most important).¹⁸ Virtually all the Aramaic texts fit in only four of those categories, namely Parabiblical Texts; Historical Texts and Tales; Apocalyptic and Eschatological Texts; and Magic and Divination. From a different perspective, I myself stated that virtually all the Aramaic narrative texts found amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls belong to two main categories, namely (1) texts related or ascribed to pre-Mosaic figures; or (2) narratives that have an Eastern Diaspora setting.¹⁹

Armin Lange's other five main categories include only few Aramaic texts. In the category of Exegetical Texts (like commentaries and pesharim) he includes the *Biblical Chronology* and the *List of False Prophets*, even though they are of an entirely different category than the Hebrew exegetical texts. His category of Texts concerned with Religious Law (like the rules and other halakic texts) includes no Aramaic texts, even though some Aramaic texts, like the *Aramaic Levi Document* do contain halakic sections; The *Astronomical Enoch* can be included in the Calendrical Texts. The category Poetic and Liturgical Texts contains no Aramaic texts at all. In *DJD* 39, the group of Sapiential Texts did not list any Aramaic texts, but Émile Puech's recent *DJD* 37 volume indicates that *Wisdom Composition* (4Q563) and *Proverbs* (4Q569) should probably be included in this list.²⁰ One may add that some more of the

¹⁶ Some of the proposed names of the compositions, as well as the attribution of different manuscripts to the same composition, are problematic. For a discussion of some of these, see D. Dimant, "Review of *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie 4Q529-4Q549*," *DSD* 10 (2003): 292-304.

¹⁷ Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," 200-201.

¹⁸ A. Lange (with U. Mittman-Richert), "Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre," in *DJD* 39:115-64.

¹⁹ Tigchelaar, "The Imaginal Context," 261.

²⁰ É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie (4Q550-4Q575a, 4Q580-4Q587)* (*DJD* 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 335, cautions that the few remains of 4Q563 (*4QÉcrit de sagesse*) could belong to a wisdom composition, or perhaps to the end of a Testament, where the patriarch exhorts his children.

small *DJD* 37 manuscripts, such as, e.g., 4Q583 (*4QProphecy*^e) are too fragmentary to fit easily in the existing classifications.

Though the general constitution of the Aramaic texts found at Qumran is clearly different from that of the Hebrew texts, the collection of Aramaic texts is not homogeneous. For example, the use of the dicolon in 4Q156 to indicate sense units (verses and half-verses) is unique in the corpus;²¹ linguistic analysis suggests that the Targum of Job (4Q157; 11Q10) originated in the East.²² The Aramaic manuscripts were copied in the time range from the end third century B.C.E. or early second century B.C.E. (for 4Q208)²³ to the first part of the first century C.E. Also, some texts seem to have quite different concerns, and might therefore have been produced in different groups. For those reasons, we cannot in general talk about all the Aramaic texts as one group. In this paper, references will be mainly to certain groups of Aramaic compositions.

3. AUTHORITATIVENESS OF SCRIPTURES: SOME PERSPECTIVES

The changing views in the past decades on the processes of canonization have also resulted in an attempt to differentiate our terminology. Exemplary is the work of Eugene Ulrich, who made the following distinction between several terms that are related to, but not identical to the concept of canon:

An authoritative work is a writing which a group, secular or religious, recognizes and accepts as determinative for its conduct, and as of a higher order than can be overridden by the power or will of the group or any member. A constitution or law code would be an example.

A book of scripture is a sacred authoritative work believed to have God as its ultimate author, which the community, as a group and individually, recognizes and accepts as determinative for its belief and practice for all time and in all geographical areas.²⁴

²¹ On the use of the dicolon in other corpora, see E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 138–40.

²² T. Muraoka, “The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI,” *JJS* 25 (1974): 425–43; a position which is still held by Muraoka today.

²³ J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 273.

²⁴ E. Ulrich, “The Notion and Definition of Canon,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L.M.

This functional definition of Scripture is certainly valid for many religious groups, particularly in the Jewish and Christian traditions. However, as cautioned by Miriam Levering, many views on Scriptures are influenced by Protestant culture, and “the nature and scope of the authority and normativity of Scriptures may be much narrower or much different [than thought], and the purposes for which authority is sought may differ.”²⁵ Ulrich himself acknowledges differences when he refers to “writings that increasingly functioned as authoritative books.”²⁶ Levering’s comments about differences in nature and scope not only hold true from a comparative perspective, but such differences can also be found within one and the same religious tradition. Since this is not the place for a systematic overview of the authoritativeness of Scriptures in early Judaism, I will merely highlight some aspects that relate to the topic of this paper and this volume.

First, it is clear that Scriptures are not the only source of authority or authoritativeness. Other sources that are implicitly or explicitly referred to as authoritative are, for example, ancestral tradition, supernatural revelations, or even inspired interpretation. Likewise, the authoritative character of Scriptures or other sources may perhaps indeed ultimately be attributed to divine inspiration or authorship, but it is often first of all related to the antiquity of those Scriptures or traditions, or to the special status of specific human authors or protagonists. Sometimes the two are explicitly connected: for example, *1 En.* 33:3–4 claims that both Enoch and Uriel are the authors of the *Astronomical Book*.

Second, a group’s or individual’s study of authoritative Scriptures may be aimed at increasing insight with respect to, for example, doctrine, providence, history, or halakic rules. Many explicit references to Scripture, however, are argumentative and selective, and suggest

McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 21–35 (29). See also the similar definition in P.W. Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–304 (272): “The word *Scripture* denotes a writing that was considered divinely revealed, uniquely authoritative, and believed to be ancient origin (even if it was actually quite recent).”

²⁵ M. Levering, “Introduction: Rethinking Scripture,” in *Rethinking Scripture: Essays from a Comparative Perspective* (ed. M. Levering; Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1989), 1–17 (10).

²⁶ E. Ulrich, “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 51–78 (57).

a context of discourse, dispute, or conflict. They aim to legitimize or support one's own positions or interests, or to denounce opponents.²⁷

Third, the scope of the authority of texts may be broad or limited, and shift over time. Also, texts may exercise different kinds of authority. The early Jewish texts give little evidence for references to the authority of Scriptures with regard to belief or doctrine, but much more with respect to conduct (halakah) and interpretation of the present.²⁸

Fourth, in every literary culture later literary texts interact with earlier ones, which therefore may be called authoritative or even canonical in a literary or cultural sense. Allusions to, or the imitation, or even emulation, of the style of earlier literature certainly indicates some kind of authoritativeness, but not necessarily the kind that determines belief or practice.

From a methodological point of view, we can approach the question of the relation of the Aramaic texts to the Hebrew Scriptures from different perspectives. We should investigate the explicit and implicit references in those Aramaic texts to the Hebrew ones. But also, we should study more generally the features and functions of those Aramaic texts, and see how they relate to the growth of authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures.

4. ARAMAIC TEXTS AND THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES

4.1. *Explicit Quotations or References*

From the beginning of Scrolls scholarship, scholars have focused on the use of explicit quotations both for text-critical reasons, and as a means to determine which texts were canonical or regarded as Scrip-

²⁷ See, e.g., S. Metso, "Biblical Quotations in the Community Rule," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 81–92, who argues that the biblical quotations in the *Community Rule* were added secondarily in the need to justify rules already in effect (90).

²⁸ A good example is given by A. Lange, "Authoritative Literature and Scripture in the Chronistic Corpus," in *"The Words of a Wise Man's Mouth are Gracious" (Qoh 10,12): Festschrift for Günter Stemberger on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. M. Perani; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 29–52, who shows that the *katuv*-formulas in the book of Chronicles with very few exceptions pertain to the cult and sacrificial matters. See below my comments on the *Aramaic Levi Document*.

ture.²⁹ The Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls contain very few explicit quotations. The only certain case seems to be 4Q562 (4QNonidentified Text A) 7 1–2 “the [word] which the prophet spoke [ab]out [...will] be like who touches the apple of his eye” which is most likely to be a reference to Zech 2:12. Unfortunately, the manuscript is so fragmentary that very little can be said at all, and the function of the quotation remains unclear. It is possible that 4Q556 (4QProphecy^a) 1 7 “About this, the prophet said that...” also introduced a quotation, but the text is broken and both the prophet (Daniel?) and the possible quotation (but it could also be a paraphrase) cannot be identified.³⁰ Explicit references to Scriptures, albeit without literal quotations, are found in Tobit, which book refers repeatedly to the book or law of Moses,³¹ and in 14:4 to Jonah (LXX Vat) or Nahum (LXX Sin).³² This paucity of explicit quotations could be ascribed to the genre and setting of the texts. A large part of the texts is attributed to pre-Mosaic figures, which would not be expected to quote Scriptures that are attributed to Moses and later figures. Many other texts are visionary or prophetic, a genre that claims itself to be revelatory, and therefore also is not likely to refer to other Scriptures.

4.2. Quotations, Allusions, Use of Scripture

The hitherto unknown Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls preserve a few certain or possible quotations and allusions to Hebrew

²⁹ Thus, e.g., I.H. Eybers, “Some Light on the Canon of the Qumran Sect,” in *Papers Read at 5th Meeting of Die Ou-Testamentiese Werkgenootskap in Suid-Afrika* (Potchefstroom: Pro Rege, 1962): 1–14, reprinted in S. Leiman, ed., *The Canon and Masorah of the Hebrew Bible: An Introductory Reader* (New York, N.Y.: Ktav, 1974), 23–36. Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 294: “Statements that Indicate Scriptural Status.”

³⁰ Puech, *DJD* 37:153–73 considers it possible that 4Q556 and 4Q556a are two copies of the same composition. The few references in 4Q556a indicate that the text describes the events during the Antiochean crisis, and there are some correspondences with Dan 11.

³¹ See J.J. Collins, “The Judaism of the Book of Tobit,” in *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology* (ed. G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 23–40 (31–34) demonstrates that in Tobit the “law of Moses” is not a reference to the Pentateuch, but roughly equivalent to “normative Jewish tradition.”

³² Parts of Tob 14:4 remain in 4Q196 Schøyen fragment, published by M. Haller-mayer and T. Elgvin, “Schøyen ms. 5234: Ein neues Tobit-fragment vom Toten Meer,” *RevQ* 22/87 (2006): 451–61, and in 4Q198 1, but neither preserves the reference to the prophet Jonah or Nahum.

Scriptures. The clearest of those is the small fragment 4Q583 1 (*4QProphecy^c*), which has in lines 1–2 the remains of an Aramaic text corresponding to Isa 14:31–32; line 3 is unwritten; the first ten or so words of the new section in line 4 are missing, after which we read “*arose against him, increased between Media and Persia, Assyria and the Mediterranean.*”³³ The fragment is too small and isolated to determine its genre and the function of the quotation, and it is not clear whether the rendering of “smoke from the North” (as in MT and LXX) by “evil from the North” (as in Jer 1:14; 4:6; 6:1) is interpretive (linking Isa 14:31 to Jer 1). Also, we do not know whether the quotation was formally introduced with a reference to Isaiah or Scripture. Because of the general reference in line 4 it is less likely that we have here an Aramaic pesher-like interpretation. Rather, as suggested by Puech, we have here a prophecy which is attached to the Isaian one.

In 4Q558 (4QpapVision^b) 51 ii 4 we find the phrase “Therefore, I will send Elijah befo[re],” which closely corresponds to Mal 3:23, and seems to be an allusion, paraphrase, or even quotation.³⁴ Unfortunately, 4Q558 consists mainly of very small fragments, and the character of the work, which has references to historical figures as well as terms which one expects in eschatological contexts, is not quite clear.

Dimant suggested that the phrase **לִי כֶסֶפָא וְדָהָבָא** (“to me the silver and the gold”) at the beginning of 4Q529 (4QWords of Michael) 1 15 is a citation of Hag 2:8 which refers to the splendor of the future Temple. Even though 4Q571 (4QWords of Michael^a) adds substantially to the text of 4Q529 1 11–14, the exact meaning of the section remains unclear (for example, the identity of the son/man and his father), but it is clear that the context of the Aramaic section mentions the city (Jerusalem), as well as probably God’s (lit. the Lord of Eternity) return to his house (4Q571 12).³⁵ Still, the immediately preceding and following words are missing, and we cannot ascertain whether we have here a quotation, allusion, or an accidental verbal correspondence (for example, the words might be part of the direct speech between the son and his father).

The background of the combined text of 4Q243 13 and 4Q244 12 (4QPseudo-Daniel^{a,b}) with the phrase “they were sac]rificing their chil-

³³ Puech, *DJD* 37:447–52 with discussion of earlier interpretations of the fragment.

³⁴ See the most recent discussion in *DJD* 37:217–18.

³⁵ Dimant, “Review of *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*,” 294, which suggestion is mentioned as possible by Puech in *DJD* 37:400.

dren to the demons of error; and God became angry at them and said to give them into the hand of Nebu[chadnezzar]” can be found in Ps 106:37, 40–41,³⁶ but the specific phrasing of “sacrificing their children to the demons of error” may also have been influenced by *Jub.* 1:11 “sacrifice their children to demons and to all the works of error of their hearts.”³⁷

In spite of the paucity of (explicit) quotations from or clear conscious allusions to the Hebrew Scriptures, the study of texts like the *Books of Enoch* clearly shows the knowledge and use of the Hebrew Scriptures.³⁸ Four completely different examples with regard to *1 Enoch* should suffice to illustrate the extent of the use of those Scriptures.

(1) Lars Hartman has analyzed in detail the use of Scripture in *1 En.* 1–5. For example, the theophany in *1 En.* 1 contains no explicit quotations of Scripture, but both the literary forms and most specific expressions and motifs can be shown to have been directly derived from the Hebrew Scriptures;³⁹ (2) The very close verbal correspondence between *1 En.* 6:1–2 and Gen 6:1–2 suggests that *1 Enoch* here adopted the text of Genesis, before gradually expanding on the story told so lapidary in Gen 6:1–4. This does not mean that *1 En.* 6–11 is a kind of midrash on Gen 6, but that the author or editors of this section deliberately associated their text with the Gen 6 episode; (3) In a study on the use of Scripture in *1 En.* 17–19, Michael Knibb called attention to several lexical correspondences with the Hebrew Scriptures, and observed the relatively high correspondence of items which Enoch saw in *1 En.* 17:1–18:5 with locations mentioned in Job 38 in a series of rhetorical questions suggesting that no one man had ever been there. Knibb argues that if one reads the Enochic section against Job 38, the implication would be “that Enoch had access to secrets known otherwise

³⁶ Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22:150.

³⁷ *Jubilees* 1:11, 13 combines elements of Ps 106:37 and Deut 32:17, 20. The expression “demons of error” is also found in *T. Jud.* 23:1 (δαίμονες πλάνης).

³⁸ See the section “Scripture in *1 Enoch*,” in G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2001), 57–58.

³⁹ See L. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (Lund: Gleerup, 1979). Cf. also the discussion in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 137–49. In view of the indebtedness to theophany sections in the Hebrew Scripture, I consider, with M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 105–6, that *1 En.* 1:4 *emheyya*, “from there,” may reflect a misunderstanding of *mn tmn* a reference to Hab 3:3 (“from Teman”).

only to God, and that...the mystery he reveals...is true";⁴⁰ (4) In his overview of the use of Scriptures in *1 Enoch*, George Nickelsburg mentions the indebtedness to the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel, and describes Isa 65–66 as a foundational text, which “color[s] the descriptions of the new age in almost all parts of *1 Enoch*.”⁴¹

Dependence on, or use of forms of the Hebrew Scriptures, is attested for example in the theophany of *1 En.* 1, or the figure of the guide angel(s) in *1 En.* 17–36, but also in the case of the *New Jerusalem* text, which should be understood against the background of Ezek 40–48.

4.3. *Translations, Reworkings, and Parabiblical Texts*

Three manuscripts consist of translations of Hebrew Scriptures in Aramaic, namely 4Q156 (translation of Leviticus), and 4Q157 and 11Q10 (translation of Job).⁴² Also the last columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon* correspond quite closely to the Hebrew text of Gen 13 and 14, so that its character is virtually that of a translation.

The composite character of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which is reflected in the different protagonists (Lamech, Noah, Abram), and voices (first; third), is also clear in the difference between aggadic narratives (especially in the Lamech and Noah sections) and more close renderings of the Hebrew text in the Abram part.⁴³ All sections of the *Genesis Apocryphon* have in common with the Aramaic Enochic and Patriarchal texts that they ascribe non-scriptural traditions to scriptural figures. In some cases, as in the extensive retelling of Abram and Sarai in Egypt, the tradition is an expansion of a scriptural narrative. In many other cases, the connection with a scriptural text or narrative element is less clear. This goes, for example, for Lamech's fear that a Watcher had fathered his son, or for Methuselah's journey to Enoch.

⁴⁰ M. Knibb, “The Use of Scripture in *1 Enoch* 17–19,” in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome: Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (ed. F. García Martínez and G. Luttikhuisen; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 165–78 (173).

⁴¹ Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 57–58 (57).

⁴² On the discussion as to whether one should call all Aramaic translations targumim, see, e.g., D. Shepherd, *Targum and Translation: A Reconsideration of the Qumran Aramaic Version of Job* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 2004).

⁴³ Dimant, “The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community,” 202–3 states that the *Genesis Apocryphon* is unlike other Aramaic texts in that it follows closely the biblical story, whereas the Hebrew Book of *Jubilees* is actually more like the Aramaic aggadic texts. It seems to me that Dimant's claim is largely built on the last part of the *Apocryphon*, and does not hold true for the earlier sections.

It should be emphasized that all these texts are attributed to scriptural figures, especially in the line of Enoch, Noah, Abram, Jacob and his sons, and Levi, Qahat and Amram, even if they are little more than names in the scriptural texts. The common designation of this kind of writings as “parabiblical” (or perhaps “parascriptural”)⁴⁴ may obfuscate the fact that some of these writings are not primarily connected to scriptural texts or themes, but to figures that are also found in the Scriptures.

4.4. *Daniel and Aramaic “Danielic” Texts*

For this survey of the relation of Aramaic text to Hebrew Scriptures, the case of Aramaic “Danielic” texts and the Aramaic and Hebrew parts of Daniel is problematic. A series of hitherto unknown texts related to, or reminiscent of, Daniel were found at Qumran, but in no single case, except perhaps 4Q245, can it be assumed that the biblical book of Daniel actually preceded or influenced those other texts.⁴⁵ Therefore, the title Pseudo-Daniel (for 4Q243–245), and even the label parabiblical are problematic.

4.5. *Authoritativeness of Scriptures in the Aramaic Texts*

In accordance with the literary fiction of pre-Mosaic authorship, the large corpus of Aramaic texts attributed to Enoch, Noah, and the

⁴⁴ R.A. Kraft, “Para-mania: Beside, Before, and Beyond Bible Studies,” *JBL* 126 (2007): 5–27.

⁴⁵ For discussions of the Danielic texts, see three articles in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, eds., *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), namely P.W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran” (329–67), L.T. Stuckenbruck, “Daniel and Early Enoch Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls” (368–86), and E. Eshel, “Possible Sources of the Book of Daniel” (387–94). In addition to the works discussed in those essays one should now also consider 4Q556–4Q556a (4QProphecy^{a,b}), which seems to contain *vaticinium ex eventu* prophecy about the period of the Antiochean crisis, and perhaps 4Q570 (4QNon-Identified Text D). Puech, *DJD* 37:9, even speculates that in 4Q550 either of the two Jews at the court, Patireza and his son Bagasrava, could have been identical with the prophet Daniel. However, in most cases there is not enough evidence, and different positions are possible. For example, J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1993), 77–79, argues that 4Q246 alludes to Dan 7, but Puech, in his edition of 4Q246 in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (*DJD* 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 165–84, considers the text contemporaneous with Daniel, towards the end of the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Patriarchs, never refers explicitly to any of the Hebrew Scriptures. Instead, we see different phenomena. Those Aramaic texts clearly presuppose the figures and narratives of the Hebrew Scriptures, and sometimes extensively interact with and use those Scriptures. At the same time, a few refer explicitly to an authoritative corpus of texts attributed to Enoch and Noah, or an authoritative body of knowledge transmitted orally, from Abraham on, from father to (grand)son. Such references to the transmission of books or of oral instructions are found especially in the *Books of Enoch*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the *Aramaic Levi Document*, and in the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542).⁴⁶ Noteworthy is *ALD* 10:10 where Isaac instructs Levi “for thus my father Abraham commanded me, for thus he found in the writing of the Book of Noah concerning the blood,”⁴⁷ because it connects the teaching of the patriarchs (the “Abraham-Amram axis”) to that of the prediluvian generation (the “Enoch-Noah axis”), and authorizes specific halakah by referring to a written book.⁴⁸

What do the authors of those texts want to achieve by having Isaac and Abraham refer to older texts? The reference to books of Noah could be interpreted as a fictional necessity, to solve the problem of the apparent lack of transmission of priestly traditions between Shem and Abraham. The need to go back beyond Abraham to Noah and Enoch may serve to stress the antiquity of priestly traditions per se, but also to emphasize the connection between Enoch, Noah, and Levi, those three who are said to walk with God.⁴⁹ However, there are no explicit quotations from those real or fictional books, and the label

⁴⁶ On these texts and the transmission of teaching in antiquity, see M.E. Stone, “The Axis of History at Qumran,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 134–49.

⁴⁷ Translation from J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone, and E. Eshel, eds., *The Aramaic Levi Document* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 91.

⁴⁸ See H. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (Brill: Leiden, 2004), 298–99 and, without furthering the discussion in this respect, Peters, *Noah Traditions*, 53–54. The motif of Abraham having access to books of the forefathers also appears in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which has Abraham reading to the Egyptians from the words of Enoch (19:25) and *Jub.* 12:27; 21:10. In the last example, what Abraham found in the words of Enoch and Noah again serves to authorize halakah on sacrifice and the eating of flesh. The (Hebrew) *Book of Jubilees* is most explicit about the chain of transmission. *Jubilees* 7:38–39 describes the transmission of instructions (“commanded”) from Enoch to Methuselah to Lamech to Noah to his sons. In *Jub.* 10:14 Noah gives the book of healing only to Shem.

⁴⁹ Gen 5:22, 24; 6:9; Mal 2:6.

“words of Noah” could simply function as a cover-all for sacrificial levitical halakah.

Yet, the explicit references to Abraham’s behaviour and instructions, and to the word of Noah may have a specific function. Larry Schiffman has compared the entire sacrificial halakah of *ALD* with that of sectarian and Tannaitic halakah. He describes that in general the issues of sacrificial halakah in *ALD* are “oriented toward sacrificial procedure, toward filling the gaps in the biblical text and describing the manner in which rites are to be performed” and that the details “are as close to rabbinic laws as they are to sectarian ones.”⁵⁰ It is important that in several of the cases where the halakah of *ALD* is not largely in agreement with Tannaitic (or once with sectarian) halakah, and hence where controversies could have existed, the *ALD* refers explicitly to Abraham, and to the words of Noah. This goes for the twelve kinds of wood allowed for sacrifices (*ALD* 7:5–7),⁵¹ as well as the washing of hands and feet to remove the blood after the sacrifice (*ALD* 10:5–7)⁵² and covering the blood of non-sacral animals (*ALD* 10:9–10).⁵³ The *Aramaic Levi Document* also refers to Abraham with respect to the splitting of wood checked for worms (7:4), which may not have been contradictory to Tannaitic law, but certainly to *Jub.* 21:13.

In all these cases the question is whether we have here different practices based on divergent interpretations of existing Scripture (for example, the issue of covering blood of non-sacral animals in *ALD* 10:9 could have been derived by applying Lev 17:13 to non-sacral slaughter),

⁵⁰ L.H. Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. Chazon, Dimant, and Clements), 177–202 (202).

⁵¹ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran,” 185–86: “a much more restrictive view than that of the Tannaim” (186). *ALD* 7:7 attributes this explicitly to Abraham (“These are those that he told me are fitting to offer up”).

⁵² Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran,” 187–88: “the requirement of washing the blood off the hands and feet of the priest before offering the parts of the animal is unique to this text” (187). Together with the next item, these are bracketed by a preceding “My father Abraham commanded me” (*ALD* 10:3) and a concluding “Thus my father Abraham commanded me, for thus he found in the writing of the book of Noah concerning the blood” (10:10).

⁵³ Schiffman, “Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the *Aramaic Levi Document* from Qumran,” 201–2: “in agreement with the Temple Scroll and the sectarian form of halakhah” (202).

or whether we have here a description of actual sacrificial practices which are attributed back to Levi, Abraham, and Noah. Hence, here the references to authorities (Abraham, Noah) clearly serve to authorize disputed halakah.

In the *Books of Enoch*, references to Scriptures are self-referential: the books Enoch refers to are either the same books in which those references are found, or other books in the Enochic corpus. Thus, the writing mentioned in *1 En.* 33:3–4, part of the *Book of Watchers*, refers to the *Astronomical Book*, whereas the books mentioned in *1 En.* 82:1 probably refer to the entire Enochic collection, which contains wisdom for all generations of eternity.

The Enochic and Patriarchal works, as well as the *Genesis Apocryphon* (and the Hebrew book of *Jubilees*) also refer to other sources of knowledge, apart from ancestral books. Thus, several protagonists are taken to heaven, communicate with angels, read heavenly tablets, or have revelatory visions or dreams. Visions are also found in other Aramaic texts, like the *New Jerusalem* and those probably to be attributed to Daniel (e.g. *Four Kingdoms*). In the case of the very fragmentary prophecies such as 4Q556–556a, it is possible, but not certain that they are part of an angelic speech to a visionary. In this respect, the Aramaic texts stand apart from the Hebrew Dead Sea scrolls, which rarely refer to such means of knowledge.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Because of the lack of detailed study of all Aramaic texts, conclusions have to be cautious and limited of scope. It has been argued that the phenomenon of explicit quotations (in contrast to general references to the Law or earlier books) of the Pentateuch and other Hebrew Scriptures increases drastically in the literature to be dated after the Maccabean revolt. This would indicate that the concept of authoritative literature gradually developed, and was accepted more broadly from the second century B.C.E. on.⁵⁴ The evidence of the Aramaic texts

⁵⁴ E.g. Lange, "Authoritative Literature and Scripture in the Chronistic Corpus," who focuses on the quotation formulas. Cf. also A. van der Kooij, "The Canonization of Ancient Books Kept in the Temple of Jerusalem," in *Canonization and Decanonization* (ed. A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 17–40, and with the same argument and examples, idem, "Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and

is ambiguous in this respect. The references to heavenly tablets and to writing in texts like the *Books of Enoch* and *ALD* certainly function as a fictional device, but also demonstrate an appreciation of “writtleness.” The writings with pre-Mosaic fictional authors maintain the literary fiction and therefore cannot quote Hebrew Scriptures that are attributed to later authors. At the same time, parts of *1 Enoch* clearly use literary forms and motifs, and even the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. The manner in which one refers to earlier literature depends not only on the degree of authoritativeness of that literature, but also on the literary forms, genre, and subject matter of the texts authors were creating. From this perspective, one may take the genre of texts, rather than the presence or absence of quotations, as an indirect indication of their authors’ view on the authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures.

The choice of scriptural pre-Mosaic figures as fictional authors of the parabiblical Aramaic texts we now have, affirms the cultural authoritativeness of the Hebrew Scriptures, or, put more minimally, of the traditions incorporated in those Scriptures. But it also challenges the view that those Hebrew Scriptures were the only authoritative traditions. In particular *1 Enoch*, with its repeated statement that its knowledge, written by Enoch in books and transmitted to his progeny, is for all generations, claims a more ancient, distinct, and separate scriptural authority that has not been superseded by the giving of the Law at Sinai. The *ALD*, on the contrary, emphasizes priestly (levitical) oral instruction from father to son, even though it does acknowledge the importance of writing. The *Visions of Amram* is an example of a third source of authority, namely visionary revelation (note that in the preserved text, Amram never refers to instruction given by his forefathers). All these types of Aramaic texts should be contrasted to various forms of rewritten Scripture or explicit exegesis which are found in Hebrew literature. This does not necessarily imply that the Hebrew Scriptures were less authoritative for the authors of the Aramaic texts, only that there were different strategies of authorizing additional elements, and that there was a correspondence between language, literary genres, and authorizing strategies.

Hasmonaean Politics,” in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 27–38.

DANIEL AND THE QUMRAN DANIEL CYCLE:
OBSERVATIONS ON 4QFOUR KINGDOMS^{A-B} (4Q552–553)

Albert L.A. Hogeterp

1. INTRODUCTION

The Qumran Daniel cycle hitherto published in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series has received extensive scholarly attention.¹ 4Q246 (4QApocryphon of Daniel ar) has also been linked to the Qumran Daniel cycle in view of its apparent dependence on Dan 7, even though the text does not explicitly attribute its parabiblical elaboration to the literary figure of Daniel.² The present article focuses on *4QFour Kingdoms* (4Q552–553), a fragmentary composition, the *DJD* edition of which was recently published by Émile Puech, who distinguishes fragments of three manuscripts: 4Q552 (4QFour Kingdoms^a), 4Q553 (4QFour Kingdoms^b) and 4Q553a (4QFour Kingdoms^c).³

¹ 4Q242 (4QPrNab ar), 4Q243 (4QpsDan^a ar), 4Q244 (4QpsDan^b ar), 4Q245 (4QpsDan^c ar). For the *editio princeps* of 4Q242 see J.J. Collins in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 83–94; for the *editio princeps* of 4Q243–245 see J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint, *DJD* 22:95–164; for the *editio princeps* of 4Q246 as 4QApocryphe de Daniel ar see É. Puech, *DJD* 22:165–84. See also, e.g. P.W. Flint, “The Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 41–60; L.T. Stuckenbruck, “The Formation and the Re-Formation of Daniel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Volume 1: Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:101–30, with further bibliography.

² Flint, “Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 41–60, omits 4Q246 from his survey, whereas Stuckenbruck, “Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel,” 117–18, notes the “wide agreement that 4Q246 is dependent on Daniel 7,” and J.J. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; ed. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:403–30 (413–15) mentions several verbal parallels between 4Q246 1 and Dan 2 and between 4Q246 2 and Dan 7:14, 27; see Puech, *DJD* 22:178–84 on the interpretation of 4Q246 as an Aramaic Apocryphon of Daniel.

³ É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens, deuxième partie (4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587)* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009). The author further consulted English translations by F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition: Volume 2 (4Q274–11Q31)* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 2:1102–7; and by D.W. Parry and E. Tov, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader: Part 6, Additional Texts*

4Q552–553 has hitherto received relatively little attention in Qumran studies.⁴ A recent survey of Qumran apocalyptic literature by John Collins discussed 4Q552–553 as a text “sometimes classified as Danielic” in view of its four kingdoms scheme and the identification of Babylon and Persia.⁵ The four kingdoms scheme is part of 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b}, as edited by Puech, which means that these two manuscripts will receive most attention in this article.⁶ This article provides further analysis of 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} by studying its linguistic, literary and theological characteristics and comparing them with Daniel and the other Aramaic writings of the Qumran Daniel cycle. This comparative analysis will deal with the question of how the contribution of 4QFour Kingdoms to Danielic tradition may best be characterized: in terms of a parabiblical elaboration on the book of Daniel, an interpretation of specific features within the Qumran Daniel tradition or in broad terms of pseudepigraphical composition. This is an open question, in view of the variance between a general view of the composition’s development of Danielic themes, as held by Loren Stuckenbruck, and the identification of connections between 4Q552 6, 4Q246 1–2, and Dan 7 by Puech.⁷ Further evaluation of this question may yield valuable insights into the extent to which 4QFour Kingdoms is conversant with Daniel and the Qumran Daniel tradition. Close examination of the fragments of 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} may further indicate

and *Unclassified Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 6:76–79. Cf. K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 108–9.

⁴ 4Q552–553 was not in the survey by Flint, “Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 41–60. C.M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 257 briefly mentioned 4Q552–553 as an example of the “periodization of history”; A. Toepel, “Planetary Demons in Early Jewish Literature,” *JSP* 14 (2005): 231–38, refers to 4Q552–553 as evidence for the motif of the rule of spiritual beings. On 4Q552–553, cf. Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 415–17, who observes that its classification as “apocalypse” remains inconclusive; and Parry and Tov, *DSSR*, 6:76–79, who published 4Q552–553 among “Apocalyptic Texts—Symbolic Apocalypses.”

⁵ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 415–17.

⁶ Puech, *DJD* 37:81, classifies 4Q553a within the same literary genre, without holding that its relationship to the *Four Kingdoms* composition is assured. At any rate, 4Q553a 7 2, as edited by Puech, *DJD* 37:88, comprises the phrase רב איל [גיא], “chief of the trees.”

⁷ Stuckenbruck, “Formation and the Re-Formation of Daniel,” 120, conceives of general terms for themes developed in the four kingdoms scheme and a royal court setting for vision interpretation, while deeming dependence on Daniel speculative; Puech, *DJD* 37:71–72.

whether and how this composition draws on underlying textual variety in the Daniel tradition. Detailed study of 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} may also yield a glimpse of the literary Daniel tradition that surrounded the canonization process of the book of Daniel in the late Second Temple period.

The book of Daniel is fragmentarily represented by eight Qumran manuscripts,⁸ whose text types include “non-aligned texts” (4QDan^a, 6QpapDan) and whose chronology of textual transmission is very close to the literary history of Daniel.⁹ Daniel was probably a popular object of parabiblical elaboration in the late Second Temple period. This is attested by additions to this book which have a reception history as apocrypha (Pr Azar, Bel, Sg Three, Sus), the Qumran Daniel cycle and a plural reference to “the books, as many as he (Daniel) composed and left behind” by Josephus (*A.J.* 10.267).¹⁰ Daniel was apparently regarded as a prophet, as the introductory citation formula כַּאֲשֶׁר בְּרַאֲשֵׁי הַסֵּפֶר דְּנִיָּאֵל in the Eschatological Midrash^a (4Q174 1–3 ii 3),¹¹ the reference to Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου in Matt 24:15 and Josephus’ mention of ἡ Δανιήλου προφητεία (*A.J.* 12.322) indicate. The authoritative status of the book of Daniel in sectarian Qumran literature by the first century B.C.E. is further underpinned by the citation of words from Dan 9:25 in 11QMelch 2:18. The authority of the prophetic figure of Daniel is presupposed by references to דְּנִיָּאֵל in 4Q178 12 1 and in the non-sectarian *Pseudo-Daniel* texts from Qumran (4Q243 1 1; 2 1; 5 1; 6 3; 4Q244 4 2; 4Q245 1 i 3).

The composition of the Aramaic text 4QFour Kingdoms stands apart from sectarian Qumran literature. Devorah Dimant classified 4Q552–553 among those Qumran Aramaic texts that do not use the terminology of the Qumran community and that “contain almost exclusively visionary-pseudepigraphic compositions, testaments and

⁸ 1Q71–72 (1QDan^{a-b}), 4Q112–116 (4QDan^{a-c}), 6Q7 (6QpapDan).

⁹ E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 116, 169, refers to a palaeographical date between 125–100 B.C.E. for 4QDan^{c-e}.

¹⁰ A. Paul, *La Bible avant la Bible: La grande révélation des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Cerf, 2005), 142 and n. 1, interprets this passage in *A.J.* 10.266–267 as Josephus’ designation for a heterogeneous “assortment of writings related to the literary tradition of Daniel.”

¹¹ A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (“Florilegium”) und 4Q177 (“Catena A”) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 26.

narrative-aggadic works.¹² Ursula Schattner-Rieser ascribed a pre-Qumran origin to the text's composition.¹³ Puech has taken into account a broad time span for the composition's pre-Qumran dating, ranging from the late fourth to the mid-second century B.C.E., while palaeographically dating 4Q552 to 50–25 B.C.E., 4Q553 to 100/75–50 B.C.E., and 4Q553a to 50 B.C.E.¹⁴

2. THE TEXT OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS SCHEME IN 4Q552–553

Before proceeding with a linguistic and literary analysis, including a theological interpretation of the two manuscripts, 4Q552 and 4Q553, the relationship between them should be mapped out to provide literary evidence of them being one composition. It should be noted from the start that 4Q552 1 i + 2 12, 1 ii 1–12 and 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 1–7 preserve overlapping but not completely identical fragments that attest to the symbolic four kingdoms scheme from which the composition derives its name. The synoptic table below presents the continuous text of the overlapping fragments, based on the transcriptions of individual fragments as published by Puech,¹⁵ arranged line by line according to corresponding clauses.

4Q552 1 i + 2 12b	4Q553 3+2 ii+ 4 1–7
[וחזית מלאכא] 12b	[vacat] וחזית [°] 1
[די עלוהי כ]ען	2 די עלוהי [י כוען]
4Q552 1 ii 1–12	
נוגהא קאם 1	נוגהא קאם vacat
וארבעה אילנין [אמרין לה]	וארב[עה אלנין אמרי]ן לה
וקאם אילנא 2	וקמו אלניא
ורחקו מנה	3 ורחקו] מנה
ואמר [לי התחזא] 3 צורתא	ואמר לי התחזא [vacat] צורתא
ואמרת אן אחזא ואתב[ונ]ן ב[ה]	ואמרת אן אחזה ואתבנונן 4 בה
וחזית] 4 אילנא די [קאם] הוא שים במ[דנחא לה]	וחזית] אלנא די קאם הוא שים במדנחא לה

¹² See D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58 (34–35, 54), on 4Q552–553 as "Apocalypse—Four kingdoms."

¹³ U. Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte: I. Grammaire* (Lausanne: Zèbre, 2004), 25.

¹⁴ Puech, *DJD* 37:58, 60, 74, 82.

¹⁵ Texts from Puech, *DJD* 37:62, 64, 78.

<p>ושאלתה מן שמך ואמר לי בבל [ואמרת לה] 6 אנתה הוא די שליט בפרס ו[חזית א]לנא אחרנא(?) vacat v[די נ]חית למערבא ל[משלט וקאם(?) 8 למשנק ושאלתה</p>	<p>5</p> <p>7</p> <p>9</p>	<p>ושאלתה מן שמך ואמר לי בבל vacat v[די נ]חית למערבא ל[משלט וקאם(?) 8 למשנק ושאלתה</p> <p>ואמרת לה מן 6 שמך vacat ו[ואמר לי מ]די ואמרת לה אנתה הוא די שליט על תקפי ימא ועל מחוזא ועל [כ]ל עמיא [] vacat 7 [וחזית] א[לנא תליתיא ואמרת לה מן שמך ולמא חוזך שנה מנהון ואמר לי יואן ואנה שליט על]</p>
---	----------------------------	--

In tracing the literary shape and character of the composition as witnessed in these two manuscripts, 4QFour Kingdoms^a and 4QFour Kingdoms^b, several observations can be made about the overlapping fragments and their location in the textual fragments of 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b}.

First, as compared to 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4, 4Q552 1 ii comprises some divergent and some extra material. This material can be traced throughout the fragments that narrate the vision of four trees which rule over different kingdoms. The two overlapping fragments first mention a conversation of four trees, ארבעה אילנין, at the time of dawn, גווגהא¹⁶ (4Q552 1 ii 1 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 2), presumably with an *angelus interpres*, if one relies on Puech's reconstruction, וחזית, מלאכא, in 4Q552 1 i + 2 12, together with a reference to angels in 4Q552 1 i + 2 5. 4Q552 1 ii 2 singles out the rising up of one tree, וקמו אלניא, as compared to the plural, וקאם אילנא, in 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 2. Perhaps the singular reference in 4Q552 1 ii 2 anticipates separate interrogations of individual trees by the first person singular

¹⁶ Puech, *DJD* 37:65: "la lumière de l'aurore"; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1103, translate this as "the dawn rose." Cf. Dan 6:20; M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: The Judaica Press, 1971), 873.

protagonist (4Q552 1 ii 5–12), while the plural in 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 2 accentuates the collectivity of the four trees.

4Q552 1 ii 2 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 3 subsequently narrate that the trees move far away from the *angelus interpres*, ורחקו מנה. The expression of distance is spatial and could be related to subsequent references to the geographical orientation and location of dominions in the overlapping fragments (4Q552 1 ii 4–12 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4–7). 4Q552 1 ii 2–3 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 3–4 then turns to the contact between the *angelus interpres* and the first person singular protagonist in relation to the perception and interpretation of the figure of each tree.¹⁷ The protagonist perceives a tree, possibly situated in the East, במ[רנחא] (4Q552 1 ii 4 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4), as parallel to the geographical setting of the second tree in the West, למערבא, in 4Q552 1 ii 7. The protagonist attributes the rule over Persia to the tree in the East, which calls itself בבל (Babel) (4Q552 1 ii 3–6 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4–5).

After this point, 4Q552 1 ii 7–8 comprises additional material about the vision of a second tree which is omitted in 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 5. 4Q552 1 ii 7–8 relates that the protagonist saw another tree “[which came] down to the West to [rule and it rose] in order to choke.”¹⁸ This extra material provides additional information about the geographical setting and character of the rule of the second tree which, according to 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 5–6 // 4Q552 1 ii 8, calls itself Media. According to 4Q552 1 ii 9–10 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 6, the protagonist attributes the rule over the powers of the sea, the harbour and all the peoples to this second tree, which is called Media.

4Q552 1 ii 10–12 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 7 fragmentarily preserve the vision of a third tree, which presumably calls itself “Yavan,” i.e. Greece, again with a different character to the former trees [נה מנהון] חזוד (4Q552 1 ii 12 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 7). Puech’s reconstruction of יואן

¹⁷ Puech, *DJD* 37:65, 79, אן אחזא ואתבונן בה, as “Oui, je (la) vois et je voudrais la comprendre!” but אן marks the beginning of a conditional sentence, as noted by Schattner-Rieser, *L’araméen*, 96, with reference to 1QapGen 22:21–22, 4Q539, 4Q552, 4Q553 and 11Q10, so that a translation such as “if I see, then I will understand it” seems more appropriate. At that point of narration, the first person singular protagonist has not yet seen any of the four trees, as the subsequent sentence, וחזית אילא די קאם, in 4Q552 1 ii 3–4 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4, affirms.

¹⁸ Puech, *DJD* 37:64–66, reads חית[נ], a verb which is spelled incorrectly as נהת in Dan 4:10, 22; on למשנק, cf. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1607.

relies on passages in the book of Daniel (Dan 2 and 7) and on other ancient Jewish texts.¹⁹

A second textual point concerns the divergent position the four kingdoms scheme occupies among the respective fragments and columns of 4Q552 and 4Q553. 4Q552 1 i + 2, the column which precedes the four kingdoms scheme of 4Q552 1 ii, comprises a royal court setting in which a king addresses the protagonist (4Q552 1 i + 2 8), a setting which has not been preserved in the fragments of 4Q553 1 i–ii and 2 i that precede the four kingdoms scheme in 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4. I will focus on the sequence of 4Q552 1 i + 2–1 ii and 4Q553 1 i–ii, 2 i, 3 + 2 ii + 4 when I turn to the literary setting and theological outlook of *4QFour Kingdoms*.

Apart from the fragments mentioned above that precede the overlapping parts in the four kingdoms scheme, 4Q552 also contains fragments 3–6, which will figure in the discussion below.

A subsequent discussion of the linguistic and literary features will serve to provide a general picture of the composition, with a comparative look at Daniel and other writings of the Qumran Daniel cycle. This analysis will further help to develop an interpretation of the theological outlook of 4Q552–553 with a view to the character of its relatedness to Daniel and the Daniel tradition. Linguistic and literary scrutiny of *4QFour Kingdoms* may help to single out particularly Danielic features, on the one hand, and characteristics of 4Q552–553 as a separate composition, on the other. This analysis will serve to situate 4Q552–553 more accurately in the literary Daniel tradition, of which the book of Daniel forms an authoritative part through textual transmission in biblical Qumran scrolls and through citation in sectarian Qumran literature.

3. LINGUISTIC FEATURES AND LITERARY SETTING OF 4Q552–553

3.1. *Linguistic Features*

The Aramaic of *4QFour Kingdoms* merits further comparison with other Aramaic Qumran texts, other Aramaic texts of the Qumran Daniel cycle and the Aramaic sections of the Hebrew Bible, in order to

¹⁹ Puech, *DJD* 37:58, 66.

situate the text in a general sociolinguistic framework. This linguistic analysis should make clear whether and to what extent the Aramaic of *4QFour Kingdoms* evinces particular connections with the Aramaic of Daniel, thereby providing potential indications for identifying and characterizing a literary relationship between Daniel and *4QFour Kingdoms*. This survey will draw attention to some grammatical features, general items of vocabulary, non-Aramaic influences and theological vocabulary.

With regard to grammar, *4QFour Kingdoms* shares several features with Ezra, Daniel and other Qumran Aramaic texts. The masculine second person singular personal pronoun, אנתה (4Q552 1 ii 6),²⁰ is also attested in Ezra 7:25, Dan 2:29–6:21, 4Q550 5 + 5a 4 and 4Q558 3 1.²¹ The noun בלא, “all, everyone/everything” (4Q552 1 i + 2 9), is also attested in Dan 2:40, 4:9, 18, 25, 4Q198 1 5–6, 4Q212 1 iii 22, 4Q213 1 i 17, 4Q214 2 9, 4Q246 1:3, 8 and 2:3, 4, 6. The role of הוא as copula in the phrase הוא די שליט בפרס (4Q552 1 ii 6 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii 4 4–5), which Schattner-Rieser noted in comparison with 1QapGen 19:7 and 4Q550c 1 i 1,²² is further paralleled by אנתה־הוא in Dan 2:38, 4:19, and 5:13.

With regard to vocabulary, several nouns and verbs merit comparative attention. The term for dawn, נוגהא, in 4Q552 1 ii 1 is paralleled by Dan 6:20 (בנגהא). The Aramaic noun for tree, אילנא, is paralleled by Dan 4:7–8, 11, 17, 20. The noun for power, תקף, in the construct expression תקפי ימא (“powers of the sea,” 4Q552 1 ii 10) is paralleled by the biblical evidence of Esth 9:29, 10:2, Dan 11:17 and other Qumran evidence (4Q201 i 6; 4Q203 7 i 7; 1QapGen 22:31). The related verb תקף (“to grow strong”) is part of the Danielic dream vision of a tree that symbolizes the kingdom of Babylon (Dan 4:8, 17, 19). Apart from תקפי ימא, 4Q553 1 ii 2 also includes mention of חיל תקיף (“mighty of power”).²³ Other terms related to power in *4QFour Kingdoms* are שליט and שלטנה[של]. As part of the phrase “you are ruler over Persia,” שליט can be designated as an adjective, “governing, mighty,” or as a noun, “official, ruler,” derived from the verb שלט with the preposition ב (4Q552 1 ii 6). The form שליט ב has a close parallel in Dan 4:22, 29 and 5:21, 29. The noun שלטנה[של], “rulership” (4Q553 1 i 4), is paralleled

²⁰ Cf. Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen*, 52.

²¹ Puech, *DJD* 37:25, 186.

²² Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen*, 110.

²³ Puech, *DJD* 37:76; Parry and Tov, *DSSR*, 6:80–81.

by the noun שלטן, “dominion,” in Dan 3:33, 4:19, 31, 6:27 and 7:6, 12, 14, 26–27 (שלטנא in v. 27).²⁴ Both terms for East and West, [מ]דנחא (4Q552 1 ii 4 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4) and מערבא (4Q552 1 ii 7), also occur in Aramaic Qumran fragments of Astronomical Enoch (4Q209 23 5, 7; 4Q210 1 ii 17; cf. מדנחא in 4Q156 1 6 and מערב in 4Q558 63 2).²⁵ The term מפקא, “end” (4Q552 1 i + 2 10), is paralleled by rabbinic Hebrew²⁶ but not by biblical Hebrew, while צורתא (4Q552 1 ii 3) has a parallel in biblical Hebrew (צורה in Ezek 43:11), and its Aramaic form צורתא is paralleled in rabbinic Hebrew.²⁷ The expression בפרוש (4Q552 1 i + 2 10) is paralleled by rabbinic Hebrew usage, where it may signify “distinctly, explicitly, directly.”²⁸ Apart from this, בפרוש occurs as a Hebrew adverbial expression in the Damascus Document (CD 2:13 // 4QD^a 2 ii 13).²⁹

4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} includes various terms for “appearance” and “vision”: מחזוהי, “his appearance” (4Q553 1 ii 1), derived from the biblical Hebrew מחזה, and “vision” (חזוהי, 4Q552 5 10; possibly also חזוך, “your vision,” in 4Q552 1 ii 12).³⁰ A translation of חזוהי as “vision” is paralleled by חזוא in 4Q547 4 8, whereas חזוהי signifies “appearance” in 4Q544 1 13.³¹ The use of חזוהי to signify “vision” is further paralleled by the biblical usage of חזוא as “vision” in Dan 2:19, 28, 4:2, 6–7, 10, 7:1–2, 7, 13, 15, while the use of חזוהי to signify “appearance” is paralleled in Dan 7:20.

As regards the use of verbs, 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b} employs standard verbs for saying, אמר, and asking, שאל, derived from biblical Hebrew. The composition further includes several inflections of חזוהי (“to see”): as the perfect tense חזית (“I saw,” 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 1; 4Q552 1 ii 3 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4; 4Q552 3 2) and as the imperfect tense אחזא/אחזא (“I will see,” 4Q552 1 ii 3; 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 3). The Aramaic usage

²⁴ Puech, *DJD* 37:76, further refers to שלטנא in 4Q246 2:9.

²⁵ Puech, *DJD* 37:225.

²⁶ Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 778.

²⁷ Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1271–72.

²⁸ Puech, *DJD* 37:62–63, reads בפריש, rendering an uncertain translation “en un prodige(?),” but the reading בפרוש in 4Q552 1 i 10, presented and translated as “in plain sight” by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1103, could make better sense, also in view of other Hebraisms in the composition, such as אל עליון in 4Q552 6 10. Cf. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1171.

²⁹ Translated as “with precision” by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:553, 585.

³⁰ García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1105. Yet, they translate חזוך in 4Q552 1 ii 12 as “your appearance.”

³¹ Cf. חזיה, “his appearance,” in 4Q205 2 ii 29.

of the verb חזוה is paralleled throughout the Aramaic section of Dan 2:4b–7:28. The form חזיית is further paralleled in various other Aramaic Qumran texts.³²

Finally, theological vocabulary addressing and designating God may further be discerned in 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-b}: אַל עליון, “God Most High” (4Q552 6 2). This designation of God derives from biblical Hebrew,³³ but it also occurs in some other Aramaic Qumran texts (1QapGen 12:17; 20:12, 16; 21:2, 20; 22:15–16, 21; 4Q246 2:1; 4Q558 88 1).³⁴ The more Aramaicized form עליא occurs in 4Q242 1–3 2, 3, 5, 6, 4Q550 7 + 7a 1³⁵ and 11Q18 18 2. In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the Aramaic form עליא occurs alongside עליון. The Aramaic form עליא predominates in Dan 3:26, 32, 4:14, 21–22, 29, 31, 5:18, 21, and 7:25. As a designation of God, עליון is also a recurrent Hebrew term in the Dead Sea Scrolls.³⁶ The reference to the divine epithet אַל עליון in 4Q552 6 2 is paralleled by the designation of “the great God” in Dan 2:20, as witnessed by 4QDan^a,³⁷ which corresponds with LXX Dan 2:20, κύριος μέγας, in contrast to the reading אַל־הַא in MT Dan 2:20. Since Dan 2:20 is part of a dream vision with tree symbolism and its interpretation, the correspondence between the divine epithet אַל עליון in 4Q552 6 2 and the textual witnesses of 4QDan^a and LXX Dan 2:20 may be significant in pointing to textual variety of the Daniel tradition underlying 4QFour Kingdoms.

The above survey of overlapping fragments and discussion of vocabulary already indicate that 4QFour Kingdoms is replete with visionary

³² 1QapGen 6:11; 14:17; 19:14; 21:10; 4Q157 1 ii 8; 4Q196 2 11; 4Q204 1 vi 5; 1 xii 25–26; 5 ii 27; 4Q206 2 ii 3; 4Q207 1 2; 4Q209 23 8, 10; 4Q210 1 ii 19–20; 4Q213a 2 16; 4Q214a 2–3 ii 6; 4Q214b 5–6 i 2; 4Q489 1 2; 4Q546 6 5; 4Q558 65 2 (Puech, *DJD* 37:226).

³³ Gen 14:18–22; Num 24:16; Pss 7:18; 9:3; 18:14; 21:8; 46:5; 47:3; 50:14; 57:3; 73:11; 77:11; 78:17, 35, 56; 82:6; 83:19; 87:5; 91:1; 92:2; 97:9; 107:11; Lam 3:35, 38; 2 Sam 22:14; Isa 14:14.

³⁴ Schattner-Rieser, *L'araméen*, 88, surveys עליון in 1QapGen 21:17 and 4Q246 2 as examples of Aramaic words ending with ן- that are directly derived from Hebrew. As for the reading [ן]עליון[א], see Puech, *DJD* 37:238.

³⁵ Puech, *DJD* 37:36.

³⁶ 1Q19bis 2 2; 1QS 4:22; 10:12 // 4QS^d 9:12; 11:15 // 4QSⁱ 1 3; 1QH^a 12:31; 14:33; 4Q175 10 (citation of Num 24:16); 4Q219 2:21; 2:25 // 4Q221 1 1; 2:29 // 4Q221 1 5; 2:32; 4Q221 1 6; 7 7; 4Q222 1 4; 4Q291 1 3; 4Q378 26 1, 3, 4; 4Q379 18 6; 4Q422 2:9; 4Q434 2 10; 4Q438 6 2; 4Q457b 2:3, 7; 4Q461 3 3; 4Q482 1 1; 8 2; 4Q491 14–15 7; 4Q492 1 13; 4Q525 2–3 ii 4; 11Q11 6:3; 11Q14 1 ii 4, 7.

³⁷ Cf. M. Abegg, Jr., P. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible. The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999), 487.

language and symbolic identification, and that it is concerned with the course of power, all of which have several parallels in the book of Daniel. As the object of prophetic vision, Danielic thought in 4Q552–553 further incorporates features of language paralleled in Qumran and non-Qumran Hebrew and Aramaic texts, such as divine epithets (אל עליון) and terms for the concrete impact of prophetic vision (מפקא, בפרוש). In their coherence with the four kingdoms scheme, the Danielic parallels of language evoke the impression that 4Q552–553 represents a stage in the literary history of the Daniel tradition in which Danielic thought, the four kingdoms scheme, was considered the object of ongoing prophetic vision.

Dawn as the setting for the vision of the four trees could perhaps stand for a state between sleep and waking,³⁸ thereby yielding an analogy with dream visions in the book of Daniel. An analysis of the literary setting and theological outlook would put the specific vision of *4QFour Kingdoms* into further comparative relief as a literary composition that elaborates on Danielic thought.

3.2. *Literary Setting*

As has been noted above, the overlapping fragments on the four kingdoms scheme in 4Q552 1 ii and 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 are preceded by divergent fragmentary columns. These preceding columns, 4Q552 1 i + 2 and 4Q553 1 i–ii and 2 i, as well as 4Q552 3–6, may tell us more about the literary setting of the four trees vision.

4Q552 1 i + 2 comprises 12 lines, of which the last line, as reconstructed by Puech, partly overlaps with 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 1–2 (cf. the synoptic table above). Together with the sequence of columns 4Q552 1 i + 2 and 1 ii, this overlap presupposes a continuous text in *4QFour Kingdoms*^a. Apart from 4Q552 1 i + 2 12b // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 1–2, the preserved text in 4Q552 1 i + 2 1–12 has no clear parallel in fragments 1 i–ii and 2 i of 4Q553 that precede 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4.³⁹ Together with the divergence in 4Q552 1 ii 2 // 4Q553 and the additional material in

³⁸ Cf. 4Q547 4 8: [ת] וְאָנָה אֶתְעִירֶת מִן שְׁנַת עֵינַי וְחִזּוּא כְּתַבְּ[ת], “And I awoke from the sleep of my eyes and [I] wrote the vision”; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1092–93.

³⁹ The word [ת]תְּלָתָהּ [א]לְנָא, reconstructed in 4Q552 3 5 by Puech, *DJD* 37:68, could have a parallel in 4Q553 1 ii 4, where Puech, *DJD* 37:76, reads [א]לְנָא, but the fragmentary preserved text precludes further inferences.

4Q552 1 ii 7–8, the divergent portions of preserved text that precede the four kingdoms scheme in 4Q552 and 4Q553 respectively speak for slightly divergent recensions of the same composition in 4QFour Kingdoms^a and 4QFour Kingdoms^b.

The continuous text in 4Q552 1 i + 2 and 1 ii presents a setting in which the presence of angels, “the angels who were,” מלאכיא די הוו in 4Q552 1 i 5, appears to anticipate the other-worldly dimension of the four kingdoms vision.⁴⁰ The presence of angels is not without parallel in Daniel. Dan 3:28 and 6:23 mention the role of an angel, and MT Dan 4:14 presupposes a heavenly council setting with its specification of פתגמא מאמר קדישין (“sentence by the word of the holy ones”),⁴¹ while LXX Dan 4:22, 24 comprise a conceptualization of God’s heavenly council through repeated references to οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ.

Puech’s reconstruction [מתחזין לדניאל] in 4Q552 1 i + 2 appears speculative, in view of the absence of any other identifiable reference to Daniel in the fragments of 4QFour Kingdoms^{a-c}. In fact, this reconstruction is as equally problematic as Klaus Beyer’s speculative identification of the seer in 4Q552–553 and 4Q246 with Daniel, an interpretation criticized by Stuckenbruck as “no more than a possibility.”⁴² In terms of possibilities, the one “speaking to them,” אמר להון (4Q552 1 i + 2 6),⁴³ could also be the *angelus interpres*, מלאכא, a word reconstructed in 4Q552 1 i + 2 12 and paralleled by distinct references to “ho[ly] angels” ([מלאכיא קד]ישיא) and one “angel” (מלאכא) in 4Q553a 2 ii 1–2.⁴⁴ An angel or archangel does speak to other angels in 4Q529 1, מלי כתבא די אמר מיכאל למלאכיא,⁴⁵ and the words spoken in 4Q552 1 i + 2 6b–8a, ם[יהשל] ןבשׂתא יומין הוא דן [יהשל] ם, “it will all come to pass within the hour of days; this will accomplish itself,” as reconstructed by Puech,⁴⁶ do concern the revelatory subject of envisioned future events (להוא).

4Q552 1 i + 2 8–9 introduces a royal court setting with the phrases “the king said to me: ‘on account of this they [will instruct] you how

⁴⁰ Text from and translation after Puech, *DJD* 37:61–62.

⁴¹ Translation from the *Jerusalem Bible*, 903.

⁴² Stuckenbruck, “Formation and Re-Formation of Daniel,” 120 and n. 57, with reference to Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte*, 144, 148.

⁴³ Puech, *DJD* 37:61.

⁴⁴ Puech, *DJD* 37:83.

⁴⁵ Text from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1060.

⁴⁶ Puech, *DJD* 37:61–62.

everything did happen,'” **לי מלכא בדיל כדן [יתבוננ]ונך איך כלא עביד** ו**אמר**.⁴⁷ This sentence gives expression to a king's supposition that the protagonist will receive instruction from a heavenly council of angels, presumably represented by one *angelus interpretes* (cf. 4Q552 1 i + 2 6 and 12). The instruction concerning “how everything did happen,” **איך כלא עביר**,⁴⁸ could relate to events occurring in a vision, possibly such as tersely described in the preceding lines, 4Q552 1 i + 2 6–8, which encompasses **כולה**. The narrative appears to convey a dramatic tension between future events (**להוא** [יאתו], **ם** [יהשל] in 4Q552 1 i + 2 6–8) and a reference to a current or past situation with a passive participle (**עביד** in 4Q552 1 i + 2 9), thereby implying the king's ignorance of the contents of angelic communications.

The subsequent portion of text following 4Q552 1 i + 2 12, which relates the rising up of a group, presumably the angels,⁴⁹ resumes an account of the events envisioned. In 4Q552 1 i + 2 10–12a, as reconstructed by Puech, the narrator affirms that the words spoken by the figure in 4Q552 1 i + 2 6, possibly an *angelus interpretes*, will be realized (**להוין**, 4Q552 1 i + 2 10). In addition, 4Q552 1 i + 2 10b–12a, as reconstructed by Puech, reads: **ומפקא להון בפריש [להוא ויקומון] מראיהון** ו**מפקא [יעבוד קרבא] ומפקא**.⁵⁰ In view of a generally unclear distinction between **י** and **ו** in several Qumran manuscripts,⁵¹ the reading **בפרוש**, as presented by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar as well as Donald Parry and Emanuel Tov,⁵² should still be considered a possibility. The sentence in 4Q552 1 i + 2 10b–11a then

⁴⁷ Text from and translation after Puech, *DJD* 37:62. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1103, translated **מלכא** as a vocative, but the sequence verb (**אמר**), complement (**לי**) and subject in determined state (**מלכא**) is possible here and makes better sense as the distinct role of dream-interpretation for a first person singular protagonist in a royal court setting in view of the continuous text of 4Q552 1 i + 2 and 1 ii. Cf. e.g. Job 42:9, **יהוה דבר אליהם**, and 11QtgJob 38:1–2, **אלהא** [הוין] **אמר**.

⁴⁸ On the passive participle **עביד**, cf. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1035.

⁴⁹ Cf. the comment by Puech, *DJD* 37:63, on **מלאביא** in 4Q552 1 i + 2 5 as subject of **הוין קאמין** in 4Q552 1 i + 2 9. Perhaps the rising up, i.e. departure of the angels, marks a shift toward the communication between the first person singular protagonist and another figure, presumably the *angelus interpretes*, at the beginning of the four trees vision.

⁵⁰ Puech, *DJD* 37:62. Cf. Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 1228.

⁵¹ Cf. J.G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 108, who refers to “a vagueness in distinction between *waws* and *yods*, a common feature in numerous sectarian DSS, as well as in Hebrew MSS of medieval times.”

⁵² García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1102; Parry and Tov, *DSSR*, 6:76.

reads “and the end for them [will be] in a wonder (בפריש)⁵³ / in clear view (בפרוש), and their lords [will rise up] and it is against you that one of them [will make war].” As בפרוש is paralleled in both rabbinic Hebrew and other Qumran evidence (see section 3.1 and n. 28 above) and the context of 4Q552 1 i + 2 puts emphasis on the assured fulfillment of envisioned events, the reading בפרוש appears preferable. The latter reconstructed part, in 4Q552 1 i + 2 12a, remains uncertain as it is dependent on comparison with other texts rather than on explicit text-internal indications.⁵⁴ Another possibility for a reconstructed reading would be [יעבוד דינא] ובך חד מנהון, which renders the same number of reconstructed letters and is paralleled by [ע]בד לִי דינא in 4Q553 2 i 3.⁵⁵ In the latter reading, in terms of uprising and judgement, it is possible that judgement on the dominion of a king is recounted as an illustrative case for the conviction that “their end will be in clear view.”

The royal court setting for the subsequent narration of the four trees vision evoked in 4Q552 1 i + 2 is paralleled in Dan 4, in particular Dan 4:22, 24, 27, as well as in 4Q243 3 2, which further comprises the word מלכא.⁵⁶ The divergent portion of text in 4Q553 2 i does not comprise words addressing a king. Nevertheless, 4Q553 2 i 5 comprises a concern for a kingdom, with the phrase “during the kingdom,” במלכות.⁵⁷ 4Q553 1 i 4–5 further appears to concern power, [של]טנה, and its appellation. Together with reference to “three [trees],” [אלניא] תלתה, in 4Q553 1 ii 4,⁵⁸ this provides somewhat different elements of a prelude to the four trees vision with their respective names of dominion, as compared to 4Q552 1 i + 2.

The prelude provided by 4Q552 1 i + 2 concerns issues of power. The four trees vision, with its strongly implied four kingdoms scheme

⁵³ Puech, *DJD* 37:62–63.

⁵⁴ Puech, *DJD* 37:62, 64 (“Le sens demande de comprendre quelque chose comme [יעבוד קרבא] [יעבוד קרבא]”) with reference to 4Q246 1 and for the *vacat* in 4Q552 1 i + 2 12. Cf. הוא יעבד לה קרב in 4Q246 2:8 and קרבא in 4Q544 1 4 // 4Q545 1 ii 19.

⁵⁵ Text of 4Q553 2 i 3 from Puech, *DJD* 37:77.

⁵⁶ Cf. the arrangement of fragments of 4Q243–244, among which 4Q243 3 is associated with a court setting by Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22:139 and 145, and by Flint, “Daniel Tradition at Qumran,” 46.

⁵⁷ Puech, *DJD* 37:77.

⁵⁸ Puech, *DJD* 37:75–76. Puech, *DJD* 37:77, refers to the context of the composition for the reconstruction [אלניא] תלתה, while admittedly indicating the uncertainty of this reconstruction.

(4Q552 1 ii // 4Q553 6 ii), as well as references to rulership and power in other fragments (4Q552 3 4, [תקפ]י חילי[א]; 4Q553 1 i 4, [של] טנה; 4Q553 1 ii 2, תקיף חיל; cf. 4Q553a 3 ii 2, [שלי]ט(יא)),⁵⁹ further confirm this impression. Fragment 6 of 4Q552 provides a theological framework for the notion of power, referring to God Most High (4Q552 6 10), who, according to Puech's reconstruction, "[will give] their[kingdom] to an[other]" ([מלכות]הון אל עליון לא[חרן] ינתן).⁶⁰ 4Q552 6 11 represents a superior divine dimension of "the [righ]teous [God] who is seated above them" ([אלוה צדי]קא די עליהון יתב),⁶¹ and 4Q552 6 12 mentions a mandate over judges, presumably a divine mandate,⁶² in view of the preceding lines. Puech relates his reconstruction of 4Q552 6 10 and successive lines to the context of the four kingdoms scheme, identifying the kingdom at issue in this fragment with "the fourth kingdom or the Kingdom of God" in 4Q246 1 and Dan 7.⁶³ Yet the notion of the divine gift of dominion to another (4Q552 6 10) is further paralleled by the repeated phrase עליא במלכות עליא יתננה, "the most High rules in the kingdom of men, and gives it to whomever he pleases" in MT Dan 4:14, 22, 29.⁶⁴ The relation of 4Q552 6 9–12 to Daniel thereby appears to be general, in terms of an elaboration on a Danielic theme.

4. THE THEOLOGICAL OUTLOOK OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS SCHEME IN 4Q552–553

It has been pointed out in previous scholarly works that the general idea of a four kingdoms scheme, which is presupposed in the four trees vision of 4Q552 1 i + 2 12b and 1 ii // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4, has

⁵⁹ Puech, *DJD* 37:68, 75–76, 85.

⁶⁰ Puech, *DJD* 37:71.

⁶¹ Reconstruction follows Puech, *DJD* 37:71, except for יקא[עד] [מלכא צד]. A reconstruction follows ידא [אלוה צק] [מלכא צד] comprises the same number of letters as יקא[עד] [מלכא צד], is paralleled by אל צדיק in Isa 45:21 and does not constitute confusion with מלכי צדק, such as in 11QMelch.

⁶² Puech, *DJD* 37:71, reads for 4Q552 6 12 [מלכא] שלי[טא די כול מותבה דינין] [שגיאין] ישמיון [serviront].

⁶³ Puech, *DJD* 37:71–72.

⁶⁴ Translation from the *Jerusalem Bible*, 903.

a broader cultural background than Dan 7.⁶⁵ The notion of four trees involved in power struggles is also paralleled in Judg 9:7–17,⁶⁶ a parable in which four trees discuss reigning over one another, which in turn is the object of pseudepigraphical elaboration in Pseudo-Philo's *L.A.B.* 37. Nevertheless, the tree symbolism in 4Q552–553 has a specific linguistic (Aramaic term אֵילָן, Dan 4:10, 11, 17, 20, 23) and thematic (a tree as the symbol for the duration of a kingdom) background in Dan 4. Furthermore, the symbolic identification of one tree, named Babel, with rule over Persia, פֶּרְס (4Q552 1 ii 5–6 // 4Q553 3 + 2 ii + 4 4–5), the geographical association of another tree's orientation to the West, and its identification with rule over “the powers of the sea and over the harbour” (4Q552 1 ii 7 and 9–10) evokes more substantial points of analogy with the book of Daniel and Danielic tradition.

Daniel 7:1–28 makes a symbolic identification of four beasts with four kingdoms, at the end of which Dan 7:27 envisions an everlasting kingdom of the “people of the saints of the Most High” (RSV). Daniel 8 comprises other visions, followed by the reference to the rise of four kingdoms (Dan 8:22), partially identified with the kings of Media and Persia and the king of Greece (Dan 8:20–21). Daniel 10–11 further unfolds an eschatologically loaded vision of the successive rise to power of the kingdoms of Persia and Greece, kings of the South and North (Dan 11:5–6), and the Kittim. Daniel 11:30 mentions ships of the Kittim.

The Aramaic *Pseudo-Daniel* compositions of the Qumran Daniel cycle include a more elaborate perspective of time, starting with a reference to the biblical past up to the eschatological period (4Q243–244).⁶⁷ The reference to Moses in 4Q553 5 i 2 could perhaps have a general point of analogy in the survey of 4Q243 11 ii and 12 that includes the exodus from Egypt. As part of its vision of the eschatological period, the composition 4Q243–244 includes a general reference to “the king-

⁶⁵ Collins, “Apocalypticism and Literary Genre,” 415–17. Cf. W. Burkert, “Apokalyptik im frühen Griechentum: Impulse und Transformationen,” in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 235–54 (244–51), on the theme of four kingdoms, including discussion of its role in ancient Greek literature.

⁶⁶ A parallel noted by Paul, *La Bible avant la Bible*, 141. Puech, *DJD* 37:58, mentions Judg 9:7–15, Ezek 31, Dan 4, 4Q385 2 10, *T. Naph.* 5:8, *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 15:12, and 4Q246 1–2.

⁶⁷ Cf. the edition of the combined text of 4Q243–244 by Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22:133–51.

doms of [the] peoples,” מלכות עממיא (4Q243 16 3), and the dealings “until [this] day,” עד יומא [דנה] (4Q243 24 5), presumably of “the kings of the peoples,” מלכי עממיא (4Q243 24 4).⁶⁸ These general references to kingdoms and kings in an eschatological perspective indicate that 4Q243–244 also envisioned a succession of kingdoms, albeit without specific reference to a four kingdoms scheme in the extant fragments. 4Q246 1:6 specifically refers to a “king of Assyria [and E]gypt,” מלך אתור ומצרים, while 4Q246 2:2–3 mentions a restricted period of years for the rule of a kingdom that crushes everything before the envisioned advent of an eternal kingdom (4Q246 2:5; cf. Dan 7:27).

In light of the above Danielic and pseudo-Danielic evidence, it stands to reason to suppose that 4Q*Four Kingdoms* provided a general elaboration on Danielic themes and Danielic tradition. The four trees vision ultimately represents a combination of Danielic features: the dream vision of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon (Dan 4:4–18), together with its interpretation in Dan 4:19–27 and the four kingdoms scheme with specific identifications in Dan 7–8 and elaborations in Dan 10–11. The fact that four trees rather than four beasts (Dan 7) symbolize four kingdoms in 4Q552–553 has a point of connection to Dan 4. Here, a tree which grows strong and is eventually hewn down by heavenly decree (Dan 4:11–17) is taken to symbolize the king and his dominion (Dan 4:20–27). Integrated in the four kingdoms scheme, the motif of the tree and its branches may symbolize the dynasty of a kingdom.

The setting of 4Q552 1 i + 2 strongly implies a vision of future events (4Q552 1 i 6–8 and 10), possibly with eschatological overtones (מפקא in 4Q552 1 i + 2 10). The presentation of the four kingdoms scheme in connection with the envisioned end of successive dominions, being “in clear view,” [להוא] ומפקא להון בפרוש (4Q552 1 i 10–11), is generally paralleled by Dan 7 (Dan 7:12, 26).

The fact that 4Q552 1 ii 5–6 // 4Q553 6 ii 4–5 symbolically identifies a tree named Babel that rules over Persia could imply a contemporizing exegesis in comparison with Dan 7:4–8, whose vision of four beasts is often taken to symbolize the Babylonian empire, the Medes, the Persians and the Greeks. This contemporizing exegesis would follow currents of thought represented by Dan 10–11 and a pseudo-Danielic tradition of Qumran. A comparison with these writings leaves

⁶⁸ Text and translation from Collins and Flint, *DJD* 22:144, 148.

open the possibility that, apart from Babel's rule over Persia (4Q552 1 ii 5–6 // 4Q553 6 ii 4–5), the identification of the four kingdoms in *4QFour Kingdoms* includes Greece, the kings of the South and North (Dan 11:5–6) or a king of Assyria and Egypt (4Q246 1:6), and the Kitim, i.e. the Romans.

5. CONCLUSION

The above analysis of 4Q552–553 (*4QFour Kingdoms*^{a-b}) has identified two slightly different recensions of the composition and outlined several points of connection with Danielic language, Danielic themes and the contemporizing exegesis of the Danielic four kingdoms scheme. *4QFour Kingdoms* is not in an equally close textual dialogue with Daniel as *Pseudo-Ezekiel* in relation to Ezek 37, for instance, nor is its pseudepigraphical character, the attribution of the composition to Daniel,⁶⁹ assured. Nevertheless, *4QFour Kingdoms* may, in broader terms, be considered a parabiblical work that provides an interpretive elaboration on Danielic themes and exhibits underlying textual variety in the Daniel tradition.

The interpretive elaboration on Danielic themes and tradition in *4QFour Kingdoms* includes a contemporizing exegesis of the four kingdoms, as compared to the symbolic vision in Dan 7:4–8, which may have points of analogy in Dan 10–11, 4Q243–244 and 4Q246. Analogous with the four kingdoms scheme and the envisioned everlasting kingdom that are juxtaposed in Dan 7 (cf. Dan 7:14, 18, 27), the extant fragments of *4QFour Kingdoms* imply a juxtaposition between the earthly lordship whose end is “in clear view” (4Q552 1 i + 2 10) and God's Lordship to whom dominion and mandate of judgement belong (4Q552 6 9–12). The reconstructed reading in 4Q552 6 10, “their[kingdoms] God most High [will give] to an[other],” is generally paralleled by the Danielic motif of the divine gift of the kingdom of men to whomever the most High pleases (Dan 4:14, 22, 29), rather than being specifically connected with Dan 7 and 4Q246 1.⁷⁰ These general points of thematic connection between *4QFour Kingdoms* and the book of Daniel yield the impression that the parabiblical character

⁶⁹ Cf. section 3.2 and n. 42 above.

⁷⁰ Contra Puech, *DJD* 37:71–72.

of 4Q552–553 should not be conceived of in terms of close textual dialogue with a fixed biblical text but in terms of an elaboration of Danielic thought as part of a literary tradition that conceived of Daniel as prophecy.

Parabiblical examples of textual variety are identifiable in the literary setting of the four trees vision, particularly as attested in 4QFour Kingdoms^a. The royal court setting and the reference to a heavenly council of angels in the prelude to the four kingdoms scheme in 4Q552 1 i + 2 5 and 8 are paralleled by MT Dan 4, LXX Dan 4:22, 24 (οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ), 4Q243 2–3, and 4Q244 1–4. The fact that מלאכי־הוֹי הוֹי in 4Q552 1 i + 2 5 has a parallel in LXX Dan 4:22, 24, rather than in the Masoretic text of Daniel, could speak for this being a parabiblical feature of textual variety in 4QFour Kingdoms as a specimen of Daniel tradition. Another parabiblical feature of textual variety is the correspondence between divine epithets in 4Q552 6 2 (אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיּוֹן), 4QDan^a, and LXX Dan 2:20 compared with MT Dan 2:20, which briefly refers to אֱלֹהֵי. In this regard, 4QFour Kingdoms may be situated on a trajectory of early Danielic tradition that incorporated features of the literary history of Daniel, witnessed by a non-aligned Qumran Daniel scroll (4QDan^a) and LXX Daniel, which is not preserved in the Masoretic Text. The glimpse of textual variety that the parabiblical composition 4QFour Kingdoms provides is part of the textual transmission of the Qumran Daniel tradition that carried on into the first century B.C.E., as the palaeographical dates assigned to 4Q552, 4Q553, and 4Q553a indicate. The canonical process that the book of Daniel underwent was well on its way in the first century B.C.E., as citations from Daniel as Scripture in Qumran sectarian texts such as 4Q174 and 11Q13 attest. However, the textual variety underlying 4QFour Kingdoms, together with its first-century B.C.E. transmission history, indicate that the authoritative status of Daniel was probably conceived differently in the late Second Temple period than during the period after, when the fixed canonical text of Daniel came to be categorized among the writings in the (proto-)Masoretic tradition. 4QFour Kingdoms evinces a different picture of authoritativeness: one of Danielic thought that served as a prophetic model in a literary situation that was characterized by relative textual variety in the Daniel tradition.

PLURALISM AND AUTHORITATIVENESS:
THE CASE OF THE S TRADITION*

Charlotte Hempel

The once formidable gap between Hebrew Bible scholarship and the study of the nonbiblical Dead Sea Scrolls has been declining in the course of recent years. Regarding matters of date and provenance, for example, we recognize a trend towards dating large parts of the Bible later than once thought.¹ At the same time a growing proportion of the nonbiblical material has turned out to be presectarian even if we cannot always agree on where to draw the lines in a number of individual cases. It seems to me that both fields—if they may be called that—are also moving closer together on a methodological level. Recent publications have shown that the sectarian texts, such as the *Community Rule*, were not authored from beginning to end by the charismatic Teacher of Righteousness—as once suggested by some—but rather reflect complex literary developments of the kind frequently proposed with reference to biblical texts.² In what follows I would like to use the evidence of the S manuscripts to reflect on the issue of the function of the Rule manuscripts as authoritative works in the community in light of their literary complexity and pluriformity.

Even though the *Community Rule* will be my main illustrative example, some of the most interesting pieces of evidence on the growth of

* It is with great pleasure that I offer the following to mark Florentino García Martínez' achievements as retiring Director of the Qumran Institute in Groningen. An earlier version of this paper appeared in German as "Vielgestaltigkeit und Verbindlichkeit: Serekh ha-Yachad in Qumran," in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009), 101–21.

¹ See for instance the remark by C. Newsom, "A Response to George Nickelsburg's 'Currents in Qumran Scholarship: The Interplay of Data, Agendas and Methodology,'" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1999), 115–21 (116): "Suddenly the distance between Hebrew scriptures and Ugarit looks much greater than that between Hebrew scriptures and Qumran."

² See already P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 11.

this and other texts are cases where literary developments spill over, so to speak, from one text to another. Steven Fraade has recently described such cases rather well as “synoptic intersections.”³ Perhaps the best example of such an overspill is the penal code which is attested in the *Community Rule*, 11QFragment Related to *Serekh ha-Yahad*, the *Damascus Document* as well as 4Q265 (*Miscellaneous Rules*).⁴ At this point it is interesting merely to note the practice of the editors of the 4QS manuscripts of listing passages from the *Damascus Document* and 4Q265 as “parallels” to *Serekh* texts.⁵ I have recently dealt with this question elsewhere and will merely note here the improved presentation of the evidence in Eibert Tigchelaar’s “Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada” in the final volume in the *DJD* series where he refers to “overlaps” in the context of multiple copies of the same composition and “parallels” with reference to material from different compositions.⁶

In what follows I will be chiefly concerned with the copies of the *Community Rule* from Caves 1 and 4. Access to the full text of the ten Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Rule* since the early 1990s has revealed some remarkably complex literary processes in the growth of this text. The scholarly world knew of the existence of several *Rule* manuscripts from Cave 4 from a number of early reports by Józef Milik, the member of the original editorial team of the scrolls responsible for 4QS,

³ See S. Fraade, “Ancient Jewish Law and Narrative in Comparative Perspective: The Damascus Document and the Mishnah,” *Diné Israel: An Annual of Jewish Law* 24 (2007): 65–99 (93). See also C. Hempel, “CD Manuscript B and the Rule of the Community—Reflections on a Literary Relationship,” *DSD* 16 (2009): 370–87.

⁴ Cf. J.M. Baumgarten, “The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 268–76; C. Hempel, “The Penal Code Reconsidered,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 337–48; J. Jokiranta, “Social Identity in the Qumran Movement: The Case of the Penal Code,” in *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (ed. P. Luomanen, I. Pyysiäinen, and R. Uro; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 277–98; S. Metso, “The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (ed. J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, and A. Pinnick; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85–93; eadem, “Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found at Qumran,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 315–35 (317–22); A. Shemesh, “Expulsion and Exclusion in the Community Rule and the Damascus Document,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 44–74.

⁵ Compare P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (*DJD* 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 139.

⁶ See E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Annotated List of Overlaps and Parallels in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran and Masada,” in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (E. Tov et al.; *DJD* 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 285–322.

who would occasionally refer to a reading in 4QS.⁷ It is still a mystery, however, why he never hinted at the remarkable variants between 1QS 5 and 4QS^d and 4QS^b in particular.

The official edition of the 4QS manuscripts by Geza Vermes and Philip Alexander appeared in the *DJD* series in 1998.⁸ It should be noted that Alexander and Vermes point out the possibility that two of the Cave 4 manuscripts (4QS^h and 4QS^j) are not complete copies of the Rule but may comprise instead parts of collections that also include excerpts from S.⁹

The most important variants between 1QS and 4QS can be summed up as follows:

1. *None of the 4QS manuscripts attest material from the two annexes to 1QS, i.e. 1QSa (The Rule of the Congregation) and 1Qsb (The Rule of Blessings).* Because of the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts it is, of course, impossible to say with any certainty that the 4QS MSS lacked these additional documents. It is noteworthy, though, that one fragment which was cautiously published as belonging to 4QS^b, does appear to contain the last words of 1QS followed by the remains of a further line, and the latter does not correspond to the opening lines of 1QSa.¹⁰

Moreover, the only fragment preserved of 4QS^j contains material from the end of the hymn found in 1QS 11. As noted by the editors and also clearly visible on plate 21 in *DJD* 26, remains of stitching are preserved on the left edge of this fragment pointing towards the presence of at least another sheet. As mentioned earlier it is unclear, however, whether or not 4QS^j is part of a fragmentary copy of the Community Rule at all or whether it forms part of a collection of possibly hymnic texts. Vermes and Alexander further observe that this manuscript might have been a *Taschenrolle* or portable scroll. They describe the manuscript as follows: “The tiny writing and the narrow line-spacing are consonant with a very small scroll. 4QS^j may be the remains of a miniature scroll, probably produced in this size as to be

⁷ See J.T. Milik, “Le travail d’édition de fragments manuscrits de Qumran,” *RB* 63 (1956): 60–62 and idem, review of P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline Translated and Annotated, with an Introduction*, *RB* 67 (1960): 410–16.

⁸ Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26.

⁹ Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:11–12, 190, 201.

¹⁰ See 4Q256 XXIII (frg. 8) in Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:63–64.

easily portable.”¹¹ 4Q298 (*Address of the Maskil to the Sons of Dawn*) was similarly described as a portable scroll by the editors Stephen Pfann and Menahem Kister.¹² Whatever the case may be, it is not possible for us to ascertain at this point what followed after the stitching and the end of the hymn in 4QSⁱ.

Having said all this, Emanuel Tov has recently mounted a challenge against the widely held view that 1QSa and 1QSB were part of the same scroll as 1QS. In a very important footnote in his *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, a work that is a goldmine of detailed scholarship with important implications for all kinds of questions, he notes: “1QSa was not stitched after 1QS (disproved by the physical evidence): the stitching holes in 1QSa parallel to lines 1–8 in that scroll have no counterparts in the well-preserved end of the last sheet of 1QS, and therefore the two texts cannot have been stitched together.”¹³ Instead Tov, following an early suggestion by Milik, argues that 1QSa may have been rolled up within 1QS. Tov’s observations present the lack of evidence for 1QSa and 1QSB in the 4QS manuscripts in a new, and perhaps dimmer, light.

2. 4QS^b is the only 4QS manuscript to contain the full spectrum of material found in 1QS. This manuscript comprises, therefore, parts of the first four columns of 1QS, material attested in 1QS’s central section, as well the final hymn found in 1QS 10–11. However, the material containing text corresponding to the central section of 1QS (1QS 5–9), displays *significant variants*. Here, 4QS^b is close to 4QS^d as frequently noted.¹⁴ If the hypothesis put forward by the late Hartmut Stegemann were correct and 1QS was a *Sammelhandschrift* rather than a single composition,¹⁵ then presumably we would have an alternative version of such a *Sammelhandschrift* in the form of 4QS^b.

¹¹ Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:201.

¹² See S. Pfann and M. Kister, “298: 4QWords of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (T. Elgvin et al.; *DJD* 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 1–30 (17).

¹³ See E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 111.

¹⁴ Cf., e.g. S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 74–90 and Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:46.

¹⁵ H. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSB, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 479–505 and idem, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids, Mich.; Eerdmans, 1998), 108–16.

3. 4QS^d does not include any material found in the first 4 columns of 1QS and begins instead with what I have been referring to as the central portion of 1QS starting in 1QS 5. 4QS^d does, however, have a dramatically different text of this material in many places.

Firstly, 4QS^d attests a different heading in 4QS^d 1:1. Thus, 1QS 5:1 begins with the words: “This is the rule for the men of the community” (וזה הסרך לאנשי היחר), whereas 4QS^d 1:1 begins with the title: “Midrash for the Maskil over the men of the law” (מדרש למשכיל על אנשי (התורה)). In 1QS 5:1 we may be dealing with a subheading or, with Stegemann, with the title of a new document within a *Sammelhandschrift*. As far as 4QS^d 1:1 is concerned, there is little doubt that we are dealing with the title of the manuscript.¹⁶

Secondly, 1QS 5 and 4QS^{d/b} display important variants in their descriptions of leading authorities in the community. Whereas 1QS 5 assigns a key role to “the sons of Zadok and the multitude of the men of the community,” 4QS^{d/b} speak at this very point much more simply of “the many” (הרבים).

These substantial divergences between 1QS and 4QS^{d/b} have been the subject of a series of articles and a monograph since 1991. Thus, Vermes argued, convincingly in my view, that 4QS^d represents an earlier tradition that predates 1QS’s account which gives prominence to the sons of Zadok.¹⁷ It is true, that in 1QS the sons of Zadok are said to operate a kind of power-sharing system with the multitude of the people of the community (רוב אנשי היחד).¹⁸ It seems clear, however, that given the way this group is singled out and referred to before the multitude, they were more than a partner in power-sharing—at least in the literary version of events represented by 1QS. In a different context (namely the Jerusalem priests Zadok and Abiathar in the Hebrew Bible) Heinz-Josef Fabry has similarly emphasized the phenomenon of, as he puts it, “Vorordnung bei Gleichrangigkeit” and observes that in literary terms such passages are commonly an indication of latent developments in the background (“literarisch immer ein Signal für

¹⁶ See Metso, *Textual Development*, 37 and Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:85.

¹⁷ G. Vermes, “Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 250–55.

¹⁸ So Metso, *Textual Development*, 122.

latente Vorgänge im Hintergrund").¹⁹ It has further been argued that such a "Zadokite redaction" left its mark elsewhere in 1QS²⁰ as well as in 1QSa as I tried to argue elsewhere.²¹

Vermes's initial proposals concerning the literary developments reflected in 1QS and 4QS^{d/b} were soon confirmed on a much larger scale by the detailed and much cited monograph of Sarianna Metso.²² The Vermes/Metso position found favour with a fair number of subsequent scholars. A significant alternative was proposed by Vermes's former pupil and collaborator on *DJD* 26, Alexander.²³ The key element of Alexander's argument is his stress on the palaeographically earlier date of the 1QS manuscript copy (ca. 100–75 B.C.E.). This he takes as vital evidence against the view that 1QS contains a literarily later account. The crucial question raised by Alexander runs as follows: why would the community produce and preserve a carefully

¹⁹ H.-J. Fabry, "Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran," in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments, Festschrift für Erich Zenger* (ed. F.-L. Hossfeld and L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger; Freiburg: Herder, 2004), 201–17 (202).

²⁰ Cf. the reference to "the sons of Zadok" (בְּנֵי הַצְּדוֹק) in 1QS 9:14 where 4QS^a has "the sons of righteousness" (בְּנֵי הַצְּדִיק). It has been suggested that the *waw* was added in 1QS as part of a Zadokite recension, see R.A. Kugler, "Priesthood at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; vol. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:93–116 (98–99).

²¹ C. Hempel, "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa," *DSD* 3 (1996): 253–67. See also R. Kugler, "A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok," *DSD* 3 (1996): 315–20; G. Vermes, "The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok—Priests—Congregation," in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag, Band I Judentum* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1:375–84. On 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSB see also Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:10.

²² Metso, *Textual Development*. Further, P.S. Alexander, "The Redaction-History of *Serekh ha-Yahad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 437–53; A.I. Baumgarten, "The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration," *DSD* 4 (1997): 137–56; M. Bockmuehl, "Redaction and Ideology in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS/4QS)," *RevQ* 18/72 (1998): 541–60; J.H. Charlesworth and B.A. Strawn, "Reflections on the Text of *Serek ha-Yahad* Found in Cave IV," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 403–35; P. Garnet, "Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5:1–7: Towards a *Serek* Text History," *JSP* 15 (1997): 67–78; C. Hempel, "Comments on the Translation of 4QSD I,1," *JJS* 44 (1993): 127–28; and M.A. Knibb, "Rule of the Community," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:793–97. More recently see also the contributions of J.J. Collins ("Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls") and E.J.C. Tigchelaar ("The Scribe of 1QS") in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97–112 and 439–52, and Fabry, "Zadokiden und Aaroniden."

²³ Cf. Alexander, "Redaction-History."

executed and good quality copy of an earlier and now obsolete text of the Community Rule such as 4QS^d in around 30–1 B.C.E.? Alexander's position has recently been endorsed by Tov²⁴ and Devorah Dimant,²⁵ and Michael Knibb, though clearly sympathetic to the Metso/Vermes hypothesis, stressed the importance of the arguments put forward by Alexander.²⁶ The issue highlighted by Alexander lies at the heart of the topic of this volume.

My own most recent contribution to the debate about the literary priority of 1QS or 4QS^{d/b} has tried to steer the argument into a new direction.²⁷ Even though I have aligned myself earlier with the position of Vermes and Metso, my recent contribution on the literary development reflected in the Rule manuscripts can stand entirely independently from this debate. In an article published in *Revue de Qumrân* in 2006, I attempted to look beyond the variants between 1QS and 4QS. I made the point that it was inevitable scholars would be drawn to the 4QS *variants* as soon as they became known, given this new and crucial textual evidence was not available to most of us for decades. A central question since 1991 has been: which manuscript contains the more original form of the text—as if each manuscript, especially the manuscripts from Cave 4, could be seen as solid building blocks in the growth of the S tradition. A close reading of 1QS and the 4QS manuscripts reveals, however, a significant degree of unevenness, contradictions almost, within one and the same manuscript. A good example of manuscript internal inconsistency in 1QS is the term “the many” (הרבים) which abounds in 1QS 6–7 despite its noticeable absence from 1QS 5.

We noted already the interest generated by the variant between 1QS 5 which allots a leading role to the sons of Zadok over against 4QS^{d/b} which speak instead of the many. It is particularly striking to observe, therefore, the preponderance of references to the many in 1QS 6–7 where we find more than thirty occurrences of the term. Especially remarkable is the evidence of 1QS 8:26 where 1QS refers to the

²⁴ Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 27.

²⁵ Cf. D. Dimant, “The Composite Character of the Qumran Sectarian Literature as an Indication of Its Date and Provenance,” *RevQ* 22/88 (2006): 615–30 (619).

²⁶ Knibb, “Rule of the Community.”

²⁷ C. Hempel, “The Literary Development of the S Tradition—A New Paradigm,” *RevQ* 22/87 (2006): 389–401.

authority of the many, a reference that is absent from 4QS^d's text.²⁸ The complexity of the evidence paints a picture of fluid traditions within and between different manuscripts. I proposed therefore, that the quest for the earliest form of the text of the *Rule* is best identified in the common material shared by the manuscripts rather than in the earlier of two variants where the manuscripts diverge. I identified such common ground in the material on the separation from the people of injustice (אֲנָשֵׁי הָעוֹל) shared by 1QS 5 and 4QS^{d/b} in spite of major differences in the surrounding material.²⁹ Another example is the shared reference to the sons of Aaron and the multitude of Israel in 1QS 5:20–22 and 4QS^d 2:1–2.³⁰ Both manuscripts share this terminology here in remarkable contrast to the language they employ earlier. Both 1QS and 4QS^d are here contradicting their own statements elsewhere (i.e. 1QS 5:2–3 und 4QS^d 1:2).

4. *Almost a whole column of text found in 1QS 8:15–9:11 is lacking from 4QS^e.* The missing material includes *inter alia* the famous reference to the expectation of the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (1QS 9:11).

5. *Finally, 4QS^e closes with the calendrical text Otot instead of the final hymn found in 1QS.*³¹

All this leaves us in little doubt that the Rule of the Community manuscripts testify to a long and complicated literary history of this text. Scholars disagree on the direction of this development: from long to short, from (palaeographically) earlier manuscripts to later ones, from “the many” to “the sons of Zadok” or *vice versa*. What seems difficult to deny, however, is the complex literary developments *per se*. The significance of this apparently modest conclusion—what we might

²⁸ For a fuller discussion of this passage cf. Hempel, “Literary Development of the S-Tradition.” See also Alexander and Vermes, *DJD* 26:112.

²⁹ On this material see C. Hempel, “The Community and Its Rivals According to the Community Rule from Qumran Caves 1 and 4,” *RevQ* 21/81 (2003): 47–81.

³⁰ See C. Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 207–24.

³¹ Cf. J.C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998), 80–84. All divergences between the different manuscripts of S are also presented and analyzed in detail by Metso, see especially her monographs *Textual Development* and *The Serekh Texts* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).

call the minimalist position on S—for the study of ancient texts in a wider sense should not be underestimated.³²

A further twist in this already complex tale are the very close literary relationships, at times even *verbatim* correspondences, between parts of S and other texts, such as the *Damascus Document*.³³ One may think of the relationship between S and D as the literary equivalent of Siamese twins. We may add to this the evidence of 4Q265 (*Miscellaneous Rules*), a text containing material reminiscent of both S and D.³⁴ Finally, this web of textual connections should now also include the textual witnesses of Two Spirits material recently identified by Tigchelaar.³⁵ In short, the literary developments we witness within and between the individual manuscripts of the Community Rule occasionally spill over into other texts. Put differently, the literary phenomena we observe burst the boundaries of individual manuscripts and at times even compositions.

The complex literary evidence provided by the Community Rule manuscripts reviewed above now presents scholars with two rather different questions:

1. How did this literary situation arise? What was the direction of the development and which is the most original text?
2. What is the *significance* of the preservation and production of different texts of the same composition over a prolonged period? Which text was the authoritative one that was referred to by a community at any given time?

In recent years my own thinking and writing has focused very much on the first of these questions, and I have indicated at least briefly

³² On the wider implications of the complex literary developments reflected in the S manuscripts see G.J. Brooke, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction Between Higher and Lower Criticism,” in *New Directions in Qumran Studies* (ed. J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons, and L.K. Pietersen; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 26–42; C. Hempel, “Sources and Redaction in the Dead Sea Scrolls—The Growth of Ancient Texts,” in *Methods and Theories in the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 162–81; and G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (3d ed.; London: SCM, 1994), 23; idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Forty Years On: The Fourteenth Sacks Lecture Delivered on 20th May, 1987* (Oxford: Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies, 1987).

³³ See Hempel, “CD Manuscript B and the Community Rule.”

³⁴ Cf. C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) and further literature referred to there.

³⁵ E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “‘These are the Names of the Spirits of...’: A Preliminary Edition of 4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230) and New Manuscript Evidence for the *Two Spirits Treatise* (4Q257 and 1Q29a),” *RevQ* 21/84 (2004): 529–47.

where I stand on some of the issues arising from the first question. In the remainder of this article I would like to address the second question raised above.

Two different attempts at answering this second question have been offered by Philip Davies and Metso. Davies (in a contribution in honour of another Groningen scholar, the late Adam van der Woude) highlights that 1QS is “incoherent, unsystematic and contradictory” and concludes that it comprises a largely utopian work with little basis in an existing community even though he is not opposed to the notion that a historical community of some kind did exist.³⁶

Metso, on the other hand, was able to draw on her extensive study of the literary development of the S tradition when raising the question of the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Rule*. She finds an answer in “the very nature of halakic literature” in the Second Temple period.³⁷ She argues that the *Community Rule* should not be conceived of as a written law code or constitution where one might look up cases before taking the appropriate action. Instead she envisages an environment where decisions are taken orally on the part of often priestly authorities that were recorded in writing only after the event.³⁸

My own response to these questions is sympathetic to Metso. However, I would like to suggest broadening the context beyond the confines of Second Temple halakic literature to include Second Temple texts more broadly, especially also biblical or less anachronistically with George Brooke “prebiblical texts.”³⁹

³⁶ P.R. Davies, “Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. F. Garcia Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C.J. Labuschagne; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 152–63.

³⁷ S. Metso, “In Search of the *Sitz im Leben* of the *Community Rule*,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 306–15 (312); eadem, “Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from the Rule Texts Found at Qumran,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 315–35; eadem, *Serekh Texts*, 63–70.

³⁸ Most recently Alison Schofield has proposed that the different manuscripts of S reflect a number of diverse communities, cf. A. Schofield, “Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 Serekh Copies,” *DSD* 15 (2008): 96–120.

³⁹ Cf., e.g., G.J. Brooke, “The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. E.D. Herbert and E. Tov; London: The British Library, 2002), 31–40; idem, “Qumran Scrolls and the Demise.” See also E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999).

It seems timely and valuable to me to stimulate more intellectual dialogue between the scholarly debates on the nature of the pre-Bible and canon in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls⁴⁰ and the scholarly debate on the fluidity and complexity of the S manuscripts. The relative neglect of such a dialogue may be based on the surely equally anachronistic and regrettable commonplace distinction between “biblical” and “nonbiblical” manuscripts in Qumran studies. Such a tendency has recently and laudably been lamented also by Jim VanderKam.⁴¹ This sharp distinction would not have occurred to the occupants of the site although they would, of course, have had an idea about which writings carried particular authority. Much of the scholarship of recent decades has demolished the notion of a Bible at this time. It seems to me that both groups of texts, biblical and nonbiblical and the questions they raise in the minds of scholars share a great deal, and I would like to campaign for less *apartheid* in treating them and thinking about them than is sometimes, maybe even frequently, the case.⁴²

I should clarify that by bemoaning the sharp separation on that part of most scholars between biblical and nonbiblical Scrolls, I am not implying that I doubt that some kind of distinction can be made. I am not concerned here with the important debates on the authoritative status of a number of fringe compositions such as *4QReworked Pentateuch*, an issue on which the honouree of this volume was an early contributor in his chapter on “Biblical Borderlines” in the volume *The*

⁴⁰ See, for instance, Brooke, “Rewritten Law”; S. Talmon, “The Crystallization of the ‘Canon of Hebrew Scriptures’ in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Herbert and Tov), 5–20; idem, “The Old Testament Text,” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible, Volume 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome* (ed. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 159–199; E. Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 5–37; idem, “Scriptures: Text,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman and VanderKam), 2:832–36; Ulrich, *Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*; idem, “The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran,” in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. P.W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 51–66.

⁴¹ Cf. J.C. VanderKam, “Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91–109 (95–96).

⁴² Schofield has recently independently drawn on some analogies with the scholarly issues addressed by students of the text of the Hebrew Bible in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, “Rereading S,” 105 n. 19. Schofield sketches what one may call a scenario of local text types for S whereas I am stressing the coexistence of multiple witnesses of S testifying to a lack of concern for final texts in the transmission of both the biblical texts and the S manuscripts.

People of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁴³ I am concerned with broader issues. Even if we did see the day when all of us agreed on which texts are scriptural and which are not, I am concerned about not keeping these entities cut off from one another in the scholarly questions we bring to them. We seem to witness high levels of specialisation even within an already highly specialised field.

I am thinking here particularly of the relaxed attitude witnessed by the Qumran collection towards a plurality of what will become biblical texts⁴⁴ and the equally relaxed and surprising attitude towards a complex and pluralistic S tradition.⁴⁵ Inconsistencies between manuscripts did not trouble the owners of these texts—be they scriptural manuscripts or not. As far as the Qumran biblical scrolls are concerned, the striking absence of evidence indicating any desire towards promoting a standard text has long and often been noted by scholars. Let me quote one of the pioneers in this field, Shemaryahu Talmon, who writes in his contribution to volume 1 of the *Cambridge History of the Bible*:

The co-existence of diverse text-types in the numerically, geographically and temporally restricted covenants' community, the fact that...no obvious attempts at the suppression of divergent manuscripts or of individual variants can be discovered in that voluminous literature, proves beyond doubt that the very notion of an exclusive Textus Receptus had not yet taken root at Qumran.⁴⁶

It may be time now to acknowledge and recognize that the situation Talmon and others have emphasised in the realm of the biblical manuscripts appears to apply also to the Rule manuscripts. By asking the question which of the S manuscripts is the current and most authoritative one, we may be bringing questions to the material that did not arise to the tradents and/or authors of these ancient texts. Instead, the textual fluidity of a broad section of the Qumran library indicates that some—maybe all?—Jews of this period were happy to tolerate inconsistencies in and pluralities of texts.

⁴³ F. García Martínez, "Biblical Borderlines," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (F. García Martínez and J. Trebelle Barrera; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 123–38.

⁴⁴ Recently P. Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst for Division: Cult Disputes as the Motive for Schism in the Pre-70 Pluralistic Environment* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 104ff. speaks of a "laissez-faire attitude."

⁴⁵ Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst for Division*, 115 notes a connection between Bible and S.

⁴⁶ Talmon, "Old Testament Text," 185.

If a group approaches the plurality of scriptural texts with such a “liberal attitude” (to use Talmon’s phrase), it is not altogether surprising that they should handle their own affairs in a comparable manner. Such a relaxed attitude to texts may have several reasons.

First, it seems possible, maybe even probable, that the liberal attitude to nonstandardized texts was shared widely by Jews at this period, a point also raised by Florentino García Martínez with reference to the biblical scrolls.⁴⁷ The question deserves further thought. One may ask, for instance, why the relatively large number of copies of the *Damascus Document* from Cairo and Qumran display a much more stable text—if you like—than the *Serekh*, and that despite the fact that the dates of the ancient and mediaeval copies span a millennium not to speak of the geographical distance of their discovery. One way to account for this discrepancy in the level of variation and stability is almost certainly the recognition that some texts or parts of texts became fixed more readily and earlier than others—for a variety of reasons. The most topical texts such as the *Rule*, for instance, would then contain material that was still evolving.

Second, the plurality of texts further indicates that the manuscripts as we have them frequently preserve snapshots of growing, living, or evolving texts. They do not bear witness to a desire to produce a systematic final and/or authoritative document. In a different context (i.e. Milik’s identification of proto-Esther at Qumran), García Martínez speaks of the “organic growth of a literary text” and, he continues, “we are right inside this organic fabric of traditions which merge as ‘texts’ and end up being ‘bible.’”⁴⁸ The “Bible” element apart, the same applies to the *Community Rule*. From our standpoint the lack of stability in texts and traditions is always an *interim* state, a stage in the development. I ask myself whether the author/editor/scribes behind S ever intended—or even conceived of the need—for this development to end. Maybe change was a permanent fixture.

Talmon speaks of the “living Bible” at Qumran.⁴⁹ Brooke has noted the way in which “rewritten Scripture” signals respect for authoritative traditions. “They show how seriously the Qumran community and its forebears took their inherited authoritative traditions. These

⁴⁷ García Martínez, “Biblical Borderlines,” 123.

⁴⁸ García Martínez, “Biblical Borderlines,” 136.

⁴⁹ Cf. Talmon, “Crystallization of the Canon,” 11.

works were not to be left untouched on the shelf, but to be used and studied.”⁵⁰ These observations may be broadened to include also texts such as the *Community Rule*. The growth of the *Rule* points towards a cumulative and successive process or even processes.

Such a pluralistic picture can already be found in the Hebrew Bible, which includes its fair share of repetition and contradiction happily existing side by side and helping to provide bread and butter to scholars from ancient times to this day. On the one hand, the books of Chronicles offer an alternative version of events recorded also in Samuel and Kings. On the other hand, Deuteronomy addresses legal issues also dealt with in Exodus,⁵¹ extending even to a central text such as the Ten Commandments. This point is highlighted convincingly by Sid Leiman who argues, “the authorities responsible for its [i.e. Scripture’s] canonization were not troubled by apparent or real inconsistencies.”⁵² Later Jewish legal works such as Mishnah and Talmud are also cumulative, and this commonality was noted already by Metso.⁵³ Adin Steinsaltz observes, moreover, “a new formulation occasionally rendered previous mishnayot superfluous, but since it was the rule that ‘a mishnah does not move from its place,’ both statements were retained.”⁵⁴ Comparable to my own assessment of the reasons for different levels of stability in the texts, Steinsaltz writes with reference to rabbinic traditions: “Halakhah pertaining to biological or ritual matters may be preserved unchanged for long periods because of the stability of the objects under discussion, but this is not so in the case of civil law.”⁵⁵ I came to a similar conclusion in my study of the laws of the *Damascus Document* noting that the communal rules display more updating than the noncommunity specific general

⁵⁰ G.J. Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104 (99). See also A.K. Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?” in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 285–306 (285–86 nn. 2–3).

⁵¹ Cf. Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon,” 300, 302 and Brooke, “Rewritten Law,” 32.

⁵² S.Z. Leiman, “Inspiration and Canonicity: Reflections on the Formation of the Biblical Canon,” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition, Volume Two: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (ed. E.P. Sanders; London: SCM, 1981), 56–63 (60).

⁵³ Metso, “In Search of the *Sitz im Leben*.”

⁵⁴ A. Steinsaltz, *The Essential Talmud* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976), 38–39.

⁵⁵ Steinsaltz, *Essential Talmud*, 145.

halakah.⁵⁶ Most recently Kister has noted the shared fluidity between the S manuscripts and talmudic literature.⁵⁷

The relationship between “lower criticism” and “higher criticism” has been the subject of renewed debate in recent years. Especially noteworthy here are two articles by Brooke and Tov respectively.⁵⁸ Qumran has shown that the search for uncovering an *Urtext* in its pristine purity is obsolete at this period of Jewish history. A remarkably similar picture has been painted by David Parker with reference to the emergence of the New Testament.⁵⁹

Closely related to this is our understanding of the role of scribes and, to use Tov’s phrase “their role in the transmission process.”⁶⁰ Talmon writes on this topic: “We can now observe at close range, so to say *in situ*, scribal techniques of the Second Temple period which left their impression on the text in subsequent stages of its history.”⁶¹ And observe we can, now with Tov’s reference book on these processes to hand.⁶² A crucial question that arises with reference to the Rule manuscripts is: Are scribes merely responsible for corrections within one manuscript such as found particularly frequently in 1QS 7–8 or are the same professionals also behind the diverse developments of different manuscripts of S with all their numerous significant variants?

⁵⁶ C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 188–91. There I argue in favour of distinguishing between “general halakah” and “communal rules” in the laws of the *Damascus Document*. I further observe that in contrast to the “communal rules” the “general halakah” (on topics such as the Sabbath) has been transmitted faithfully and displays few indications of updating.

⁵⁷ M. Kister, “The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 61–76 (76 n. 40).

⁵⁸ See Brooke, “Qumran Scrolls and the Demise”; E. Tov, “The Writing of Early Scrolls: Implications for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture,” in *L’écrit et l’esprit: Etudes d’histoire du texte et de théologie biblique en hommage à Adrian Schenker* (ed. D. Böhler, I. Himbaza, and P. Hugo; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 355–71.

⁵⁹ See D.C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). Note also his illuminating references to analogies with the study of the development of the text of Shakespeare’s plays or the poetry of Wordsworth (*Living Text*, 4–6).

⁶⁰ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 25 and ch. 2. See also Brooke, “Qumran Scrolls and the Demise,” 37–38; M. Goodman, “Texts, Scribes and Power in Roman Judaea,” in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (ed. A.K. Bowman and G. Woolf; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 99–108; and Tigchelaar, “Scribe of 1QS.”

⁶¹ Talmon, “Old Testament Text,” 184.

⁶² Tov, *Scribal Practices*.

In trying to sum up, we note that the search for the original text of the Hebrew Bible has gone out of fashion in light of the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Brooke speaks of “the abandoned quest.”⁶³ It seems timely, therefore, to refrain from insisting on establishing the final, authoritative *Endtext* of the *Rule*. Just as Tov can powerfully speak of a “changing biblical text,”⁶⁴ we may also want to accept a “changing *Serekh* text.” Why does it surprise us that the *Rule* texts witness a considerable degree of plurality, while we have come to acknowledge a remarkable degree of flexibility and plurality with reference to the emerging Scriptures?

Given that the notion of a Bible is anachronistic for this period, it may well be that Jewish attitudes to texts were rather relaxed and laid back in the late Second Temple period—surprising and unexpected as this may seem to us.⁶⁵ This clearly also applies to cherished and authoritative texts. No text could have been more revered and cherished than the emerging Bible in a movement such as the one behind the Qumran library whose members were steeped in the Scriptures. The Scriptures gave them the terms of reference for their literary outputs and inspired their identity and self-understanding. The lack of a canon of Scriptures and a *Rule* canon is equally surprising and comparable.⁶⁶ The ancient manuscripts found in the vicinity of Qumran testify to an unexpected degree of literary and textual complexity and plurality, and it seems to me that the issues faced by scholars of the *Rule* texts can be fruitfully and constructively related to the challenges faced by experts on the canon and the text of the Hebrew Bible. The fluidity of these ancient texts appears to cross the boundaries created by customary categories such as biblical and nonbiblical Dead Sea Scrolls.

⁶³ Brooke, “Rewritten Law,” 36.

⁶⁴ E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 1; cf. also Brooke, “Rewritten Law,” 36.

⁶⁵ See Heger, *Cult as the Catalyst for Division*, 115.

⁶⁶ In a different context Al Baumgarten eloquently speaks of the “inelegance” of the picture painted by the texts and observes astutely, “reality is regularly much more disorderly than elegant human attempts to organize and then understand it.” A.I. Baumgarten, “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 137–56 (155).

PROPHECY AND HISTORY IN THE PESHARIM

John J. Collins

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of the pesharim, the formal commentaries on prophetic texts from Qumran, has undergone a transformation in the last twenty years or so. In the early days of research on the Scrolls, the pesharim were regarded as atomistic compositions which paid little attention to the literary or historical context of the prophetic text,¹ and were studied largely as sources for the history of the sectarian movement led by the Teacher of Righteousness, and especially for the light they might shed on its origins.² In the late 1980s and early 1990s, however, several scholars raised objections against this procedure. It was pointed out that “the author of the *pesharim* is somewhat constrained by the datum of the biblical text.”³ George Brooke, building on the work of his teacher William Brownlee, emphasized the exegetical aspect of the pesharim, and noted that they often draw language from passages other than the primary one under consideration.⁴ Philip Davies argued that the author may have inferred historical events from the biblical text, and also inferred them from the *Hodayot*, read as autobiographical poems of the Teacher.⁵ Philip Callaway found that even the most event-like statements “were found to lack specific information

¹ E.g. K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakkuk Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953); F.F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1959).

² See, e.g., F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 89–120.

³ P.R. Davies, “History and Hagiography,” in *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 87–105 (91).

⁴ G.J. Brooke, “The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” in *Images of Empire* (ed. L. Alexander; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 135–59; idem, “The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site* (ed. M.O. Wise et al.; New York, N.Y.: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 339–53. Compare W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979).

⁵ Davies, “History and Hagiography.”

necessary for reconstructing history.”⁶ Scholars drew different conclusions from these observations. Brooke concludes that “Any history they [i.e. the pesharim] represent is in the first instance the history of the period of their composition; say at the turn of the era, or even later. We have no reason to suppose that their author or authors had actually lived through the earlier events they may purport to describe.”⁷ Davies has gone so far as to assert that the Wicked Priest is an entirely fictional character.⁸ Of course such skepticism is by no means universally shared. Michael Wise has published a new attempt to date the Teacher, mainly on the basis of the references to the Wicked Priest in the pesharim.⁹ James Charlesworth has written a spirited defense of the value of these texts as an historical source. Yet Charlesworth also begins by criticizing an earlier generation of scholars who “mined the pesharim for historical information without allowing sufficiently for the hermeneutical nature of the documents.”¹⁰ He calls for a “middle course,” that respects the literary character of the commentaries but does not abandon the quest for historical information. Even Davies, in his 1987 article, allowed that “wherever there is presented as an interpretation of a biblical text information which is not derivable from the text but seems gratuitous, then that information may be regarded as potentially of historical value,”¹¹ although he also raised the possibility that the pesharim may also generate pseudo-historical information from other sources.¹²

⁶ P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988), 168.

⁷ Brooke, “Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” 137.

⁸ P.R. Davies, “What History Can We Get from the Scrolls, and How?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 31–46.

⁹ M.O. Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of His Movement,” *JBL* 122 (2003): 53–87; cf. J.J. Collins, “The Time of the Teacher: An Old Debate Renewed,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint: Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. P.W. Flint, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 212–29.

¹⁰ J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 4.

¹¹ Davies, “History and Hagiography,” 92.

¹² Timothy Lim qualifies Davies’s point by insisting that material derived from biblical texts may also have historical value. T.H. Lim, *Pesharim* (London: Continuum, 2002), 68–69.

All parties agree that “the pesharim are not history in the normal sense of the word.”¹³ The issue is not only that they provide “interpreted history”; all history involves interpretation. Rather the issue is that the historical information they provide is oblique and indirect, and usually in code besides. They provide no coherent narrative to put the allusions in historical context. It is not the purpose of the pesharim to provide historical information as such. Rather, it is their purpose to reassure the members of the 777 that history was unfolding as had been foretold by the prophets, and that they would be vindicated in the not too distant future.¹⁴ In the process, the commentaries reaffirm the identity and rightness of the sectarian movement.¹⁵ Historical information plays an important part in this argument, but it is given selectively and indirectly, and is subordinated to the purpose of reassuring the community.

In this essay I propose to examine the role of historical allusions in the rhetoric of the pesharim, focusing on the commentary that contains the most explicit historical references, *Pesher Nahum*, and the one that has played the largest role in discussions of the history of the sect, *Pesher Habakkuk*.

2. PESHER NAHUM

Pesher Nahum consists of five fragments from five well-preserved columns of text, and a fragment from a sixth column.¹⁶ The textual citations begin at Nah 1:3b and extend to Nah 3:14. The pesher presumably

¹³ J. Jokiranta, “Pesharim: A Mirror of Self-Understanding,” in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. De Troyer and A. Lange; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 23–34 (27).

¹⁴ B. Nitzan, “The Peshar and Other Methods of Instruction,” in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac, Part II: The Teacher of Righteousness* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Kraków: Enigma, 1991), 209–20 (213), writes that the peshar “was intended to show that...all that occurs in the reality of history... does not deviate or contradict the words of the ancient prophets and visionaries.” But the demonstration of the reliability of prophecy is a means to the end of providing reassurance to the community.

¹⁵ This point is emphasized especially by Jokiranta, “Pesharim.”

¹⁶ For a recent edition of the text see M.P. Horgan, “Nahum Peshar (4Q169 = 4QpNah),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Volume 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 144–56. See also her older

covered the whole book. The biblical book is an oracle concerning the fall of Nineveh. The pesher takes no account of the original setting. It has been suggested that “the author of the pesher does not take the eschatological significance of biblical prophecy as its only intended meaning. Rather, the pesher application would have superseded, but not invalidated, the earlier historical significance that the original prophet himself believed to be the subject of his prophecy.”¹⁷ But the extant fragments give no support to this suggestion. According to a famous statement in 1QpHab 7:1–8 “God told Habakkuk to write down the things that are going to come upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the end-time he did not make known to him.” If the pesharim had any relevance to the time of the prophet, it is simply of no interest to the latter-day interpreter.

What then was Nahum’s prophecy about? The first extant passage of the pesher expounds Nah 1:3b–6, which describes a theophany of Yahweh: “in whirlwind and storm is His way and cloud is the dust of his feet...” (4Q169 1–2 1). In this case the pesher does not depart far from the biblical text, which it interprets in terms of divine judgment. It does, however, offer an interpretation of the sea: “He rebuked the sea and dried it up. Its interpretation: “the sea”—that is all the Ki[ttim]” (4Q169 1–2 3). Only the beginning of the word Kittim is preserved. The identification of the sea as the Kittim, if the restoration is correct, seems gratuitous, and reflects an assumption that the text must refer to historical entities. In the words of Brooke: “This would indicate that the author lives during the period of the continuing domination of the Kittim and looks for divine vindication.”¹⁸ The consensus of scholarship is that the Kittim in the pesharim should be identified as the Romans.¹⁹

The historicizing application of the text is taken further in the exposition of Nah 2:12–14 in 4Q169 3–4 i 1–2: “Where the lion went to bring the lion’s cub and there was no one to frighten.”²⁰ In this

edition, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979), 158–90.

¹⁷ S. Berrin, *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 15.

¹⁸ See Brooke, “Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim,” 139.

¹⁹ T.H. Lim, “Kittim,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:469–71; idem, *Pesharim*, 64–67.

²⁰ Translation from Berrin, *Peshar Nahum Scroll*, 87.

case we are told that “its interpretation concerns Deme]trius King of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem on the advice of the Seekers-After-Smooth Things” (4Q169 3–4 i 2). There follows a statement that “[Jerusalem was not given] into the hand of the kings of Greece from Antiochus until the rise of the rulers of the Kittim, but afterwards it will be trampled” (4Q169 3–4 i 3). There is consensus that the reference is to Demetrius III Akairos (94–88 B.C.E.) who was invited by the Jewish opponents of King Alexander Jannaeus.²¹ He routed Jannaeus in battle, but suffered heavy losses and withdrew from Judea. In this case, the word לביא (lioness) appears to be read as a *hip'il* infinitive, and this provides the connection to the invitation issued to the Greek king.²² This passage is exceptional in providing actual names, but it shows clearly the attempt to correlate the words of the prophet with contemporary (or near contemporary history). In the words of Timothy Lim, it gives the reader “the clearest indication that the pesherist was indeed interested in history. His commentary was not just an exegetical and literary play on the words and oracles of the prophet Nahum, but in it was also a concern for contemporary life and events.”²³

The following verse in Nahum, “the lion tears enough for his cubs, and strangles prey for his lionesses” (Nah 2:13), is given a related but distinct interpretation: “concerning the lion of wrath, who would strike with his great ones and the men of his counsel” (4Q169 3–4 i 5). There is continuity with the biblical text, insofar as both text and interpretation describe violent action by the “lion,” but the specific interpretation depends on correlation with a story known from another source. There is a further allusion to this story in the following verses, which refer to hanging men up alive. This is almost universally recognized as a reference to Alexander Jannaeus, who had 800 of his opponents crucified.²⁴ The opponents are identified as the “Seekers after Smooth Things,” a phrase that had been recognized as an allusion to the Pharisees even before the publication of *Pesher Nahum*.²⁵

²¹ Josephus, *A.J.* 13.372–416.

²² Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 134–35.

²³ Lim, *Pesharim*, 64.

²⁴ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 104–9. G.L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 557–73, regards him as a gentile king. The “lion of wrath” is also mentioned in 4QpHos^b ii 2–4.

²⁵ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 91–99; A.I. Baumgarten, “Seekers After Smooth Things,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman and VanderKam),

4Q169 3–4 ii 1 further identifies the “Seekers after Smooth Things,” also referred to as Ephraim, as the “city of bloodshed, filled with plunder” mentioned in Nah 3:1a.²⁶ Here again the pesher completely disregards the original context, which referred to Nineveh. “Filled with plunder” is deliberately ambiguous: Nineveh was filled with plunder taken from other nations but will now be filled with plundering by its conquerors. The pesher picks up the motif of plundering in the next lemma, and takes it only in the sense that the city is the victim:

Its interpretation concerns the dominion of the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things: the sword of the nations will not cease from the midst of their congregation. Captives, plunder, and heated strife (are) among them, and exile for fear of the enemy. And a multitude of guilty corpses will fall in their days... (4Q169 3–4 ii 4–6)

The prophet blamed the “harlotries” of Nineveh for its destruction. The pesher blames “those who lead Ephraim astray—with their false teaching, their lying tongue, and deceitful lip they lead many astray” (4Q169 3–4 ii 8). When the prophet says of Nineveh, “I will treat you with contempt,” the pesher says that this “concerns the Seekers-After-Smooth-Things, whose wicked deeds will be revealed to all Israel in the last period” (4Q169 3–4 iii 3). The pronouncement that “Nineveh is devastated” is similarly taken to refer to the “Seekers-After-Smooth-Things, whose counsel will perish and whose congregation will be dispersed” (4Q169 3–4 iii 6–7).

The prophet continues by asking “will you do better than Amon?” the Egyptian capital Thebes which had been captured by the Assyrians in 663 B.C.E. According to the pesher, Amon is Manasseh (4Q169 3–4 iii 9), presumably because Manasseh is traditionally paired with Ephraim. The following column applies to Manasseh the destruction wrought upon Thebes: “Its interpretation concerns Manasseh at the

2:857–58; J.C. VanderKam, “Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 465–77; L.H. Schiffman, “Pharisees and Sadducees in Pesher Nahum,” in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ed. M.Z. Brettler and M.A. Fishbane; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 272–80; Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 97–98; H. Bengtsson, *What’s in a Name? A Study of the Sobriquets in the Pesharim* (Uppsala: Uppsala University, 2000), 110–35. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 577–99, identifies the Seekers as the rulers of Jerusalem.

²⁶ Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 590, denies that the Seekers are identified with Ephraim.

last period, whose reign over Israel will be brought down... his wives, his children, and his infants will go into captivity. His warriors and his honored ones [will perish] by the sword" (4Q169 3-4 iv 3-4). When the prophet switches back to address Nineveh, "you also will be drunken, you will go into hiding" (Nah 3:11), we are told that this concerns "the wicked ones of E[phraim...] whose cup will come after Manasseh" (4Q169 3-4 iv 5-6). It is generally agreed that Manasseh should be identified as the Sadducees,²⁷ and that the passage refers to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C.E.²⁸

The biblical book of Nahum celebrated the destruction of Nineveh as a fitting punishment. The pesher has more of a future orientation. Shani Berrin concludes that "the historical value of 4QpNahum lies in its application of prophetic texts to describe the divine retribution of 'Ephraim' and, to a lesser degree, 'Manasseh.'" ²⁹ But this retribution is not entirely future. Divine retribution against the Pharisees is already illustrated by the punitive actions of Alexander Jannaeus, in hanging men alive. It is quite likely that some of the destruction couched in the future tense, such as the captivity of Manasseh, is *ex eventu* prophecy, and has already taken place. But there remains the final "cup" of Ephraim, which will come after Manasseh, and, of course, the destruction of the Kittim is entirely in the future. By showing, or claiming to show, that Nahum's prophecy applied to these parties, and that it had already been partially fulfilled, the pesherist strengthens the credibility of the judgment yet to come.

Berrin, following a suggestion of Hanan Eshel, entertains the possibility that the pesher was revised over time:

Perhaps Jannaeus's suppression of the Pharisees had been presented in an early version of 4QpNah as 'the' eschatological fulfillment of Nahum, possibly with the flight of the Pharisees described as their final eradication.

²⁷ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 268; H. Eshel, "Ephraim and Manasseh," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman and VanderKam), 1:253-254. Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 107, says the reference is to the precursors of the group later known as the Pharisees. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 587-89, denies the identification.

²⁸ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 276: "The pesher clearly treats Manasseh's downfall as an accomplished fact, but this still leaves some window for the date of composition. The defeat of Manasseh could be dated to 63 BCE when Aristobulus was imprisoned by Pompey (Ant 14 #57); to 61 BCE when he was taken to Rome in captivity (#79), or to 49 BCE with his death (#124). In any case, this pericope reflects the mid-first century BCE. Its composition may be dated after Pompey's invasion of Judea and, in all likelihood, shortly before Hyrcanus's death."

²⁹ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 305.

Subsequently, with the Pharisaic revival and dominance under Salome, the pesher would have required editing. Some of the interpretations would have required serious updating.³⁰

While this hypothesis cannot be disproved, it hardly seems necessary. Presumably the original pesher covered all of Nahum, so we would have to assume that some of the early interpretations were lost or suppressed.³¹ The pesher makes quite good sense as a unified composition. The recollection of events from an earlier generation serves a purpose here. It establishes the reliability of the prophecy by showing that it has been partially fulfilled. In this respect, we may compare the use of *ex eventu* prophecy in the apocalypses, which also serves to establish the reliability of those predictions that remain to be fulfilled. In order to serve this purpose, the events to which reference is made must be well known, at least to the presumed readers of the pesher. They must reflect an account of the historical episodes in question that was accepted by the pesherist's community, whether or not it was objectively true. It should also be noted that the earliest of the events in question took place no more than twenty-five years before Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem, certainly within living memory.

The pesher, however, does not narrate the events in question. It merely alludes to them. For this reason, the judgment of Brooke that "we can learn little or nothing of the history of the Qumran Community from these texts, and little enough about the Romans,"³² holds true for *Pesher Nahum*. The historical allusions presuppose a narrative, but they do not supply it. We are fortunate that we have a relevant historical narrative in the writings of Josephus. We do not know whether the initial readers of the pesher had such a written narrative. They probably did not need it. The actions of Alexander Jannaeus surely remained fresh in the popular memory for a generation or two, and the Roman conquest of Jerusalem even more so. But we must assume that the original readers knew enough of the history to catch the allusions. There is little scope for fiction here. Even if the implied historical narrative was distorted, it must have been established well enough to lend credibility to the view that prophecy was being fulfilled.

³⁰ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 215.

³¹ Berrin, *Pesher Nahum Scroll*, 215, suggests that they were suppressed "to preserve the authoritative nature of a given current version."

³² Brooke, "Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim," 159.

3. PESHER HABAKKUK

The book of Habakkuk raises different questions from the book of Nahum, and the difference is reflected in the pesher, which deals with the first two chapters of the book, but not the hymn in the third. The book begins with a plaintive cry: "O Lord, how long shall I cry for help?" The Lord responds that he is bringing the Chaldeans, a fierce and impetuous nation, but this leads the prophet to complain of the conduct of these people who capture people as a fisherman catches fish. In the second chapter, the Lord assures the prophet that end foretold in the vision will surely come: "if it tarries wait for it. It will surely come, it will not delay" (Hab 2:3). Pride and wealth are treacherous and will not endure, but the righteous will live by faith. Five woes are proclaimed against evildoers of various sorts.

As Jutta Jokiranta has noted in her recent study, the pesherist "ignores the genres of prayer and lament in the scriptural text. He seeks identifications."³³ The biblical text is by no means free of ambiguity, as it is not explicit as to who are the wicked mentioned at the beginning, or who are condemned in the five woes in Hab 2. Habakkuk evidently engaged in polemic against those he regarded as wicked among his own people as well as the Chaldeans.³⁴ The pesherist, predictably, identifies the Chaldeans as the Kittim, but distinguishes several distinct "wicked" agents: traitors, the house of Absalom, the Wicked Priest, the Man of the Lie, and of course the Gentiles.³⁵ These identifications are based on the biblical text in part, but not entirely.

At the end of the first column, the pesher cites Hab 1:5. Most of the citation is lost because of the fragmentary nature of the text, but the interpretation presupposes the reading בוגדים ("traitors") rather than בגוים. It is unlikely that the pesherist altered the text here. The

³³ Jokiranta, "Pesharim," 23–34. Compare Lim, *Pesharim*, 68: "It is the nature of pesherite exegesis to read into the scriptural text allusions to contemporary figures and events."

³⁴ See J. Jokiranta, "Pesharim and Sectarian Identity," in *Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran Serakhim and Pesharim* (Ph.D. diss., Helsinki, 2005), 102–60 (132–33). Some scholars have tried to distinguish different layers in the book. The original core would have been concerned with social critique. Later, the Babylonians became the focus of criticism.

³⁵ Jokiranta, "Pesharim and Sectarian Identity," 136–37.

same reading is probably presupposed in the LXX (οἱ καταφρονηταί).³⁶ The citation may be reconstructed as follows: “Look, O traitors, and see, wonder and be amazed, for I am doing a deed in your days that you would not believe if it were told.” The interpretation that follows (1QpHab 2:1–10) is concerned exclusively with the identification of the traitors. Not one but three identifications are affirmed: 1) “the traitors together with the Man of the Lie, for (they did) not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God”; 2) “the trait[ors to] the new [covenant,] f[o]r they were not faithful to the covenant of God”; and 3) “[... the trai]tors at the end of days.” A prophecy may have more than one referent. Each of the three groups is accused of not “believing” or “being faithful” (אֱמַן), in accordance with the citation, and the reference to “your days” may have suggested the interpretation in terms of the end of days. But the specific identifications are not derived from the biblical text. The pesher presupposes that the Man of the Lie and the Teacher are known figures, and that the Liar and his followers can plausibly be identified as “traitors.” It also presupposes that the Man of the Lie was not a member of the new covenant. It presupposes a narrative, whether written or oral, about the Teacher and his adversaries that is then correlated with the prophetic text, by means of the catchwords “traitors” and “believe.”³⁷

A second illustration may be taken from 1QpHab 8. Here there is a relatively lengthy citation of Hab 2:5–6, which concerns a haughty man who multiplies what is not his own. The interpretation identifies the figure as the Wicked Priest, although this figure has not hitherto been introduced and the biblical text gives no hint of his priestly status. The points of contact with the text are that he became arrogant and took property that was not his own. One might conceivably argue that his specific crimes are inferred from the words of the prophet, but there must have been a reason why this particular prophecy was thought to apply to the Wicked Priest in the first case. The pesher also distinguishes two stages in the career of the Wicked Priest: he was called by the name of truth when he first arose, but when he ruled in Israel he became arrogant. This can hardly be inferred from the prophet’s

³⁶ Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 23; Jokiranta, “*Pesharim* and Sectarian Identity,” 137–38.

³⁷ See already my essay, “Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 301–14 (309).

statement that “wealth betrays a haughty man,” since the prophet implies that the man was haughty even before he took the property of others. Here again the pesher presupposes certain information about this priest, which is not derived from the biblical text.

A third illustration can be taken from 1QpHab 11. The text of Hab 2:15 is cited as follows: “Woe to him who gives his neighbors to drink, mixing in his wrath—indeed, making (them) drunk in order that he might look upon their feasts” (1QpHab 11:2–3). The reading “their feasts,” *מְעוּדֵיהֶם*, differs from MT *מְעוּרֵיהֶם*, “their nakedness.” The reading of the pesher is listed as a possible textual variant in BHS, but Lou Silberman suspected a deliberate alteration, to provide a peg on which to hang the interpretation.³⁸ The variant is only attested here and in 1QH^a 12:12–13 (Suk. 4:11–12); it is not found outside the Scrolls.³⁹ In any case, the “feasts” become the main focus of the interpretation here. There is no reference to drunkenness in the interpretation. This motif is deferred to the following pericope, 1QpHab 11:8b–15, where it is emphasized. Instead, the pesher construes the text to mean that the villain drinks or swallows his neighbor. But here again the commentator introduces information that has no apparent basis in the biblical text: the statement that the priest pursued the teacher to his place of exile.

From these examples, it should be clear that the commentator does not base his interpretation exclusively on the passage that is being expounded. There are always points of connection with the text, but the interpreter has a lot of flexibility. A text may be interpreted in more than one way, and words and phrases do not necessarily carry the same meaning whenever they occur. *הַצְדִּיק*, “the righteous,” from Hab 1:13 is interpreted as the Teacher of Righteousness in 1QpHab 5:10, but the *צְדִיק* of 2:4b (“the righteous man will live by his faithfulness”) is interpreted as everyone who observes the Law and is faithful to the Teacher in 1QpHab 8:1–3. Many features of the text are ignored.⁴⁰ Consequently, what is found in the interpretations is never simply required by the text, although it is limited by the points of connection that can be found in a given lemma.

Various other sources may be brought to bear on the interpretation of a specific passage. Brooke, building on the work of Brownlee,

³⁸ L.H. Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab),” *RevQ* 3/11 (1961): 323–64 (358).

³⁹ See further Lim, *Pesharim*, 56.

⁴⁰ This is more obvious in the pesher on Isaiah.

has drawn attention to the use of secondary biblical citations.⁴¹ So, for example, the interpretation of Hab 1:17 in 1QpHab 6:8–12 cites Isa 13:18, “who take no pity on the fruit of the womb,” and draws other phrases from similar oracles. The pesherist is evidently steeped in the language of Scripture, and draws on it incessantly. Brooke cautions: “Before jumping to conclusions, therefore, about the history that may or may not be reflected in reading between the lines of the pesharim, it is important first of all to identify which literary sources are being used by the interpreter.”⁴² A pertinent example can be found in 1QpHab 11. Hab 2:16, “You will be sated with shame rather than glory. Drink then, you yourself, and totter. The cup of Yahweh’s right hand will come around to you and disgrace (will come) upon your glory,” is interpreted as follows:

Its interpretation concerns the priest whose shame prevailed over his glory, for he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart, but he walked in the ways of inebriety, in order that the thirst might be consumed, but the cup of the wrath of God will swallow him up, adding to all his shame. (1QpHab 11:12–15)⁴³

In this case, the reference to drunkenness is suggested by the text. Józef Milik pointed out that the interpretation draws on Deut 29:18, “to devastate the dry and the irrigated land together,” a phrase that is repeated in 1QS 2:14 in a metaphorical sense.⁴⁴ Milik concluded that here too it serves as a metaphor for unfaithfulness. It remains true that the metaphor would be all the more apt if the priest in question had a reputation for heavy drinking, but caution is necessary nonetheless.

A more fundamental question about the possibility of identifying historical references in the pesharim was raised by Davies.⁴⁵ On the one hand, he raised the possibility that the interpreters might “infer ‘events’ from the biblical text.”⁴⁶ On the other hand, he noted correspondences between passages in the *Hodayot* and 1QpHab, especially in passages relating to the Teacher, and suggested that “historical

⁴¹ Brooke, “Pescharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 341.

⁴² Brooke, “Pescharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 343.

⁴³ Translation from Horgan, “Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab),” in *Pescharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. Charlesworth), 157–85 (181).

⁴⁴ J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM, 1959), 69–70.

⁴⁵ Davies, “History and Hagiography.”

⁴⁶ Davies, “History and Hagiography,” 92.

events” in the life of the Teacher may have been inferred from the *Hodayot*, on the assumption that the so-called “Teacher Hymns” were read as reflecting the Teacher’s experience.

As his primary illustration, Davies cited the interpretation of Hab 2:15 in 1QpHab 11:2–8:

Woe to him who gives his neighbours to drink, mixing in his poison, indeed, making them drunk in order that he might look upon their feasts. The interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness—to swallow him up with his poisonous vexation—to his place of exile. And at the end of the feast, (during) the repose of the Day of Atonement, he appeared before them, to swallow them up and to make them stumble on the fast day, their restful sabbath.⁴⁷

Davies argued that some of the interpretation derives “naturally, if not inevitably from the biblical text itself,” once it is assumed that the hero is the Teacher and the villain the Wicked Priest. But he identified three important items that were not extracted from the text: the “exile” of the Teacher, the “making stumble,” and the “swallowing.” He then noted that Hab 2:15 is also quoted in 1QH^a 12:10–13:⁴⁸

And they, teachers of lies and seers of falsehood,
have schemed against me a devilish scheme,
to exchange the Law engraved on my heart by Thee
for the smooth things (which they speak) to thy people.
And they withhold the drink of knowledge from them that thirst
And for their thirst they give them vinegar to drink
To look upon their straying, behaving madly at their festivals
That they be caught in their nets...⁴⁹

Davies claimed that “the ‘extraneous’ items in the 1QpHab interpretation happen all to be present in the hymn. ‘Looking upon their straying’ comes between ‘giving to drink’ and ‘feasts,’ which seems to include it within the Habakkuk quotation of the hymn... The commentary follows this line, using the word ‘stumble’ instead.”⁵⁰ The “exile” of the “Teacher” is described immediately before the relevant passage in 1QH^a:

⁴⁷ Translation from Horgan, *Pesharim*, 19.

⁴⁸ Davies, “History and Hagiography,” 94. Davies cited the *Hodayot* passage as 1QH^a 4:9f., in accordance with Sukenik’s edition.

⁴⁹ Translation from Davies, “History and Hagiography,” 94. Davies noted that “the quotation here is mixed up with Isa 32.6 and Ps. 69.22.”

⁵⁰ Davies, “History and Hagiography,” 94–95.

Teachers of lies [have smoothed] Thy people [with words].
 And [false prophets] have led them astray...
 They have banished me from my land
 Like a bird from its nest...

Davies concludes:

The hymn pictures the psalmist (= the ‘Teacher’) in exile with ‘teachers of lies’ plotting to deceive the ‘thirsty’ who wish to drink (of the Law from the Teacher?) so as to cause them to go astray, especially as regards feast-days, and fall into snares. Finally, the ‘swallowing’ of the ‘Teacher’ by the ‘Wicked Priest’ is nothing else than an allusion to the ‘devilish scheming’ (*zmmu bly^l*) of 4.10. Whatever the historical background (if any) of the accusations in the hymn, the author of the Habakkuk commentary, using this passage, has been able, it seems, to construct an event with the ‘Teacher’ in exile and his flock, threatened with stumbling on a feast day.⁵¹

Not all the correspondences claimed by Davies are persuasive. “Stumbling” and “straying” may mean much the same thing, but the specific metaphors are different. The relevant passage in the *Hodayot* does not use the word “stumble.” The reference to swallowing is not derived obliquely from “devilish scheming” but from Hab 1:13, “when the wicked swallows the righteous,” which is cited in 1QpHab 5:8–9, but interpreted with reference to a different incident.⁵² Hab 2:15 is cited in both texts, even with the same textual variant over against MT, which reads “their nakedness” (מעוריהם) instead of “their feasts” (מועדיהם). The only item in the pesher that might conceivably be derived from the hymn is the reference to the exile of the Teacher. Brooke, while generally affirming Davies’s analysis, argues that “it is not as if there are two written sources, Hab 2:15 and the *Hodayot*, which are woven together in 1QpHab. Rather, it is because 1QH is also using Hab 2:15 that its broader context, which contains allusions to other scriptural texts, notably Ps 69:22–24, can be seen to lie behind the interpretation in the Habakkuk Commentary.”⁵³ In short, the hymn is only one of several interdependent texts echoed in the pesher.

The idea that commentators might infer historical events from hymnic material is not unreasonable in itself. The prose account of the crossing of the sea in Exod 14 is most probably inferred from the

⁵¹ Davies, “History and Hagiography,” 95.

⁵² Lim, *Pesharim*, 68.

⁵³ Brooke, “Pesharim and the Origin of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 344.

poem in Exod 15.⁵⁴ Baruch Halpern has argued persuasively that the prose account of the death of Sisera in Judg 4 is inferred from the Song of Deborah in Judg 5.⁵⁵ Halpern argued that the authors of the prose texts should properly be regarded as historians: they were attempting to reconstruct history from the material available to them. The hymns were allusive, and did not give clear accounts of the incidents to which they refer. The prose accounts clarify the specific details, even if they do so by constructing imaginative accounts that are ultimately fictitious. The peshar, however, is almost as allusive as the hymn on which it supposedly relies. The logic of the peshar requires that the reader recognize the allusions, and accept that the prophecy has already been fulfilled in part. In this respect it resembles the logic of *ex eventu* prophecies in the apocalypses. Confidence in the reliability of the coming judgment of the sinners, and vindication of the elect, depends on finding correspondences between the prophetic text and the historical narrative known to the reader. But the pesharim are not constructing that narrative, only alluding to it in an elliptic way. They are scarcely intelligible to the modern reader who does not know that narrative, and they would have been unintelligible in antiquity if the referents of the stereotypical language were not known in the community. We do not have a written narrative of the history of the community, except for the brief schematic account at the beginning of the *Damascus Document*. We do not know whether such a written account ever existed, but there must at least have been a well-known oral narrative.

Davies has questioned the historical value of the references to the main adversaries of the Teacher, the Man of the Lie and the Wicked Priest. Both are known primarily from the pesharim. The Liar is also known from the *Damascus Document*, but the Wicked Priest is not mentioned anywhere else in the corpus of the Scrolls. "How is it," he asks, "that plurals in 1QH ('teachers of lies . . . seers of falsehood') have become singulars in 1QpHab (the 'Man of the Lie')? This is, as we shall see, a more general phenomenon, whereby rather vaguer plural terms in the Hymns become soubriquets for discrete individuals, or for identifiable parties, in the *pesharim*."⁵⁶ Should we conclude that the

⁵⁴ F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 123–44.

⁵⁵ B. Halpern, *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco, Calif.: Harper & Row, 1988), 76–104.

⁵⁶ Davies, "History and Hagiography," 97.

individual is inferred from the vaguer plural term? Or is the difference here a matter of genre? The *Hodayot* are to some degree modeled on the biblical psalms, where enemies are typically referred to in vague general terms, which could more easily accommodate the new situations of the people who used the psalms.⁵⁷ It seems to me easier to suppose that specific enemies were referred to vaguely in the hymns, in the manner of the Psalms, than to suppose that the specific enemy in the pesharim is inferred from the plurals of the hymns. Be that as it may, the *Hodayot* provide no basis at all for speaking of a “Wicked Priest.” It is surprising, to be sure, that this figure never appears outside of the pesharim, but the allusions in the commentaries presuppose that the readers knew of a figure who could be so labeled.⁵⁸ He is evidently distinct from the Man of the Lie, despite some correspondences in description.⁵⁹ There is no indication that the latter ever ruled in Israel. In his most recent discussion of the topic, Davies suggests that the Wicked Priest was invented out of whole cloth. But if that were the case, the original readers of the pesharim would have been even more bewildered than their latter-day counterparts.

When Davies wrote his article more than twenty years ago, it was commonly assumed that the supposed encounter between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest dated to the mid-second century B.C.E., approximately a century before the pesharim were written. It was reasonable, then, to question whether the authors of the pesharim had any reliable sources about those events, especially in view of the lack of written historical narratives. The mid-second century dating of the Teacher, however, was based to a great degree on the belief that the usurpation of the high priesthood by the Maccabees was a decisive factor in the

⁵⁷ See e.g. H. Gunkel, *An Introduction to the Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel, Completed by Joachim Begrich* (trans. J.D. Nogalski; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998), 160, on the “Individual Complaint Songs.”

⁵⁸ One possible explanation of the absence of the Wicked Priest from the *Rule* books and *Hodayot* is that the conflict between him and the Teacher had not yet taken place when the older compositions were written.

⁵⁹ G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 77; H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: published privately, 1971), 82–87, 95–115. See the discussion by T.H. Lim, “The Wicked Priest or the Liar?” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 46–51.

formation of the sect.⁶⁰ But there is no explicit support for this belief in the texts. The reasons for the separation of the sect given in the *Damascus Document* and 4QMMT concern the cultic calendar and halakic observance.⁶¹ At no point is mention made of the legitimacy of the high priest. It now appears that the settlement at Qumran should be dated no earlier than 100 B.C.E. rather than half a century earlier.⁶² Wise has made a strong argument that the references to the Teacher should be taken to refer to the same general period as the more clearly identifiable references in the pesharim, the first half of the first century B.C.E.⁶³ The gap between the time of composition and the events alluded to need be no more than a generation.

None of this guarantees that the history that we glimpse between the lines of the pesharim is accurate in an objective sense. It is surely tendentious and perspectival. But in order for the pesharim to function intelligibly, they must have referred in a recognizable way to the historical narrative that was accepted in the community. The correspondences provided the assurance that prophecy was being fulfilled, and would eventually be fulfilled in a definitive way. This assurance in turn confirmed the community in its way of life.

4. CONCLUSION

4QMMT, the so-called Halakhic Letter, sets out the reasons why the sect separated from the majority of the people, and makes an attempt to persuade the addressee of the rightness of its way, by urging him to consult the Scriptures: “we have [written] to you so that you may study (carefully) the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David...”⁶⁴ The passage continues: “and it is written ‘and

⁶⁰ See the review of scholarship by J.C. VanderKam, “Identity and History of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; ed. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:487–533 (508–13).

⁶¹ See already my essay, “The Origin of the Qumran Community: A Review of the Evidence,” in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages*, 239–60 (250).

⁶² J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 65, dates the initial settlement to the first half of the first century B.C.E., between 100 and 50 B.C.E.

⁶³ Wise, “Dating the Teacher of Righteousness,” 53–87.

⁶⁴ 4QMMT C 10. Translation from E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 59.

it shall come to pass, when all these things [be]fall you,' at the end of days, the blessings and the curses...' and we know that some of the blessings and the curses have (already) been fulfilled...and this is the end of days when they will return to Isra[el]..."⁶⁵

I suggest that we see a similar logic in the pesharim, although in this case the argument is directed to the members of the sect, to reassure them in their beliefs. (The coded language could scarcely have been intelligible to outsiders.) The commentaries demonstrate that prophecy is being fulfilled. The demonstration requires close attention to the biblical text, as recent scholarship has emphasized, but it also presupposes an authoritative account of recent and current history, with which the text is correlated. That account is now difficult for us to reconstruct, but it is essential to the logic and rhetoric of the pesharim. History is taken to corroborate prophecy, and, in the process, to assure the sect that it will be vindicated by divine judgment, and indeed that the vindication is already underway.

⁶⁵ Qimron and Strugnell, *DJD* 10:61, translate: "and this is at the end of days."

PROPHET, BOOKS AND TEXTS: EZEKIEL, *PSEUDO-EZEKIEL*
AND THE AUTHORITATIVENESS OF EZEKIEL
TRADITIONS IN EARLY JUDAISM

Mladen Popović

1. INTRODUCTION

The manuscript evidence from the Judaean Desert has brought to the fore the fact that “the Bible” did not yet exist in a crystallized form in the late Second Temple period. Many “biblical” books were available in different textual forms or in different editions. The exact wording of biblical books was not yet fixed, meaning that they were in a state of textual fluidity. This is often referred to as a situation of textual pluriformity.

In addition to biblical manuscripts, there are many “nonbiblical” manuscripts that are intricately related to what we perceive as their biblical exemplars and are therefore called “parabiblical” compositions, implying a secondary or less authoritative status. The question is whether the models we use when interpreting these texts correspond in any way to the manner in which ancient scribes and readers understood them. How did the author(s) of parabiblical compositions understand their texts to relate to their scriptural exemplars? Did they recognize them as significantly different from the biblical books and value them as such? And how did the audience and readers perceive this relationship between biblical and parabiblical writings?¹

On the basis of the texts and manuscripts that are currently at our disposal it is perhaps not possible to answer these questions in a straightforward manner, but they should nonetheless influence our hermeneutical perspective if we are to avoid anachronisms. If we recognize the existence of innerbiblical interpretation, such as in

¹ For a lucid discussion about emic and etic levels for understanding the different categories involved, see A.K. Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306.

Deuteronomy or Chronicles,² with regard to the late Second Temple period it may be incorrect to characterize the parabiblical writings from Qumran as “pseudo” or “apocryphal” and to see them as in a way secondary to the biblical book. The new pseudo or apocryphal compositions may indeed be intertextually dependant on the older biblical books as authoritative, scriptural exemplars. But our use of the terms “parabiblical” and “biblical” need not imply that ancient Jewish readers saw a qualitative difference between these texts—some might have, whereas others might not—nor do the terms “new” and “old” denote a strict chronological sequence. Furthermore, what does “authoritative” refer to in the case of scriptural exemplars? Does it refer to the biblical book as such, to the text itself, to an important figure from the past that appears in that book or to certain traditions contained in that book or associated with an important figure from the past?

Concerning the authoritative status of a biblical book in early Judaism, various scholars have suggested that the existence of parabiblical writings may indicate the authoritativeness of the compositions serving as exemplars or pretexts. I would like to suggest another perspective to this discussion, using “Ezekiel” and “Pseudo-Ezekiel” as a case study. The perspective I argue for is informed by the following parameters: first, a composition may have different degrees of authority over time but also contemporaneously between different groups or within the same community. Second, the text to which authority is attributed may be available in different form and wording, again both over time but also contemporaneously. Third, the form and wording of the text may be influenced by other texts that are close to it. With these parameters in mind, the relation between biblical Ezekiel and parabiblical *Pseudo-Ezekiel* may be perceived to have been reciprocal in the late Second Temple period, not only in terms of one occasioning the creation of the other, and the latter thereby confirming the former’s authoritative status,³ but also in terms of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* influencing the text of biblical Ezekiel.

² Cf. M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).

³ Cf. e.g. G.J. Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R.A. Clements; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104 (93–94, 96); Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon,” 287–88.

We must differentiate between Ezekiel the prophet, the book of Ezekiel and traditions or texts associated with Ezekiel.⁴ In some cases, he himself or his book are explicitly referred to, in others they are not and they seem to be of less importance than some of the traditions associated with them. The book and figure of Ezekiel were authoritative—although this did not necessitate explicit mention or reference—but the form of the text was not yet fixed and the text as such cannot be assumed to have been authoritative. Ezekiel—prophet, book and text—seems to have been primarily interpreted from an eschatological perspective. This perhaps does not really address which specific aspects were deemed authoritative (e.g. Ezekiel's descriptions of the divine throne, Jerusalem and the temple), but it does highlight the fact that authoritativeness is not so much a quality inherent in a source—with the source controlling what aspects are authoritative—as that it is an attributed quality—with those who attribute a sense of authoritativeness to the source determining to which of its aspects attention is drawn and from what perspective. The act of ascribing authoritativeness and the aim with which that is done, in this case from an eschatological perspective, reveal the specific interest in and use of Ezekiel. In addition, if the book and figure of Ezekiel were authoritative but the form of the text not yet fixed in the late Second Temple period, then it is within such a dynamic and pluriform context of literary creativity that we must turn to the Pseudo-Ezekiel texts and enquire after their relationship with biblical Ezekiel as an authoritative source.

I shall propose a model or perspective according to which the parabolic composition of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* was also responsible for, or

⁴ For surveys of and discussions about the influence of Ezekiel on the Dead Sea Scrolls and other early Jewish and New Testament literature, see, e.g. É. Cothenet, "L'influence d'Ézéchiél sur la spiritualité de Qumrân," *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 431–39; G.J. Brooke, "Ezekiel in Some Qumran and New Testament Texts," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (2 vols.; ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:317–37 (329, 331–37); S. Bøe, *Gog and Magog: Ezekiel 38–39 as Pre-text for Revelation 19,27–21 and 20,7–10* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); G.T. Manning, Jr., *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period* (London: T&T Clark, 2004); P. Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen zu Textgeschichte und Entstehung des Ezechielbuches in masoretischer und griechischer Überlieferung* (Diss. Zürich, 2004), 76–86; H.J. de Jonge and J. Tromp, eds., *The Book of Ezekiel and its Influence* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007); F. García Martínez, "The Interpretation of the Torah of Ezekiel in the Texts from Qumran," in *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1–12 (published previously as "L'interprétation de la Torah d'Ézéchiél dans les MSS de Qumrân," *RevQ* 13/49–52 [1988]: 441–52).

contributed to, the formation of the final form of biblical Ezekiel in the Masoretic Text. This may seem a paradox, but before the canon of the Hebrew Bible was more or less established, the boundary between a biblical text and its parabiblical companion may not have been very strong.⁵ In addition, for some tradents parabiblical texts may not necessarily have been less authoritative than their scriptural pretexts. Consequently, I shall argue that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* texts from Qumran and biblical Ezekiel texts, as witnessed by the pre-Hexaplaric Papyrus 967 and (proto-)MT, belong to a trajectory of Ezekiel traditions in the late Second Temple period mutually influencing each other's interpretative emphases and directions during the transmission process and thus shaping the final form and expectations of what was to become the biblical book of Ezekiel in MT.

2. EZEKIEL TEXTS IN SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

When describing the events following the death of Josiah, Flavius Josephus notes that the prophet Ezekiel left behind two books in which he, like the prophet Jeremiah, predicted the fall of Babylon (*A.J.* 10.79). In this passage Josephus wishes to accentuate the parallelism between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. His ascription of two books to Ezekiel may serve this aim. Jeremiah is also credited with leaving behind writings (*A.J.* 10.79).⁶

⁵ See e.g. J. Trebelle Barrera, "The Bible and Biblical Interpretation in Qumran," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (F. García Martínez and J. Trebelle Barrera; transl. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 99–121 (104); Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon," 298–99, 301–2.

⁶ See C.T. Begg and P. Spilsbury, *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary: Volume 5, Judean Antiquities Books 8–10* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 231. The reference to writings by Jeremiah is possibly to the biblical books of Jeremiah and Lamentations. But, given the existence of Jeremiah apocrypha, Josephus may have had more texts in mind than just the biblical books of Jeremiah and Lamentations. Josephus does not mention a specific number of writings. See also *A.J.* 10.35, 267 for references to books written by, respectively, Isaiah and Daniel. However, in a different context Josephus seems to limit Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel to having written only one book (see *C. Ap.* 1.37–43). Josephus states there are only twenty-two volumes, which are inspired by God and contain the record of all time. In his numbering of the books, he apparently does not count two or more books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel or Daniel; cf. S. Mason, "Josephus and His Twenty-Two Book Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 110–27.

Josephus' reference to two books by Ezekiel has been explained in different ways. A first explanation is that the biblical book was composed of two parts, namely Ezek 1–24 and 25–48. The Babylonian Talmud (*B. Bat.* 14b) may support this. It states that the book of Ezekiel begins with destruction and ends with consolation.⁷ A second explanation is that Josephus may have had in mind an actual second book in addition to the biblical book.

There are ancient *testimonia* to the existence of an *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* (*Hypomnesticon*, Epiphanius, the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, Chester Beatty 185) and various early Christian writers quote from this apocryphon in Greek.⁸ Furthermore, there are the so-called Pseudo-Ezekiel manuscripts from Qumran.⁹ Among the Dead Sea Scrolls, fragments of six copies of a Hebrew composition were found that presents

⁷ Cf. M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel, 1–20* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 3; Begg and Spilbury, *Judean Antiquities Books 8–10*, 231. Interestingly, in *B. Bat.* 14b this characterization of the book of Ezekiel is used to explain an arrangement of the Prophets that differs from the masoretic tradition, namely Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Isaiah.

⁸ Cf. J.R. Mueller, *The Five Fragments of the Apocryphon of Ezekiel: A Critical Study* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); M.E. Stone, B.G. Wright, and D. Satran, eds., *The Apocryphal Ezekiel* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000). Depending on how one views the relationship of the Pseudo-Ezekiel manuscripts from Qumran to these early Christian fragments, there is evidence for at least one and perhaps two separate apocryphal books in which the prophet Ezekiel figures prominently. Benjamin Wright rightly cautions for scenarios that are too static regarding the transmission and evolution of apocryphal Ezekiel material. This process may have been more fluid and consisted of the introduction of traditions and excerpting of material throughout the history of the apocryphal work, as well as the transmission of material in more than one form. See Stone, Wright, and Satran, *The Apocryphal Ezekiel*, 54–57. On *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and early Christian texts see also M. Kister, “Barnabas 12:1; 4:3 and 4QSecond Ezekiel,” *RB* 97 (1990): 63–67; R. Bauckham, “A Quotation from 4QSecond Ezekiel in the *Apocalypse of Peter*,” *RevQ* 15/59 (1992): 437–45; B.G. Wright, “Qumran Pseudepigrapha in Early Christianity: Is 1 Clem. 50:4 a Citation of 4QPseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385)?” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 183–93; idem, “The Apocryphon of Ezekiel and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery, 1947–1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 462–80; D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 14–16.

⁹ I think it likely that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* was a composition in Ezekiel's name as the remaining text is presented as a first-person account and it is said that these are the words of Ezekiel (4Q385b 1). However, it cannot be ruled out that the whole text was framed in the third person by another author. Perhaps the possibility of its association with the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* (see also the section below on the Pseudo-Ezekiel manuscripts from Qumran) points in the direction of the first-person *Pseudo-Ezekiel* text being part of a larger composition framed in the third person, but this is not necessarily the case.

several dialogues between God and Ezekiel. In preliminary publications it was first named *Second Ezekiel*¹⁰ but then *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.¹¹ Thus, in the late Second Temple period other writings in Ezekiel's name existed in addition to the biblical book. But what can we say about the biblical book of Ezekiel at that time? Was it "finished"?

3. THE FORMATION AND TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL IN LIGHT OF TEXTS FROM THE JUDEAN DESERT AND PAPYRUS 967

Biblical scholars assess the historical evolution of the book of Ezekiel in a variety of ways. The approaches of Walther Zimmerli and Moshe Greenberg are exemplary of two different perspectives.¹² Zimmerli was of the opinion that a core of prophecies by Ezekiel were collected, redacted and supplemented through a process of *Fortschreibung* within a school of followers.¹³ Other scholars have dated this *Fortschreibung* and redactional activity to the exilic generations following that of Ezekiel.¹⁴ Greenberg, on the other hand, was sceptical of the possibilities for determining redactional and supplemented layers. In his holistic approach he was of the opinion that Ezekiel as it is in MT was "contemporary with the sixth-century prophet and decisively shaped by

¹⁰ J. Strugnell and D. Dimant, "4QSecond Ezekiel," *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 45–58; D. Dimant and J. Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision in *Second Ezekiel* (4Q385 4)," *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 331–48.

¹¹ D. Dimant, "The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel at Qumran," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of His Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G.G. Stroumsa; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 31–51. For the *editio princeps*, see M. Smith, "4QpapPseudo-Ezekiel," in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (M. Broshi et al.; DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 153–93; Dimant, *DJD* 30.

Note that John Strugnell ("The Angelic Liturgy at Qumrân: 4Q Serek Širôt 'Olat Haššabāt," in *Congress Volume Oxford 1959* [Leiden: Brill, 1960], 318–45 [344]) initially used "pseudo-Ezekiel" when referring in passing to these manuscripts.

¹² For a comparison, see J.D. Levenson, "Ezekiel in the Perspective of Two Commentators," *Int* 38 (1984): 210–17.

¹³ W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel: 1. Teilband, Ezechiel 1–24* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969), 104*–14*; idem, "Das Phänomen der 'Fortschreibung' im Buche Ezechiel," in *Prophecy: Essays Presented to Georg Fohrer on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday 6 September 1980* (ed. J.A. Emerton; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 174–91.

¹⁴ See e.g. R.E. Clements, "The Chronology of Redaction in Ezekiel 1–24," in *Ezekiel and his Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation* (ed. J. Lust; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 283–94; L.C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19* (Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1994), xxiv–xxxvi.

him, if not the very words of Ezekiel himself.” In addition, Greenberg was sceptical of the use of versions to come to a *Vorlage* that is different from MT. According to Greenberg, “we must assume that Ezekiel’s utterances were sacrosanct from the time they were written down.”¹⁵

Many Ezekiel scholars nowadays seem to attribute the majority of what was to become the biblical book to the prophet himself and understand that its formation was mostly concluded during Ezekiel’s lifetime.¹⁶ Biblical scholars also seem to take the book’s authoritative and canonical status from the postexilic period onwards somewhat for granted. However, it has also been noted that none of Ezekiel’s laws for priestly conduct were ever implemented.¹⁷ If the biblical book was authoritative in some ways, it does not seem to have been so regarding priestly performance after the exile. Furthermore, in addition to clues that the *merkabah* was read and expounded upon in synagogues, Ezekiel’s visions of the divine chariot also received apprehensive and sometimes outright fearful responses in rabbinic circles in the late second and early third centuries C.E. In addition, contradictions were perceived with the Mosaic Torah.¹⁸ This may suggest that the book’s

¹⁵ Greenberg inferred that the book of Ezekiel enjoyed holy status from the sixth century onwards from major contradictions in the prophetic record; Greenberg, *Ezekiel, 1–20, 18–27* (27); idem, “What are Valid Criteria for Determining Inauthentic Matter in Ezekiel?” in *Ezekiel and his Book* (ed. Lust), 123–35 (135).

¹⁶ See e.g. M.S. Odell and J.T. Strong, eds., *The Book of Ezekiel: Theological and Anthropological Perspectives* (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000); S.L. Cook and C.L. Patton, eds., *Ezekiel’s Hierarchical World: Wrestling with a Tiered Reality* (Leiden: Brill, 2004). But other scholars assume a longer formation process for the book with later editing and redactional activity; see, e.g. R. Bartelmus, “Ez 37,1–14, die Verbform *w^cqatal* und die Anfänge der Auferstehungshoffnung,” *ZAW* 97 (1985): 366–89; K.-F. Pohlmann, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel): Kapitel 1–19* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996); H.M. Wahl, “‘Tod und Leben’: Zur Wiederherstellung Israels nach Ez. xxxvii 1–14,” *VT* 49 (1999): 218–39; K.-F. Pohlmann and T.A. Rudnig, *Das Buch des Propheten Hesekiel (Ezechiel): Kapitel 20–48* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001); Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*; A. Klein, *Schriftauslegung im Ezechielbuch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Ez 34–39* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008).

¹⁷ Greenberg, *Ezekiel, 1–20*, 15: “the temple was not built and the Zadokite priests were not installed in it, as prescribed in the blueprints and ordinances of Ezekiel; nor was his sacred calendar and its sacrifices ever put into effect.” Greenberg uses this and other data to argue a different point, namely that nothing in Ezekiel supposes a historical setting later than 571 B.C.E.; D.I. Block, “In Search of Theological Meaning: Ezekiel Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium,” in *Ezekiel’s Hierarchical World* (ed. Cook and Patton), 227–39 (229).

¹⁸ See e.g. W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel: 2. Teilband, Ezechiel 25–48* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969), 115*; D. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 11–37; D.I. Block, *The*

inclusion in the canon was for some by no means evident and beyond dispute.

In his commentary on Ezekiel, Daniel Block questions “the need for the chronological, geographical, and temperamental distance between prophet and book often imagined by scholars, and acknowledges the respect for the text held by subsequent transmitters of the documents.”¹⁹ One may ask what exactly respect for the text entails. Does it mean not to alter or add to it? Does it mean that the text existed originally only in one form?

The biblical Ezekiel manuscripts from the Judaean Desert and P967 illustrate two aspects of the textual transmission history of Ezekiel.²⁰ First, only three of the seven Ezekiel manuscripts are likely to have been copies of the entire book (4Q73, 11Q4 and MasEzek). The remains of the four other manuscripts are too meagre or they suggest the possibility of being excerpts and not copies of the whole book. But excerpted texts can also indicate a sense of some kind of authoritative-ness in the source.

Second, the text of biblical Ezekiel was somewhat flexible or in a state of textual fluidity in the late Second Temple period. On the one hand, the text form of what was to become MT was already present. On the other hand, there were texts that are identical with neither MT nor LXX. This means that different Ezekiel texts were in existence at that time.²¹ MT was not the only text form available, nor for that matter was it the only authoritative text. This is indicated by the pre-Hexaplaric Papyrus 967. The shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* of P967 differed from what was later accepted as canonical in MT. However, Lust suggests that the text of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of P967 was recognized as authorita-

Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997), 44. For early Christian responses, see e.g. A. Russel Christman, ‘What Did Ezekiel See?’ *Christian Exegesis of Ezekiel’s Vision of the Chariot from Irenaeus to Gregory the Great* (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

¹⁹ Block, *Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 1–24*, 23. The Hebrew University Bible offers a picture of the Hebrew text according to which MT presents in general the “more original” text. See *The Hebrew University Bible: The Book of Ezekiel* (ed. M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, S. Talmon, and G. Marquis; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2004) and the review by Arie van der Kooij in *DSD* 13 (2006): 367–71.

²⁰ For a brief overview of the six manuscripts from Qumran and one manuscript from Masada, dating from the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E., see Appendix 1.

²¹ See also Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 103–4.

tive because it was used for a translation.²² Therefore, in addition to what was later to be MT, there was also the Hebrew *Vorlage* of P967. These text forms of Ezekiel (i.e. P967 and MasEzek) may have existed alongside each other for some time, even if from hindsight one edition can be seen to have replaced the other. There is no evidence that the status of these different Ezekiel texts was called into question before 70 C.E.²³

As a result of these observations, claims that the book's formation was mostly concluded by the sixth century B.C.E. and that subsequent transmitters held the text in respect seem somewhat unwarranted or at least in need of further qualification.²⁴ Such claims are too general and perhaps anachronistic, projecting later canonical authority back in time. What was to become MT was but one form among different Ezekiel texts that were in circulation in the late Second Temple period. The presumed authoritativeness of the book of Ezekiel does not imply that the text was fixed before 70 C.E. Or to put it differently, textual differences did not affect the book's authoritative status.²⁵

The significance for our discussion of this well-known observation regarding textual fluidity and pluriformity is that the authoritative, scriptural antecedents on which the parabiblical texts are said to depend were not fixed in one form. Thus, we need not suppose a simple one-on-one relationship between parabiblical compositions and biblical books as known to us from MT. This suggests the possibility that

²² J. Lust, "Septuagint and Canon," in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 39–55 (55).

²³ No manuscript is extant among the Dead Sea Scrolls that may support the *Vorlage* of Old Greek P967, so we have no manuscript evidence from Qumran for of a more direct link between *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and P967. One can therefore only raise the possibility that the shorter apocalyptic-tinged Hebrew *Vorlage* of P967 supported or stimulated the sort of apocalyptic interpretations of Ezekiel that we find in the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* text from Qumran. If this were so, this may be a further indication of the authoritativeness of the Hebrew *Vorlage* at least for the writer(s) and readers of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.

²⁴ Cf. H.M. Patmore, "Did the Masoretes Get it Wrong? The Vocalization and Accentuation of Ezekiel xxviii 12–19," *VT* 58 (2008): 245–57 (257): "So our proposed reading gives us an insight into how the text might have been understood sometime after the composition of the book of Ezekiel (in some form at least) probably in the sixth century BCE, and sometime before the first century CE (and possibly earlier). But how soon after the 6th century BCE the stabilisation of the Masoretic form of the consonantal text occurred is a matter as yet unresolved."

²⁵ Cf. E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 3–120; idem, "From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness," *DSD* 10 (2003): 3–25.

other textual forms of biblical books may also have informed specific parabiblical compositions.

4. THE PSEUDO-EZEKIEL MANUSCRIPTS FROM QUMRAN

According to Devorah Dimant's *DJD* 30 edition, there are six copies of Pseudo-Ezekiel among the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are two issues concerning the material reconstruction that need to be addressed, but these are in need of further research and cannot be resolved here.

First, the correct order of the remaining fragments may reveal an internal coherency important for determining the aim and meaning of the text. For example, does 4Q385 6, which contains the *merkabah* vision, belong to the beginning or end of what is preserved of the text? In their first preliminary publication, Strugnell and Dimant suggested that the *merkabah* vision "may have formed the beginning of *Second Ezekiel*, or at least its inaugural vision."²⁶ In another preliminary publication, Dimant and Strugnell referred to a material reconstruction by Hartmut Stegemann, who located 4Q385 6 "in the fourth column of the scroll, that is, in the second column of the second sheet,"²⁷ to argue that the *merkabah* fragment "may have come from the beginning of the original scroll."²⁸ In the final publication, however, Dimant places 4Q385 6 at the beginning of the third sheet since, "In this way it would provide a natural conclusion to the theme treated throughout the previous columns."²⁹ Dimant argues that "the outline of Ezekiel 37–43 strings the surviving passages into a coherent sequence, and assigns all the scenes to the sphere of the final, redemptive era."³⁰ However, her interpretation of the *merkabah* vision in *Pseudo-Ezekiel* as modelled on Ezek 43:1–5 is strained, because "It follows, more or less closely, the sequence of the first chapter of the biblical *Ezekiel*."³¹ Thus, the placement of 4Q385 6, the internal coherency as well as whether biblical Ezekiel controls the outline of the text all need reconsideration.

²⁶ Strugnell and Dimant, "4QSecond Ezekiel," 48.

²⁷ Dimant and Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision," 331 n. 2.

²⁸ Dimant and Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision," 331.

²⁹ Dimant, *DJD* 30:20.

³⁰ Dimant, *DJD* 30:10.

³¹ Dimant and Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision," 331–32.

Second, in order to understand the literary context of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, we must determine whether the fragments assigned to the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* belong to the same or a separate composition. Dimant argues, primarily on the basis of form and content, for distinguishing between different compositions here. Monica Brady, however, has shown that the criteria used by Dimant to identify separate compositions are not compelling.³²

Third, I would like to add the following observation: if we take into account P967 and the longer text in MT, and if Lust's suggestion that the redactor who inserted Ezek 36:23c–38 MT was inspired by biblical Jeremiah is correct,³³ then the possibility that Jeremiah and Ezekiel traditions could be merged in the late Second Temple period³⁴ may stimulate new research into the relationship between *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* and into reconsidering whether they in fact belong to one and the same composition.

5. BIBLICAL EZEKIEL AND PARABIBLICAL PSEUDO-EZEKIEL

Scholars have variously characterized the connection between biblical Ezekiel and *Pseudo-Ezekiel*. Some characterizations emphasize the priority of the biblical pretext, whereas others stress more the originality of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* as a new composition. These characterizations betray the different understanding that scholars have of the relation between *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and the biblical book, and in general of the relationship between parabiblical and biblical texts.

In an older publication, Dimant describes *Pseudo-Ezekiel* as a “pseudepigraphic work attributed to a scriptural author” that “aims at recreating the prophetic milieu of Ezekiel and at commenting upon

³² M. Brady, “Biblical Interpretation in the ‘Pseudo-Ezekiel’ Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 88–109.

³³ J. Lust, “Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript,” *CBQ* 43 (1981): 517–33 (522–25).

³⁴ Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran,” 329, also refers to 3Q5 and Maurice Baillet's *DJD* 3 edition of it as a text containing vocabulary echoing various sections of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But after the publication of *DJD* 3, Baillet and others swiftly identified 3Q5 as a copy of *Jubilees*. See J.C. VanderKam, “The Jubilees Fragments from Qumran Cave 4,” in *Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. Treballe Barrera and Vegas Montaner), 2:635–48 (637).

his prophecies.”³⁵ It appears that she understands *Pseudo-Ezekiel* as a completely secondary text. Its author had the intention to comment upon biblical Ezekiel’s prophecies. In her *DJD* edition, Dimant grants that “the author attempts to extend the prophetic authority of Ezekiel to his own interpretations and additions,” but it remains a “close imitation” and a “conscious effort to model its discourse on the canonical prophecies of Ezekiel.”³⁶

In the following two characterizations, the emphasis is also laid on the biblical pretext. According to Benjamin Wright, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* is “one of a number of important pseudepigrapha that purport to come from the mouth or pen of a biblical figure and that rework and reinterpret biblical texts.”³⁷ Beate Ego characterizes the *merkabah* vision in 4Q385 6 as an abstract or epitome of Ezek 1.³⁸ But one may question whether this is a correct characterization if this passage is understood in the larger context of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.

In the characterizations drawn by Brady and García Martínez, we can discern a shift in understanding of the relationship between *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and biblical Ezekiel.³⁹ The value of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* increases and it is upgraded to an independent text with its own interests distinct from biblical Ezekiel. According to Brady, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* consists of a “combination of biblical with nonbiblical elements” that “seem to suggest that the writer was concerned not so much with explicating passages of biblical text, but more so with employing biblical passages, ideas, and themes to advance his message” through “a new text framed by dialogue between the Lord and a pseudepigraphic figure.”⁴⁰ García Martínez also emphasizes the creative and innovative character of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*. He argues that “the author of *Pseudo Ezekiel* has completely transformed the meaning of the vision of the Prophet,” and that “The name of the prophet Ezekiel and his authority is clearly a

³⁵ Dimant, “Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel,” 49.

³⁶ Dimant, *DJD* 30:10.

³⁷ B.G. Wright, “Notes on 4Q391 (papPseudo-Ezekiel^e) and Biblical Ezekiel,” in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ed. R.A. Argall, B.A. Bow, and R.A. Werline; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 2000), 289–98 (298).

³⁸ B. Ego, “Reduktion, Amplifikation, Interpretation, Neukontextualisierung: Intertextuelle Aspekte der Rezeption der Ezechielschen Thronwagenvision im antiken Judentum,” in *Das Ezechielbuch in der Johannesoffenbarung* (ed. D. Sänger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004), 31–60 (33–39).

³⁹ Cf. also Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 99–100.

⁴⁰ Brady, “Biblical Interpretation in the ‘Pseudo-Ezekiel’ Fragments,” 106.

vehicle... to introduce a new idea and to give it the necessary authority.” This results in a new composition.⁴¹

Finally, adopting Dimant’s characterization in *DJD* 30 and inspired by Hindy Najman’s idea of Mosaic discourse in Second Temple Judaism,⁴² Alex Jassen suggests that the author of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* “assumes that his own words are part of an ‘Ezekelian Discourse,’ with which Ezekiel would have agreed” and “interlaces the contemporary word with the ancient prophetic word..., the full meaning of which is only now revealed.”⁴³

Pseudo-Ezekiel claims authoritative status by presenting itself as containing the actual words of Ezekiel himself:

[And these are the wor]ds of Ezekiel. And the word of the Lord came to m[e] as foll[ows: [son of man, prophe]sy and say:⁴⁴

The words of Ezekiel are God’s words, as Ezekiel transmits the words of the Lord. This claim is also affirmed in another fragment of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* that says, “the mouth of the Lord has spoken these things” (4Q385 4 7), a prophetic formula known from Isa 1:20, 40:5, 58:14 and Mic 4:4. The composition of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* does not present itself as a secondary, or, as we call it, pseudo Ezekiel text.

If, in the late Second Temple period, the book and figure of Ezekiel rather than a fixed textual edition were authoritative, if biblical Ezekiel was available in different textual forms and if *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, albeit also extant in variant textual forms, was understood to transmit the words of Ezekiel himself, what are the implications for the relationship between biblical Ezekiel and parabiblical *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, both being attributed to the figure of Ezekiel? Were both kinds of writings seen as a “real” Ezekiel text, transmitting his words and prophecies? Here we must distinguish between how *we* may perceive this relationship and

⁴¹ F. García Martínez, “The Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 163–76 (170, 172).

⁴² See e.g. H. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410; eadem, “Angels at Sinai: Exegesis, Theology and Interpretive Authority,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 313–33; eadem, *Secounding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁴³ A.P. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 231–34.

⁴⁴ The translation of 4Q385b 1–2 is from Dimant, *DJD* 30:73.

how readers *then* may have understood it. Differences in genre or textual strategy that define or inform the taxonomic boundaries we draw to classify different texts need not have been boundaries for people in antiquity when reading or thinking about these texts.⁴⁵

One possibility is that multiple texts attributed to Ezekiel existed side by side and were all considered to be Ezekiel texts: “multiple texts” as in different text editions and as in what we may consider to be the actual biblical book of Ezekiel and other writings in Ezekiel’s name. Another possibility is that a distinction was indeed made between one book of Ezekiel, which was to become the biblical book, and other writings in his name. Although we have no evidence that such a distinction was specifically made, the quotation formulae that refer to the book of Ezekiel the prophet (see 4Q174/4Q177) instead of books in the plural may indicate a sense of one book “really” belonging to Ezekiel instead of multiple writings, leaving open the question of which book exactly that may have been and in what form. These possibilities are not mutually exclusive, but how they correspond to the reality of historical circumstances in the late Second Temple period depends on how people at that time dealt with this textual variety—whether they saw only one writing or text edition as a “real” Ezekiel text transmitting his words and prophecies or whether the singular “book” could, nevertheless, conceptually encompass the idea that multiple Ezekiel writings existed. I do not think that we have enough evidence to answer these questions, but they are worth pondering, given the evidence that we do have for a dynamic and pluriform context of literary creativity in the late Second Temple period.

In addition to these considerations, we would also need to differentiate between different people or groups of people in antiquity. The historical situation in Greco-Roman Palestine was such that multiple Ezekiel texts were in circulation at a macro-level, but these were not necessarily recognized as such by everybody at a micro-level. If we limit ourselves to the Dead Sea Scrolls, we see that multiple Ezekiel texts were available within the context of one group—that of Qumran—however that group may be understood. A broader “Ezekelian Discourse,” as Jassen hypothesizes, may provide a framework to look at the different Ezekiel writings where the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* composi-

⁴⁵ Cf. Petersen, “Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon,” 302–6.

tion need not be seen to rival or replace biblical Ezekiel, but rather to supplement it.

Various scholars have suggested that the existence of a parabiblical text may indicate the authoritativeness enjoyed by the composition serving as pretext. George Brooke, for example, understands rewritten Scripture as dependent on authoritative scriptural texts. It does not replace the biblical text but offers alternative or supplementary versions of it. Parabiblical texts presuppose and are related to existing authoritative texts. This does not mean that the parabiblical texts themselves are thereby automatically nonauthoritative, or, in anachronistic terms, noncanonical; far from it. Brooke also suggests that the reworked scriptural compositions may, to a great extent, “carry the authority of the tradition forward in ways in which the primary texts on which they depend could not.” They may have been “the principle vehicle through which interest was maintained in the texts which later became canonical.”⁴⁶ Daniel Falk follows the work of Najman by arguing that “the technique of rewriting or imitation is a strategy for extending or invoking the authority of traditions already accepted as authoritative.”⁴⁷

On the other hand, if parabiblical texts are indeed related to existing authoritative texts, Armin Lange asks whether this means “that compositions of which no parabiblical literature is preserved—e.g. the Book of Isaiah—did not enjoy a corresponding religious authority.”⁴⁸ Julio Treballe, however, has argued that it is precisely those biblical compositions that have “parabiblical” companions, such as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, that may have been less authoritative than texts such as Isaiah that do not. Treballe distinguishes between two groups of texts that were differently transmitted, interpreted and authorized. He understands the existence of parabiblical texts as one of a set of indicators for the different levels of authoritativeness that “biblical” texts enjoyed in the late Second Temple period. Other factors are, for

⁴⁶ Brooke, “Between Authority and Canon,” 93–94.

⁴⁷ D.K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts* (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 16.

⁴⁸ A. Lange, “The Parabiblical Literature of the Qumran Library and the Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 305–21 (321).

example: number of copies, form of preservation, textual stability or fluidity, character of translations and quotation formulae.⁴⁹

Returning more specifically to Ezekiel and *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, still another perspective is possible. If the boundaries between biblical and parabiblical writings were less strong in the late Second Temple period than we now perceive them to be, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* should not be understood as just supplementing biblical Ezekiel. In addition to *Pseudo-Ezekiel* confirming or elevating biblical Ezekiel's authoritative status, the former may also have influenced the latter's final textual form and interpretative emphasis.

6. "APOCALYPTIC EZEKIEL" IN *PSEUDO-EZEKIEL* AND PAPYRUS 967 AND THE FINAL FORM AND MESSAGE OF BIBLICAL EZEKIEL

The *Pseudo-Ezekiel* manuscripts from Qumran, together with P967, may encourage us to reconsider how biblical Ezekiel came to be the way it is in MT. I suggest that this dialectic process took place sometime during the second century B.C.E.⁵⁰ The context of this process was one in which these texts were not sharply distinguished as to there being a fixed authoritative edition and a divergent nonauthoritative edition, nor as to there being a biblical Ezekiel book and a parabiblical or pseudo Ezekiel book, at least not in a qualitative sense. If such strict distinctions or boundaries are an anachronism for the late Second Temple period, then different traditions, texts and books associated with or ascribed to the authoritative prophetic figure of Ezekiel may have interacted with each other on a more or less level playing field.

Both *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and P967 attest to a tendency in late Second Temple Judaism to approach Ezekiel from an apocalyptic and eschatological perspective. Dimant and García Martínez, for example, agree that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* interprets Ezekiel from a strong apocalyptic and eschatological perspective.⁵¹ García Martínez and Lust have shown

⁴⁹ J. Trebelle, "A 'Canon within a Canon': Two Series of Old Testament Books Differently Transmitted, Interpreted and Authorized," *RevQ* 19/75 (2000): 383–99. See also J.C. Trebelle Barrera, "Origins of a Tripartite Old Testament Canon," in *Canon Debate* (ed. McDonald and Sanders), 128–45.

⁵⁰ Cf. Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 354–65.

⁵¹ Dimant, "Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel"; García Martínez, "Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel."

that similar apocalyptic tendencies occur in *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and biblical Ezekiel in P967.

P967 shows several important instances of a shorter text and a different order of Ezek 36–40 in comparison to MT.⁵² When Lust first presented his hypothesis that the Old Greek in P967 represents not only a different but also an older Hebrew *Vorlage* of Ezekiel than MT, he attributed and dated the modifications in MT to post-70 C.E. and the Pharisees who reacted against the apocalyptic view of Ezekiel, possibly so as to make it more eligible for inclusion in the canon.⁵³ Lust thus suggested that the differences might have been theologically motivated. The goal of the MT editor was to historicize biblical Ezekiel to prevent an eschatological and apocalyptic reading of the text, as in P967.

However, after the publication of the Ezekiel manuscript from Masada this explanation is no longer possible, as has been pointed out.⁵⁴ The Ezekiel fragments from Masada prove that the longer form and order of MT already existed at least before 70 C.E. (see Appendix 1). In addition, Hector Patmore argues that one may speak of P967 offering a text different from MT, but not necessarily earlier. He concludes that P967 and the proto-MT manuscript from Masada “demonstrate that at some point two different versions of the Hebrew were in existence at the same time.”⁵⁵ Lust therefore recently modified his position.

⁵² It lacks, for example, Ezek 12:26–28 and 36:23c–38. Ezek 36:23b is followed directly by Ezek 38–39 and then by Ezek 37, which serves as an introduction to Ezek 40–48.

⁵³ For his position on this matter, see Lust, “Ezekiel 36–40”; idem, “The Use of Textual Witnesses for the Establishment of the Text: The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel, an Example, Ez 7,” in *Ezekiel and his Book* (ed. Lust), 7–20; idem, “Septuagint and Canon”; idem, “Messianism in LXX-Ezekiel: Towards a Synthesis,” in *The Septuagint and Messianism* (ed. M.A. Knibb; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 417–30; idem, “Ezekiel’s Utopian Expectations,” in *Flores Florentino* (ed. Hilhorst, Puech, and Tigchelaar), 403–19. See also S.S. Scatolini, “Ezek 36, 37, 38 and 39 in Papyrus 967 as Pre-Text for Re-reading Ezekiel,” in *Interpreting Translation* (ed. García Martínez and Vervenne), 331–57. For a different view see, e.g., M.N. van der Meer, “A New Spirit in an Old Corpus? Text-Critical, Literary-Critical and Linguistic Observations regarding Ezekiel 36:16–38,” in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy: Festschrift for Henk Leene* (ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra; Maastricht: Shaker, 2002), 147–58; J. Flanagan, “Papyrus 967 and the Text of Ezekiel: Parablepsis or an Original Text?” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (ed. C.A. Evans and H.D. Zacharias; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 105–16.

⁵⁴ Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 354; E. Tigchelaar, “Notes on the Ezekiel Scroll from Masada (MasEzek),” *RevQ* 22/86 (2005): 269–75 (275); H.M. Patmore, “The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel: The Implications of the Manuscript Finds from Masada and Qumran,” *JSOT* 32 (2007): 231–42.

⁵⁵ Patmore, “Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel,” 241.

He argues that the Masada fragments do not imply that the shorter version of P967 no longer circulated at that time and concludes that “Both versions may have been used alongside each other for quite some time.”⁵⁶

García Martínez argues that *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, being a nonsectarian composition, demonstrates a more widespread tendency in second-century B.C.E. Judaism to interpret Ezekiel apocalyptically. This tendency makes the apocalyptic interpretation of biblical Ezekiel in P967 easier to understand.⁵⁷ Lust agreed and argued in response that “Simultaneously with the de-apocalypticizing process preserved in MT, other re-interpretations of Ezekiel developed the apocalyptic views expressed in LXX-Ezekiel,” and that *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, although completely modifying Ezekiel’s text and expectations, bears witness to such a tendency in second-century B.C.E. Judaism.⁵⁸ Lust thus no longer dates the de-apocalypticizing MT to post-70 C.E., but now apparently dates it to the second century B.C.E., making it contemporary to and simultaneous with *Pseudo-Ezekiel*. What is the significance of this textual fluidity and the concurrent existence of different editions of Ezekiel in the late Second Temple period? And how must we understand this in relation to the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* composition from Qumran that dates to the second century B.C.E.?

I would like to suggest that we can take the observations of García Martínez and Lust one step further and propose that the *Pseudo-Ezekiel* texts and the biblical Ezekiel texts as witnessed by P967 and MT belong to a trajectory of Ezekiel traditions in the late Second Temple period mutually influencing each other’s interpretative emphases and directions during the transmission process, thus shaping the form and expectations of the book of Ezekiel that ended up in the canon. García Martínez and Lust have demonstrated why, due to the apocalyptic concern in P967, the vision of the dry bones in Ezek 37 is differently arranged than in the text of MT, and how *Pseudo-Ezekiel* takes the apocalyptic context of this vision even further. In his response to García Martínez, Lust does not explicitly reflect on the second example that García Martínez adduces, the hastening of the last days, as evidence of the apocalyptic interpretation of Ezekiel in *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.

⁵⁶ Lust, “Ezekiel’s Utopian Expectations,” 404.

⁵⁷ García Martínez, “Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel,” 176.

⁵⁸ Lust, “Ezekiel’s Utopian Expectations,” 418, 419.

But this example may also shed light on the relationship between these different Ezekiel texts. For this, we have to turn to Ezek 12:21–28.

Ezek 12:26–28 do not appear in P967, whereas MT has them:

The word of the Lord came to me: Mortal, the house of Israel is saying, ‘The vision that he sees is for many years ahead; he prophesies for distant times.’ Therefore say to them, Thus says the Lord God: None of my words will be delayed any longer, but the word that I speak will be fulfilled, says the Lord God. (NRSV)

Lust argues that the inserted dispute deals rather with the theme of Ezekiel’s visions on the final days and not with that of true and false prophecy from Ezek 12:21–25:

The word of the Lord came to me: Mortal, what is this proverb of yours about the land of Israel, which says, ‘The days are prolonged, and every vision comes to nothing?’ Tell them therefore, ‘Thus says the Lord God: I will put an end to this proverb, and they shall use it no more as a proverb in Israel.’ But say to them, The days are near, and the fulfillment of every vision. For there shall no longer be any false vision or flattering divination within the house of Israel. But I the Lord will speak the word that I speak, and it will be fulfilled. It will no longer be delayed; but in your days, O rebellious house, I will speak the word and fulfill it, says the Lord God. (NRSV)

Lust suggests that Ezek 12:26–28 are concerned with preventing an eschatological or apocalyptic understanding of Ezekiel’s prophecies and therefore historicize Ezekiel’s message. The editors of MT thus wished to make clear that Ezekiel’s prophecies were not in the far and distant future. According to Lust, Ezek 12:26–28 may have been inserted to answer objections against the admission of Ezekiel, with its apocalyptic-coloured visions, in the Hebrew canon.⁵⁹

I suggest that in *Pseudo-Ezekiel* we cannot just see the direction an apocalyptic interpretation of Ezekiel took in the second century B.C.E., but also, more specifically, how a similar concern over the fulfilment of Ezekiel’s prophecies was answered in a completely different way.

The theme of the hastening of the last days in the first copy of *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385 4) is a recurrent topic in some apocalyptic writings and in this form in *Pseudo-Ezekiel* it perhaps may have “nothing to do

⁵⁹ Lust, “Septuagint and Canon,” 49; idem, “Ezekiel’s Utopian Expectations,” 415–16.

with the biblical text of Ezekiel.”⁶⁰ However, the statement of God in Ezek 12:23 that none of his words will be delayed any longer and that they will be fulfilled, may have been the biblical basis or impetus for *Pseudo-Ezekiel*'s passage about the hastening of the last days in order to speed the salvation of Israel.⁶¹

1. [] Instead of my grief
2. make my soul rejoice and let the days hasten quickly that it be said
3. by men: 'Indeed the days are hastening on so that the children of Israel may inherit.'
4. And the Lord said to me: 'I will not re[fu]se you, O Ezekiel! I will cut
5. the days and the year[s]]
6. a little as you said []
7. [for]the mouth of the Lord has spoken these things v[*acat*]⁶²

In *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385 4 4) God confirms Ezekiel's prophecy. He says explicitly to Ezekiel that he will not refuse him. Thus, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* addresses the issue implied by Ezek 12:24, of whether Ezekiel's prophecies are true or false. They are true, says *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, as God will vindicate Ezekiel. In the same fragment (4Q385 4 4–5), God answers that he will cut short the days and years. Thus, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* may respond to Ezek 12:23, that says God's word will not be delayed any longer but will be fulfilled (cf. also line 6: "shortened as you said"). In this way, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385 4) presents a different answer from Ezek 12:26–28 MT to a similar concern over the fulfilment of Ezekiel's prophecies. The interpretation evinced by *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385 4), the shortening of time, may have been precisely the sort of apocalyptic understanding that the insertion of Ezek 12:26–28 MT was supposed to counter.

However, in light of the Masada fragments of Ezekiel, one perhaps cannot simply say that MT is a reaction to the apocalyptic perspective

⁶⁰ See Dimant, *DJD* 30:37–42; García Martínez, "Apocalyptic Interpretation of Ezekiel," 172–75 (the quote is from 172).

⁶¹ See also B.G. Wright, "Talking with God and Losing His Head: Extrabiblical Traditions about the Prophet Ezekiel," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (ed. M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1998), 290–315 (297 n. 18).

⁶² The translation of 4Q385 4 is from Dimant, *DJD* 30:38.

of P967 and *Pseudo-Ezekiel*. The apocalyptic interpretation in the latter two texts may have influenced the historicizing and de-apocalypticizing tendency in MT. But it may also be the case that apocalyptic interpretations were instigated or intensified by tendencies witnessed in MT. Both textual variants, that is, P967 and (proto-)MT, and both perspectives, that is, apocalyptic (P967 and *Pseudo-Ezekiel*) and de-apocalypticizing (MT), may be seen as different reactions to a more or less similar set of circumstances. In addition to the historical context of second- and first-century B.C.E. Judaism in Greco-Roman Palestine, this similar set of circumstances also included a biblical text of Ezekiel as a common tradition, the text of which was not yet fixed in its entirety.⁶³ With *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, P967 and biblical manuscripts from Masada and Qumran—some of which are identical with or similar to MT, while others are not—we find ourselves in the middle of the final phase of formation of what was to become the biblical book of Ezekiel in later masoretic tradition.⁶⁴ And in this formative phase biblical and parabiblical texts, in a sort of dialectic process, helped shape biblical Ezekiel's final form and message.

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE AUTHORITATIVENESS OF EZEKIEL AND *PSEUDO-EZEKIEL*

The best evidence of a situation in late Second Temple Judaism of variant literary editions of biblical books circulating simultaneously,⁶⁵ and together with parabiblical writings, comes from Qumran, but it is likely that Qumran is representative of the broader context. This allows us to see how certain perspectives of Ezekiel with different books of Ezekiel (biblical and parabiblical) existed simultaneously and could also exist within one community.⁶⁶

⁶³ But that text is not necessarily the *Urtext* of Ezekiel.

⁶⁴ J. Stromberg, "Observations on Inner-Scriptural Scribal Expansion in MT Ezekiel," *VT* 58 (2008): 68–86 argues that MT Ezekiel shows how the editing of a book can be oriented toward a larger body of scriptural texts and that the very process of adaptation of scriptural texts was informed by the texts which were being adapted. I would add that parabiblical writings might also have been a fundamental component in this process.

⁶⁵ Cf. Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture," 18.

⁶⁶ Different writings and text editions do not necessarily presuppose distinct communities or people behind them.

If the boundary between a biblical and parabiblical writing was less strong in the late Second Temple period than we now perceive it to be, how does this affect the status of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*? Is it possible that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* was granted a sense of authoritativeness at Qumran and if so on what level? Whether *Pseudo-Ezekiel* enjoyed authoritative status at Qumran or with other groups or strata in Jewish society is difficult to determine. When we differentiate between the prophetic figure of Ezekiel, books ascribed to him or written in his name and texts or traditions associated with him, the question is how that affects our manner of looking at the Ezekiel texts that did not become biblical texts but that, during a certain period, existed side by side with what was to become exclusively Ezekiel's book.

It is possible that for some people such a parabiblical book as *Pseudo-Ezekiel* had an authoritative status if not surpassing, then at least equal to its literary antecedent of a biblical text of Ezekiel,⁶⁷ the text of which was not yet fixed in its entirety. This possibility may seem even more likely if we consider that in the Dead Sea Scrolls Ezekiel—the prophetic figure, the books in his name, or the texts/traditions associated with him—was primarily interpreted from an eschatological perspective. Although we have no concrete evidence that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* informed the eschatological interpretations of Ezekiel in other texts from Qumran, taken together with Ezekiel's textual history as witnessed by the Qumran and Masada manuscripts and P967, it may serve as circumstantial evidence indicating that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* enjoyed some kind of authoritativeness, at least at Qumran, and probably also beyond.

Albeit not a strong argument in itself,⁶⁸ there are not a particularly large number of copies of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, but this may show that it was valued at Qumran. In addition, the time span from the oldest copy from the second century B.C.E. to the latest copy around the turn of the era indicates that *Pseudo-Ezekiel* continued to be valued as worth copying over a longer period. Such a community living at Qumran thus ensured the transmission of this text during the late Second Temple

⁶⁷ Cf. Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon," 288: "by employing the term Scripture we do not...have to rule out that even 'secondary' writings like the *Temple Scroll*, the *Book of Jubilees*, the Enochic literature, etc. could be imputed an authoritative status if not surpassing, then at least equalising that of their literary antecedents."

⁶⁸ Cf., e.g. Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 51–54; S. White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 9.

period. This continuing effort to copy and transmit the text presumably also means that people at or related to the Qumran community appreciated and probably also accepted, in one way or another, the apocalyptic claims of *Pseudo-Ezekiel*.

To be authoritative is a status or quality that a text can acquire, but also lose, over time. This status depends, to a large degree, on the acceptance by a larger group of people of the normative claims made by the text and its author(s)/scribe(s).⁶⁹ One also needs to distinguish between different levels of authority for different texts.⁷⁰ For some Jews biblical Ezekiel might have had less authority than the books of the Pentateuch, Isaiah or Psalms, but this might not have been so for others. The importance and authority that some people ascribed to Ezekiel may be indicated by, first, the literary productivity in the form of a parabiblical composition like *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, second, the textual fluidity witnessed by P967 and (proto-)MT and, third, the possibility that all these texts together dialectically shaped the final form of what was to become the biblical book of Ezekiel. The contest between different perspectives for understanding Ezekiel indicates that value or a sense of authoritativeness was attributed to the book and the words of the prophet in the late Second Temple period.⁷¹

⁶⁹ For this factor and others that contribute to a text's authoritativeness see e.g. Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture," esp. 7–8, 23–25; White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 8–9. Cf. E. Ben Zvi, "The Prophetic Book: A Key Form of Prophetic Literature," in *The Changing Face of Form-Criticism for the Twenty-First Century* (ed. M.A. Sweeney and E. Ben Zvi; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 276–97 (280), who defines an "authoritative book" as "one that communicates an explicit or implicit claim for social and theological/ideological authoritativeness, and was likely accepted as such by at least some sector of the ancient readership and rereadership." He further notes that this description "holds true for those books that were included eventually in the Hebrew Bible and many that were not (e.g. Jubilees, Enoch, Temple Scroll). The basic difference between the two groups is not to be found in the presence or absence of claims to authoritativeness or any formal or genre marker, but on the level and range of the acceptance of the textually inscribed claims by different communities within Israel and through time."

⁷⁰ Cf. A.K. Petersen, "Constraining Semiotic Riverrun: Different Gradations and Understandings of Canonicity and Authoritative Writings," in *Religion and Normativity: The Discursive Fight over Religious Texts in Antiquity* (ed. A.-C. Jacobsen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2009), 22–41.

⁷¹ I thank George Brooke and Eibert Tigchelaar for their comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper.

APPENDIX 1: BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS OF EZEKIEL FROM
QUMRAN AND MASADA

What little that remains of the copy from Cave 1 (1Q9) matches Ezek 4:16–5:1. As far as we can tell, the orthography is identical with MT. It is possible though that this is not a copy of the biblical book but an excerpted Ezekiel text.⁷²

From Cave 3 comes a small fragment that contains a *hapax legomenon* from Ezek 16:31 (לְקִלְסִי), identifying what remains with Ezek 16:30–33. Ezek 16 (16:47 in combination with Isa 26:20) is also used in a copy of Pseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385 6 3). Brooke therefore suggests that this copy from Cave 3 (3Q1) may have been an excerpted text.⁷³ Peter Schwagmeier, however, entertains the possibility that “der vorliegende Text gar nichts mit dem Ezechielbuch zu tun hat.”⁷⁴

Cave 4 yielded three manuscripts. 4Q73 covers parts of Ezekiel chapters 10, 11, 23, and 41 (Ezek 10:6–16; 10:17–11:11; 23:14–15, 17–18; 23:44–47; 41:3–6). The orthography of this manuscript is very close to that of MT, exhibiting some minor variants. In one case, a different *Vorlage* may be suspected (4Q73 3 i).⁷⁵ Emanuel Tov classifies the text of this manuscript as independent or nonaligned.⁷⁶ Brooke notes that the passages from 4Q73 “feature variously in other non-biblical texts from the Qumran caves.” He suggests it may have been “an anthology of excerpted Ezekiel texts.”⁷⁷ But in light of the material remains, another suggestion may be put forward. The format and extant lines do not support 4Q73 being an excerpted Ezekiel text. It has a very large writing block with a reconstructed 42 lines with large margins and, according to Tov, it is a so-called *de luxe* edition.⁷⁸ Instead of 4Q73 being an excerpted Ezekiel text, it is therefore more likely that this manuscript originally contained a copy of the whole book of Ezekiel. The text may be very close to that preserved later in MT, “er deckt sich aber weder mit MT noch mit G.”⁷⁹

⁷² Cf. Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 62–65.

⁷³ Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran,” 318. Cf. Dimant, *DJD* 31:44–45.

⁷⁴ Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 65–66 (66).

⁷⁵ J.E. Sanderson, “4QEzek^a,” in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (E. Ulrich et al.; *DJD* 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 209–14.

⁷⁶ E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 127.

⁷⁷ Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran,” 319.

⁷⁸ Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 126.

⁷⁹ Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 59–61 (61).

4Q74 preserves six fragments from three consecutive columns. The format of this manuscript suggests the possibility that it was “a brief scroll of excerpts” containing “only one or a few episodes from the book: perhaps the prophet’s inaugural vision alone (Ezek 1:1–3:15) or the four vision reports together (adding Ezekiel 8–11; 37:1–14; and 40–48).”⁸⁰ The text of 4Q74 is almost the same as MT.⁸¹

4Q75 is a small fragment that preserves three lines from Ezek 24:2–3 that correspond with MT.⁸²

From Cave 11 comes 11Q4. Some small fragments could be recovered from its surface only. These contain the remains from Ezek chapters 1, 4, 5, and 7 (Ezek 1:8–10; 4:3–5; 4:6; 4:9–10; 5:11–17; and 7:9–12). According to Edward Herbert, 11Q4 “should be viewed as broadly Masoretic in that it does not show evidence of agreement with \mathfrak{G} , but not in the sense that it is incapable of deviating from \mathfrak{M} .”⁸³ Schwagmeier’s conclusion leads in the same direction, “daß 11Q4 einen Text bietet, der zwar nah an MT ist, der aber weder mit MT...noch mit G...identisch ist.”⁸⁴

Finally, hidden beneath the floor of the synagogue at Masada were more than fifty fragments (MasEzek) that preserve parts from Ezek 35:11–38:14. The extant text is taken to be very similar to MT, apart from some minor variants.⁸⁵ But it is also suggested that in one case MasEzek confirms LXX.⁸⁶ More important is the fact that MasEzek attests the order of MT Ezek 35, 36, 37 and 38 and the presence of Ezek 36:23b–38 in a manuscript from before 73 C.E.⁸⁷

⁸⁰ It has 11 lines per column. If it had contained the entire text of Ezekiel it would have been probably long, 32 meters with 280 columns. J.E. Sanderson, “4QEzek^b,” in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (Ulrich et al.), 215–18 (216).

⁸¹ J. Lust, “Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran: Preliminary Edition of 4Q Eza and b,” in *Ezekiel and his Book* (ed. Lust), 90–100 (96); Brooke, “Ezekiel in Some Qumran,” 319; Sanderson, *DJD* 15:216.

⁸² J.E. Sanderson, “4QEzek^c,” in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (Ulrich et al.), 219–20 (219).

⁸³ E.D. Herbert, “11QEzekiel,” in *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude; *DJD* 23; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 15–28 (22).

⁸⁴ Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 55–59 (59).

⁸⁵ S. Talmon, “1043–2220 (MasEzek) Ezekiel 35:11–38:14,” in *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965: Hebrew Fragments from Masada* (S. Talmon; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1999), 59–75; Tigchelaar, “Notes on the Ezekiel Scroll.”

⁸⁶ Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 101–3.

⁸⁷ Schwagmeier, *Untersuchungen*, 103; Tigchelaar, “Notes on the Ezekiel Scroll,” 275.

TEXT AND FIGURE IN ANCIENT JEWISH *PAIDEIA*

Hindy Najman

1. INTRODUCTION

The following paper focuses on Philo's relationship to his context, which is both Greek and Jewish at once. This is part of a larger project to understand the relationships in early Judaism between authoritative *figures* such as Moses and Ezra and authoritative *texts* such as *Jubilees* or *4 Ezra*.¹ In what follows, I will argue that figure and text are intertwined in Philo's thought. Indeed, the authority of Scripture, as Philo understands it, depends on its relationship to these exemplary figures. At the same time, authoritative figures and texts are intertwined in Philo's conception of *paideia*, a reinterpretation that forms part of his strategy to authorize Judaism in the light of Hellenistic culture, and to legitimize Jewish written law in the light of the unwritten law of nature.

In this paper, I explore these themes of figures, Scriptures, and *paideia* in Philo's Jewish-Greek project. Which figures does Philo emphasize, and why? How are they related to Scripture and law? And how does the interplay of figure and text, prevalent in many ancient Jewish texts, structure Philo's conception of the goal of *paideia*?

2. PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA: GREEKJEW, JEWGREEK

Philo is one of the most striking representatives of a Hellenistic Judaism that can seem worlds apart from the Second Temple Judaisms of

¹ For my previous work on this topic see H. Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), and a series of recent publications, including: "How should we Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honor of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 529–36; "Reconsidering Jubilees: Prophecy and Exemplarity," in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. G. Boccacini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 229–43; and "La recherche de la perfection dans le judaïsme ancien," in *Des Actes du colloque: Les élites locales en Palestine et en diaspora* (ed. J. Riaud; Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006).

Palestine. For example, we do not find anything like pseudonymous authorship in Philo's writings. This can make it seem impossible for Philo's writings to shed any light on, for example, Qumran, or vice-versa. Yet Philo was unquestionably a Second Temple Jew, not only chronologically but also in many aspects of his religious consciousness.²

At the same time, Philo certainly faced a challenge quite distinct from the challenge confronting the Qumran community: he had to authorize Judaism itself to both Jews and non-Jews, within the relatively new context of the Hellenistic competition of cultures; this competition was at the same time political, especially in light of the even newer Roman Empire's quest to authorize itself through the appropriation of the Greek philosophical and literary heritage.

The place of Judaism within this new Roman world was far from clear. On the one hand, the significance of the Greek heritage was now as universal as the empire itself sought to be. Consequently, Near Eastern cultures, which enjoyed the mystique of antiquity and exoticism, could legitimize themselves by identifying their gods with Greek gods and their teachings with Greek teachings. On the other hand, religious syncretism did not cohere easily with the Mosaic law, which seemed primarily to address Jews alone and was therefore in danger of appearing parochial. This rendered it not only potentially insignificant to Hellenic universalism, but also potentially threatening to Rome. It is in this context that Philo's Greek-Jewish conception of *paideia* is developed.³

² For Philo's Jewish context, see e.g. N.G. Cohen, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse* (Frankfurt am Main, Lang: 1995) and idem, "The Jewish Dimension of Philo's Judaism—An Elucidation of *de Spec. Leg.* IV 132–150," *JJS* 38 (1987): 165–86. See also comparative discussions in F. García Martínez, "Divine Sonship at Qumran and in Philo," *SPhilo* 19 (2007): 85–99 and H. Najman, "Philosophical Contemplation and Revelatory Inspiration in Ancient Judean Traditions," *SPhilo* 19 (2007): 101–11.

³ For Philo and his Hellenistic context, I am drawing on a long history of previous scholarship. See e.g. P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete For His Time* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); J.J. Collins, "The Diaspora Setting," in *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 135–57; P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (2 vols.; London: Clarendon, 1972), 1:189–301; R. Goulet, *La Philosophie de Moïse: Essai de reconstitution d'un commentaire philosophique prephilonien du Pentateuque* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1987); D.M. Hay, "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," *StPh* 6 (1979–1980): 41–76; E. Hilgert, "Philo Judaeus et Alexandrinus," in *The School of Moses: Studies in Philo and Hellenistic Religion* (ed. J.P. Kenney; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1995), 1–15; J.A. Sterling, "Philo and the Logic of Apologetics: An Analysis of the *Hypothetica*," *SBLSP* 29 (1990): 412–30; H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1983); H. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy*

2.1. *Moses and Paideia*

Philo's strategy (arguably along with the strategies employed in other Second Temple such as the Wisdom of Solomon or perhaps even Pseudo-Aristeas) is to inscribe the Jewish tradition of Moses and Mosaic law into the school of Plato.⁴ He does this, I suggest, by reading the Mosaic tradition in light of the Greek concept of *paideia*. *Paideia* should be understood as education, instruction or even culture—what Werner Jaeger described as “the process of educating man into his true form, the real and genuine human nature.”⁵

This concept is central to the Platonic tradition, but how do these Greek conceptions of *paideia* get reworked in a Jewish register (while still continuing to function in a Greek context)? How will someone like Philo, writing in Greek, adjust to universalized expectations of Greek notions of *paideia* in his authorizing of the particularized Torah of Moses? How does he negotiate the difficult position he is in, namely to authorize a particular copy of what he will repeatedly claim has the very same status as the law of nature, inscribed into the cosmos at the very beginning of the world?⁶

in Judaism, Christianity, and in Islam (2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), 1:332–47.

⁴ Here I am disagreeing with those who have advocated for a *Mosaic school*, for instance G. Boccaccini (e.g. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998]), who argues that there is a deep division between Mosaic and Enochic Judaism in the Second Temple period, analogous to the oppositions between the Greco-Roman schools of philosophy. I see no evidence for such schools, which would have to involve institutions of discipleship, of whose existence in Second Temple Judaism there is no sign. Nor in general do I find any evidence of a distinction between communities that discuss Mosaic law and Torah and those that do not. There is no reason to think that distinct traditionary processes, organized around distinct ideas and ascribed to distinct founding figures, could not have coexisted within one community.

⁵ W. Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture, Vol. 1: Archaic Greece, The Mind of Athens* (trans. G. Highet; 2d ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), 1:xxiii.

⁶ For this concept of law in Philo, see my articles, “The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law,” *SPhilo* 11 (1999): 55–73 and “A Written Copy of the Law of Nature: An Unthinkable Paradox?” *SPhilo* 15 (2003): 54–63. I am indebted to previous scholarship on natural law in Philo and in Hellenistic thought more generally, e.g. M. Bockmuehl, “Natural Law in Second Temple Judaism,” *VT* 45 (1995): 17–44 (43); J. DeFilippo and P. Mitsis, “Socrates and Stoic Natural Law,” in *The Socratic Movement* (ed. P. Vander Waerdt; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994), 252–71; E.R. Goodenough, “Philo's Exposition of the Law and His *De Vita Mosis*,” *HTR* 26 (1933): 109–25; R.A. Horsley, “The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero” *HTR* 71 (1978): 35–59 (56ff.); V. Nikiprowetzky, “Loi de Moïse, Loi de Nature, Sagesse,” in *Le Commentaire de L'Ecriture Chez Philon d'Alexandrie* (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 116–54;

To understand how Philo reconceives *paideia*, we must first examine his conception of the end of the human being: to become soul alone or mind alone.⁷ This is evident in his writings both on Moses and on the Therapeutae:

Afterwards the time came when he had to make his pilgrimage from earth to heaven, and leave this mortal life for immortality, summoned thither by the Father who resolved his twofold nature of soul and body into a single unity, transforming his whole being into mind, pure and the sunlight. Then, indeed, we find him possessed by the spirit, no longer uttering general truths to the whole nation but prophesying to each tribe in particular the things which were to be and hereafter must come to pass. Some of these have already taken place, others are still looked for, since confidence in the future is assured by fulfillment in the past. (*Mos.* 2.288)⁸

So much then for the Therapeutae, who have taken to their hearts the contemplation of nature and what it has to teach, and have lived in the soul alone, citizens of Heaven and the world, presented to the Father and Maker of all by their faithful sponsor Virtue, who has procured for them God's friendship and added a gift going hand in hand with it, true excellence of life, a boon better than all good fortune and rising to the very summit of felicity. (*Contempl.* 90)

In other words, the end of the human being is to return to the state of the very first human creation, who, according to Philo, is initially *created as mind alone*. The Adam of Genesis, chapter one, is distinct from the Adam of chapters two and three:

It is therefore very natural that Adam, that is to say the mind, when he was giving names to and displaying his comprehension of the other animals, did not give a name to himself, because he was ignorant of himself and of his own nature. A command indeed is given to man, but not to the man created according to the image and idea of God; for that being is possessed of virtue without any need of exhortation his own

J.W. Martens, "Philo and the 'Higher' Law," *SBLSP* 30 (1991): 309–22; R.D. McKirahan, Jr., "Chapter 19: The NOMOS-PHYSIS Debate," in *Philosophy Before Socrates: An Introduction with Texts and Commentary* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Hackett, 1994), 390–413; L. Strauss, *Natural Right and History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 146–61; G. Striker, "Origins of the Concept of Natural Law," in *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 209–20; P. Vander Waerdt, "Zeno's Republic and the Origins of Natural Law," in *The Socratic Movement* (ed. Vander Waerdt), 272–308.

⁷ These concepts are isomorphic terms in this period. Personal communication with Brad Inwood.

⁸ Translations of Philonic texts are taken from the *Loeb Classical Library*, translated by F.M. Colson and G.M. Whitaker.

instinctive nature, but this other would not have wisdom if it had not been taught to him. (*Leg.* 1.92)

It is worthwhile to note the many traditions in which the primordial Adam plays a role in constructing the image of a perfect human being, for example 4 *Ezra* or Qumranic and later Gnostic traditions.⁹ While the similarities are suggestive, I would want to emphasize an important difference between accounts of return to the primordial Adam that involve an eschatological rupture in time, and accounts like Philo's, which conceive the return as the natural result of a continuous process of development.

For Philo, we have an idealized human who attains his end naturally in a process that is teleological: the end is the natural and best outgrowth of a process of instruction and development. This conception of perfection¹⁰ has struck people as wholly Greek and far less engaged with matters of holiness and purity as part of the path to perfection, an emphasis found in Qumranic and other Second Temple Hebrew and Aramaic traditions. But it is precisely here, in one of Philo's most Hellenistic aspects, that I want to consider the ways in which Jewish ideas and texts are brought to bear.

3. THREE PATHS OF PERFECTION: *AUTOMATHEIS*; SAGE AS MODEL; TEXT AS GUIDE

Philo's conception of the path to perfection, of *paideia*, involves a distinctive approach to his Jewish sources. Importantly, Philo understands

⁹ For primordial Adam traditions see e.g. C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

¹⁰ For the idea of perfection in ancient Jewish literature, see my article, "La recherche de la perfection." For another treatment of sagely perfection in Philo, see D. Winston, "Sage and Super-Sage in Philo of Alexandria," in *The Ancestral Philosophy. Hellenistic Philosophy in Second Temple Judaism: Essays of David Winston* (ed. G. Sterling; Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2001), 171–80. Pierre Hadot has written extensively on perfection as the goal of the philosophical life in ancient Greek thought; see P. Hadot, *Qu'est-ce la philosophie antique?* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995) and *Exercices spirituels et philosophie antique* (Paris: Études augustiniennes, 1987); see also the introduction by A. Davidson, "Pierre Hadot and the Spiritual Phenomenon of Ancient Philosophy," in *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault* (trans. M. Chase; Oxford: Blackwell, 1995), 1–45. See also S. Cavell, *Cities of Words: Pedagogical Letters on a Register of the Moral Life* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap, 2004).

Torah and wisdom already to be latent within the human being. He maintains, following the Platonic tradition, that all knowledge is to be found within the human being. In this he differs from many roughly contemporaneous Jewish writings that claim that the pertinent kind of knowledge must come from without—from the radically external, that is, God or an angel (as we can see in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the later text of *4 Ezra*, and Danielic and Jeremianic traditions). Philo's Platonic view raises a problem: if wisdom already lies within the human being, then *how* then can there be such a thing as instruction at all?

This dilemma is reminiscent of Socrates' reformulation of Meno's paradox in Plato's *Meno*:

For one wouldn't inquire into what one knows—for one knows it, and there's no need to inquire into such a thing, nor into what one doesn't know—for one doesn't know what one is inquiring into. (80e)

How can you inquire into anything? Because, according to this model of latent wisdom, either you already know it—or you don't. If you don't know it, then how would you recognize it, and if you do know it, then why is inquiry necessary at all? Here, *I* am asking the question (on Philo's behalf) in a slightly different way: how can you be *taught* what you already know?

I have identified three connected solutions, three paths to perfection, that Philo presents in his many writings, and that shed light on the way he understands *paideia* in a Jewish-Greek context. The first path is attributed to precious few people in Philo's writings: those who are described as *automatheis*—self-taught.

3.1. *Being Self-Taught*

Philo praises the one who is self-taught, who will need no instruction because he can intuit the law of nature—that is, the law of the cosmos—on his own. Moreover he comes, on his own, to see God. As I already mentioned, this is true of the first Adam, but there are other biblical figures that Philo will celebrate for being self-taught: notably, Abraham, Isaac, and Moses. Each is *automatheis*, and will require no external education to achieve his natural end:

Abraham:

for these first men, without ever having been followers or pupils of any one, and without ever having been taught by preceptors what they ought

to do or say, but having embraced a line of conduct consistent with nature from attending to their own natural impulses, and from being prompted by innate virtue and looking upon nature herself to be, what in fact she is, the most ancient and duly established of laws, did in reality spend their whole lives in making laws, never of deliberate purpose doing anything open to reproach, and for their accidental errors propitiating God, and appeasing him by prayers and supplications, so as to procure for themselves the enjoyment of an entire life of virtue and prosperity, both in respect of their deliberate actions, and those which proceeded from no voluntary purpose. (*Abr.* 6)

Isaac:

And Isaac, who was thought worthy of self-taught knowledge, of his own accord also leaves all the corporeal essence which was attached to his soul, and is added to and made an inheritor with (not the people, as the others whom I have mentioned were), but with the ‘race,’ as Moses says; for ‘race’ is one, and the highest of all: but ‘people,’ is the name of many. (*Sacr.* 6)

Moses:

But, while the divine judgment was still waiting, Moses was carrying out the exercises of virtue with an admirable trainer, the reason within him under whose discipline he labored to fit himself for life in its highest forms, the theoretical and the practical (*Mos.* 1.48).

For these figures, *paideia* is part of a long journey. What is remarkable about them is that they don’t require an external teacher in order to reach their end. Instead, they follow the nature within themselves. As we see in this last passage, it is not that the self-taught person needs no teacher at all—rather, the self-taught person has an *internal* teacher.

Thus, Philo’s solution to Meno’s paradox would seem to be as follows: all people have wisdom latent within them, just by virtue of being human. Some people, however, are born with the gift of being able to activate this latent wisdom; having an internal teacher, they have no need for an external one.

3.2. *The Sage as Model*

Throughout his writings, Philo speaks of the sage not only as self-taught, but also as an exemplar whose life and deeds are included in the law of Moses so that they may be imitated by others. Here I have in mind especially Moses and Abraham, from whom those who are not self-taught may learn. Here is the second stage of Philo’s solu-

tion to Meno's paradox: those who are not born with the gift of being self-taught cannot learn from an external teacher, because the wisdom they need to learn is latent within and not imparted from without; however, they may take as their models those who *are* self-taught. By imitating the self-taught, they learn from an internal teacher *at a second remove*: namely, from the reason internal to the self-taught. So, like the self-taught, they too learn without resorting to an external teacher.

Philo's image of the exemplary sage—which philosophical tradition conceives of in a very abstract, sometimes impersonal way—becomes highly concrete through the association with Jewish texts and interpretive traditions.¹¹ Telling the stories of the sage, the one who is self-taught, becomes key to their function as exemplars to be emulated. Let us consider a few Philonic texts that discuss the role of these stories:

What more shall I say? Has he not also enjoyed an even greater communion with the Father and Creator of the universe, being thought unworthy of being called by the same appellation? For he also was called the god and king of the whole nation, and he is said to have entered into the darkness where God was; that is to say, into the invisible, and shapeless, and incorporeal world, the essence, which is the model of all existing things, where he beheld things invisible to mortal nature; for, having brought himself and his own life into the middle, as an excellently wrought picture, *he established himself as a most beautiful and Godlike work, to be a model for all those who were inclined to imitate him. Happy are those who imprint it, or strive to imprint, that image [of Moses] in their souls. For it were best that the mind should carry the form of virtue in perfection, but, failing this, let it at least have the unflinching desire to possess that form.* (Mos. 1.158–159)

Here, recounting life story and qualities of the sage is key to the following his model.

¹¹ On the concept of the exemplary sage in other Jewish traditions see H. Najman, "How should we Contextualize Pseudepigrapha?" "La recherche de la perfection," and "Reconsidering Jubilees"; M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1990), 318–21, 326–27; B.G. Wright, "From Generation to Generation: The Sage as Father in Early Jewish Literature," in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J.M. Lieu; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 309–32. For more general background on ideal figures see J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsburg, eds., *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), and M.E. Stone and T.A. Bergren, eds., *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1998).

It is important to note that, in Philo's view, the patriarchs exemplify the possibility of leading a virtuous life even if one does not have access to the written law of Moses:

Great indeed are the efforts expended both by lawgivers and by laws in every nation in filling the souls of free men with comfortable hopes; but he who gains this virtue of hopefulness without being led to it by exhortation or command has been educated into it by a law which nature has laid down, a law unwritten yet self-taught. (*Abr.* 16)

The self-taught sages led virtuous lives before Sinai, following the "law which nature has laid down."¹² For two reasons, Philo says, did Moses include accounts of their lives in the Pentateuch:

First he wished to show that the enacted ordinances are not inconsistent with nature; and secondly that those who wish to live in accordance with the laws as they stand have no difficult task, seeing that the first generations before any at all of the particular statutes was set in writing followed the unwritten law with perfect ease, so that one might properly say that the enacted laws are nothing else than reminders of the life of the ancients, preserving to a later generation their actual words and deeds. (*Abr.* 5)

This last phrase is of great importance for my argument. Philo says that the enacted laws—that is to say, the laws given by God to Israel through Moses—may be properly regarded as reminders of the lives of the patriarchs, indeed as nothing else. In other words, if read in accordance with Philo's instruction, the lives of the patriarchs and the laws of Moses turn out to be equivalent. Now, since the lives of the patriarchs embody the law of nature, it follows that the enacted laws of Moses also embody the law of nature. But this implies that the status of the laws of Moses, as copies of the laws of nature, would have remained unclear if not for the fact that the laws of Moses are situated within the context of the lives of the patriarchs and their descendants. Thus, the laws of Moses cannot be reduced to a code. They are expressions of the "actual words and deeds" of sages.¹³

¹² The patriarchs are interpreted as law-abiding before Sinai in a variety of other traditions roughly contemporary to Philo. For sources and discussion, see J.L. Kugel, *The Bible as It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997), 116–17 (Noah), 157–58 (Melchizedek), 165–78 (Abraham).

¹³ On this idea of instruction as example, beyond a code, in a different Jewish context, see the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Šabbat*, where, in order to learn how to perform the ritual of *Havdalah*, a student needed to go and *watch* Ulla, not read

3.3. *Text as Guide*

This brings us to the third path to perfection: the path that involves studying the perfect copy of the natural law—Mosaic Torah. Textual instruction can lead a person to the end of becoming soul alone or mind alone. The Torah of Moses can serve this function because it is the perfect copy of the primordial and cosmic law of nature:

But Moses is alone in this, that his laws, firm, unshaken, immovable, stamped, as it were, with the seals of nature herself, remain secure from the day when they were first enacted to now, and we may hope that they will remain for all future ages as though immortal, so long as the sun and moon and the whole heaven and universe exist. Thus, though the nation had undergone so many changes, both to increased prosperity and the reverse, nothing—not even the smallest part of the ordinances—has been disturbed; because all have clearly paid high honor to their venerable and godlike character. (*Mos.* 2.14)

In his account of creation, Philo uses the metaphor of stamping with a seal to express the relationship between original and copy:

Before the particular and individual mind there subsists a certain original as an archetype and pattern of it, and again before the particular sense-perception, a certain original of sense perception related to the particular as a seal making impression is to the form which it makes. (*Leg.* 1.22)

Philo's claim, then, is that the laws of Moses are copies of the laws of nature.¹⁴ Indeed, he says elsewhere that they are "likenesses and copies of the patterns enshrined in the soul" (*Mos.* 2.11), and that "the laws [are] the most faithful copy of the world-polity" (*Mos.* 2.51–52). But here lies a paradox. How is it so much as possible for the written laws of a particular nation to be copies of the laws of nature?

Philo seems to share, in large part, a framework of thought with Cicero and others rooted in Greek philosophy. Yet there is simply no

Ulla's tradition or hear the instruction via another member of the Talmudic academy. This particular *sugya* is discussed in interesting ways in M. Jaffee, "Torah in the Mouth and Torah in the Heart: How Judaism Was Transmitted in a Minimally-Literate Near Eastern Jewish Community," *Queens College Journal of Jewish Studies* 7 (2005): 67–74.

¹⁴ See H. Najman, "A Written Copy of the Law of Nature" and "The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law," and sources therein and above, n. 6. For a discussion of law and nature in a wider Hellenistic context, see especially the excellent discussion by McKirahan, Jr., "Chapter 19: The NOMOS-PHYSIS Debate."

room in Cicero's thinking for a written copy of the law of nature. Cicero characterizes the law of nature as follows:

I see that because custom is so corrupted such behavior is neither thought dishonorable nor forbidden by statute and civil law. It is, however, forbidden by the law of nature. For there is a fellowship that is extremely widespread, shared by all with all (even if this has often been said, it ought to be said still more often); a closer one exists among those of the same nation, and one more intimate still among those of the same city. For this reason our ancestors wanted the law of nations and the civil law to be different: everything in the civil law need not be in the law of nations, but everything in the law of nations ought also to be a part of civil law. We, however, do not have the firm and lifelike figure of true law and genuine justice: we make use of shadows and sketches. I wish we would follow even those! For they are drawn from the best examples of nature and truth.¹⁵

Here, the law of nature is distinguished from the laws of particular nations. The distinction concerns both normative status and epistemic access. First, the law of nature has superior normative status. It constrains the laws of particular nations, but they do not constrain it. Second, there seems to be no special problem gaining epistemic access to the laws of particular nations, which are presumably embodied, not only in custom, but in written statutes. But gaining epistemic access to the law of nature is problematic. At best, we can know "shadows and sketches" of the law of nature. Those are "drawn from the best examples of nature and truth"—that is, presumably, from the exemplary lives of those who are virtuous and wise. But we do not know the originals. We know nature and truth *only* through those whose lives copy them.

Cicero's point about our extremely limited knowledge of the law of nature entails that this law is necessarily unwritten, and can never be the law of any particular *polis*. In contrast, Philo maintains that the law of nature is precisely the law of Moses, hence, the law of the Jewish *polis*. While this law cannot be reduced to a code of written laws, it can be embodied in a Scripture that grounds law in the lives of self-taught sages. This must have sounded utterly paradoxical to Philo's philosophical contemporaries, who were forced either to reject

¹⁵ This passage is cited from the translation of M.T. Griffin and E.M. Atkins, eds., *Cicero: On Duties* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 125–26.

Philo's claims on behalf of the law of Moses, or else to transform their conception of the law of nature.

It may seem to us that Philo is apologetic when he justifies Judaism in the Hellenistic terms of the law of nature. But there is good reason to think that he means—with utter seriousness—his paradoxical identification of the law of Moses with the law of nature. Thus, in the two passages below, Philo sees it as highly significant that Moses prefaces the Law with an account of creation that might otherwise seem out of place:

The beginning is, as I just said, quite marvelous. It contains an account of the making of the cosmos, the reasoning for this being that the cosmos is in harmony with the Law and the Law with the cosmos, and the man who observes the Law is at once a citizen of the cosmos, directing his actions in relation to the rational purpose of nature, in accordance with which the entire cosmos also is administered. (*Opif.* 3)

He did not, like any prose-writer, make it his business to leave behind for posterity records of ancient deeds for the pleasant but unimproving entertainment which they give; but, in relating the history of early times, and going for its beginning right to the creation of the universe, he wished to show two most essential things: first that the Father and Maker of the world was in the truest sense also its Lawgiver, secondly that he who would observe the laws gladly welcomes conformity with nature and lives in accordance with the ordering of the universe, so that his deeds are attuned to harmony with his words and his words with his deeds. (*Mos.* 2.48)

4. CONCLUSION

The goal of becoming mind alone seems entirely Platonic. If anything in Philo's thinking about Judaism is a Hellenistic imposition, surely it is this. However, that very goal is read into Gen 1, then into the lives of Moses and Abraham, and generally integrated into a detailed reading of biblical narratives. Moreover, the lives of these self-taught sages stand as exemplars for people in general, and for Jews in particular, so that those who are not blessed with being self-taught may nevertheless learn to actualize their latent wisdom.

Indeed, the actual practice of Mosaic law is connected up with the lives of the sages in such a way that the law of Moses may be said to be the perfect copy of the law of nature. Of course this application of the law of Moses to one's life must be considered with respect to the

particular laws and with respect to their universal rereading in Philo's allegorical interpretations.

If Philo seems to us to Hellenize Judaism, it is important to note that he also Judaizes Hellenism. He Hellenizes Judaism by taking the becoming of mind-alone as the goal of human life. But he Judaizes Hellenism by presenting that goal as attainable through a life lived in accordance with a written law—a Scripture—that is nothing less than the embodiment of the law of nature. This emphasis on the role of textual study in *paideia* marks Philo as an inhabitant of the larger world of ancient Judaism. We can say this without ignoring or downplaying the differences between Philonic Judaism and other varieties of ancient Judaism. Indeed, we can understand these differences only against the background of a deeper commonality.¹⁶

¹⁶ I am grateful to Steven Fraade, Paul Franks, Martha Himmelfarb, Robert Kraft, Nathalie Lacoste, and Eva Mroczek for their helpful suggestions.

ANCESTRAL, ORACULAR AND PROPHETIC AUTHORITY:
“SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY” ACCORDING
TO PAUL AND PHILO

George H. van Kooten

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper I would like to argue that Paul’s view on the authoritative Jewish writings, the “holy writings,” as he calls them (Rom 1:2), is rather nuanced and subtle.¹ For Paul, the fact that these writings are called “holy” does not imply that they are divinely revealed in their entirety and for that reason authoritative and holy. As I will demonstrate, these writings are considered authoritative for a variety of reasons, firstly because they are the *ancestral* writings of the Jews, in the same way as the ancestral writings of others in Greco-Roman antiquity were considered authoritative. This will be explored in section one.

Secondly, in Paul’s view, some parts of the Jewish writings are more authoritative than others insofar as they contain the direct divine oracles of God, normally rendered in direct divine speech and addressed to the prophets who record them. This divine, oracular authority will be explored in section two.

Thirdly, the question that then arises is in what sense the prophets, and in particular their writings, are related to God’s oracles, which are encompassed by the prophetic writings. We will look at Philo, who seems to have reflected theoretically on the difference between oracular and prophetic authority and who provides a close analogy for Paul’s more implicit views on the issue. This is the subject of section three.

Finally, if Paul has such a nuanced view of the multilayered authority of the Jewish writings, we need to understand how this is related both to the well-known view expressed in 2 Tim 3:16, generally

¹ I wish to express my thanks to the participants in this colloquium for their criticism and suggestions, especially Jan Bremmer, Piet van der Horst, Arie van der Kooij, Hindy Najman, and Eric Peels.

believed to be a later Pseudo-Pauline pseudepigraphon, that “all Scripture is inspired by God” and to other concepts in Paul’s writings such as “the word of God” and “revelation.” Whereas the later notions do not seem to contradict Paul’s concise and discerning differentiations between ancestral, oracular and prophetic authority, it appears that the more rigid, monolithic view of 2 Tim 3:16 was made as a counterclaim against an emerging gnostic way of thinking which denied the authoritative status of particular writings. Although 2 Timothy’s position is understandable in such a polemical context, it would be wrong, I would suggest, to mistake this for Paul’s understanding of the authoritative Jewish writings. His nuanced approach still reflects and has much in common with a general Jewish and Greco-Roman appreciation of the importance of ancestral writings and the special status of divine oracles, of which the prophets were the recipients and interpreters.

2. HUMAN AND ANCESTRAL AUTHORITY

2.1. *References to Moses, David and Isaiah as Human Authorial Names*

Firstly we will discuss Paul’s reference to the human and ancestral aspect of his appreciation of the Jewish Scriptures as authoritative writings. On several occasions, Paul refers to figures such as Moses, David and Isaiah in their capacity as human authors. In these instances he does not refer to the “holy writings” but uses their names as authorial names. In relation to David and Isaiah, it seems clear that they are regarded as human authors to whom one can refer. Paul explicitly refers to David twice as the author of a subsequent quotation in his writings: in Rom 4:6–8 Paul quotes Ps 31:1–2 and in Rom 11:9–10 he quotes Ps 68:23–24. On both occasions Paul introduces the quotation with the phrase καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει, “and David says.” In a similar way, quotations from Isaiah are introduced in Rom 10:16: Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει; Rom 10:20–21: Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει; and Rom 15:12: καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει. Although David and Isaiah would have been held in high esteem by Paul, it seems that in these passages he considers them as human authors of authoritative writings, without implying or referring to the holy or divine nature of their

writings. These writings seem to be authoritative because they derive from revered ancestors.

This is particularly clear in the case of Moses. In many instances Paul credits Moses as the author of a particular passage which he quotes. Paul qualifies these passages either by means of the formula ὁ νόμος λέγει, “the Law says,” implying it is the Mosaic law he refers to, or by mentioning Moses by name. In the latter cases he introduces quotes from Moses with the formula Μωϋσῆς λέγει, “Moses says,” or Μωϋσῆς γράφει, “Moses writes,” followed by quotations from the Mosaic Pentateuch, Exodus, Leviticus and Deuteronomy.²

A very interesting case is Rom 10:5–8, in which Paul differentiates between Moses as the one who describes “the righteousness that comes from *the Law*” and those passages, all but one drawn from Moses, which concern “the righteousness that comes from *faith*.” In this way Paul distinguishes two layers within the Jewish writings, a positive, still useful perspective and another less positive, disputable perspective, both of which are part and parcel of the same collection of predominantly Mosaic writings:

Moses writes (Μωϋσῆς...γράφει) concerning the righteousness that comes from the Law, that ‘the person who does these things will live by them’ (Lev 18:5). But the righteousness that comes from faith says, ‘Do not say in your heart (Deut 9:4), “Who will ascend into heaven?” (Deut 30:12)’ (that is, to bring Christ down) ‘or “Who will descend into the abyss?” (Ps 107:26)’ (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead). But what does it say? ‘The word is near you, on your lips and in your heart (Deut 30:14)’ (that is, the word of faith that we proclaim). (Rom 10:5–8)

In this passage, Paul differentiates between two perspectives within the Mosaic law. Although together they constitute “the entire Law,” a concept used in Gal 5:3 (cf. Gal 5:14), it is noteworthy that Paul explicitly credits the negative view—that righteousness comes from the Law—to Moses, whereas the other, positive view about the righteousness that comes from faith, which is predominantly based on Moses, is nevertheless not ascribed to him explicitly. The simple reason for this might be that Paul also emphasizes the positive view with a reference to one of the many non-Mosaic Psalms (Ps 107:26). Be this as it may, for

² See Rom 10:5–8 (= Lev 18:5; Deut 9:4; Deut 30:12, 14) and Rom 10:19 (= Deut 32:21). Cf. Rom 9:15 (= Exod 33:19).

our present study it is relevant that Paul points to a tension *within* the Jewish Scriptures that he refers to; in his view, two very differing views are present in the same Mosaic writings. This tension, it seems, can be accepted with little difficulty if there is also a human aspect to these writings.

2.2. *The Formula “the Law Says”: A Reference to an Authoritative Ancestral Law*

On other occasions Paul refers to the Mosaic writings without mentioning Moses by name, instead using the formula ὁ νόμος λέγει. He uses it various times: in 1 Cor 7:7, 9:8–9, 14:34 and Rom 3:19.³ The way in which he refers to the Mosaic law clearly implies that the Law being referred to is authoritative, but it says nothing about the exact status of the writing, that is, whether it is considered human, divine or inspired. Rather it seems only authoritative because it is ancestral. This becomes particularly clear when we realize that the phrase ὁ νόμος λέγει was also a common formula in pagan Greek.⁴ One of its earliest occurrences is in Plato’s *Republic* and *Laws*.

In *Resp.* 451b Socrates states that he believes “that involuntary homicide is a lesser fault than to mislead opinion about the honourable, the good, and the just” and for that reason he is hesitant to enter into a discussion with Glaucon, if he would indeed be deemed to deceive him. Glaucon, however, reassures him and answers that even if there was a false note in the argument he would “release” Socrates “as in a homicide case,” and thus urges him to continue with confidence. Socrates replies:

Well, said I, he who is released in that case is counted pure, *as the law says* (ὡς ὁ νόμος λέγει). And presumably, if there, here too.

³ In Rom 3:19 Paul uses it in a general sense to refer to what the Law has to say. In 1 Cor 14:34 the formula καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει supports an allusion, whereas in the other cases it introduces a quotation (1 Cor 7:7; 9:8). In the former of the last two passages, the actual formula reads ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν (1 Cor 7:7) and in the latter passage the formula ὁ νόμος λέγει is further elaborated by the phrase ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται: “Do I say this on human authority? Does not the Law also say the same? For it is written in the law of Moses” (1 Cor 9:8–9).

⁴ Cf. H.W. Hollander, “The Meaning of the Term ‘Law’ (NOMOS) in 1 Corinthians,” *NovT* 40 (1998): 117–35 (122 n. 25).

The phrase ὡς ὁ νόμος λέγει is used in this case to express the regulation stated by the law that someone who is “released” is considered pure.

The expression is regularly used by Plato in various contexts. Discussing an example of a good and reasonable man who has lost his son, Plato introduces the view that “reason and law” exhort such a man to resist his grief, whereas his emotions urge him to give way to his grief, such that there are two opposite impulses operating in him. The deadlock is overcome only if the man is prepared to follow the guidance of “the law”:

The law, I suppose, says (Λέγει που ὁ νόμος) that it is best to keep quiet as far as possible in calamity and not to chafe and repine, because we cannot know what is really good and evil in such things and it advantages us nothing to take them hard, and nothing in mortal life is worthy of great concern. (*Resp.* 604b)

Once again, Plato uses the phrase Λέγει...ὁ νόμος. As in the previous case, Plato clearly refers to an authoritative law which people are bound or prepared to follow, but his reference says nothing about the divine status of the law under consideration. The most one can say is indeed that this law is considered to be authoritative.

The reason why it is authoritative might be made clear in Plato’s *Laws*, where the law referred to is explicitly qualified as ὁ νόμος ὁ πάτριος, “the ancestral law”:

That which is the real self of each of us, and which we term the immortal soul, departs to the presence of other gods, there—as the ancestral law says (καθάπερ ὁ νόμος ὁ πάτριος λέγει)—to render its account, a prospect to be faced with courage by the good, but with uttermost dread by the evil. (*Leg.* 959b)

Following Plato, the phrase ὁ νόμος λέγει also occurs in Aristotle’s writings⁵ and is frequently used by orators such as Isaeus, Demosthenes, Aeschines and Hyperides from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E.,⁶ and continues to be applied in the centuries to follow.⁷ However, what captivates our attention most now is the specific way in

⁵ Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1375b18.

⁶ See Isaeus, *De Pyrrho* 68; Demosthenes, *Andr.* 6, 20; *1 Boeot.* 12; Aeschines, *Tim.* 13; Hyperides, *Ath.* 6.6.

⁷ See Aelius Aristides, *Παναθηναϊκός* 125; Aelian, *Var. hist.* 4.1, 7; Plotinus, *Enn.* 3.2.9; Apsines, *Rhet.* 372. See, for Jewish sources, also *4 Macc.* 2:5 and Philo, *Det.* 159; *Deus* 99.

which Plato qualifies this law as ancestral: “as the *ancestral* law says.” This phrase makes us aware that what renders the law authoritative is its ancestral, traditional nature and its time-honoured character, the fact that it was already binding, or thought to have been binding, for the previous generations. Indeed the notion of “the ancestral law” (ὁ πάτριος νόμος) or even, in plural, “the ancestral laws” (οἱ πάτριον νόμοι) proliferates in both Greek pagan sources and in Jewish sources of the Greco-Roman era. It is not only found in such wide-ranging Greco-Roman pagan authors as Thucydides, Herodotus, Isocrates, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, Aristotle, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius Halicarnassensis, Strabo, Plutarch, Arrianus, Appian, Lucian, Aelius Aristides, Athenaeus, Cassius Dio, Sextus Empiricus, Philostratus, Porphyrius and Julianus,⁸ but it also occurs in the writings of Jewish authors such as the author of 2 Macc, Philo and Josephus.⁹ The topic is also debated by Christian authors, notably by Origen, who answers the charge brought against the Christians by Celsus—that they destroy the paternal laws and traditions which each nation follows.¹⁰ All these authors, pagan, Jewish and Christian, attest to the importance of the notion of πάτριος νόμος, “ancestral law.”

Similar, but less frequent expressions include πατρικὸς νόμος,¹¹ or simply ὁ νόμος πατρὸς and πατέρων νόμος.¹² This opens up a whole field of ancestral authorities. It is not only the law that can be regarded as ancestral, since traditions and writings are also depicted as ances-

⁸ Thucydides, *Hist.* 2.34.1; 4.118.1–3; 8.76.6; Herodotus, *Hist.* 3.82; Isocrates, *Paneg.* 55; *Panath.* 169; Xenophon, *Anab.* 2.3.2; 5.2.14; 6.5.7; 7.8.5; Plato, *Leg.* 680a; 793a; 959b; *Epin.* 985d; Demosthenes, *Mid.* 52; Aristotle, *Ath.* 29.3; *Pol.* 1268b; Diod. Sic. 14.65.2; 16.24.5; 17.110.5; 40.2.1; Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Ant. rom.* 2.65.3; 4.84.5; 15.9.6; Strabo, *Geogr.* 15.1.64; 17.3.24; Plutarch, *Alex.* 69.8; *Sert.* 22.5; Arrian, *Anab.* 3.16.9; Appian, *Mith.* 279; *Bell. civ.* 2.7.47; 2.10.63; 3.7.44; 5.13.128; Lucian, *Phal.* 2.9; Aelius Aristides, *Ῥοδίσις περὶ ὁμονοίας* 567 (Jebb); Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 6.106 (Kaibel); Cassius Dio, *Hist. rom.* 54.9.10; Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 11.166; Philostratus, *Ep.* 1.5; Porphyry, *Abst.* 4.22; Julianus, *Ep.* 89b line 377.

⁹ See 2 Macc 6:1; 7:2; 7:37; 4 Macc. 4:23; 5:33; Philo, *Spec.* 2.13; *Prob.* 80; *Hypoth.* 195; *QE* frg. 14; Josephus, *Vita* 135; *C. Ap.* 2.143; *A.J.* 4.71; 4.130; 5.108; 7.130; 7.131; 7.374; 8.362; 9.243; 10.11; 10.214; 11.110; 11.140; 11.231; 11.338; 12.142; 12.146; 12.240; 12.267; 12.300; 12.381; 12.382; 14.235; 14.242; 16.163; 16.365; 17.149; 17.150; 18.84; 18.236; 18.264; 18.280; 19.301; 19.349; 20.218; *B.J.* 1.108; 1.209; 1.650; 1.653; 2.7; 2.86; 2.192; 2.393; 3.356; 6.334; 7.357.

¹⁰ Origen, *Cels.* 2.1–4; 5.25–43.

¹¹ Cratinus, frg. 116; Dionysius Halicarnassensis, *Ant. rom.* 12.16.4; Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 15.6 (Kaibel).

¹² Sophocles, *Aj.* 548–549; Plato, *Criti.* 120b; Xenocrates, frg. 222 = Plutarch, *Def. orac.* 416C; Prov (LXX) 6:20; Philo, *Ebr.* 84; Plutarch, *Def. orac.* 436F.

tral and hence authoritative. Some examples of passages referring to ancestral traditions and writings in both pagan and Jewish sources in Greek are useful here, as they reveal to us the importance of ancestry in the way authority is constructed. In his *Deipnosophists* Athenaeus mentions customs handed down *κατά τινα πατρῶν παράδοσιν*, “by ancestral tradition” (3.97 Loeb = 3.52 Kaibel). It is these kinds of traditions that Paul has in view when he describes his pre-Christian Jewish past:

You have heard, no doubt, of my earlier life in Judaism. I was violently persecuting the church of God and was trying to destroy it. I advanced in Judaism beyond many among my people of the same age, for I was far more zealous for *the traditions of my ancestors* (τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων). (Gal 1:13–14)

This description of Judaism as characterized by ancestral traditions accords very well with the report of Paul’s Pharisaic education in Acts 22:3, according to which Paul was “brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, educated strictly according to the ancestral law” (τοῦ πατρῶου νόμου). That indeed, particularly in Pharisaic Judaism, the transmission of ancestral laws was paramount, is confirmed by Josephus’ outline of the Pharisaic position, in contrast with that of the Sadducees:

For the present I wish merely to explain that the Pharisees had passed to the people certain customs handed down by former generations (νόμιμά τινα παρέδοσαν... ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς) and not recorded in the laws of Moses (οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωυσέως νόμοις), for which reason they are rejected by the Sadduceean group, who hold that only those regulations should be considered valid which were written down (in Scripture), and that those which had been handed down by the ancestors (τὰ δ’ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων) need not be observed. (*A.J.* 13.297)

In the writings of Greco-Roman authors, both pagan and Jewish, laws and traditions gain much authority if they are ancestral. According to the Jewish author of the *Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira*, ancestral origins also explain why particular books are appreciated. According to the introduction, in which the author explains why he wishes to translate a book by his grandfather from Hebrew into Greek, the author states that his grandfather had devoted himself to “the Law and the Prophets and *the other books of our ancestors*”:

Many great teachings have been given to us through the Law and the Prophets and the others (or: the other books) that followed them, and for these we should praise Israel for instruction and wisdom. Now, those

who read the Scriptures must not only themselves understand them, but must also as lovers of learning be able through the spoken and written word to help the outsiders. So my grandfather Jesus, who had devoted himself especially to *the reading of the Law and the Prophets and the other books of our ancestors* (ἐπι πλείον ἑαυτὸν δοῦς εἰς τε τὴν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πατρίων βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν), and had acquired considerable proficiency in them, was himself also led to write something pertaining to instruction and wisdom, so that by becoming familiar also with his book those who love learning might make even greater progress in living according to the Law. (Prologue)

In this quote it is clear that the writings of the Mosaic law, the prophets “and the other ancestral books” are authoritative for Jesus and his grandson precisely because they are the books of the Jewish ancestors. Because they are ancestral, they are worthy of respect. This also seems to imply that if these writings are authoritative because of their ancestral nature, there may be clear ethnic limitations with respect to their authority. Just as Plato refers to what the ancestral law says, Ben Sira mentions with reverence the ancestral books of the Jews, as do other authors with respect to different ancestral traditions. For such laws, traditions and books to be appreciated, it was not necessary to state that they were the product of divine revelation. It was sufficient that they were ancestral for them to be appreciated.

However, not everyone took an uncritical stance towards ancestral writings. Cicero, for example, differentiated between ancestral civil law—the ethnically determined laws of the nations—on the one hand, and the law of nature—the universal law—on the other. According to Cicero, it is possible that something:

...is neither by custom accounted morally wrong nor forbidden either by statute or by civil law; nevertheless it is forbidden by the moral law (*neque more turpe haberi neque aut lege sanciri aut iure civili, tamen naturae lege sanctum est*). For there is a bond of fellowship—although I have often made this statement, I must still repeat it again and again—which has the very widest application, uniting all men together and each to each. This bond of union is closer between those who belong to the same nation, and more intimate still between those who are citizens of the same city-state. It is for this reason that our forefathers chose to understand one thing by the universal law and another by the civil law; the civil law is not necessarily also the universal law, but the universal law ought to be also the civil law (*Itaque maiores aliud ius gentium, aliud ius civile esse voluerunt; quod civile, non idem continuo gentium, quod autem gentium, idem civile esse debet*). But we possess no substantial, life-like image of true Law and genuine Justice; a mere outline sketch is

all that we enjoy. I only wish that we were true even to this; for, even as it is, it is drawn from the excellent models which Nature and Truth afford. (*Off.* 3.69)

In Cicero's view there is a difference between the moral, natural law (the *naturae lex*), which should govern all nations, that is, the law of the nations or the universal law (*ius gentium*), and the specific ancestral and ethnic set of laws of those who belong to the same nation, the *ius civile*. Insofar as Cicero states that "the universal law ought to be also the civil law," he is critical of ethnic, ancestral law. Hindy Najman has shown that Philo was acquainted with this debate but developed a rather surprising view. Whereas Cicero believed the civil law to be only a faint copy of the true natural law and for that reason remained sceptical about the precise relationship between them, according to Philo the ethnic law of the Jewish nation is identical to the law of nature. As Najman states:

For the Hellenistic thinkers who developed the concept of the law of nature, no written civil law could be more than a shadow and appearance of the original.... So Philo would have to show *in opposition to Greek thought on the topic*, that the perfect and authoritative copy of the law of nature was to be found... in the written law of Moses, despite its writtenness and despite its apparent particularity.¹³

And that is what Philo did. For, according to Najman:

... his central theme is that a unique status must be accorded to one collection of written laws, the Law of Moses, which is the law of a particular nation. These laws are unique. They remain 'firm, unshaken, immovable, stamped as it were, with the seals of nature herself.'¹⁴

It seems that Paul, by contrast, prefers Cicero's scepticism regarding the unrestricted validity of ethnic ancestral laws. Paul, having characterized his Jewish Pharisaic education as instruction in ancestral traditions (Gal 1:14), is very critical about the temporal and hence arbitrary nature of the Jewish law (Gal 3:17), promulgating instead "the law of Christ" (Gal 6:2), which is not ethnic but derives from a particular individual. At the same time, Paul is very positive about the

¹³ H. Najman, "The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law," *SPhilo* 11 (1999): 55–73 (59).

¹⁴ H. Najman, "A Written Copy of the Law of Nature: An Unthinkable Paradox?" *SPhilo* 15 (2003): 54–63 (57–58), with reference to various proof texts in Philo.

possibility of non-Jewish nations following *the law of nature*, despite the fact that they are ignorant of the *Jewish law* (Rom 2:14). In that sense, both Cicero and Paul are critical of the unquestioned validity of ethnic ancestral laws.

As a rule, however, we have seen that the ancestry of particular laws, traditions and books greatly enhanced their authority. The sources quoted above show that laws are often qualified as “ancestral laws.” In many sources, the existence of *πάτριοι νόμοι* are accepted as a given. In other sources such as the works of Cicero and Paul, they are critically reflected upon, while in Philo the correctness of the Jewish ancestral laws is even reinforced. Regardless of this large variation in the degree of appreciation, it is beyond doubt that the status and authority of such laws are related to their ancestral origins. What I suggest is that these other examples show that Paul also considered the ancestral law, in his case the Mosaic law, authoritative, although in his Christian phase this was not to the same degree as earlier. The fact that he regarded the Mosaic law as authoritative does not necessarily imply that he regarded the Mosaic law and the other Jewish writings as divinely revealed in their entirety. As we will see in section two, in Paul’s view the Jewish writings did contain divine oracles, but he attributed the authorship of the Law as such to human authors. However, before entering this discussion, I will conclude my review of the formulas Paul used to refer to the Jewish writings.

2.3. *The Phrase “That Which Is Written Says”*

Paul not only explicitly refers to figures such as Moses, David and Isaiah—with respect to their authorship of parts of the Jewish writings—with the formula *ὁ νόμος λέγει* as a way of referring to the Mosaic law, but also uses a similar phrase, *ἡ γραφή λέγει*, “that which is written says” or, in a “Biblicizing” translation, “Scripture says.” Paul uses the phrase five times and on three occasions to introduce a quotation of the Mosaic law.¹⁵ In these instances the formulas *ἡ γραφή λέγει* and *ὁ νόμος λέγει* are thus identical. The fact that the formula *ἡ γραφή λέγει* is mostly used to refer to the Mosaic law seems to reflect the fact that within the Septuagint reference is also made to the Mosaic law

¹⁵ Gal 4:30; Gen 21:10; Rom 4:3; Gen 15:6; Rom 9:17; Exod 9:16.

by means of the formula καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ νόμων Μωυσῆ (4 Kgdms 14:6) or καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσῆ (2 Chr 23:18; cf. Dan 9:13 Theod). From these Septuagint formulas, καθὼς γέγραπται etc., it is but a small step to the formula ἡ γραφὴ λέγει as an equivalent of the phrase ὁ νόμος λέγει.

In two instances, however, Paul also uses the phrase ἡ γραφὴ λέγει to refer to non-Mosaic writings: in Rom 10:11 the formula introduces a quotation from Isa 28:16 and in Rom 11:2 a quote from 1 Sam 12:11 (or Ps 94:14). These two instances are puzzling insofar as the singular form of the formula (ἡ γραφὴ λέγει) seems to imply a reference to a unified, coherent body of texts, an impression we otherwise only obtain from Paul when he speaks of “the Law and the Prophets”: (Rom 3:21). I will return to this latter phrase shortly, however, it should first be mentioned that the phrase ἡ γραφὴ λέγει has been used in the singular in pagan Greek as a reference to a particular writing. Nevertheless, it is extremely rare and only found in the surviving documents of the fifth-century B.C.E. Greek orator Antiphon (*Antiphon, In novercam* 2:...ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ καὶ ἡ γραφὴ λέγει). There is a somewhat similar instance in *4 Macc.* 18:14, in which the mother of the martyrs tells her sons that their father “used to remind you of the Scripture of Isaiah, which says (τὴν Ησαίου γραφὴν τὴν λέγουσαν), ‘Even if you pass through the fire, it shall not burn you.’” However, although γραφή does occur here in the singular, it is qualified by a reference to the author, Isaiah, so that the reference is to a particular writing and not to a collective body of writings, as seems to be the case in Rom 10:11 and 11:2. There are also instances, both in pagan and Jewish sources, in which writings are referred to in the plural. Thales uses the phrase λέγεται δὲ ἐν γραφαῖς (*Thales, frg. 1 = Theophrastus, Phys. op.* 1) and, similarly, Philo applies the formula ἐν ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς λέγεται (*Her.* 159). However, what is strange about the two occurrences of the formula ἡ γραφὴ λέγει in Rom 10:11, 11:2 is, as already mentioned, that it seems to assume that Paul was already able to refer to a unified body of Jewish literature known as “the Scripture.” While the plural, “the Scriptures,” which he uses on various occasions (Rom 1:2; 15:4; 16:26; 1 Cor 15:3, 4), expresses the fact that the Jewish writings were written by various authors, a single reference to “the Scripture” as the common denominator of the writings of the Mosaic law, Isa and 1 Sam (and/or the Pss), quotations of which Paul introduces by means of the formula ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, seems peculiar and calls for an explanation.

This oddity is not apparent with regard to the many occurrences in Paul of the formulas καθὼς γέγραπται (“as it is written”) and γέγραπται γὰρ (“for it is written”), because they are a vague way of referring to something which has been written without implying that this must be in a coherent body of texts.¹⁶ The phrase ἡ γραφή λέγει (“the Scripture says”), however, is different in this respect and it might indeed be best understood, as I already briefly suggested above, as a unifying reference to what he has in mind elsewhere when he, if only once in his extant letters, refers to “the Law and the Prophets” (Rom 3:21). Paul speaks of “the Law and the Prophets” in the same manner as Jewish-Greek writings, as is shown in 2 Macc 15:9, Sir Prologue, 4 Macc. 18:10 and Josephus, *A.J.* 9.281. Yet, this characterization of the authoritative Jewish writings does not necessarily imply that they were seen as divinely revealed in their entirety. The Law, as we have seen, is the ancestral law of Moses, in the same way that pagan Greeks would talk of their ancestral laws. Other Jewish writings, as Ben Sira has shown us, were equally regarded as ancestral writings first and foremost. As we will now see, the writings of the prophets were not regarded as being fully divinely revealed. According to both Paul and Philo, the divine revelation was most tangible in the oracular statements of God himself, which were contained in these prophetic writings. These writings and God’s oracles, in Philo’s and Paul’s shared opinion, did not coincide, leaving room for a subtle understanding of the Jewish authoritative writings. In the following section we will explore the oracular authority of the Jewish writings before moving to a discussion of the difference between oracular and prophetic authority in the fourth section.

3. DIVINE, ORACULAR AUTHORITY: GOD’S ORACULAR UTTERANCES

Thus, it seems that part of the authority of the Jewish Scriptures rests on their ancestral status. Paul’s reference to Moses, David and Isaiah

¹⁶ The phrase καθὼς γέγραπται, which occurs frequently in Paul (see Rom 1:17; 2:24; 3:4; 3:10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13; 9:33; 10:15; 11:8; 11:26; 15:3; 15:9; 15:21; 1 Cor 1:31; 2:9; 2 Cor 8:15; 9:9), is only found in Jewish and Christian writings and not in pagan Greek literature. For the Jewish writings, see the Septuagint: 4 Kgdms 14:6; 23:21; 2 Chr 23:18; 25:4; 1 Esd 3:9; Tob 1:6; Dan 9:13 Theod. A similar phrase, γέγραπται γὰρ, which also occurs in Paul (Rom 12:19; 14:11; 1 Cor 1:19; 3:19; Gal 3:10; 4:22; 4:27), is also found in pagan Greek writings. See, e.g., Demosthenes, *Aristocr.* 24. There are many occurrences of this phrase in the writings of Galen.

as the authors of the writings he quotes implies that these writings are thought to be authored by humans. Furthermore, the formula “the Law says,” which Paul uses, is primarily a reference to an authoritative ancestral law. Even the formula “that which is written says,” which is either equivalent to the formula “the Law says” or synonymous with a reference to “the Law and the Prophets,” does not suggest the “Scripture” referred to is divine in origin. All these references and formulas seem to touch mainly upon the ancestral authority of the Jewish writings. This seems to be all the more the case as, in addition to these instances of ancestral authority, Paul explicitly states when God is the actual author of a specific passage in the Jewish writings. These passages are those where God is quoted as the subject of direct divine speech. There are many instances in which Paul qualifies specific quotations from the Jewish Scriptures as divine by means of the phrase λέγει κύριος (“the Lord says”),¹⁷ or simply with λέγει (“he says”), if it is sufficiently clear that God is the subject of the utterance.¹⁸ Sometimes the phrase λέγει κύριος is part of the original quotation and does not have to be supplemented by Paul with an introductory formula.¹⁹ What is remarkable in all these cases is that without exception the quotations concern utterances by God in direct speech. The formula is never followed by descriptive indirect speech.

In two instances Paul explicitly describes this direct divine speech as being addressed to a human author, or as being reported in the writings of such an author. In the first instance Paul writes:

What then are we to say? Is there injustice on God’s part? By no means! *For he says to Moses* (τῷ Μωϋσῆϊ γὰρ λέγει), ‘I will have mercy on whom I have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion’ (Exod 33:19). So it depends not on human will or exertion, but on God who shows mercy. (Rom 9:14–16)

This example clearly shows that God is quoted in direct speech and that this divine utterance is addressed to Moses, who subsequently noted it down in Exodus.

¹⁷ In 1 Cor 14:21 Paul quotes the divine speech of Isa 28:11–12. See further Rom 12:19; Deut 32:35.

¹⁸ See 2 Cor 6:2; Isa 49:8; Gal 3:16; Gen 13:15; 17:8; 24:7.

¹⁹ See 2 Cor 6:17; Isa 52:11, 4; 2 Cor 6:18; 2 Sam 7:14 (2 Sam 7:8: λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ); Rom 14:11; Isa 49:18; Jer 22:24, Ezek 5:11 etc.; Isa 45:23.

In the second instance Paul describes how a divine utterance was recorded in the book of Hosea. Paul, reflecting on God's wrath and mercy, writes:

What if God, desiring to show his wrath and to make known his power, has endured with much patience the objects of wrath that are made for destruction; and what if he has done so in order to make known the riches of his glory for the objects of mercy, which he has prepared beforehand for glory—including us whom he has called, not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles? *As indeed he says in Hosea* (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει), "Those who were not my people I will call "my people", and her who was not beloved I will call "beloved" (Hos 2:25). 'And in the very place where it was said to them, "You are not my people," there they shall be called children of the living God' (Hos 2:1). (Rom 9:22–26)

Again, God's utterances are in direct speech and they are said to be recorded in the book of Hosea. Apparently, divine speech does not fully coincide with the writings of Hosea or Moses, but is contained in them in those words which God uttered in first person direct speech. This also applies to all of the examples mentioned above where Paul quotes God's own words, introduced by the formula λέγει κύριος or simply λέγει. All these examples contain divine sayings in direct speech.

That Paul takes only these words to be divine utterances is explicitly confirmed in Rom 11:3–4 where Paul depicts them as *oracular* utterances. Paul does so by distinguishing between, on the one hand, the question posed to God by Elijah concerning his loneliness, as narrated in 1 Kgs 19 ("the Scripture"), and God's reply to Elijah on the other hand. As we will see, this divine reply is explicitly described as *oracular*. The dialogue between Elijah and God is relevant to Paul in the context of his considerations of whether God has rejected the Jewish people. According to Paul:

God has not rejected his people whom he foreknew. Do you not know what the Scripture says of Elijah? (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίᾳ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;) How he pleads with God against Israel: 'Lord, they have killed your prophets, they have demolished your altars; I alone am left, and they are seeking my life' (1 Kgs 19:10–14). But what is *the divine reply* to him? (ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός;) 'I have kept for myself seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to Baal' (1 Kgs 19:18). So too at the present time there is a remnant, chosen by grace. (Rom 11:2–4)

This passage shows that "the Scripture" (ἡ γραφή) has no particular divine qualities in itself. Rather it is seen as a correct historical

description of events, in this case the history of Elijah, whose desolate question to God is reported here. It is God's verbatim reply, however, again in first person direct speech, which is regarded as divine—as a *χρηματισμός*, a divine, oracular response.²⁰ Hence, the Scripture is authoritative not because it is itself divine but because it contains divine oracles to which it provides a proper historical setting and on which it is assumed to reflect.

Paul's use of *χρηματισμός* is fully paralleled by the retelling in 2 Macc of an episode in Jeremiah's life following the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem, which is unknown from the book of Jeremiah itself (2 Macc 2:1–8). The author of 2 Macc introduces this passage with the claim that he found this information “in the records” (2 Macc 2:1). After disclosing some information from these records, the author of 2 Macc continues:

It was also in the same document that the prophet (ὁ προφήτης), having received an oracle (*χρηματισμοῦ γενηθέντος*), ordered that the tent and the ark should follow with him, and that he went out to the mountain where Moses had gone up and had seen the inheritance of God. Jeremiah came and found a cave-dwelling, and he brought there the tent and the ark and the alter of incense; then he sealed up the entrance. (2 Macc 2:4–5)

According to this passage, the records reveal that the prophet Jeremiah received a particular divine oracle concerning the storage of the tent and the ark following the temple's destruction. The link which the author of 2 Macc establishes between being a prophet and receiving an oracle is particularly relevant. Jeremiah, who is known as the author of the book of Jeremiah, is a prophet not because he wrote a book but because he received oracles. In line with this, one could argue that a prophetic book is not of divine quality but does contain oracles in direct speech from God. This is certainly also the picture which arises from the example of Rom 11:2–4, in which neither the narrative of 1 Kgs 19 nor the entire book of 1 Kgs is seen as divine. This is reserved only for God's oracular response.

We see something similar in Prov 31:1, which reads:

²⁰ The translation “divine reply” (NRSV) conceals the oracular nature of a *χρηματισμός*. See LSJ 2005, s.v. *χρηματισμός*.

Οἱ ἐμοὶ λόγοι εἴρηνται ὑπὸ θεοῦ, βασιλέως χρηματισμός, ὃν ἐπαίδευσεν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ (My words have been spoken by God, an oracle of the king, which his mother taught him)

The words which God has spoken are characterized as an oracle, in this case transmitted by the king's mother to her son. Other examples containing the closely related terminology of χρησμός ("oracular response, oracle") occur in Philo and will be discussed later in connection with the differentiation between oracular and prophetic authority (see section four below).

This terminology of divine oracles, χρηματισμοί, is also known in pagan Greek. Vettius Valens, for example, speaks of θεῶν χρηματισμός, "oracles of the gods," at the beginning of his work (*Anth.* 1.1). Moreover the link between prophets and oracles as present in 2 Macc 2:4–5 is also attested to by several pagan Greek authors, such as Demon, Diodorus Siculus and Polyaeus.²¹ A very relevant passage is also found in Josephus, who uses the same terminology in a retelling of the episode of Isaiah's prediction of the Assyrian retreat in 2 Kgs 18:37. Josephus writes:

When *the prophet* had done these things and *received an oracle from God* (ὁ δὲ προφήτης ταῦτα ποιήσας χρηματίσαντος αὐτῷ τοῦ θεοῦ), he encouraged both the king himself and the friends who were with him by foretelling that the enemy would be defeated without a battle and retire ignominiously. (*A.J.* 10.13)

This close link between prophecy and oracles is in line with the pagan Greek understanding of a prophet, which is defined by Robert Parker as "the mortal who speaks in the name of a god or interprets his will. It is properly used only of seers and functionaries attached to an established oracular shrine."²² It also confirms what we have surmised above. The book of the prophet Isaiah contains oracles of God which Isaiah, as a prophet, received and apparently subsequently included in his book. For that reason, one might say that the prophetic book is not in itself divine but does contain divine oracles. This also seems to be Paul's view. If it is God's oracular words that are divine, it follows that prophetic writings as such are not regarded as divine. Rather

²¹ Demon, *Fragmenta* 10; Diod. Sic. 14.13.3; Polyaeus, *Strategemata* 1.16.1.

²² R.C.T. Parker, "Prophētēs," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth; 3d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1259.

they have distinct authors such as Moses, David, Isaiah and the author of 1 Kgs.

Paul's use of oracular terminology is not restricted to Rom 11:3–4 but also occurs in Rom 3:2 when he states that “in the first place the Jews were entrusted with the oracles of God (τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ).” The combination of *λόγια* and *χρησμοί* often occurs in Greek sources, for example, in Dionysius Halicarnassensis who speaks of Σιβύλλης τε λόγια καὶ χρησμοί Πυθικοί, “the Sibyl's utterances and the Pythian oracles” (*Ant. rom.* 1.49.3).²³ Another noteworthy occurrence is also found in Eusebius, according to whom:

The oracles of the Hebrews containing prophecies and responses of a divine power (Τὰ Ἑβραίων λόγια, θεοπρόπια καὶ χρησμούς θείας) beyond that of man, and claiming God as their author... are said to be free from all erroneous thought. (*Praep. ev.* 13.14.1)

The terms *λόγια* and *χρησμοί* are often found together and Paul also employs both oracular terms. It seems that Paul's conscious reference to passages in the Jewish writings which are attributed to God's direct speech and his use of oracular terminology show that he not only attributed ancestral authority to the Jewish writings but also acknowledged that some parts of them were invested with divine oracular authority.

4. PROPHETIC AUTHORITY VIS-À-VIS ORACULAR AUTHORITY: PHILO'S VIEW

As we have seen, within the Jewish Scriptures Paul attributes the highest authority to God's oracular responses. At the same time, and as the beginning of his letter to the Romans makes clear, Paul speaks of prophets (*προφήται*) as the authors of *γραφαὶ ἅγια*, “holy writings”:

Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God, which he promised beforehand through the prophets in holy writings. (Rom 1:1–2)

²³ See further, e.g., Nicolaus, *Fragmenta*, frg. 68: οἱ τε τῆς Σιβύλλης χρησμοί τὰ τε Ζωροάστρου λόγια; Philo, *Mos* 1.57; 1.294; 2.290; *Spec.* 1.315; *Virt.* 63; *Legat.* 347; Plutarch, *Pel.* 20.7; *Lys.* 25.2; *Arist.* 15.4.

The question of what the precise difference is between prophets and holy writings, on the one hand, and divine oracular responses and oracles on the other, now arises. How does the oracular authority of particular parts of the writings relate to the authority of the prophets who authored the entire writings of which the oracles have become part? It appears that this question is fully reflected upon by Philo, who, as we will see, shares the same oracular vocabulary of Paul. By way of introduction I will briefly refer to Helmut Burkhardt's 1988 monograph on Philo's view on the divine inspiration of the holy writings, and will first summarize three important observations which are relevant for the present enquiry.

Firstly, Burkhardt draws attention to the fact that Philo used a varied and rich vocabulary to refer to the Jewish Scriptures. Each term points to a particular aspect of these writings:

Während die Begriffe *graphè*, *grammata* und *anagraphai* mehr die äussere Gestalt der Aufzeichnung ansprachen, *bibloi* und *stèlai* das Material, *nomos* und *nomothesia* den Inhalt, *hieros logos* aber als Terminus der Mysterienkulte auf den gottesdienstlichen Gebrauch verwies, so berühren die... Ausdrücke *chrèsmos* und *logion* die Frage der Herkunft, nämlich aus göttlicher Offenbarung. Beide Begriffe sind in der antiken griechischen Mantik beheimatet.²⁴

Among these terms and phrases we find the oracular vocabulary of *chrèsmoi* and *logia*.

Secondly, although these *chrèsmoi* and *logia* are now fully integrated into the Jewish Scriptures, according to Burkhardt, the implication is that prior to their inclusion the oracles existed separately and were embedded in history before they were incorporated into a written corpus. The Jewish writings as we know them, according to Philo, often present these oracles within a narrative and interpretive context. As Burkhardt phrases it, these oracles are "an oder auch durch Menschen der Bibel ergangene Gottesworte: an Kain, an Noah, an Abraham, an Sarah, an Isaak, an Jakob, an Mose, durch Mose, an Bileam, durch Bileam":

Zwar handelt es sich hier faktisch überall um Worte der Bibel, die Philo hier aber jeweil nicht als solche anführt, sondern unabhängig von ihrer

²⁴ H. Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften bei Philo von Alexandrien* (Gießen: Brunnen, 1988), 111.

späteren Integration in die biblischen Schriften als vereinzelte, in der Geschichte, die er beschreibt, ergangene Gottesworte.²⁵

There is, thus, a small, but not unimportant difference between the actual oracles and the secondary form in which they are incorporated into the “biblical writings.”

Thirdly, as Burkhardt rightly points out, despite the variety of these oracles, and notwithstanding the fact that it is possible to differentiate them from the writings in which they are contained, the importance of the concept of oracles renders the term “oracles” a designation for the collective corpus of Jewish writings. The plural “oracles” is used as a designation for the biblical writings *in toto*. However, even then the term reminds the reader of the original separate oracles that were spoken at specific moments in history, before being collected in the Jewish Scriptures. Although “oracles” functions as a “Name für die Gesamtheit der biblischen Schriften,” the following remains true:

Dabei halt allerdings eben diese Pluralform stets das Bewusstsein daran wach, das *chrèsmos* an sich das Einzelorakel ist, also eine in der Regel kleine Einheit von einem oder wenig mehr Versen. Der Name *hoi chrèsmoi* für die biblischen Schriften bezeichnet diese also als eine Orakelsammlung.²⁶

I will firstly give an example which demonstrates that *hoi chrèsmoi* is a title for the Jewish Scriptures in their entirety, before touching upon the variety of particular oracles which are embedded in these Scriptures. That the reference to “the oracles” may be a reference to the collection of all Jewish Scriptures is, for example, clear from the following passage, in which Philo reflects upon the application of the allegorical method to the Jewish writings:

So we must turn to allegory, the method dear to men with their eyes opened. Indeed the oracles (οἱ χρησμοὶ) most evidently afford us the clues for the use of this method. For they say that... (*Plant.* 36)

Here the term “oracles” clearly stands for the collective Jewish writings. These oracles are inspired—they are ἱεροφαντηθέντες, the product of initiation and instruction in mysteries (*Deus* 62; *Somn.* 1.207). They are called “the most holy (ἱερώτατοι) oracles” (*Conf.* 143) or, alternatively, “the divine oracles,” οἱ θεῖοι χρησμοὶ (*Mut.* 7). From many

²⁵ Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften*, 114.

²⁶ Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften*, 118.

passages it appears that these “collective oracles” are the sum total of distinct oracles.

The original separate oracles which had not yet been included in collective writings were characterized and specified in the following ways. These oracles are often (although not always) expressed in direct divine speech, as in the following case:

An oracle was issued to him (i.e. Moses; ἀλλὰ χρησμὸς ἐξέπεσεν αὐτῷ), ‘Thou shalt behold that which is behind Me, but My face thou shalt not see’ (Exod 33:23) (*Post.* 169).

According to Philo, oracles are a separate source of information, in addition to the sources of philosophy and history. Moses, for example, is described as someone who not only had access to philosophy but also to oracles. Moses’ knowledge is understood to be based on this dual expertise:

Moses, both because he had attained the very summit of philosophy, and because he had been instructed through oracles (χρησμοῖς) in the greater and most essential part of Nature’s lore, could not fail to recognize that... (*Opif.* 8).²⁷

Likewise, oracles offer historical information which is not otherwise available. As Philo says, in this way Moses learnt of the pre-historic times of creation:

Let not us then, the pupils of Moses, be any longer at a loss as to how man came to have a conception of the invisible God. For Moses himself learnt it by an oracle (χρησμοῦ), and has taught us how it was (*Det.* 86)²⁸

²⁷ Cf. also *Fug.* 55–56: “I attended the lectures of a wise woman, whose name is Consideration... She confirmed what she said by oracles also (χρησμοῖς)”; *Mos.* 1.207: “Long before, they had asked what was the birthday of the world on which this universe was completed, and to this question... they now at long last found the answer, learnt not only through oracles (χρησμοῖς) but by a perfectly certain proof.”

²⁸ Josephus also emphasizes the divine inspiration which enabled Moses to write the history of the period prior to him. He also seems to regard the (post-Mosaic) prophets as reporters of the history of their day. According to Josephus, the prophets, among whom he includes Moses, obtained “their knowledge of the most remote and ancient history (τὰ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ παλαιότατα) through the inspiration which they owed to God (κατὰ τὴν ἐπίπνοιαν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ), and committing to writing a clear account of the events of their own time just as they occurred... Our books, those which are justly accredited, are but two and twenty, and contain the record of all time. Of these, five are the books of Moses, comprising the laws and the traditional history from the origin of man (τὴν ἀπ’ ἀνθρωπογονίας παράδοσιν) down to the death of the lawgiver... From the death of Moses until Artaxerxes, who succeeded Xerxes as king of Persia, the prophets subsequent to Moses wrote the history of the events of

In these passages, the “oracles” clearly refer to specific moments in time, before they were collected, put into written form and embedded in a narrative context. In the same way, “the oracles” can also be the specific ten commandments given by God to Moses (*Migr.* 85).

In addition to these and other oracles there are also specific oracles, such as the following “Messianic” oracle which resembles a similar prophecy in Josephus and probably derives from Balaam’s oracle in Num 24:7 LXX:²⁹

For ‘there shall come forth a man’, says the oracle (φησὶν ὁ χρησμός), and leading his host to war he will subdue great and populous nations, because God has sent to his aid the reinforcement which befits the godly, and that is dauntless courage of soul and all-powerful strength of body. (*Praem.* 95)

If looked upon in detail, it is Philo’s view that the Jewish writings are a collection of specific, distinct oracles, each given in particular historical circumstances. As we have already seen, together, as a collection placed in the narrative and interpretative setting of the Jewish Scriptures, they can also be referred to as “the oracles.”

The specific relationship between the individual oracles and the prophets who receive, interpret and collect them, is examined in detail in a particular passage in Philo’s *De vita Mosis*, in which much of what I have argued in this paper is also discussed. As we will see, the vocabulary of this passage is almost identical to that used by Paul. Here Philo distinguishes between three different types of oracles. I will first mention them before quoting the passage in full. Subsequently, I will provide a detailed commentary on the entire passage.

According to Philo, three types of oracles are to be distinguished: (1) oracles which are spoken by God “in his own person” in direct divine speech and which are simply noted down by the prophets, who, in these instances, merely act as translators and intermediaries of the divine will; (2) oracles which are part of a more elaborate set of questions and divine answers brought about in a kind of interplay and cooperative relationship between prophet and God; (3) and, finally,

their own times (οἱ μετὰ Μωϋσῆν προφήται τὰ κατ’ αὐτοὺς πραχθέντα συνέγραψαν) in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life” (*C. Ap.* 1.37–40).

²⁹ See further Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.13; Suetonius, *Vesp.* 4.5.

oracles which are not spoken by God but by the prophet, although under divine influence.

This concise distinction shows that prophetic authority and divine oracular authority are not simply one and the same. The third kind of oracle in particular shows a greater independence of the prophet vis-à-vis God than the first kind. In Philo's view, it is the third kind of oracle which is more appropriately viewed as Moses' own. Although he is inspired when he utters them, it is Moses' prophetic capacity which is evident, rather than God's inspiration. This shows that the Jewish Scriptures were not yet categorically understood as the simple product of divine revelation, but were seen to exhibit various degrees of revelation mingled into a single collection of writings.

In the introductory passage from his *De vita Mosis*, Philo offers a sketch of the three different kinds of oracles:

...I will now go on to show in conclusion that he (i.e. Moses) was a prophet of the highest quality. Now I am fully aware that all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses. But I will confine myself to those which are more especially his, with the following preliminary remarks. Of the divine utterances, (1) some are spoken by God in His own Person with His prophet for interpreter, (2) in some the revelation comes through question and answer (τὰ δ' ἐκ πεύσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως ἐθεσπίσθη), (3) and others are spoken by Moses in his own person, when possessed by God and carried away out of himself. (1) The first kind are absolutely and entirely signs of divine excellences, graciousness and beneficence, by which He incites all men to noble conduct... (2) In the second kind we find combination and partnership: the prophet asks questions of God about matters on which he has been seeking knowledge, and God replies and instructs him. (3) The third kind are assigned to the lawgiver himself: God has given to him of His own power of foreknowledge and by this he will reveal future events. (1) Now, the first kind must be left out of the discussion. They are too great to be lauded by human lips... Besides, they are delivered through an interpreter, and interpretation and prophecy are not the same thing. (2) The second kind I will at once proceed to describe, interweaving with it (3) the third kind, in which the speaker appears under that divine possession in virtue of which he is chiefly and in the strict sense considered a prophet. (*Mos.* 2.187–191)

A treatment of the oracles of mixed character then follows (2.192–245), after which Philo, with reference to the introductory passage quoted above, introduces the third kind of oracle:

Having completed this necessary account of the oracles of mixed character, I will proceed next to describe those delivered by the prophet himself

under divine inspiration (δηλώσω τὰ κατ' ἐνθουσιασμὸν τοῦ προφήτου θεσπισθέντα λόγια), for this was included in my promise. (*Mos.* 2.246).

After this treatment (2.246–287), there are a few remarks about the final passages of the Mosaic writings (2.288–292), where Moses, just before his death, is said to utter some oracles and inspired sayings to each individual tribe of the Israelites, as well as prophesying his own death:

Then, indeed, we find him possessed by the spirit, no longer uttering general truths to the whole nation but prophesying to each tribe in particular the things which were to be and hereafter must come to pass.... It was very fitting that persons so different... should receive as a sort of legacy a suitable apportionment of oracles and inspired sayings (διανομήν λογίων καὶ χρησίων ἀρμόζουσας). This was indeed wonderful. But most wonderful of all is the conclusion of the holy Scriptures (τὸ τέλος τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων)...; the divine spirit fell upon him and he prophesied with discernment while still alive the story of his own death.... Such, as recorded in the holy Scriptures (διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μνημονεύεται), was the life and such the end of Moses, king, lawgiver, high priest, prophet. (*Mos.* 2.288–292)

The passages above outline the last part of Philo's second treatise on the life of Moses. While the first treatise discusses Moses as king, the second treatise treats Moses in his capacity as lawgiver, high priest and prophet. It is the last aspect, that of Moses as prophet which concerns us here, and the passages just quoted constitute the framework of Philo's discussion. This framework yields a number of interesting points, which I will comment on below. Firstly, however, I will provide some remarks on Philo's general views about the relationship between the sacred books and the oracles, before discussing the three specific kinds of oracles which he distinguishes in more detail.

4.1. *Sacred Books and Oracles: Some General Remarks*

Firstly, Philo says that "all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses" (πάντ' εἰςὶ χρησμοί, ὅσα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἀναγράφονται, χρησθέντες δι' αὐτοῦ). The idea behind this passage is that sacred books contain oracles. This implies that sacred books are constituted by more than their oracular content. Such an idea is confirmed by the following passage from Philo's *De migratione Abrahami*, in which Philo discusses the appropriateness of the title of the second book of the Mosaic Pentateuch and mentions that oracles are contained in this book:

Right well, then, did the Hierophant (the one who teaches rites of sacrifice and worship, i.e. Moses) inscribe one entire sacred book of the law-giving (μίαν τῆς νομοθεσίας ὅλην ἱερὰν βίβλον) ‘Exagoge’ or ‘Leading Out,’ for the name thus found was appropriate to *the oracles contained in it* (οἰκεῖον ὄνομα εὐράμενος τοῖς περιεχομένοις χρησμοῖς). (*Migr.* 14)

Sacred books of Mosaic lawgiving thus contain oracles. It even seems that these books are actually considered sacred because of these oracles. Therefore, sacred books are not so much sacred in their own right but derive their status from the oracles within them. In the introductory passage on Moses’ status as a prophet from *De vita Mosis*, quoted above, the books which encompass these oracles are called αἱ ἱερὰ ἱερογραφαὶ, “the holy writings,” or, in the quotation from the end of *De vita Mosis*, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα. As regards these various terms, it appears that in the remaining Greek sources αἱ ἱερὰ ἱερογραφαὶ only occurs in Jewish sources,³⁰ whereas τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα is very frequent both in pagan and Jewish sources, including Plato, Diodorus Siculus, Strabo and Plutarch among the pagan, and Philo and Josephus among the Jewish authors.³¹ Another frequent term in pagan and Jewish writings is αἱ ἱερὰ βίβλοι, “the holy books.”³² Although the term τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα is more frequent, there are many occurrences of τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα which do not refer to books, but to the inscriptions of holy characters, especially Egyptian hieroglyphs on surfaces such as pillars.³³

If we compare Philo’s terminology to that of Paul, we find the following. According to Philo in his introduction to Moses as prophet, “all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses.” As we have seen, Paul also regards the holy writings as consisting of oracular responses, χρηματισμοί (Rom 11:4), and λόγια, oracles (Rom 3:2; see section one above). Similarly to Philo, at the very beginning of his letter to the Romans, Paul distinguishes between prophets and holy writings. According to Paul, God had already announced the gospel beforehand “through the prophets in holy writings” (not, as the NRSV translates: “through his prophets in *the* holy scriptures”):

³⁰ The occurrence in Hecataeus of Abdera is probably due to the preservation of this text in Josephus, *C. Ap.* 2.45. Among other phrases, Josephus also uses the phrase ἱερὰ βιβλία, see *Vita* 418.

³¹ See the many occurrences in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

³² See esp. *Diod. Sic.* 1.44.4; 1.70.9; 1.73.4; 1.82.3; 1.95.5; 1.96.2; 34/35.1.4 (7x), *Philo* (27x) and *Josephus* (19x). There are also occurrences in 2 *Macc* 8:23 and *Plutarch*, *Num.* 22.2.

³³ Cf. also Jan Bremmer’s contribution to this volume.

διὰ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν γραφαῖς ἁγίαις (Rom 1:1–2). This passage raises the same question about the precise relationship between prophets and their holy writings as we encounter in an explicit form in Philo's *De vita Mosis*.

It seems that the slight variation in terminology between Philo and Paul is not important. Rather than the terms αἱ ἱεραὶ βίβλοι and τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, Paul uses the term γραφαὶ ἁγίαι. This term seems to occur first in Paul. Similar expressions are used in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, specifically in the *Testament of Naphtali*, which tells us that the dying Jacob refers to “the writing of holy Enoch” (4:1) and also mentions “a sacred writing” which appeared to him (5:8).³⁴ However, as the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* seem to be Christian, Paul's use of the expression γραφαὶ ἁγίαι must be earlier, and even if this term constitutes a Pauline neologism there does not seem to be a conceptual or otherwise notable difference between γραφαὶ ἁγίαι and Philo's terminology. Firstly, as we will see further below, in later Pauline writings the author of 2 Tim returns to the expression τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα (see Ps-Paul, 2 Tim 3:16). Secondly, although there seems to be a notable difference between Paul's use of the adjective ἅγιος and the adjective ἱερός, which is used by Jewish and/or pagan authors in expressions such as αἱ ἱεραὶ γραφαί, αἱ ἱεραὶ βίβλοι, ἱερὰ βιβλία and τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, upon closer scrutiny this appears to be irrelevant. The Jewish author of 1 Macc also uses the adjective ἅγιος to describe the authoritative Jewish writings, which he calls τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια, “the holy books.” Here, in his letter to the Spartans, the Jewish high-priest Jonathan says that “we have as encouragement the holy books that are in our hands” (1 Macc 12:9). In a comparable way to this use of τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια, Paul uses γραφαὶ ἁγίαι. It is unnecessary to assume that Paul feels the need to explicitly correct the terminology of αἱ ἱεραὶ βίβλοι and τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, which are more prevalent among both pagans and Jews.

If there was a difference in emphasis between Paul's characterization of the authoritative Jewish writings as γραφαὶ ἁγίαι and the depictions of these writings as ἱεραὶ, it could perhaps be that in the latter instances there was some sort of implicit link with τὸ ἱερόν, the temple, in which holy writings were often stored. Whereas τὸ ἅγιον is only used in

³⁴ *T. Naph* 4:1: Ταῦτα λέγω, τέκνα μου, ὅτι ἀνέγνων ἐν γραφῇ ἁγία Ἐνώχ, ὅτι καί γε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀποστήσεσθε ἀπὸ Κυρίου, and 5:8: καὶ ἰδοὺ γραφὴ ἁγία ὤφθη ἡμῖν.

Jewish and Christian sources as a designation for the temple, τὸ ἱερόν is the common pagan term, which, in addition to τὸ ἅγιον, is also used in Jewish and Christian sources. The term τὸ ἱερόν, thus, is the term shared by pagans, Jews and Christians, and used to refer to both pagan temples and the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. The link between holy writings and τὸ ἱερόν, the temple, is explicitly made in several passages in Josephus. In *A.J.* 3.38, Josephus says that “a writing deposited in the temple (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀνακειμένη γραφή) attests that God foretold to Moses that water would thus spring forth from the rock.” In another passage, in *A.J.* 4.303–304, Josephus writes:

Then he (i.e. Moses) recited to them a poem in hexameter verse, which he has moreover bequeathed in a book preserved in the temple (καταλέλοιπεν ἐν βιβλῳ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ), containing a prediction of future events, in accordance with which all has come and is coming to pass, the seer having in no whit strayed from the truth. All these books he consigned to the priests (ταῦτ’ οὖν τὰ βιβλία παραδίδωσι τοῖς ἱερεῦσι).

Also, on a different occasion, in order to emphasize a particular fact, Josephus claims that it “is attested by the Scriptures that are laid up in the temple” (δηλοῦται διὰ τῶν ἀνακειμένων ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γραμμάτων; *A.J.* 5.61).³⁵ If there is a strong association between the adjective ἱερός and the very frequently used term τὸ ἱερόν, this could be a reason why Paul did not want to characterize the authoritative Jewish writings as ἱεραὶ γραφαὶ but rather wished to call them γραφαὶ ἅγια. It may well be that given his emphasis on the rational, non-ritual nature of Christianity (Rom 12:1–2) and his apparent disinterest in the Jewish temple, the Jewish writings for him were not holy on account of their close relationship to the temple.³⁶ Yet, as I have pointed out, the Jewish author of 1 Macc could also opt for the adjective ἅγιος and call the Jewish writings τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια, whereas, in his turn, the Pseudo-Pauline author of 2 Tim 3:16 called them τὰ ἱερά γράμματα, apparently not sharing Paul’s possible reservations.

³⁵ In pagan writings, cf. Bolus, *Physica et mystica*, 2.43.2–3: μόνον δὲ εἶπεν· «αἱ βίβλοι ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εἰσιν.»

³⁶ For Paul’s emphasis on the rational, non-ritual nature of Christianity and his alternative view on humanity as God’s shrine, which houses God’s image, see G.H. van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

However, whatever the difference between Paul and Philo in their nomenclature for the Jewish Scriptures, whether Paul calls them γραφαὶ ὄγιοι or Philo calls them αἱ ἱεραὶ βίβλοι as he does in the introductory passage on Moses as prophet, both authors agree that the holy writings contain oracles. As Philo says with regard to the Mosaic Pentateuch, “all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses.” In the last instance, thus, it seems that these books are holy because they contain “the most holy (ἱερώτατοι) oracles” (*Conf.* 143).

4.2. *Three Specific Kinds of Oracles*

In the extensive passage from *De vita Mosis* quoted above Philo distinguishes three types of oracles. The first type consists of oracles in the strictest sense of the word. As Philo states:

Of the divine utterances, some are spoken by God in His own Person with His prophet for interpreter (τῶν λογίων τὰ μὲν ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ λέγεται δι’ ἑρμηνέως τοῦ θείου προφήτου). (2.188)

Like Paul, Philo also calls the oracles λόγια (cf. Paul in Rom 3:2). The first type, which are delivered through Moses, are those which are “spoken by God in His own Person.” I will provide a brief overview of the various instances in which Philo describes these spoken oracles ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ.

Borrowing the terminology of initiation into the greater and the lesser mysteries from the Eleusinian mysteries, Philo describes his own relationship to Moses and the prophets, and in this context refers to an oracle received by one of the prophets:

I myself was initiated under Moses the God-beloved into his greater mysteries, yet when I saw the prophet Jeremiah and knew him to be not only himself enlightened, but a worthy minister of the holy secrets (οὐ μόνον μύστης ἐστὶν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱεροφάντης ἰκανός), I was not slow to become his disciple. He (i.e. Jeremiah) out of his manifold inspiration gave forth an oracle spoken in the person of God (ὁ δ’ ἄτε τὰ πολλὰ ἐνθουσιῶν χρησμόν τινα ἐξείπεν ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντα) to Virtue the all-peaceful: ‘Didst thou not call upon Me as thy house, thy father and the husband of thy virginity?’ (Jer 3:4) (*Cher.* 49)

Philo’s interpretation of this oracle follows, but what concerns us here is that Philo describes his access to God’s oracles as an initiation into the mysteries in which Moses and the prophets act like the initiating priest at Eleusis, passively receive the oracles of God, which are

“spoken in the person of God,” and subsequently teach the pupil who is to be initiated. The example from Jeremiah 3:4 also clearly shows, as we have seen before, that Philo does indeed distinguish between the oracles, in this case “an oracle spoken in the person of God,” and the fuller narrative and interpretative context of the book of Jeremiah.

Similar examples of oracles spoken by God in his own person can be drawn from other treatises in which it is explicitly stated that particular oracles are spoken by God (see *Plant.* 63; *Mut.* 39; *Somn.* 2.221; *Spec.* 4.39). All these examples concern oracles which are given in direct divine speech. As a matter of fact, they are fully comparable with the passages from Paul which were discussed in section one above and in which Paul introduces utterances of God in direct speech by means of such phrases as λέγει κύριος. As we saw above, Philo, in his formal, “technical” analysis of the various kinds of oracles contained in the Jewish Scriptures, calls them oracles which are spoken by “God in His own Person.”

In one particular passage Philo gives an impression of how he believes this kind of oracle is transmitted by God in direct divine speech to the prophet who receives it:

I remember too an oracle given by a prophet’s mouth in words of fire which runs thus (στόματι δ’ οἶδά ποτε προφητικῶ θεσπισθέντα διάπυρον τοιόνδε χρησμόν): ‘From Me thy fruit has been found. Who is wise and he shall understand them, who is understanding and he shall know them?’ (Hos 14:9–10). Under the prophet’s words I recognized the voice of the invisible Master whose invisible hand plays on the instrument of human speech, and I was lost in admiration at the saying also. (*Mut.* 139)

As this passage implies, the degree to which the prophet participates in this kind of oracle is minimal, their role being only instrumental. In this case, as Philo explains in the extensive passage from the *De vita Mosis*, the prophet is actually only an intermediary and also interpreter through whom God utters his oracle in direct divine speech. These oracles are spoken by God in his own person “with His prophet for interpreter” (*Mos.* 2.188). Or, as Philo explains more fully, “they are delivered through an interpreter, and interpretation and prophecy are not the same thing” (καὶ ἄλλως λέγεται ὡσανεὶ δι’ ἑρμηνέως· ἑρμηνεία δὲ καὶ προφητεία διαφέρουσι; *Mos.* 2.191). Real prophecy, according to Philo, occurs only when a prophet does not merely function as an intermediary but also acts in accordance with his full potential as a prophet, even if it is God’s inspiration which enables him to do so. Such oracles, as we will see shortly, make up the third kind,

those which are spoken by Moses in his own person. As such, they fully contrast with the oracles spoken by God in his own person.

Between this pair of opposites, the second kind of oracles are those which Philo calls “the oracles of mixed character” (2.246) because they are the result of both divine and human input. They come about “through question and answer” (2.188):

In the second kind we find combination and partnership: the prophet asks questions of God about matters on which he has been seeking knowledge, and God replies and instructs him (τὰ δὲ δευτέρα μίξιν ἔχει καὶ κοινωνίαν, πυνθανομένου μὲν τοῦ προφήτου περὶ ὧν ἐπέζητει, ἀποκρινομένου δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκοντος) (2.190)

The first kind of oracle, occurring through direct divine speech, is also attested to by Paul on those occasions where he introduces quotations through formulas such as λέγει κύριος, and the second type equally occurs in Paul, in Rom 11:3–4. In this passage, which we have already discussed in section one above, it is the prophet Elijah who poses a question to God, which God answers through a χρηματισμός, an oracular response (Rom 11:2–4). This oracle is indeed understood as an interplay of prophetic questions and divine answers. The only difference between Paul and Philo is that the latter theorizes upon it, whereas Paul only presupposes such a differentiation between various kinds of oracles.

The third and last type which Philo mentions are the oracles which do not show the kind of interaction characteristic of the second type, but are spoken by Moses in his own person, in complete contrast to the first type. It is this third kind of oracle that Philo dwells upon in order to show that Moses “was a prophet of the highest quality” (2.187). They constitute Moses’ prophetic authority. Although, as Philo says, “all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses,” the last type of oracles are “those which are more especially his” (τὰ ἰδιαιτέρα; 2.188). However, Philo concedes that these oracles only occur when Moses is “possessed by God and carried away out of himself” (τὰ δ’ ἐκ προσώπου Μωυσέως ἐπιθειάσαντος καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ κατασχεθέντος; 2.188) and that they are delivered “under divine inspiration” (2.246):

The third kind are assigned to the lawgiver himself (τὰ δὲ τρίτα ἀνατίθεται τῷ νομοθέτῃ): God has given to him of His own power of foreknowledge and by this he will reveal future events. (2.190)

For that reason they are “spoken by Moses in his own person” (2.188). In these instances Moses is not merely an intermediary, as is the case when he delivers the first kind of oracles, instead:

... the speaker appears under that divine possession in virtue of which he is chiefly and in the strict sense considered a prophet (τὸ τοῦ λέγοντος ἐνθουσιῶδες ἐμφαίνεται, καθ’ ὃ μάλιστα καὶ κυρίως νενόμισται προφήτης; 2.191)

There seems to be an interesting analogy here with the reasoning in *Peshar Habakkuk* among the Dead Sea Scrolls.³⁷ In this document, the author also regards the prophets as mere intermediaries of God’s word, as is the case in Philo’s first type of oracle. In contrast with these intermediary figures, there is another figure, which the author of the *Peshar Habakkuk* identifies as the Teacher of Righteousness, who offers an inspired interpretation of God’s words to the prophets. Whereas the prophet Habakkuk lacked insight into the meaning of the words which he received from God, the Teacher of Righteousness perceived their proper meaning:

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the age. And as for what he says: ‘So that the one who reads it may run’ (Hab 2:2). Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has disclosed all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets. (1QpHab 7:1–5)³⁸

In a sense, this characterization of the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness corresponds to Philo’s portrayal of Moses in his real prophetic capacity—in which he does not just receive oracles but is able to utter them in his own person. At the same time, there may be a

³⁷ I owe this observation to Prof. Arie van der Kooij.

³⁸ Translation from F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill and Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996), 200. The reverse phenomenon can also be seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Whereas the author of *Peshar Habakkuk* differentiates between the words of the prophets and their authoritative and inspired interpretation through the Teacher of Righteousness, the author of the *Temple Scroll* rewrites the Mosaic laws in direct divine speech. As G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English: Revised and Extended Fourth Edition* (rev. and ext. 4th ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 152 notes: “The aim of the redactor is to present the message of the scroll not as an interpretation of the Bible, but as an immediate divine revelation. For this purpose, not only does he formulate the supplementary legislation as directly spoken by God, but also regularly substitutes ‘I’ for ‘the Lord = YHWH’ of Scripture.”

difference. Although Philo acknowledges that Moses is only able to utter these oracles in his own person insofar as he is inspired, the thrust of the entire passage is that Moses is portrayed in his greatness as a prophet and acquires some independence from God. There appears to be a sliding scale of oracles which runs from those given in direct divine speech through “mixed oracles” in which God and human interrogators cooperate, to oracles which are more particularly assigned to Moses himself. Although “all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses,” the latter oracles “are more especially his” (2.188). Yet despite the relative independence of this last type of oracle, they do not run counter to God’s oracles, as they are not Moses’ own additional suggestions. This had been the case with Balaam, who, after giving the proper oracles of God, continues to provide his own personal counsel, for which Philo criticizes him:

The other (i.e. Balaam) replied: ‘All that has been said hitherto was oracles from above. What I have now to say is suggestions of my own designing.’... Hereby he convicted himself of the utmost impiety. For, ‘Why’, we might ask him, ‘do you put forth your own personal counsels in opposition to the oracles of God? That were to hold that your projects are more powerful than the divine utterances.’ (*Mos.* 1.294)

Clearly the difference between Balaam and Moses is that the latter, although he also speaks in his own person, still utters oracles because he speaks through inspiration. For this reason Philo emphasizes that “all things written in the sacred books are oracles delivered through Moses.” However, having said that, it appears that Philo’s distinction of three kinds of oracles shows that his understanding of the Jewish Scriptures is quite nuanced. For Philo, not all oracles are divine to the same degree, and the Mosaic writings do not fully coincide with these oracles but offer a narrative and interpretive framework for them. As Philo explains at the very end of his *De vita Mosis*, the full Mosaic writings are in fact also a kind of biographical memoir of Moses:

Such, as remembered in the holy Scriptures (διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μνημονεύεται), was the life and such the end of Moses, king, lawgiver, high priest, prophet. (*Mos.* 2.292)

As our analysis shows, however, these Mosaic Scriptures are deemed holy because they have, at their heart, the holy oracles of God.

4.3. *Philo and Paul in Comparison*

Much of this nuanced view can be recognized in Paul's letters. Paul also speaks of holy writings and mentions the prophets as their authors (Rom 1:2), he also differentiates between these prophets and the oracles which they report (Rom 11:4) and refers to oracles in divine direct speech, and he also knows of oracles which are uttered by God in a dialogue with man.

Moreover, the distinction between God's own words, given in the oracles, and the activities of the prophets seems to be so fundamental to Paul that he also applies it in his stipulation of the relationship between Jesus' authority and his own. As we can deduce from 1 Cor 7, Paul regards Jesus' *ipsissima verba* to have binding authority, whereas he seems to claim for his own words a lesser status. Several times Paul, while instructing the Corinthians on specific matters, confesses that he only expresses his own view and not that of Christ:

To the married I give this command—not I but the Lord (οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ὁ κύριος)—that... (1 Cor 7:10)

To the rest I say—I and not the Lord (λέγω ἐγώ, οὐχ ὁ κύριος)—that... (1 Cor 7:12)

Now concerning virgins, I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion as one who by the Lord's mercy is trustworthy... (ἐπιταγήν κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω, γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι ὡς ἠλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι; 1 Cor 7:25)

A wife is bound as long as her husband lives. But if the husband dies, she is free to marry anyone she wishes, only in the Lord. But in my judgement she is more blessed if she remains as she is. And I think that I too have the Spirit of God (κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην, δοκῶ δὲ κάγω πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν; 1 Cor 7:39–40)

Whereas the words of Christ would be absolutely binding, Paul only gives his own judgement and opinion, although he seems to imply that his words are not only trustworthy but also inspired and prophetic insofar as he possesses the Spirit of God (1 Cor 7:40; cf. 1 Cor 14:6).³⁹ Thus, Paul's prophetic words do not enjoy the same authority as Christ's "oracular" words. Whereas the oracular words of God and the *ipsissima verba* of Christ are unquestionably authoritative, the

³⁹ On the relationship between Spirit and prophecies, see also 1 Thess 5:19–21: "Do not quench the Spirit. Do not despise the words of prophets, but test everything."

authority of prophetic words remains open to further scrutiny. This holds true for the status of contemporary prophets in the early Christian community, with Paul encouraging his fellow Christians to critically assess the words of prophets:

Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said. If a revelation is made to someone else sitting nearby, let the first person be silent. For you can all prophesy one by one, so that all may learn and all be encouraged. And the spirits of prophets are subject to the prophets, for God is a God not of disorder but of peace. (1 Cor 14:29–33)

Paul's judgement of contemporary prophets does not seem to be principally different from his evaluation of the prophets of the Jewish Scriptures. Their power is secondary to the higher authority of the divine oracles and Christ. Prophetic authority is not as authoritative as oracular authority. In relation to "scriptural authority," it appears that for Paul this is not yet a major monolithic concept, which we seem to find in the categorical assertion made in Pseudo-Paul's 2 Tim 3:16 that "All Scripture is inspired by God" (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος).

I will discuss the latter view in the final section below. In the case of Paul, there still seems to be a clear difference between ancestral, oracular and prophetic authority. This difference is a difference in the degree of gravity, in a way that is very similar to Philo's differentiation between three types of oracles. At this stage, neither Paul nor Philo hold a view on Scripture which regards each part as equally authoritative. However, below I will raise the question of whether my thesis—that Paul holds a very nuanced view on the Scriptures—is not contradicted by his conception of revelation and by his repeated statement that particular events happen "in accordance with the Scriptures."

5. CONTRADICTORY VIEWS?

Paul's nuanced view of the difference in degrees of gravity of the various constituents of the holy writings does not seem to be contradicted by the fact that he regards Christ's death and resurrection as being "in accordance with the Scriptures," nor by particular references to these writings, such as "the word of God." I will briefly discuss these writings and also reflect on Paul's terminology of revelation.

5.1. “*In Accordance with the Writings*”

In Paul’s view, Christ’s death and resurrection are “in accordance with the writings” (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς):

For I handed on to you as of first importance what I in turn had received: that Christ died for our sins *in accordance with the Scriptures*, and that he was buried, and that he was raised on the third day *in accordance with the Scriptures*. (1 Cor 15:3–4)

It seems to me that Paul’s view that Christ’s death and resurrection unfolded in accordance with the authoritative writings and were thus predicted, could well be a reference to specific oracular statements within these writings and thus fully in line with what we have found thus far. Paul’s view on Christ’s resurrection, for example, is largely based on Ps 110:1 where, in Paul’s interpretation, at the instalment of Christ as Lord, God says to him in first person direct speech: “Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet” (see 1 Cor 15:25; Rom 8:34). For Paul, then, the fulfilment of such divine oracular statements at Christ’s resurrection were indeed in accordance with the writings. The same phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφάς is often used by Galen to point to the congruence between something in reality and the way it has been described in various writings.⁴⁰ In the case of Paul, the congruence between the events of Christ’s death and resurrection, on the one hand, and their prediction in the authoritative writings, on the other, does not mean that these writings are revelatory as such and in their entirety. Rather, this prediction could be based on the actual divine oracles within these writings.

5.2. “*The word of God*”

Paul’s subtle understanding of the authoritative value of the Jewish writings is not contradicted by the factual occurrence of the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, “the word of God.” As a matter of fact, in all of the passages where it occurs this phrase does not refer to the Jewish Scriptures but refers to the present preaching of the gospel. It is this preaching which is characterized as “the word of God,” a clear

⁴⁰ See Galen, *Comp. med.* 13.995.12 (Kühn); *In Hip. epid.* 17a.1006.4 (Kühn); 17b.111.1 (Kühn); *In Hip. med. off.* 18b.713.6 (Kühn); 18b.888.18 (Kühn). See also Apollonius Dyscolus, *De constructione* 2.2.155.

instance of which is 1 Thess 2:13, where Paul writes to the ex-pagan Christian Thessalonians:

We also constantly give thanks to God for this, that when *you received the word of God that you heard from us* (παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ), you accepted it not as a human word (ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων) but as what it really is, God's word, which is also at work in you believers (ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς λόγον θεοῦ, ὃς καὶ ἐνεργεῖται ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν).

The “word of God” in this passage is not a reference to the authoritative writings of the Law and the Prophets, but stands for the preaching of the gospel which, as God's word, is contrasted with the λόγος ἀνθρώπων.

In all other instances in which the phrase “the word of God” is used in Paul's letters, it also refers to the preaching of the gospel (1 Cor 14:36; 2 Cor 2:17; 4:2; Rom 9:6–7). Perhaps in some cases it is even ambiguous and should not necessarily be translated as “the word of God,” but as “the word concerning God.” This holds particularly true for 2 Cor 2:17 where Paul, in his polemics with the sophists within the Christian community at Corinth, denies that he has sold the word of God as a sophist would, receiving money for his preaching. In this context, “the word of God” could also be understood as Paul's word concerning God, in line with the Greek expression ὁ περὶ θεοῦ λόγος, “the word about God.”⁴¹ Whatever the exact translation, however, it is clear that without exception Paul only uses this terminology in relation to the preaching of the gospel and not to the authoritative Jewish writings. This is fully parallel with the fact that he does not speak of these Jewish writings in terms of revelation, as we will see below. As such, Paul could have adopted the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as a synonym of the phrase τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, “the oracles of God.” In this case ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ would have been a characterization of the oracular statements of God which Paul discerns within the Jewish writings (Rom 3:2; 11:4). The phrase could be used in this sense in Greek. Dio Chrysostom, for example, applied the phrase θεοῦ λόγος to denote an utterance of the god Poseidon to Odysseus (*Or.* 64.12). Yet Paul refrained from using it in this sense and reserved it as a designation for the preaching of the gospel.

⁴¹ Aristotle, *Divisiones* 50; Chrysippus, *Fragmenta logica et physica* 475; Plutarch, *Sera* 558D. Cf. also Aristob. fr. 1 Denis; *Sib. Or.* 3.1.

5.3. *The Language of Revelation*

Just as “the word of God” does not refer to the Scriptures, neither does the language of revelation. Paul does not apply this language to the Jewish law, the Scriptures or the prophets. The relevant terminology consists mainly of the terms φανεροῦν, ἀποκαλύπτειν and ἀποκάλυψις. However, if Paul does not apply this language to the Jewish Scriptures, in what way does he use it?

It seems that Paul distinguishes between three important moments in a revelatory process which spans the entire period between creation and the end. In the midst of it, in the “fullness of time” (Gal 4:4), the revelation of Christ takes place. This is preceded, however, by the revelation of God himself, occurring since the beginning of creation. According to Paul:

... what can be known about God is plain to them (τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς), because God has shown it to them (ὁ θεὸς γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐφανερώσεν). Ever since the creation of the world his eternal power and divine nature, invisible though they are, have been understood and seen through the things he has made. (Rom 1:19–20)

Paul returns to the language of revelation only when he speaks about the revelation of the gospel after the dominance of the Mosaic law. In this gospel the righteousness of God as it manifests itself in Jesus Christ is disclosed. Although Paul never qualifies the Law and the Prophets as revelatory, he does say that this righteousness of God is *attested* by the Law and the Prophets:

But now, irrespective of law, the righteousness of God has been disclosed (δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται), and is attested by the Law and the Prophets (μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν), the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. (Rom 3:21–22)

As Paul makes clear in his letter to the Galatians, the Law governs a temporary period prior to the moment in which the gospel is uncovered: “Now before faith came, we were imprisoned and guarded under the Law until faith would be revealed” (Gal 3:23). The Law itself is not characterized as revelatory, rather it is the gospel which is uncovered and revealed. Indeed, the gospel is the bearer of God’s ἀποκάλυψις:

I am not ashamed of the gospel; it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who has faith, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in it the righteousness of God is revealed (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ

ἀποκαλύπτεται) through faith for faith; as it is written, ‘The one who is righteous will live by faith (Hab 2:4)’. (Rom 1:16–17)

Again, we see the same ambiguity. Just as the righteousness of God “is attested by the Law and the Prophets” (3:21), it has indeed already been described in the Jewish Scriptures in the book of Habakkuk. Yet it is only its manifestation in the gospel which is qualified as revelation: “in it the righteousness of God is revealed.”

As a result of this revelation of the gospel, the manifestation of Christ to Paul is also seen as a revelation (Gal 1:12; 16). Moreover, God is said to make this new knowledge about him known in every place through Paul’s preaching (2 Cor 2:14–16). Even Paul’s own life makes the life of Christ manifest (2 Cor 4:10–11). As regards the contents on which Paul reflects in his preaching, these are alluded to in the Jewish Scriptures, which include writings which were later regarded as non-canonical, as the following quotation from the *Apocalypse of Elijah* makes clear:

... as it is written, ‘What no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the human heart conceived, what God has prepared for those who love him’—these things God has revealed to us through the Spirit (ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος).⁴² (1 Cor 2:9–10)

Yet again, there is talk of revelation only once those things alluded to in the Jewish writings surface in the time when the gospel is preached. Thus, Paul’s concept of revelation and of the gospel has to this point nothing to do with literary writing. It is not attributed to the Jewish Scriptures but relates to God’s manifestation in the works of creation and in the advent of Christ. This also holds true for a third application of the terminology of revelation, that is to the end of time.

According to Paul, it is Christ “who will bring to light (φανερώσει) the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart” (1 Cor 4:5). Or as he phrases it elsewhere, “all of us must be revealed (φανερωθῆναί) before the judgement seat of Christ, so that each may receive recompense for what has been done in the body, whether good or evil” (2 Cor 5:10). These and various other passages show that “revelation” is also an eschatological term—it relates to the eschatological revelation of Jesus Christ, the revelatory character of the

⁴² Quotation ascribed to the *Apocalypse of Elijah* by Origen.

day of judgement and the eschatological disclosure of the Christians themselves, who find their true, glorious identity.⁴³

Paul not only knows about these clearly structured moments of God's manifestation in creation, Christ's manifestation in "the fullness of time" and the still outstanding revelatory moment at the end of time, but also about the present practices of revelation within the Christian community. Paul tells the Corinthians that he refrains from speaking in tongues in the community but instructs them *through either revelation, knowledge, prophecy or teaching*:

Now, brothers and sisters, if I come to you speaking in tongues, how will I benefit you unless I speak to you in some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching (ἢ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ)? (1 Cor 14:6)

He continues, stating that other members of the community also engage in such practice themselves, notably in offering revelations:

When you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, *a revelation* (ἀποκάλυψιν), a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all things be done for building up (1 Cor 14:26)

For practical reasons, Paul advises them that "[i]f a revelation is made (ἀποκαλυφθῆ) to someone else sitting nearby, let the first person be silent" (1 Cor 14:30). These and other passages convey that, for Paul, revelation was a current activity in the Christian communities, with both Paul himself and others being the recipients of divine revelations.⁴⁴

Because Paul acknowledges the current practice of revelations within the Christian communities, it is all the more staggering that he never applies the terminology of revelation to the Jewish Scriptures. These Scriptures, the Law and the Prophets may *attest* to the righteousness of God as revealed in the gospel, but they are not themselves seen as revelation. They also include non-canonical examples, such as the *Apocalypse of Elijah*, which may contain a eulogy on "what no eye has seen," but is only styled as revelation when manifest in the gospel. It is important to emphasize that revelation in the gospel is not literary. According to Paul there is no literary form of revelation. Revelation typically takes places in reality, either in the works of creation, in the manifestation of Christ through his birth in "the fullness of time," in

⁴³ See further 1 Cor 1:7; 3:13; Rom 2:5, Rom 8:18–19.

⁴⁴ See further 2 Cor 12:1, 7; Phil 3:15; Gal 2:2.

the experience of the community or in the revelatory process related to the end of time. There is as yet no literary dimension to Paul's concept of revelation.

Nevertheless, it is very odd that apart from the works of creation nothing in the past, as narrated in the Jewish Scriptures, qualifies as revelation. One could argue that this is due to the polemics in which Paul is involved with non-Christian Jews—in such a dispute Paul would naturally downplay the revelatory importance of the Jewish Scriptures. Yet this does not provide a full explanation, as Paul did not see himself as a separatist Christian but as completely Jewish. Of course, in his polemics, as with many other Jews, Paul was engaged in his own kind of historiography as a means of stating his case for his kind of Judaism. However, this does not seem to account for his hesitance in applying the language of revelation to the Jewish Scriptures. Rather, as we have already seen, Paul attributes the various Jewish Scriptures to their human, prophetic author and it is only the direct oracular speeches of God in these writings that Paul regards as the words of God as such.

6. FINAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCLUSION

Our observation that Paul did not regard the authoritative Jewish writings as revealed and inspired in themselves can be maintained. Neither Paul nor Philo expresses a belief in scriptural inspiration. As we have seen, only the oracular statements of God contained in these writings were to be regarded as divine in the proper sense of the word. Philo distinguished various kinds of oracles. In addition to the oracles of direct divine speech which was spoken by God in his own person, he also distinguished oracles which allowed room for human-divine cooperation and presupposed that the prophet, although inspired, spoke in his own person. Paul, in his turn, did not identify the writings as “the word of God” but attributed them to human authors, either to Moses, the author of the ancestral law, or to the prophets who, like Moses, included the divine oracles within their writings and, by doing so, gave them a historical and interpretative context. For Paul, “scriptural authority” was complex, with the ancestral authority of particular respectable traditions and figures, the divine authority of oracles and the authority of decent prophets all contributing to its weight. First and foremost, the Jewish writings gave access to history and to

the divine oracles which humanity had received during that history. According to Paul, these writings were authoritative and even holy, insofar as they contained the oracles of God.

This nuanced view of Scripture seems to be modified in 2 Tim, in the famous passage about the divine inspiration of all Scripture. The relevant passage reads:

But as for you, continue in what you have learned and firmly believed, knowing from whom you learned it, and how from childhood you have known the sacred writings (ἀπὸ βρέφους [τὰ] ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας) that are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, so that everyone who belongs to God may be proficient, equipped for every good work. (2 Tim 3:14–17)

It seems very likely that this passage represents a step towards a theology of scriptural inspiration on the level of the Scriptures themselves. However, that this is the case depends on the translation. Because the line “All Scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching” lacks a verb in the Greek text (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδασκαλίαν), two translations are possible, as is generally recognized in the commentaries: (1) “All scripture [is] inspired by God and [is] useful for teaching” (NRSV); or (2) “Every scripture inspired by God [is] also useful for teaching” (alternative reading in the margin of the NRSV). The latter translation, though possible, is usually disregarded because it is considered to express the strange view that Scripture is only partially revealed. According to Clare Drury’s commentary in *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, for example:

If the NRSV translation of 3:16 is taken, the usefulness of all Scripture arises from the fact that it is divinely inspired. The alternative reading in the margin assumes that only those passages inspired by God are useful, i.e. it assumes that some parts are not so inspired. This was indeed the belief among some early Gnostic groups such as the Marcionites, so it makes most sense to follow the NRSV translation. It is the usefulness of Scripture that is the significant point.⁴⁵

Although I agree with Drury that the NRSV translation is to be preferred on account of the generally acknowledged anti-gnostic stance

⁴⁵ J. Barton and J. Muddiman, eds., *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 1230.

of the Pastoral Epistles, it is nevertheless not entirely correct to say, without further qualification, that the view that “only those passages inspired by God are useful” is gnostic. In a sense, it was also Paul’s view that various parts of Scripture had their own degrees of gravity, depending on whether their authority was ancestral, oracular or prophetic. Furthermore, this difference in degrees of gravity gave Paul the freedom to distinguish between positive and negative aspects of Moses. On the one hand he is critical of Moses’ ethnocentric law and discredits it, as we have seen, as being a late-comer to Israel, 430 years after Abraham (Gal 3:15–17). Yet, on the other hand he is aware of the fact that Moses is the author of the Mosaic law in the broad sense, which includes the narratives concerning Adam and Abraham, who are exemplary figures for Paul. For that reason Paul takes care not to limit Moses to being the author of the Sinaitic law, but also considers him to be the author of “the entire law,” as Gal 5:3, 14 make clear. In that capacity as the author of the Pentateuch, Moses is, as we have seen, not only the one who reports “the righteousness that comes from the Law” but also the one who gives voice to “the righteousness that comes from faith” (Rom 10:5–8). He is not only the author of the Mosaic law in the strict sense but also narrates “the law of the spirit of life,” the anthropological law which is very relevant to Paul because it crowns humanity’s constitution of body and soul with a spirit—a view which Paul derives from the second account of humanity’s creation in Gen 2:7 (Rom 8:2; cf. 1 Cor 15:45).⁴⁶ Such an ambiguous relationship to Moses, however, is only possible because Paul does not equate the Mosaic writings with revelation. These writings have various aspects. The Jewish Scriptures are not just revelatory but also ancestral; not just divine but also prophetic. For that reason, the translation “Every Scripture inspired by God [is] also useful for teaching” could well be possible within the Pauline view. The Scriptures are not useful for teaching in their entirety but only insofar as they have been inspired by God.

Yet, given the anti-gnostic polemics of the Pastoral Epistles, it seems most likely that the author of 2 Tim attacks the gnostic categorical criticism of the Old Testament writings. It seems to be this gnostic criticism of the Scriptures which triggered his response, and in this context the translation “All scripture [is] inspired by God and [is]”

⁴⁶ On this, cf. van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context*.

useful for teaching” (NRSV) makes perfect sense.⁴⁷ This categorical affirmation of the inspired nature of all Scripture, however, is just the response provoked by the gnostics’ lack of appreciation of the Jewish writings, which were seen as either false because they were written from the wrong perspective (Marcion), or as the corruption of an original revelation (Apelles, Adimantus and Mani).⁴⁸ Although understandable in this new polemical context, the statement by the author of 2 Tim has done much to obscure Paul’s nuanced view of the nature of the holy writings.

⁴⁷ See also Y.-M. Blanchard, “‘Toute Écriture est inspirée’ (2 Tm 3,16): Les problématiques de la canonisation et de l’inspiration, avec leurs enjeux respectifs,” *RSR* 93 (2005): 497–515.

⁴⁸ On this issue see J.A. van den Berg, *Biblical Argument in Manichaean Missionary Practice: The Case of Adimantus and Augustine* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 168–73. The view that the Jewish writings are a corruption of an original revelation is also expressed in the Qur’an, in Sura 2. Cf. S.H. Griffith, “The Bible and the ‘People of the Book,’” *Bulletin Dei Verbum* 79/80 (2006): 22–30.

“THE WORDS OF THE PROPHECY OF THIS BOOK”:
PLAYING WITH SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY IN
THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Tobias Nicklas

1. INTRODUCTION

As is generally known, the book of Revelation, i.e. the Apocalypse of John, is one of those New Testament texts that have, for the longest time, been denied to belong to the biblical canon. One of the historical reasons why, before all others, the churches of the East objected to the text is the judgement of Dionysios of Alexandria, who argued due to linguistic reasons that the Apocalypse can hardly be written by the same author as the Gospel or the Epistles of John.¹ Even nowadays, the book of Revelation is usually seen as a somewhat obscure book with strange, rather frightening images, a book that suits, if anything, for a quarry for many a sect’s eschatological expectations.

The text of the Apocalypse itself, however, shows an immense claim to authority.² More than any other New Testament text, this book wants to be understood as God’s and Christ’s word respectively, which had been revealed to John, the seer of Patmos.³ At the same time, the

¹ On the position of the Book of Revelation in the history of the New Testament’s canonization cf., e.g., A. Jakob, “Réception et canonisation des textes chrétiens: Le cas de l’*Apocalypse de Jean*,” in *Recueils normatifs et canons dans l’Antiquité: Perspectives nouvelles sur la formation des canons juif et chrétien dans leur contexte culturel* (ed. E. Norelli; Prahins: Zèbre, 2004), 133–45. On the origins and development of the New Testament canon see more generally B.M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), and the relevant articles in L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002).

² Therefore H. Windisch, “Der Apokalyptiker Johannes als Begründer des neutestamentlichen Kanons,” *ZNW* 10 (1909): 148–74, even went so far as to see the author of the apocalypse as the “founder” of the New Testament canon.

³ Also mentioned in E. Schüssler Fiorenza, “Die Worte der Prophetie: Die Apokalypse des Johannes theologisch lesen,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 14 (1999): 71–94 (79): “Die ‘Worte der Prophetie’ kommt von G*tt [!], der sie Jesus gab, der sie wiederum—durch einen Engel—den christlichen ProphetInnen und besonders dem Seher Johannes weitergegeben hat.”

text works continuously with allusions, images, motifs and structural analogies to Old Testament intertexts, whereas explicit quotations are completely missing. A more precise analysis of this play with generally accepted prophetic texts like Isaiah, Zechariah, Ezekiel and Daniel on the one hand,⁴ and on the other hand the emphasised statement that the text is God's unalterable word, whose adherence is necessary for salvation, could allow an intriguing insight into the question of which literary techniques are applied by the text of the Revelation in order to communicate its claim to be read as an "authoritative" Scripture.

2. ON THE TEXT'S CLAIM TO AUTHORITY

A suitable jumping-off point for the subject in question is provided at the end of the text, namely in Rev 22:18–19,⁵ a passage known as *Textsicherungsformel* (which is an established term for a formula securing the integrity of the text as a whole):

Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ παντὶ τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ἐάν τις ἐπιθῆ ἔπ' αὐτά, ἐπιθήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς πληγὰς τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ, καὶ ἐάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς προφητείας ταύτης, ἀφελεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ.

I testify to everyone who hears the words of the prophecy of this book: if any one adds to them, God will add to him the plagues described in this book, and if anyone takes away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God will take away his share in the tree of life and in the holy city, which are described in this book. (adapted from RSV)

⁴ On the adoption of the Old Testament in the Revelation in general cf., e.g., S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); G.K. Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).

⁵ On a study of this paragraph from a perspective that centres on the text in relation to the reader ("textzentriert-leserorientiert") cf. T. Hieke and T. Nicklas, "Die Worte der Prophetie dieses Buches": *Offenbarung 22,6–21 als Schlussstein der christlichen Bibel Alten und Neuen Testaments gelesen* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2003), 69–82, 88–89. This also offers a variety of further thoughts. Unlike the considerations made in the present contribution, the aforementioned study offers a different perspective as well as a different questioning, which concentrates on the text's impact on the claim to authority of the apocalypse itself.

I intentionally do not use the common denotation "canon formula" as the term "canon" may arouse associations that are not appropriate for many of the various texts that feature a comparable formula.

My thesis, which I am going to elaborate in the following, is that, starting with Rev 22:18–19, two lines can be worked out. The text of Revelation makes its claim to authority by means of these: (1) reference to the authority of the Torah and (2) reference to Israel's prophets. On tracing these two lines through the book of Revelation it becomes clear that the text ventures one step further. In several decisive parts it claims to be (3) the word of God or Jesus Christ's revelation, respectively.

2.1. *Reference to the Torah*

The book of Revelation, with its vision of an eschatological, heavenly Jerusalem (Rev 21–22), ranges back to the creation myths in the book of Genesis in a grand literary arc.⁶ Of course, this is already a literary reference to the Torah—one could even go so far as to say that the visions of heavenly Jerusalem cannot be understood and accepted without a fundamental knowledge and acceptance of the Paradise accounts in the book of Genesis (not forgetting other Old Testament and early Jewish intertexts).

Although this is a clear reference to the texts of the Torah, it does not imply that the book of Revelation relates its own claim to authority to the authority of the Torah as well. That, however, does happen in the *Textsicherungsformel* quoted above. It has been shown several times that formulas with a comparable structure and function can be encountered quite frequently in ancient literature—the oldest extant examples go back to Israel's ancient Near Eastern environment; similar formulas are known from Greco-Roman, early Jewish or Rabbinic literature.⁷ Beyond those more or less formal conformities, Rev 22:18–19 shows a distinct literary reference to two passages of the book of

⁶ For further information on the Old Testament backgrounds pertaining to this and various other paragraphs cf., e.g., J. Oesch, "Intertextuelle Untersuchungen zum Bezug von Offb 21,1–22,5 auf alttestamentliche Prätexen," *Protokolle zur Bibel* 8 (1999): 41–74.

⁷ Concerning this issue cf. the classic article by W.C. van Unnik, "De la règle Μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du canon," *VC* 3 (1949): 1–36. Further examples can be found in C. Dohmen and M. Oeming, *Biblischer Kanon, warum und wozu? Eine Kanontheologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1992), 70–80; D.E. Aune, *Revelation 17–22* (Nashville, Tenn.: Word, 1998), 1208–13.

Deuteronomy, which must have been available to the seer of Revelation in an Old Greek version.⁸

οὐ προσθήσετε πρὸς τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ φυλάσσετε τὰς ἐντολάς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον (Deut 4:2 LXX)

You shall not add to the word which I command you, nor take from it; that you may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you today. (adapted from RSV)

πᾶν ῥῆμα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι σήμερον τοῦτο φυλάξῃ ποιεῖν οὐ προσθήσεις ἐπ' αὐτὸ οὐδὲ ἀφελεῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ (Deut 13:1 LXX)

Every word that I command you today you shall be careful to do; you shall not add to it or take from it. (adapted from RSV)

The connections are evident. First, in its phrasing the text takes the perspective of a subject in the first person singular; the emphasised term ἐγὼ occurs in all of the texts.

Second, each of the formulas refers to a textual corpus that either precedes or follows. This corpus is described as a “Commandment (of God)” in both of the passages from Deuteronomy, while in the book of Revelation it is labelled as “words of the prophecy of this book” or “words of the book of this prophecy.” Both terms act as other names of the book of Revelation itself.

Third, each of the formulas consists of two parts. Its first part prohibits additions to the text (slight variations: Rev 22:18: ἐπιτίθημι + ἐπί; Deut 4:2: προστίθημι + πρὸς; Deut 13:1: προστίθημι + ἐπί); its second part averts omissions (in all three texts: ἀφαρέω + ἀπὸ). The variation in Revelation regarding the prohibition of additions is easy to explain, because the usage of the verb ἐπιτίθημι allows the text to create a correspondence between the deed and its sanction by God Himself, a correspondence that is only provided by the text of Revelation.⁹

⁸ On the importance of the LXX version of Deuteronomy for the book of Revelation cf. M. Tilly, “Textsicherung und Prophetie: Beobachtungen zur Septuaginta-Rezeption in Apk 22,18f.,” in *Studien zur Johannesoffenbarung und ihrer Auslegung: Festschrift für Otto Böcher zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. F.W. Horn and M. Wolter; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2005), 232–47 (232–33, 244–47).

⁹ As in, e.g., P. Prigent, *Commentary on the Apocalypse of St. John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 649.

This last motif, the threat of sanctions initiated by God Himself *and* related to the book’s contents, establishes a relationship to another text from Deuteronomy:¹⁰

οὐ μὴ θελήσῃ ὁ θεὸς εὐιλατεῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀλλ’ ἢ τότε ἐκκαυθήσεται ὀργῇ κυρίου καὶ ὁ ζῆλος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ καὶ κολληθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶσαι αἱ ἀραὶ τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης αἱ γεγραμμέναι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου καὶ ἐξαλείψει κύριος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν· καὶ διαστελεῖ αὐτὸν κύριος εἰς κακὰ ἐκ πάντων τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ πάσας τὰς ἀρὰς τῆς διαθήκης τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τοῦ νόμου τούτου. (Deut 29:19–20 LXX)

The Lord will not pardon him, but rather the anger of the Lord and his jealousy will smoke against that man, and the curses of this covenant written in this book of the law will settle upon him, and the Lord will blot out his name from under heaven.²¹ And the Lord will single him out from all the sons of Israel for calamity, in accordance with all the curses of the covenant written in this book of the law. (adapted from RSV)

The references are obvious again. The most important point is certainly the common thought that any offence against the integrity of the book results in curses, which in turn refer to the content of the book itself, which is called “book/scroll of the Law” in Deuteronomy and “prophecy” in Revelation.

With its *Textsicherungsformel* (Rev 22:18–19) the book of Revelation thus relates itself, with only slight alterations, to the texts mentioned above, which are all located at decisive places in the book of Deuteronomy and are geared towards ensuring its integrity, authority and liability. Can, however, the attempt to preserve the text’s integrity in a way similar to Deuteronomy be interpreted as a sign of a claim to authority that is comparable to the one Deuteronomy displays? I think that this question can be answered affirmatively for several reasons. Not including, for the time being, the fact that the book of Revelation calls itself “prophetic” (see below) the following aspects must be considered.

First, in accordance with Deut 29:19–20, the specific formulation of the curse intends to point out that it is God Himself who is interested in the integrity of the book. This is not only exposed in the fact that God *Himself* will punish the offender, but also in the mention of His penalties as involving the contents of the book. One could even go the

¹⁰ Also referred to in M. Tilly, “Textsicherung und Prophetie,” 235.

extra mile: the plagues described in the book, as well as the promised share in the “Tree of Life,” are parts of God’s eschatological plans as they are pictured in the book of Revelation. By expressing that God protects the text’s integrity by means of penalties corresponding to its contents—most notably God’s eschatological plans for the world and for humanity—the book eventually makes itself a factor and criterion God added to this eschatological drama on purpose.

Second, former discussions about the relationship between Rev 22:18–19 and Deut 4:2 and 13:1 hardly mention that all three Greek texts use the personal pronoun ἐγώ, in order to accentuate the narrator’s “I.” Whereas it is Moses who speaks in Deut 4:1–2 and most probably in 13:1 too, authorized by God to do so, the speaker in Rev 22:18–19 cannot easily be determined. However, when the text of Revelation’s epilogue is read synchronically, i.e. in its present context, the speaker cannot be the seer, but must be the risen Christ Himself, as the reference of 22:18–19 to 22:20a points out:¹¹ Λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα· ναί, ἔρχομαι ταχύ (“He who testifies to these things says, Surely I am coming soon”). The phrase ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα can only refer to the speaker of 22:18–19, who says, in v. 18a: Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ. Yet again, the words ἔρχομαι ταχύ can only be spoken by the risen Christ Himself, who appears as the narrator in the epilogue multiple times. Thus, another dimension accrues to the text’s claim to authority. It is not the seer, but Christ Himself who enunciates the *Textsicherungsformel*, according to which God will impose the penalties mentioned in the book on those who offend against its words.

Third, one further point could be added. Parallels to Rev 22:18–19¹² have been compiled in articles by Michael Tilly and others. Among these references, which are interpreted in the tradition of the aforementioned passages in Deuteronomy, the legend of the origin of the Septuagint according to the *Letter of Aristeas* (§§310–311) seems

¹¹ Cf. also H. Giesen, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1997), 492. A different opinion is presented by, e.g., U.B. Müller, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1984), 372; J. Roloff, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2d ed.; Zürich: Theologischer, 1987), 213. In these contributions John is regarded as the speaker of this passage, whereas this role is thought to be played by the angel in E.F. Lupieri, *A Commentary on the Apocalypse of John* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006), 362. Considering the problem of the changes of speakers within the epilogue of Revelation cf. the corresponding paragraphs in Hieke and Nicklas, “*Worte der Prophetie*.”

¹² Cf. Tilly, “Textsicherung und Prophetie,” 237–43.

to be of particular relevance for the present question. After having stressed the diligence, and above all the piety of the translators of the Torah (§§302, 305f.), the text determines that the translation—“just as if such a result was achieved by some deliberate design” (§307)—has been finished within seventy-two days. While the number seventy-two is certainly geared to expressing the perfection of the seventy-two translators’ work, the aforementioned remark suggests that the attained perfection is due to divine inspiration. The *Letter of Aristeas* alludes only indirectly to this idea, but later legends of the origin of the LXX (for example Philo, *Mos.* 2.29–41)¹³ are expanding this motif by a significant margin. The §§310–311a have to be read against this background:

As the books were read, the priests stood up, with the elders from among the translators and from the representatives of the ‘Community,’ and with the leaders of the people and said, ‘Since this version has been made rightly and reverently, and in every respect accurately, it is good that this should remain exactly so, and that there should be no revision.’ There was general approval of what they said, and they commanded that a curse should be laid, as was their custom, on anyone who should alter the version by any addition or change to any part of the written text, or any deletion either.¹⁴

Thus, the perfection of the work has, in this kind of mindset, to do with its divine inspiration. This is the reason why any alterations in the text would destroy the perfection not only gradually, but also in principle.

We may assume that the seer of the book of Revelation used (at least partly) Greek translations of those books of the “Hebrew Bible” that were important to him. At least it seems that the Torah has been available to him in an Old Greek text form, which was regarded as divinely inspired. That, however, does not mean that he was familiar with one or more legends of the origin of the LXX at the same time. Nevertheless, due to the points mentioned above, it can be assumed that he does not only follow the traditions of exegesis of the named texts of Deuteronomy when he uses the *Textsicherungsformel* from

¹³ For further information on this issue cf., e.g., M. Tilly, *Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2005), 30–33.

¹⁴ Translation from R.J.H. Shutt, “Letter of Aristeas,” *OTP* 2:7–34 (33). For an introduction to the text see, e.g., N. Meisner, *Aristeasbrief* (JSRZ 2; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1973).

Rev 22:18–19. Instead, he links the authority (and perfection) of his own work with the authority of the book of Deuteronomy (and, at the same time, with the Torah). The Torah, however, was at that time already known as an “inspired text”—at least in a broad sense of the word.

2.2. *John as Prophet and Recipient of a Revelation*

All these considerations, however, do not nearly cover all the means Rev 22:18–19 applies to gain acceptance of Revelation’s authority. The comparison to the above-quoted passages from Deuteronomy again shows the peculiarity of Revelation’s text: not the commandments are to be preserved (and observed) but the words of the *prophecy* of this book, or the words of this book of *prophecy*. The claim that the existing book contains a *προφητεία* is forcefully repeated twice within the two verses. However, it is not the first and only time this happens in the book of Revelation—the text tries to justify its prophetic character in a number of ways.

To begin with, the significance of the text’s claim to be a “prophecy” becomes obvious in the correspondence between the *Textsicherungsformel* in Rev 22:18–19 and Rev 1:3:

Μακάριος ὁ ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας καὶ τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ γεγραμμένα, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἐγγύς.

Blessed is he who reads (aloud) the words of the prophecy, and blessed are those who hear, and who keep what is written therein; for the time is near. (adapted from RSV)

As early as in the text’s introduction the reader of the following “words of prophecy” is blessed along with those who listen to it and abide by its words. Not only does the motif of the “words of prophecy” constitute an inclusion to Revelation as a whole, but it also leads to the text’s claim to acceptance as a prophecy right from the start. In the same vein it demands to be read out aloud in front of an audience. The book’s contents also show that a reading in privacy is not the communication intended. One of the crucial topics that will repeatedly come up in the following, is celestial liturgy.

On a related note, Franz Tóth writes:

Die Offenbarung des Johannes ist ein Buch vom himmlischen Kult. Der Kult bzw. der Kultbegriff spielen in diesem letzten Buch der Bibel eine

eminent wichtige Rolle. Das Buch will zeigen, was im himmlischen Heiligtum vor sich geht. Der Leser wird eingeladen, in eine Textwelt einzutauchen, in dem [!] von einem himmlischen Kultgeschehen die Rede ist, an dem er selbst—bei der Lesung des Buches im Gottesdienst—Anteil nehmen kann.¹⁵

Therefore, the Apocalypse, as a text that deals extensively with celestial liturgy, wants to be recited in a situation of “reading aloud,” “listening” and (probably) also “responding.”¹⁶ Furthermore, the text leads to the call ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ (Rev 22:20), which is the translation of μαρναναθα, a word obtained from the Lord’s Supper liturgy, a call that tries to take the readers and listeners into the intended communication with the risen Christ. What else could such a text claim, other than its intended form being set in whatever kind of ritual frame?¹⁷

Second, the text’s claim to be a “word of prophecy” complies with its description of John’s call as a Christian prophet in Rev 1:9–20. Frequent mention has been made of the text’s parallels to narrations about vocations (cf. Isa 6:1–3; Jer 1:4–10; Ezek 1:1–3:15; 1 En. 14:8–16:8) and revelations (Dan 10; *Apoc. Ab.* 10) in Old Testament and early Jewish literature.¹⁸ Thus, the seer John deliberately positions himself in the line of great prophetic figures of the past, but at the same time he aligns himself with people who received an ἀποκάλυψις. It is this correlation of “prophecy” and “apocalypse” which his book is subsisting on, beginning with the very first verses (1:1: “Revelation of/about Jesus Christ”; 1:3: “words of prophecy”). Of special importance are verses 1:11 and 19, which are not only framing the vision of John’s call but also providing a base for the book’s peculiarity. Unlike Ezekiel or Isaiah, John is not appointed as a prophet in the vision of the one who

¹⁵ F. Tóth, *Der himmlische Kult: Wirklichkeitskonstruktion und Sinnbildung in der Johannesoffenbarung* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006), 493.

¹⁶ In this context see also F. Hahn, “Liturgische Elemente in den Rahmenstücken der Johannesoffenbarung,” in *Kirchengemeinschaft, Anspruch und Wirklichkeit: Festschrift für Georg Kretschmar zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. W.-D. Hauschild, C. Nicolaisen, and D. Wendebourg; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1986), 43–57.

¹⁷ Similarly phrased by Prigent, *Commentary*, 112: “The book is intended to be read publicly, which inevitably leads us to think of a liturgical reading within a worship service. The synagogue services included a regular reading of the texts from the Law and the Prophets. The Christian gatherings undoubtedly inherited this practice, and included very early on the reading of Christian writings (cf. Col 4:16; 1 Thess 5:27; Justin, *1 Apol* 67.3).”

¹⁸ Cf., e.g., Giesen, *Offenbarung*, 83.

“looked like a Son of Man.”¹⁹ Initially there is not even a mention of him receiving a revelation:

v. 11: ὁ βλέπει γράψον εἰς βιβλίον

v. 19: γράψον οὖν ἃ εἶδες

In fact, he receives a *writing instruction*, which at least in v. 11 concretely refers to a book, destined to be sent to several communities. In turn, the instruction is given by the envisioned “Son of Man,” who is in v. 14 endowed with features which are attributed to God Himself and His Throne in Dan 7:9 (cf. also *1 En.* 46:1; *Apoc. Ab.* 11:2).²⁰ This has important consequences for John’s self-conception. He does not wish to be called the *author* of the text, but only a *scribe*; and this leads to the logical conclusion that the usual title of his book—*Apocalypse of John*—is actually inaccurate. Moreover, the text calls itself ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, a revelation who has Jesus Christ Himself as its source.²¹ According to Rev 1:1, God Himself wants to communicate with “his servants” in this revelation (conveyed by Christ, the Angel and John). John is only one of them—he is just a communicator to the communities; the text’s authority, however, is based on God and (with Him) on Christ.²²

Third, why is the book’s reference to Old Testament prophecy necessary nonetheless? The reason for this might be the situation in which and referring to which the text has been composed. Many interpreters have pointed to the circumstance that the Roman state posed a threat to the Christian communities by forcing Christians to participate in the imperial cult.²³ Surely this may have been an important

¹⁹ For further information on this text and its Christology cf. K. Huber, *Einer gleich einem Menschensohn: Die Christusvisionen in Offb 1,9–20 und Offb 14,14–20 und die Christologie der Johannesoffenbarung* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2007).

²⁰ Cf., e.g., Giesen, *Offenbarung*, 88.

²¹ Of course, the mentioned genitive construction could also be translated as “Apocalypse about Jesus Christ” but this translation does not seem to fit the book’s contents.

²² Also mentioned by Schüssler Fiorenza, “Worte der Prophetie,” 79.

²³ In new literary contributions this is considered as a key to the proper understanding of the book, so, e.g., by T. Witulski, *Die Johannesoffenbarung und Kaiser Hadrian: Studien zur Datierung der neutestamentlichen Apokalypse* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007). Cf. also J. Frey, “The Relevance of the Roman Imperial Cult for the Book of Revelation: Exegetical and Hermeneutical Reflections on the Relation between the Seven Letters and the Visionary Main Part of the Book,” in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune* (ed. J. Fotopoulos; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 231–55. In both

background dimension. Yet, it seems at least equally important to me that the Letters to the Communities of Asia (Rev 2–3) are reflecting an inner conflict, which David Aune described as a conflict between early Christian “prophets.”²⁴ Explicit hints can be found in the polemics of the Letter to the Community of Smyrna, in which the group of opponents is accused of “holding to the teaching of Balaam” (2:14),²⁵ or in the Letter to the Community of Thyatira (2:18–29; surely the most concrete one of the seven Epistles),²⁶ in which the community is reproached for letting a prophetess do as she likes. Her name is codified “Jezebel,” taken from 1 Kgs 16 and alluding to King Ahab’s wife, who was understood to be responsible for the persecution of Elijah.²⁷ Even a superficial reading shows that these passages are particularly shaped by immense aggressiveness. With the claim to pass down “words of prophecy,” the seer can bring the conflict into line with controversies of the Old Testament, where the real, God-sent prophets are jarring with pseudoprophets. There are, however, many codifications used and they prevent the reader from reconstructing the details of the conflict the seer portrays in his ciphers. So in the end it is not only John, who exposes the opponents, but they are also exposed by Christ and God, the ones who indeed initiated the prophecy. Due to these comments an argumentative dispute with the opponents becomes impossible. However, the text does not seem to be interested

of the works quoted the applicable older literature is reprocessed. Of further interest in this context is T. Witulski, *Kaiserkult in Kleinasien: Die Entwicklung der kultisch-religiösen Kaiserverehrung in der römischen Provinz Asia von Augustus bis Antoninus Pius* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).

²⁴ Cf. D.E. Aune, “The Social Matrix of the Apocalypse of John,” *Apocalypticism, Prophecy and Magic in Early Christianity: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 175–89 (188). In another contribution I reach similar conclusions: “Diesseits aus der Sicht des Jenseits: Die Sendschreiben der Offenbarung des Johannes (Offb 2–3),” in *Other Worlds and their Relation to this World* (ed. E. Eynikel et al.; Leiden: Brill, in print).

²⁵ For further information on the early Jewish and early Christian adoption of the figure of Balaam cf. G.H. van Kooten and J. van Ruiten, eds., *The Prestige of the Pagan Prophet Balaam in Judaism, Early Christianity and Islam* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

²⁶ See also G. Guttenberger, “Johannes von Thyateira: Zur Perspektive des Sehers,” in *Studien zur Johannesoffenbarung* (ed. Horn and Wolter), 160–88 (185), who, I think, goes a bit too far, as she regards Thyateira as John’s *Heimatgemeinde* (“home church”) based on her studies of the text. Nevertheless, a special relation of the seer to this church indeed appears to be of high probability.

²⁷ It is interesting to take into account that there is no ancient Jewish exegesis tradition documented in this case, which distinguishes it from the case of Balaam—as pointed out by Guttenberger, “Johannes von Thyateira,” 174–75.

in a dispute anymore. Quite the contrary is the case: the opponents are described as those who are on the wrong side and definitely to be rejected by Christ Himself, in the face of Christ's Parousia, an event which is "soon" to be expected.²⁸

This line of thought, however, is not enough to describe the entire dimension of the argument constructed by the text. This is not the only passage talking of false prophets. Of particular importance to me seems the connection between the beast rising from the earth (as mentioned in Rev 13:11) and the demonic dragon, which is referred to as "that ancient serpent called the devil, or Satan" in 12:9. It is this beast that is (in Rev 16:13; 19:20; 20:10) referred to as the "false prophet" who is thrown into the lake of burning sulphur like the first beast and the devil himself (19:20; 20:10). Thereby, a relationship is established between the beast of 13:11–18 and the opponents of Rev 2–3, especially the mentioned prophetess Jezebel.²⁹ The structure is obvious: the seer claims to have received a revelation directly from Christ, and this very revelation associates his opponents with the devil.

However, one crucial dimension of Revelation's claim to be a "prophetical book" tracing back to Christ Himself, has not been addressed yet. As frequently mentioned, the book of Revelation offers no explicit quotations from the Scriptures we now call the "Old Testament." Instead it forms a kind of textual "carpet," the fibres of which are composed of motifs, images, allusions to Old Testament texts, ideas and themes.³⁰ The outstanding role played by prophetical (and apocalyptic) texts like Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, Ezekiel and Daniel has repeatedly been emphasised and it has been analysed in detail more than once.³¹ At the same time, constant reference has been made to the Apocalypse's somewhat peculiar reception of the respective texts.

One of most evident examples can be encountered in the book of Ezekiel and the way the Apocalypse is dealing with it.³² It is not quite

²⁸ For further information see Nicklas, "Diesseits aus der Sicht des Jenseits."

²⁹ For the relationship between Letters to the Communities and visionary part of the Apocalypse cf. H. Ulland, *Die Vision als Radikalisierung der Wirklichkeit in der Apokalypse des Johannes* (Tübingen: Francke, 1997).

³⁰ Also cf. S. Moyise, "The Language of the Old Testament in the Apocalypse," *JSNT* 76 (1999): 97–113 (110), mentioning "snippets of text."

³¹ See above n. 3.

³² On the adoption of the book of Ezekiel in the book of Revelation cf. A. Vanhoye, "L'utilisation du livre d'Ézéchiël dans l'Apocalypse," *Bib* 43 (1962): 436–76; J.M. Vogelsang, *The Interpretation of Ezekiel in the Book of Revelation* (Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, Mass., 1985); J.-P. Ruiz, *Ezekiel in the Apocalypse: The Transformation*

certain in what form the book of Ezekiel was available to the seer John.³³ But the intertextual relations between his book and Ezekiel are not limited to a mere range of allusions and parallel motifs. In fact, the agreements between both texts are of a high degree, up to a point where Revelation adopts the whole structure of the book of Ezekiel for large parts.³⁴ Basic analogies can be found in the following passages of the text:

1. Vision of God	Ezek 1:4–28; 10:1–22	Rev 1:9–20; 4:1–11
2. The Scroll	Ezek 2:1–3:15 (2:9–3:4)	Rev 5:1–4; 10:8–11
3. Judgment of the Earth; Hunger, Sword and Wild Beasts:	Ezek 5:12,17; 14:21	Rev 6:8
4. Marking the Just Ones with a Sign	Ezek 9:1–6	Rev 7:1–4
5. The “Harlot”	Ezek 16 (Jerusalem) Ezek 23 (Israel, Judah)	Rev 17 (Babylon)
6. The Destruction of the Hostile City	Ezek 26–27 (Tyrus)	Rev 18 (Babylon)
7. The Victory over a Hostile Sovereign	Ezek 38–39	Rev 19:17–21; 20:7–10
8. Resurrection	Ezek 37	Rev 20:4–6
9. God’s Dwelling amongst His People	Ezek 37:26–27	Rev 21:3
10. New Jerusalem	Ezek 40–48	Rev 21:5–27; 22:1–2

Against the background of such an extensive literary relationship on the one hand, and on the other hand the claim that John’s Revelation had its authority granted by Christ, it becomes obvious why the

of *Prophetic Language in Revelation 16,17–19,10* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1989); S. Bøe, *Gog and Magog: Ezechiel 38–39 as Pre-Text for Revelation 19,17–21 and 20,7–10* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001); B. Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (Stuttgart: Bibelwerk, 2004); and D. Sängler, ed., *Das Ezechielbuch in der Johannesoffenbarung* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004).

³³ Vanhoye, “L’utilisation,” proposes a thesis which claims that Revelation draws on a Hebrew version of the book of Ezekiel. This thesis has often been criticized in the past. On this issue cf. M. Karrer, “Von der Apokalypse zu Ezechiel: Der Ezechieltext der Apokalypse,” in *Das Ezechielbuch in der Johannesoffenbarung* (ed. Sängler), 84–120.

³⁴ Cf. T. Hieke, “Der Seher Johannes als neuer Ezechiel: Die Offenbarung des Johannes vom Ezechielbuch her gelesen,” in *Das Ezechielbuch in der Johannesoffenbarung* (ed. Sängler), 1–30 (6). The following pattern orientates itself by the approach drawn up by Hieke. Cf. also similarities noted by Karrer, “Von der Apokalypse,” 91, as well as Kowalski, *Rezeption*, 252–63, 271–72, 504–7.

Apocalypse does not offer explicit quotations from the Torah or from the Prophets; someone who claims to record a revelation received from God and Christ respectively, who directly envisions heaven, does not need to quote Scripture as an authority. *Actually he cannot do it, in a manner of speaking, unless he wants to destroy at the same time the fiction of the immediacy of what was revealed to him.* By the same token he can (and has to) describe what he has seen in colours that remind of the depictions made by those who preceded him as accepted prophets and receivers of otherworldly revelations.

How can the relationship between Revelation and Ezekiel be defined against this background? Is the main concern of the Revelation an “absorption of Ezekiel,”³⁵ as Martin Karrer has suggested, or does the image of Jean-Pierre Ruiz apply: John virtually devours the Ezekiel Scroll by writing his book?³⁶ I think that quite the opposite is the case. The Apocalypse does not absorb the book of Ezekiel. Instead, it is using it to confirm the authenticity of the things envisioned and thus confirms its own authority. This only works, however, when the book of Ezekiel is already known (and accepted).

By means of various observations Thomas Hieke has recently shown how much the meaning and importance of the book of Revelation develops and how much its comprehension is facilitated once the people who read it bear the book of Ezekiel in mind, along with its contents and theological messages. One example should suffice to illustrate this aspect.³⁷ A superficial reading is enough to discover that the vision of the divine throne room depicted in Rev 4 corresponds to the descriptions in Ezek 1 and 10.³⁸ After the description of God’s throne, the book of Revelation also turns to the four creatures around the throne. However, the Apocalypse simplifies Ezekiel’s more complex depiction (a complexity that is partially due to the differences

³⁵ Karrer, “Von der Apokalypse,” 119.

³⁶ Cf. Ruiz, *Ezekiel*, 526–27.

³⁷ An interesting instance is also provided by Bøe, *Gog and Magog*, 368–69. Against the backdrop of Ezek 40–48 recipients of Rev 21:9–22:5 have to proceed on the assumption that the description of the heavenly Jerusalem also leads to a vision of the temple. However, the Apocalypse of John reacts to this expectation of the reader with an expressive statement in Rev 21:22: There is no temple in this holy city! Of course this cannot prove whether and to what extent the first readers of Revelation had the book of Ezekiel in mind when they read the Revelation. Nonetheless, I think that this question is not relevant for the claim their *text* raises.

³⁸ The crucial thoughts of this paragraph can already be found in Hieke, “Seher Johannes,” 19–22.

between Ezek 1 and 10). It is remarkable that the Apocalypse describes the creatures without wheels, whereas in Ezekiel the wheels symbolize God’s vitally important mobility—according to Ezek 10:18–22 His glory departs from the temple towards the East in order to return to it again at the end (Ezek 43:1–12). Those different motifs can be easily explained from the fact that God’s mobility, indicated in Ezekiel, is not important for the book of Revelation, which stresses God’s cosmic lordship and will describe God’s eschatological holy city *without a temple*. At the same time, there is the question of the creatures’ function in the vision of the throne room as it appears in Revelation. If one considers their role exclusively from a text-immanent point of view, they appear more or less as a kind of “decoration” to the scene³⁹—only readers who bear Ezekiel’s vision in mind can see a function in them, namely the following. The revelation that is granted to John conforms to the one of Ezekiel. Therefore, it can claim to be true.

What is indicated here by the motif of the four creatures might be substantiated by a closer look into the details as well. Revelation 4:6b depicts the place where the four creatures are situated in a rather strange fashion:

Καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου τέσσαρα ζῶα γέμοντα ὀφθαλμῶν ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν.

And in the middle of the throne, and around the throne, four living creatures, full of eyes in front and behind. (adapted from RSV)

A reader who only knows the book of Revelation may conceive this description as extremely strange and hardly imaginable. A mere glance at Ezek 1:4–5 explains that awkward phrasing.⁴⁰ There, the reader is told that Ezekiel has a revelation of God’s throne in an immense cloud of flaring fire, which is drawing nearer in a windstorm, coming from the north. Ezek 1:5 locates the four creatures “in the middle (of it)” (LXX: ἐν τῷ μέσῳ). The ἐν μέσῳ of Rev 4:6b explains itself against this background.

³⁹ Similarly expressed by Hieke, “Seher Johannes,” 27: “Die vier Lebewesen haben in Offb auf den ersten Blick ‘nur’ eine ‘dekorative’ Funktion (lobpreisende Anbetung), doch ihre eigentliche Aufgabe besteht darin, die Thronvision des Ezechiel in Offb einzuspielen. Ihre Botschaft an den Leser lautet: Johannes sieht, was einst Ezechiel sah.”

⁴⁰ This observation was motivated by Vogelsang, *Interpretation*, 56–58. A similar approach is made by Prigent, *Commentary*, 231. For alternative interpretations cf. Giesen, *Offenbarung*, 153.

Therefore, I do not think that the seer of the Apocalypse “absorbs” Ezekiel in his text; I rather suppose that his main concern is to establish his Scripture as a kind of new prophecy and as a revelation of *its own* time with its own profile that wants to exist alongside Ezekiel and others, like Zechariah, Daniel or Isaiah. This, however, can only work if the mentioned and already existing prophetic and apocalyptic Scriptures can be considered known and already accepted authorities. At least when it comes to the main features, John *sees* what Ezekiel sees. That does not mean that he “absorbs” Ezekiel, but he “puts him in relative terms” by relating him to his own revelation.

To put it in other terms: one might possibly speak of a *relecture* of Ezekiel in the broadest sense.⁴¹ Ezekiel’s visions remain relevant for Revelation, they are not discarded or absorbed; instead they are playing a decisive role as an important sub- or intertext which has to be read with reference to Revelation. At the same time, they experience a new development against the background of a new situation. The described relation to well-known authorities like Ezekiel gives the Apocalypse the opportunity to inspire the reader’s confidence in its contents and significance. The respective differences—may they be on the macro structural level or in the development of details—help the text to communicate its very own message, which it calls Christ’s immediate revelation.

3. CONCLUSION

The possibilities to establish a new authoritative religious text are limited when it has to maintain its ground next to already existing, more or less generally accepted Scriptures. One possibility that has been applied in many apocalyptic writings is the characterisation of an already known revelation as limited and incomplete. The next step would be the addition of new contents—at best by assigning the new texts to generally accepted, great authorities of the past. In this context, *4 Ezra*’s well-known distinction between two parts of God’s revelation has to be mentioned—the generally accessible revelation of the

⁴¹ On the term *relecture* in connection with the interpretation of biblical texts cf., e.g., K. Scholtissek, *In ihm sein und bleiben: Die Sprache der Immanenz in den johanneischen Schriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 2000), 131–37. This contribution mentions the “Fortschreibung als kreative[r] Traditionsgebundenheit” (131).

Torah, on the one hand, and on the other hand, secret revelations only accessible to a small elite.⁴²

Comparable strategies are used by many gospels of the second and third centuries. Some of them are drawing upon great authorities that are often introduced next to or even against established authorities (e.g., the "Beloved disciple" and Peter in the Gospel of John; Mary Magdalene in the Gospel of Mary; etc.),⁴³ while others try to fill out "gaps" of already accepted texts in order to take root alongside their authority (e.g., infancy gospels, or Dialogues of the Saviour filling out the gap indicated by the forty days of revelation in Acts 1:3).⁴⁴ In contrast to that, the Revelation of John develops remarkably different techniques; it does not obtain its authority by the recourse to great figures of the past—we may rather assume that an early Christian prophet called John indeed stands behind this text. Nevertheless, John does not fulfil the same function for the Apocalypse as Ezra does for *4 Ezra* or Paul for the *Apocalypse of Paul*. In the book of Revelation Christ Himself plays the role of the great authority, but he does not just act as an authority of the past; as "Alpha and Omega" he is *the* authority of past, present and future, the one who is coming soon. Even the exposition of the opponents as false prophets (and their connection to the devil) is put into his mouth. At the same time, Revelation does not claim to announce something mould-breaking—in most parts, it borrows its material from prophetic (and apocalyptic) texts of the Old Testament, like Ezekiel, Isaiah, Zechariah or Daniel. Due to the fact that a lot of its images proclaim well-known issues—in variation to its subtexts—it bases itself on their authority and their claim of announcing the truth. Since the Apocalypse envisions itself as having God Himself and the

⁴² For further information e.g. M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1990), 419.

⁴³ Cf., e.g., the introduction of the Beloved Disciple in the Gospel of John or the role of Mary (of Magdalene) in the Gospel of Mary. The Beloved Disciple is, almost throughout the whole text, seen in relation to the approved authority of Peter. See also the ideas developed by J. Hartenstein, "Das Petrus-evangelium als Evangelium," in *Das Evangelium nach Petrus: Text, Kontexte, Intertexte* (ed. T.J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007), 159–81.

⁴⁴ This happens, partially, in the narrations that deal with Jesus' family, birth, childhood and youth, a field where the texts that became canonical are exposing vast gaps. Revelations of the risen Christ are included in the *Dialogues of the Risen Lord* subsequent to Acts 1:3 with particular preference; these revelations, however, are mentioned but never put into practice in the Acts of the Apostles. For further information cf., e.g., J. Hartenstein, *Die zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen frühchristlicher Dialoge* (Berlin: Akademie, 2000).

risen Christ as the source of its authority, it does not offer explicit quotations from older authorities, because in doing so it would destroy the fiction of the immediacy of its own revelation. Furthermore, the example of Ezekiel shows that the book of Revelation does not intend to override the already accepted, older authorities. Instead, it picks up their images, ideas and themes and wants to be read in relation to them. It does not absorb them, but puts them in relative terms.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ Translation of the German original by Evelyn Karl and Melanie Höppler.

FROM HOLY BOOKS TO HOLY BIBLE:
AN ITINERARY FROM ANCIENT GREECE TO MODERN
ISLAM VIA SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM AND EARLY
CHRISTIANITY

Jan N. Bremmer

1. INTRODUCTION

In the middle of the 1870s, the founder of the history of religion, Friedrich Max Müller (1823–1900), conceived of the plan to edit a series of translations of those religious texts of mankind that “had been formally recognised by religious communities as constituting the highest authority in matters of religion, which had received a kind of canonical sanction, and might be therefore appealed to for deciding any disputed points of faith, morality and ceremonial.”¹ The plan resulted in his famous series *Sacred Books of the East* (1879–1910), its fifty volumes perhaps his most lasting contribution to the study of religion. Müller was clearly interested in the place of the book within religion, and it was he who coined the term “religion of the book” (German: *Buchreligion*) in 1873.² This did not mean that he considered a book the *conditio sine qua non* for religion. In the end, as he stated, the “bookless religion” of our heart was the only safe and solid foundation for the sacred books of humanity.³

Max Müller’s attention to sacred books is very appropriate to the theme of this collection in honour of Florentino García Martínez. Surely, if a book is a “holy book” it must be authoritative. Unfortunately, the exact meaning of both “holy” in this respect and “authoritative” is not that easy to determine. For our purpose we note that a

¹ F.M. Müller, *Natural Religion* (London: Longmans, 1889), 539; see also his preface to, *Sacred Books of the East, I: The Upanishads* (ed. Müller; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1879), XV–XVI. For Müller’s project see L.P. van den Bosch, *Friedrich Max Müller: A Life Devoted to the Humanities* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 118–20, 131–35, 341–47.

² F.M. Müller, *Introduction to the Science of Religion* (London: Longmans, 1873), 102ff.

³ Van den Bosch, *Friedrich Max Müller*, 347, referring to Müller, *Natural Religion*, 564 and *Anthropological Religion* (London: Longmans, 1892), 380.

“holy book” usually presupposes a closed canon and a fixed text, but it is not only special regarding its content: even its material appearance often counts. To destroy a Qur’an is not the same as shredding some administrative papers but an important symbolic act, as recent events have taught us. An authoritative book presupposes a community that accepts its authority, even if some parts of the book may be less important than others: the Gospels were clearly more authoritative than some of the Pseudo-Pauline Letters in early Christianity.⁴

Yet however important these issues are, they are not the focus of my contribution. In other words, my aim here is not to discuss the status and meaning of holy books in different cultures, but I want to trace the origin of the term “holy book” and to investigate when Jews and Christians began to call their authoritative texts “holy.” The question may seem banal but, strangely enough, none of the many studies on “Holy Books” or “Holy Writings” that have appeared in the last century focuses on the problem of the origin and development of the term. In fact, it is common practice to confuse its emic and etic usage in the sense that almost all modern scholars use the expression “holy/sacred book” also in cases where the original culture does not, and, as a rule, do not differentiate between the two usages.⁵ This is already clear in Müller’s project. His series started with an edition of the Indian *Upanishads*, but these began as oral prose and certainly not as “sacred books.”

⁴ For these questions see most recently F.E. Peters, *The Voice, the Word, the Books: The Sacred Scripture of the Jews, Christians, and Muslims* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); H. Räisänen, “The Bible Among Scriptures,” in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. A. Voitoila and J. Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 687–702; R.E. Van Voorst, *Anthology of World Scriptures* (6th ed.; Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth, 2008), 4–10.

⁵ H. Hackmann, *Religionen und heilige Schriften* (Berlin: Curtius, 1914); J. Leipoldt and S. Morenz, *Heilige Schriften* (Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1953); G. Lanczkowski, *Heilige Schriften: Inhalt, Textgestalt und Überlieferung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1956); F.F. Bruce and E.G. Rupp, eds., *Holy Book and Holy Tradition* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968); F.M. Denny and R.L. Taylor, eds., *The Holy Book in Comparative Perspective* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1985); C. Colpe, “Heilige Schriften,” *RAC* 14 (1988), 184–223; M. Levering, ed., *Rethinking Scripture* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1989); W.C. Smith, *What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1993); J.F.A. Sawyer, *Sacred Languages and Sacred Texts* (London: Routledge, 1999); U. Tworuschka, ed., *Heilige Schriften: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2000); C. Bultmann et al., eds., *Heilige Schriften: Ursprung, Geltung und Gebrauch* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2005).

In my contribution I will therefore make some observations on the origin and development of the term “holy book.” Naturally, it is impossible to exhaust the subject in a single paper, but we can at least try to make a decent start. Subsequently, I will look at ancient Greece (§2), Egypt (§3), Second Temple Judaism (§4) and early and medieval Christianity (§5). I will conclude with a few observations on its usage today, contemporary Islam included (§6).

2. ANCIENT GREECE

Early Greece was an oral culture in which authority in religion was based on oral tradition and not on written texts.⁶ It is therefore typical that the sophists, who did not hesitate to critique religion, were associated with books.⁷ Yet from the turn of the sixth century B.C.E. onwards, we start to find books in connection with Greek religion in at least three different ways. First, oracles became gradually collected into books. The earliest mention of writing in connection with oracles is the “skin” of Epimenides, apparently a single parchment sheet that was used by the famous purifier and oracle monger at the turn of the seventh century B.C.E.⁸ However, at the end of the sixth century we hear already of the collected oracles of Musaeus;⁹ in the middle of the fifth century the childless seer Polemainetos left his craft, money and books to his pupil,¹⁰ and when Aristophanes speaks of a *byblion* with

⁶ See in general W. Burkert, “Zur Rolle der Schriftlichkeit in Kulturen des Altertums,” in *Normieren, Tradieren, Inszenieren: Das Christentum als Buchreligion* (ed. A. Holzem; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2004), 25–39.

⁷ Aristophanes fr. 506 Kassel-Austin, cf. J. Mansfeld, *Studies in the Historiography of Greek Philosophy* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990), 305 n. 345; for the critique of the sophists see J.N. Bremmer, “Atheism in Antiquity,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Atheism* (ed. M. Martin; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 11–26.

⁸ Cf. J.N. Bremmer, “The Skins of Pherekydes and Epimenides,” *Mnemosyne* IV 46 (1993): 234–36; for oracles on parchment sheets note also Euripides fr. 627 Kannicht.

⁹ Herodotus, *Hist.* 7.6.11.

¹⁰ Isocrates, *Aeginet.* 19.5–6, 45, cf. W. Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1992), 43–44 and idem, *Kleine Schriften III: Mystica, Orphica, Pythagorica* (ed. F. Graf; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 198.

oracles in his *Birds*, he probably means a papyrus roll rather than a single parchment sheet.¹¹

Second, at the turn of the sixth century B.C.E., Greek mythographers started to collect and order local and national myths in single books.¹² The mythographer Acusilaus of Argos (ca. 500 B.C.E.) even presented himself as something of a sage and a purveyor of ancient wisdom, who claimed that he had written his book *Genealogies* on the basis of bronze tablets, which his father had unearthed in his house.¹³

The third and, for us, most relevant type of books we encounter first in Euripides' *Hippolytos* where Theseus reproaches his son not only because he follows an Orphic diet, but also because he honours "the vapourings of many writings" (954 = *OF* 627).¹⁴ The context clearly shows that he means the pseudepigraphical writings attributed to Orpheus. The oldest of these are probably a *Descent to Hades*, which must predate some poems of Pindar, and a *Theogony*, which must equally go back to the earlier decades of the fifth century. Orphism was a religious movement that had introduced a proper afterlife with a retribution for "sins" and a reward for those who had led an ethically blameless life, but it had also developed a somewhat more rationalised theogony and advocated a separate life style.¹⁵ Books, as the quotation

¹¹ Contra W. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1989), 83, cf. A. Henrichs, "Hieroi Logoi and Hierai Bibloi: The (Un)written Margins of the Sacred in Ancient Greece," *HSCP* 101 (2003): 207–66 (216–22); H. Bowden, "Oracles for Sale," in *Herodotus and His World* (ed. P. Derow and R. Parker; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 256–74 (264–70).

¹² For the fragments of the early mythographers see now R.L. Fowler, *Early Greek Mythography I* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

¹³ Acusilaus *FGrH* 2 T 1 = T 1 Fowler. For the type of story see A.J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste* (3 vols.; 3d ed.; Paris: Lecoffre, 1950), 1:319–24 and idem, *Études de religion grecque et hellénistique* (Paris: Vrin, 1972), 272–74; W. Speyer, *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970); P. Piovanelli, "The Miraculous Discovery of the Hidden Manuscript, or the Paratextual Function of the Prologue to the *Apocalypse of Paul*," in *The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul* (ed. J.N. Bremmer and I. Czachesz; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 23–49.

¹⁴ For the Orphic fragments (= *OF*) I refer to the splendid new edition, with detailed bibliography and commentary, by A. Bernabé, *Orphicorum et Orphicis similitum testimonia et fragmenta. Poetae Epici Graeci. Pars II. Fasc. 1–3* (Munich: Saur, 2004–2007).

¹⁵ J.N. Bremmer, "Rationalization and Disenchantment in Ancient Greece: Max Weber among the Pythagoreans and Orphics?" in *From Myth to Reason? Studies in the Development of Greek Thought* (ed. R. Buxton; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 71–83.

above shows, were important in this movement and that singles them out from mainstream Greek religion.

Orphic priests, male and female, peddled their religious ware, like, say, modern Scientology, and promised a happy afterlife via initiations.¹⁶ It seems reasonable to suppose that Orphic texts were read during these initiations, as Demosthenes ridiculed his opponent Aeschines by reproaching him: “when you became a man, you used to read for your mother the books as she performed the initiation rites” (18.259). In the Dionysiac mysteries these books must have been papyrus rolls with, probably, an Orphic cosmogony or theogony, as such poetry may have been read as an attempt to restore the normal order in case of illness.¹⁷ Yet although recited at religious occasions, these texts were not called “holy books.”

It is still typical of the oral nature of Greek culture that when we start to hear about books of alternative religious movements and cults these texts are called *hieroi logoi*, “holy tales.”¹⁸ The expression occurs first in the Egyptian part of Herodotus, which brings us to the period around the 430s B.C.E. In two of the four times that he uses the expression Herodotus mentions Greek mysteries: the Pelasgians told a *hiros* (the Ionian form of *hieros*) *logos* about the ithyphallic statues of Hermes, which “is made clear in the mysteries of Samothrace” (2.51.4), and the resemblance between the Egyptian taboo on wool “with that (taboo on wool) of Orphic and Bacchic rites” leads him to say that “there is a *hiros logos* being said about these” (2.81.2 = *OF* 43, 45, 650).¹⁹ From the other two examples, one concerns the night of the Lighting of the Lamps at Saïs for Neith/Athena during which a cosmogony was recited (see above), “describing the birth of Neith and the ensuing establishment of the cosmic order,” which Herodotus does not want to mention, commenting once again: “there is a *hiros logos* being said about this.”²⁰ The last example is the carrying of an oversized, moving phallus by women at a festival for Dionysus, Herodotus’ *interpretatio graeca* of Osiris. The concomitant myth probably told the

¹⁶ F. Graf and S.I. Johnston, *Ritual Texts for the Afterlife: Orpheus and the Bacchic Gold Tablets* (London: Routledge, 2007), 144–46.

¹⁷ Cf. Burkert, *Kleine Schriften III*, 200, who compares Mesopotamian rites in which the reading of a cosmogony has to effect a healing.

¹⁸ For the term see now Henrichs, “*Hieroi Logoi*,” to which I am much indebted.

¹⁹ For the textual problems of this passage see the bibliography on *OF* 650.

²⁰ Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.62.2, cf. the commentary of A.B. Lloyd in D. Asheri et al., *A Commentary on Herodotus Books I–IV* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 279.

reconstitution of Osiris after his dismemberment, which must have reminded Herodotus and other Greeks of Dionysus' dismemberment by the Titans,²¹ an important feature of Orphic mythology, but all he tells us is once again: "there is a *hiros logos* being said about this."²²

It seems a reasonable conclusion from these passages that for Herodotus a *hiros logos* was a secret tale, which was especially, perhaps exclusively, connected with rites that reminded him of mysteries: Samothracian, Orphic and/or Bacchic. Around 415 B.C.E., the secrecy surrounding Orphic ritual was broken by the "atheist" Diagoras,²³ who revealed to the public the *Orphikos logos*, "the Orphic tale," as we learn from Athenagoras (*Leg.* 4.1 = *OF* 557), which still suggests the oral character of the Orphic *hiros logos*. Similarly, in his famous Seventh Letter Plato says:

we must truly always believe the ancient and holy tales (*palaios te kai hierois logois*) that warn us that the soul is immortal, will be judged, and suffer the severest punishments after the separation from the body. (*Ep.* 7.335a = *OF* 433 I)²⁴

These "tales" clearly refer once again to the Orphic doctrines about retribution in the afterlife and thus to mysteries and initiations.

Is it true, though, that, as Albert Henrichs states, "in Greece proper, *hieroi logoi* remained by definition unwritten?"²⁵ This may have been the case in the fifth century, but we cannot be sure that the texts from which Aeschines read (see above) were not also called *hieroi logoi*. In any case, books with the title *Hieroi Logoi* already started to appear in

²¹ Bernabé on *OF* 57–59.

²² Herodotus, *Hist.* 2.48.3 with Lloyd ad loc. For Dionysos' dismemberment see now Graf and Johnston, *Ritual Texts*, 75–93.

²³ For Diagoras see most recently M. Winiarczyk, *Diagorae Melii et Theodori Cyrenaei reliquiae* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1981), to be read with his "Ergänzungen zu Diagoras und Theodoros," *Philologus* 133 (1989): 151–52; J.N. Bremmer, "Religious Secrets and Secrecy in Classical Greece," in *Secrecy and Concealment: Studies in the History of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Religions* (ed. H. Kippenberg and G. Stroumsa; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 61–78 (74–75); R. Parker, *Athenian Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 208; D. Obbink, *Philodemus, On Piety* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996) 525–26; J. Hordern, "Philodemus and the poems of Diagoras," *ZPE* 136 (2001): 33–38.

²⁴ Note that elsewhere Plato also uses the expression *palaios logos*, "ancient tale," for an Orphic "holy tale," cf. *Leg.* 4.715e (= *OF* 31 [III]). Its Orphic character is also demonstrated by the *Urfassung* of the so-called *Testament of Orpheus* (7a = *OF* 377.7a), cf. C. Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos* (Munich: Gunter Narr, 1993), 28, 51.

²⁵ Henrichs, "*Hieroi Logoi*," 240.

the fourth century at the latest, as the Athenian historian Clidemus “says that Rhea is the Mother of the Gods, what some also have proposed in the *Hieroi Logoi*.”²⁶ In the same century a certain Epigenes, who may well have been a pupil of Socrates,²⁷ mentions a *Hieros Logos* of Cercops the Pythagorean in his book about Orphic poetry.²⁸ In an edict of, probably, Ptolemy IV Philopator, dating from about 210 B.C.E., initiators for Dionysus should “hand in the *Hieros Logos* in a sealed copy”,²⁹ somewhat after the middle of the second century B.C.E. the Jewish historian Aristobulus mentions that Orpheus composed verses in his poems named after the *Hieros Logos* (§4),³⁰ and *Hieroi Logoi in 24 Rhapsodies* was the name of the main Orphic work to survive into Late Antiquity.³¹ It is clear from these examples that the central oral text of the Orphic(-Bacchic) rituals must have been so prominent that in the course of time books with Orphic poems adopted the title *Hieros Logos* or *Hieroi Logoi*.

3. EGYPT

If in classical Greece, then, we have a “holy tale” or text but not a “holy book,” the situation is different in Egypt. Here the books of the scholarly priests whom the Greeks called *hierogrammateis*, “temple scribes,”³² were called “books of the gods” or “divine books” in Egyptian, which

²⁶ Clidemus *FGrH* 323 F 25 = *OF* 29, where Bernabé compares Rhea as Mother in the Derveni Papyrus (col. XXII.7–8 = *OF* 398).

²⁷ W. Burkert, *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972), 129 n. 50.

²⁸ Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.21.131.5 = *OF* 406, cf. Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 114, 130 n. 60, who considers Cercops, but not his book, “a figment of ancient philology.”

²⁹ *BGU* (*Berliner griechische Urkunden*) 6.12.1, cf. Henrichs, “*Hieroi Logoi*,” 227–28 with full bibliography.

³⁰ Aristob. fr. 2 Denis (= Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.4 = *OF* 376): Ὀρφεὺς ἐν ποιήμασι τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἱερὸν Λόγον αὐτῷ λεγομένων οὕτως ἐκτίθεται. For a discussion of this passage and its translation see Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation*, 44–45 (to be read with my comment in §4).

³¹ M.L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), 227; for full bibliography see Bernabé on *OF* 90–359.

³² For the function see most recently K.-Th. Zauzich, “Hierogrammat,” in *LÄ* 2 (1977), 1199–1201; J. Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues, and Rites: The London-Leiden Magical Manuscripts and Translation in Egyptian Ritual (100–300 CE)* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 207.

the Greeks in turn translated as *hierai bibloi*, “holy books.”³³ These books were composed, copied and preserved “in the temple libraries and the House-of-Life, the cultic library that housed those texts that were seen as the emanations of the sun god Re.”³⁴ When the manuscripts deteriorated they were perhaps even preserved in special rooms as a kind of genizah, a practice that seems to have given us so many papyri in Tebtynis.³⁵

The oldest Greek example of such an Egyptian “holy book” is mentioned by Hecataeus of Abdera who wrote an *Aegyptiaca* under Ptolemy I around 315 B.C.E.³⁶ Slightly later we find Manetho’s *Hiera Biblos*, a book about the Egyptian dynasties, which, interestingly, the great Christian chronographer Julius Africanus bought for his own work on Christian chronology.³⁷ Moreover, according to Josephus, Manetho mentions that the Jews are mentioned “in their (Egyptian) holy books” (*C. Ap.* 1.91).³⁸ Another, relatively early, example occurs in the famous trilingual Decree of Kanopos of 238 B.C.E. (*Orientis Grae-*

³³ Theophilus, *Autol.* 2.6.32; *PSI (Papiri della Società Italiana)* 1149; *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* 30.181; *Sammelbuch (griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten)* 12531.10, 15, 20, cf. J. Quaegebeur, “Sur la ‘loi sacrée’ dans l’Égypte gréco-romaine,” *Ancient Society* 11–12 (1980–1981): 227–40.

³⁴ Dieleman, *Priests*, 207. For the House-of-Life see A. Gardiner, “The House of Life,” *JEA* 24 (1938): 157–79; M. Weber, “Lebenshaus,” in *LÄ* 3 (1980), 954–57; G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes* (2d ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 57. Those libraries are already mentioned by Hecataeus of Abdera *FGrH* 264 F 25 (as quoted by Diod. Sic. 1.49.3); Aelius Aristides 8.29. They may also explain the tradition about a library in the Alexandrian Serapeum, cf. T. Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 43–46.

³⁵ As is suggested by P. van Minnen, “Boorish or Bookish? Literature in Egyptian Villages in the Fayum in the Graeco-Roman Period,” *JJP* 28 (1998): 99–184 (168). See now K. Ryholt, “On the Contents and Nature of the Tebtunis Temple Library,” in *Tebtynis und Soknopaiou Nesos: Leben im römerzeitlichen Fajum* (ed. S. Lippert and M. Schentuleit; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2005), 141–70 with important new material on the contents of Egyptian temple libraries; K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2007), 69–70 in the course of a wide-ranging survey of scribes and ancient libraries; K. Zinn, “Tempelbibliotheken im Alten Ägypten,” in *Spätantike Bibliotheken: Leben und Lesen in den frühen Klöstern Ägyptens* (ed. H. Froschauer and C. Römer; Vienna: Phoibos, 2008), 81–91.

³⁶ Hecataeus *FGrH* 264 F 25 (as quoted by Diod. Sic. 1.44.4, 1.70.9, 1.73.4, 1.82.3, 1.95.5, 1.96.2). For the date see P.M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972), 2:719f.

³⁷ Manetho *FGrH* 609 T 9, F 3b (p. 25.1), cf. Julius Africanus apud Syncellus 105 Mosshammer = F 46.54–55, *Iulius Africanus Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments* (ed. M. Wallraff; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

³⁸ Manetho *FGrH* 609 F 8 (p. 88.6), cf. Jacoby’s critical apparatus.

cae *Inscriptiones Selectae* 56.70) in honour of Ptolemy III and Berenice II.³⁹ Also the title of Euhemerus' highly influential work, *Hiera Anagraphê*, "Holy Record," which was written in Alexandria more or less at the same time as Hecataeus' work, can hardly be separated from these Egyptian "Holy Books."⁴⁰

The term "holy book" proved to have had a long and successful life in Egypt. Not only do we still find Egyptian "holy books" mentioned in Late Antiquity, as for example, in Heliodorus' novel *Aethiopica*,⁴¹ but we also find the qualification "holy book" regularly in the Egyptian magical papyri.⁴² It is then hardly surprising that the *Corpus Hermeticum*, of which the Egyptian background is increasingly realised,⁴³ also contains a "holy book called *Korê Kosmou*,"⁴⁴ that the *Asclepius* carries the subtitle "Of Hermes Trismegistos: Holy Book Dedicated to Asclepius,"⁴⁵ and that Pseudo-Manetho (*FGrH* 609 F 25) can mention "holy books written by our forefather Hermes Trismegistos." In the Nag Hammadi Library we find *The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit* (NH III.2, 69.19–20),⁴⁶ and "holy books" are also mentioned in *The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth* (NH VI.6, 63.17) and in the anonymous tractate on the origin of the world (NH II.5, 110:30, 112:12).

³⁹ Unfortunately, the passage is not commented upon by S. Pfeiffer, *Das Dekret von Kanopos* (238 v. Chr.) (Munich: Saur, 2004).

⁴⁰ As noted by E. Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1924), 85 n. 1; Henrichs, "*Hieroi Logoi*," 225 n. 59 (with recent bibliography), cf. Euhemerus T 8, 30 Winiarczyk. For Euhemerus' influence on third-century B.C.E. Jewish literature see J.N. Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible, and the Ancient Near East* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 95.

⁴¹ Suda s.v. *Petosiris*; Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 2.28.2, 3.8.1; Ps. Manetho, *Apotelesmata* 5.1; Horapollon, *Hieroglyphica* 1.38, *Des Niloten Horapollon Hieroglyphenbuch I* (ed. H.J. Thissen; Munich: Saur, 2001).

⁴² PGM III.424 [*hiera biblos*]; XIII.3 ("holy book [*biblos hiera*] called *Monas* or *The Eighth Book of Moses*"), 15–16 ("holy book [*hiera byblos*] called *Pteryx*"), 231–233 [*hiera biblos*], 341–342 [*hiera biblos*]; XXIVa.2–3 [*hiera biblos*]; *Suppl. Mag.* 72.i.2–3 ("holy book [*hiera byblos*] called *Of Hermes*").

⁴³ Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes*; R. van den Broek, "Hermetism," in *Dictionary of Gnosis and Western Esotericism* (2 vols.; ed. W. Hanegraaff; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 1:558–70.

⁴⁴ *Corpus Hermeticum*, *Tome III* (4 vols.; ed. A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière; Paris: "Les Belles Lettres," 1945), 3:XXIII.

⁴⁵ A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, *Corpus Hermeticum*, *Tome II* (Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1945), 263 nn. 3–4. Note also the *Liber sanctus Hermetis ad Asclepium*, edited by C.-E. Ruelle, *RevPhil* 32 (1908): 247–77.

⁴⁶ For the title see now M. Meyer, "Gnosis, Mageia, and *The Holy Book of the Great Invisible Spirit*," in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen* (ed. A. Hilhorst and G.H. van Kooten; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 503–17 (511f.).

Finally, the fourth-century alchemist Zosimus of Panopolis mentions “the holy books of Hermes” and “the holy scriptures or books,” which looks like a treatise on the myth of the fallen Watchers that was used by Zosimus in his explanation of the origin of alchemy.⁴⁷

4. SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

Given the importance of Egypt as the land that gave birth to the expression “holy book,” we now turn to the Jews living in Egypt.⁴⁸ Unfortunately, the dating of our most important sources is not half as precise as we would like. Yet we may get some impression when we combine a number of passages that seem to be not that different in time from one another. In the famous *Letter of Aristeas* about the Septuagint, which probably dates from the second half of the second century B.C.E., we learn of the high status of the Pentateuch at the time, which has to be written on sheets of parchments in Hebrew characters (§3). The Law is *theios*, “divine” (§§3, 31), *semnos*, “reverend” (§§5, 31), *hagnos*, “demanding respect” (§31) and derives from God (§313).⁴⁹ Consequently, the letters are written in gold,⁵⁰ the seams of the parchments unnoticeable (§176), and the king prostrates himself before the work about seven times (§177). There can be no doubt: this is an authoritative book.

We should also note that the delegates from Jerusalem who bring the translation to Alexandria are clearly depicted as arriving with several scrolls, as the king asked “questions about the books” and in answer “they (the delegates) had shown what had been covered and unrolled the parchments” (§§176–177).⁵¹ Yet towards the end of the

⁴⁷ Zosimus apud Syncellus 24 Mosshammer [*hierai graphai êtoi bibloi*], cf. M. Mertens, *Les Alchimistes grecs*, IV.1 (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1995), XCIII–XCVI; A.Y. Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 229f. Note also its occurrence in the Manichaean *Kephalaia* (349,15 Funk): *oujôme efouabe*, “a holy book.”

⁴⁸ For good studies see H. Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration Heiliger Schriften bei Philo* (Giessen: Brunnen, 1988), 84–91; O. Wischmeyer, “Das heilige Buch im Judentum des zweiten Tempels,” *ZNW* 86 (1995): 218–42.

⁴⁹ The author of the *Letter of Aristeas* ascribes the last two characterisations to Hecataeus of Abdera, whom we have already met, but this is a falsification, cf. Jacoby on Hecataeus *FGrH* 264 F 23.

⁵⁰ For this custom in the case of precious writings see B.H. Stricker, *De Brief van Aristeas* (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1956), 88.

⁵¹ *Let. Aris.* §§176–177, but see also §§28, 30, 46, 176 and 317; note also CD 7:15–16.

Letter (§316 = Theodectas *TrGF* 72 T 17)⁵² we hear that the tragedian Theodectes was afflicted with cataracts when he was about to include a passage in one of his plays from what is written “in the Book,” which, significantly, is paraphrased by Josephus (*A.J.* 12.113) as “Holy Book.” This notice has perhaps not received the attention it deserves. Intriguingly, if unpersuasively, it not only connects a prolific tragedian who was older than Aristotle with the Jews, but it also is the first time that the Pentateuch, not the Old Testament,⁵³ is called “the Book.” In other words, it presupposes the Pentateuch as a closed unity.⁵⁴

In the *Letter of Aristeas* there are not yet exaggerated claims regarding the antiquity of the Pentateuch, and the king is even amazed that Greek poets and historians have not yet referred to such a wonderful book (§312). This perhaps suggests that the *Letter of Aristeas* was written before the work of Aristobulus, who is currently situated in the same period. The latter not only claimed that Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato had imitated Moses,⁵⁵ but also that Orpheus, as we already noted (§3), had called his own work *Hieros Logos* after, according to Riedweg,⁵⁶ the Old Testament.⁵⁷ However, the stress on Moses clearly suggests the Pentateuch, just like the *Letter of Aristeas* purports to describe the translation of the Pentateuch, not the whole of the Old Testament. In other words, at the time of Aristobulus some Hellenized Jews, like Philo later (see below), called the Pentateuch *Hieros Logos*, probably in order to appropriate the huge prestige of Orpheus.

⁵² Regarding the spelling Theodectes/Theodectas, Snell (*ad Theodectas TrGF* 72 T 3) notes: “scriptores semper utuntur forma Attica.” Rajak, *Translation and Survival*, 260 calls the passages about Theodectes and Theopompus (314) “obscure traditions,” but they rather seem to have been invented by the author of the *Letter*.

⁵³ Contra R.J.H. Shutt, “Letter of Aristeas,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; ed. J.H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1985), 7–34 (34), who notes: “Apparently the first time the term ‘Bible’ was used to mean the OT,” but who has overlooked that the *Letter of Aristeas* concerns the Pentateuch, as is stressed by E. Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees, introduced by Martin Hengel, edited by Amram Tropper* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1:165f.

⁵⁴ The passage has been overlooked by K. De Troyer, “When Did the Pentateuch Come into Existence? An Uncomfortable Perspective,” in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 269–86.

⁵⁵ Aristob. frg. 3–4 Denis.

⁵⁶ Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation*, 45.

⁵⁷ On Orpheus and Moses see now R. Bloch, “Orpheus als Lehrer des Musaios, Moses als Lehrer des Orpheus,” in *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (ed. U. Dill and C. Walde; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 469–86.

Now it is interesting to note that the *Letter of Aristeas* calls the content of the Pentateuch *logia*, “oracles” (§177).⁵⁸ The expression presupposes the notion of Moses as prophet,⁵⁹ which can already be found in the last chapter of Deuteronomy (34:10), and which we also find in Aristobulus (fr. 2.3–4 Denis).⁶⁰ Both developments, the Pentateuch as a book with a very holy content and as a source of oracles, converge in a story that occurs in two different versions in the later second century B.C.E. in the books of the Maccabees.

According to 1 Maccabees (3:48), before a decisive battle during the war against Antiochus Epiphanes IV, the Jews under Judas the Maccabee “unrolled the Book of the Law” in order to inquire about the outcome of the battle. In 2 Maccabees (8:23), Judas publicly read “the Holy Book” and gave out as watchword “God is my help.” It is clear that the chief of the Maccabees uses a scroll here as a Greek book of oracles,⁶¹ and we may wonder whether those of the Essenes who could predict the future did not also prophesy from the Old Testament, as it is stressed that they were well trained “in the Holy Books, sacred purifications and the sayings of the prophets” (Josephus *B.J.* 2.159). It fits with what we have seen in the *Letter of Aristeas* and Aristobulus that the main focus of the Maccabees clearly was the Pentateuch. Apparently, at that time it was already called the “Holy Book,” although there has not yet been found a single scroll containing all the five books of Moses, the exceptions perhaps (but not certainly) being 4Q365, which contains fragments of all five books of the Pentateuch, and Mur 1, which contains fragments from Genesis, Exodus and Numbers.⁶² If such scrolls did indeed exist, the scroll of the Pen-

⁵⁸ For this translation of *logia* see also B.G. Wright, “Three Jewish Ritual Practices in *Aristeas* §§158–160,” in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 11–29 (13–21).

⁵⁹ For Moses as prophet see most recently van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 168–69 (with bibliography), 192; C. Nihan, “‘Un prophète comme Moïse’ (Deutéronome 18,15): Genèse et relectures d’une construction deutéronomiste,” in *La construction de la figure de Moïse* (ed. T. Römer; Paris: Gabalda, 2007), 43–76.

⁶⁰ See also J. Lightfoot, *The Sibylline Oracles* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 67.

⁶¹ For “Sortes: Sacred Books as Instant Oracles in Late Antiquity” see P.W. van der Horst, *Japhet in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity* (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 159–89.

⁶² Cf. H.St.J. Thackeray, “The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS,” *JTS* 9 (1908): 88–98; W.A. Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004), 146–47; E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 74–79; Van der

tateuch that was taken from the temple by the Romans may well have been one too. The fact that it was displayed at the triumphal procession of Vespasian and Titus as well as afterwards kept in the imperial palace itself, together with the purple hangings of the temple, surely suggests a very special scroll.⁶³

The plural, on the other hand, occurs in the letter that the high-priest Jonathan purportedly had send to the Spartans, in which he remarks that the Jews do not need good international relations, as they have *hagia biblia*, “holy books,” to encourage them (1 Macc 12:9). The combination of *hagia* with *biblia* is unique and not found in earlier Greek literature. Like the translators of the Septuagint,⁶⁴ the author of 1 Maccabees clearly avoided the term *hieros*, which he probably considered as too much reminding of Greek cultic usage, whereas the much rarer *hagios* has more the connotations of “preeminently respectable” and “ancient.”⁶⁵ This differentiation in the Greek vocabulary of “holy” was a typically Jewish problem, and in the middle of the first century B.C.E., Alexander Polyhistor still happily uses the expression *hiera biblos* when he notes in his book *On the Jews* that the third-century B.C.E. chronographer Demetrius described Moses’ killing of the Egyptian “in the same way as he who wrote the Holy Book,” and the wanderings of the Israelites just like “the Holy Book” did.⁶⁶

Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 22. The fact that scrolls and individual books do not always coincide was already noticed by E. Rohde, *Kleine Schriften* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1901), 2:431f.

⁶³ Josephus, *BJ* 7.121–157, 162. The nature of the scroll(s) is not commented upon by M. Beard, “The triumph of Flavius Josephus,” in *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (ed. A.J. Boyle and W.J. Dominik; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 543–58; B. Eberhardt, “Wer dient wem? Die Darstellung des Flavischen Triumphzuges auf dem Titusbogen und bei Josephus (*BJ* 7.123–162),” in *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (ed. J. Sievers and G. Lembi; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 257–78; F. Millar, “Last Year in Jerusalem: Monuments of the Jewish War in Rome,” in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome* (ed. J. Edmondson et al.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 101–28 (107–12) or R. Boustán, “The Spoils of the Jerusalem Temple at Rome and Constantinople: Jewish Counter-Geography in a Christianizing Empire,” in *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. G. Gardner and K.L. Osterloh; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 326–72, who at 336 somewhat confusingly speaks of both “scrolls” and “scroll” of the Torah.

⁶⁴ The exceptions are Josh 6:8 and Dan 1:2 (probably influenced by 1 Esd 1:39).

⁶⁵ J. Nuchelmans, “A propos de *hagios* avant l’époque hellénistique,” in *Fructus centesimus: Mélanges G.J.M. Bartelink* (ed. A. Bastiaensen et al.; Steenbrugge: In Abbatia S. Petri, 1989), 239–58.

⁶⁶ Alexander Polyhistor *FGRH* 273 F 19.29 (= Demetrius frg. 3–4 Denis = Eus. *PE* 9.29.1, 15).

Our final example from the pre-Christian era is somewhat less certain. Among the Roman documents that Josephus adduces concerning Jewish rights and privileges, he quotes a letter of Augustus, probably dating sometime after 12 B.C.E., in response to complaints of Jews from Asia and Cyrenaica, in which the emperor stipulates that the stealing of their “Holy Books” (*hiera grammata*) is sacrilege (A.J. 16.164). Now the documents quoted by Josephus have long been a subject of intense debate, but the present opinion seems to be that they are basically authentic, if not always literally quoted.⁶⁷ This suggests that Augustus did indeed refer to Jewish “holy books,”⁶⁸ but also that we cannot be totally sure that he actually used the expression *hiera grammata*, as this is one of Josephus’ favourite expression for the Pentateuch (see below).

In the first century C.E. we find a great variety of expressions in Philo for the Pentateuch and the books of the later Old Testament.⁶⁹ He overwhelmingly uses the term(s) (*hieros/i nomos/i* (249 times), but he also employs, in descending frequency, *hieros logos* (40), often in combination with other terms derived from the Greek Mysteries,⁷⁰ although without ever mentioning Orpheus, *hierai bibloi* (of Moses: 23 times),⁷¹ sometimes “the Holiest Books” (*Sobr.* 17; *Virt.* 95; *Mos.* 2.45), *hierai graphai* (16), *hierai anagraphai* (9),⁷² *hiera/ôtata grammata* (4) and *hierai stêlai* (3/4);⁷³ in addition, he also often uses the Greek term *chrêsmos* (40), “oracle,” in connection with the Pentateuch as well as,

⁶⁷ For these documents see most recently M. Pucci Ben Zeev, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); T. Rajak, *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 301–33; E. Gruen, *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), 84–104; F. Hurlet, “Le style de la correspondance entre Auguste et le proconsul d’après le témoignage de Flavius Josèphe (AJ, XVI, 162–173),” *Revue historique du droit français et étranger* 82 (2004): 171–88; M. Schuol, *Augustus und die Juden: Rechtsstellung und Interessenpolitik der kleinasiatischen Diaspora* (Frankfurt: Antike, 2007).

⁶⁸ See also Schuol, *Augustus und die Juden*, 86–95.

⁶⁹ See the excellent discussion by Burkhardt, *Inspiration*, 75–124; N.G. Cohen, “The Names of the Separate Books of the Pentateuch in Philo’s Writings,” *SPhilo* 9 (1997): 54–78.

⁷⁰ C. Riedweg, *Mysterienterminologie bei Platon, Philon und Klemens von Alexandrien* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987), 70–115 (96, *hieros logos*).

⁷¹ Philo, *Abr.* 156, 177, 258; *Aet.* 19; *Cher.* 124; *Decal.* 1, 155; *Det.* 161; *Ebr* 208; *Her.* 258; *Post.* 158; *Spec.* 2.151, 4.175; *Virt.* 34, 201; *Mos.* 2.11, 36, 59, 96, 188.

⁷² Burkhardt, *Inspiration*, 83 and Henrichs, “*Hieroi Logoi*,” 241 n. 120 rightly compare the title of Euhemerus’ book.

⁷³ Burkhardt, *Inspiration*, 84.

if much less, *logia* (5–15).⁷⁴ For Philo it is especially the Pentateuch that is holy. Yet although he very regularly mentions the “Holy Books (of Moses)” he never uses the expression “Holy Book” in the singular, except for a single reference to the “one holy book Exodus” (*Migr.* 14). Did he want to differentiate his Jewish holy writ from the Egyptian Holy Books? Or, perhaps more likely, did the fact that the Pentateuch and the Old Testament were divided over so many scrolls impede the mental image of a single book?

The picture changes with Josephus, who, unlike Philo, was not interested in the allegorical interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.⁷⁵ Consequently, he does not use the expression *hieros/i logos/i* and neither does he employ *hierai graphai*, *hierai anagraphai* or *hierai stêlai*. For him, the Pentateuch constitutes the *hierai bibloi* (18 times), “Holy Books,” *par excellence*.⁷⁶ Like Philo,⁷⁷ he also rates 1–2 Kings under those “Holy Books” (*A.J.* 9.28, 46; 10.58, 63) and, again like Philo (*Mos.* 2.84), he mentions only once “the holy *Graphê*, ‘Scripture,’” (*A.J.* 3.38). In this case, though, he clearly refers to a particular scroll that can be found in the temple, just as he mentions elsewhere that *hiera grammata* (7 times) are preserved in the temple (*A.J.* 5.61). That is also the case with the poem (Deut 32) in hexameter (sic),⁷⁸ “which he (Moses) left in the Holy Book” and which contained numerous predictions (*A.J.* 4.303): once again we note the theme of Moses as prophet. In this case it seems to be the material form of the book that has led Josephus to use the expression, as he mentions that it was part of the books delivered by Moses to the priests (*A.J.* 4.304). Now in Greek, *biblion*, not *biblos*, is usually employed for the actual scroll or book. It is in accordance with this usage that Josephus mentions that he had received the *hiera biblia* as a gift from Titus (*Vita* 418).

What have we found so far? In the course of the earlier Hellenistic period, the Jews adopted the new terminology of “holy book(s).” As

⁷⁴ See the detailed discussion by Burkhardt, *Inspiration*, 112–22.

⁷⁵ See also C. Gerber, “Die Heiligen Schriften des Judentums nach Flavius Josephus,” in *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum* (ed. M. Hengel and H. Löhr; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 91–113.

⁷⁶ Josephus, *A.J.* 1.26, 82, 139; 2.347; 3.81, 105; 4.326; 10.58.

⁷⁷ Burkhardt, *Inspiration*, 141.

⁷⁸ Cf. A. Hilhorst, “Poésie hébraïque et métrique grecque: Les témoignages des Anciens, de Philon d’Alexandrie à Boniface de Mayence,” in *Des Géants à Dionysos: Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian* (ed. D. Accorinti and P. Chuvin; Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso, 2003), 305–29 (308f.).

we have seen, the term is found first in Egypt where it was the title for writings of the priestly class. Did some Jews, in an effort to “keep up with the (Egyptian) Joneses,” take over the title for the Pentateuch, perhaps sometimes abbreviated as “the Book,” as it was the most prominent part of their written tradition, like the Samaritan Torah and, perhaps, the one of the Sadducees,⁷⁹ and as it originally had been produced and preserved in the temple (below), like the Egyptian holy books? Conversely, it is also possible that Palestinian Jews had learned the expression “holy book” in the course of the lively traffic between Jerusalem and Alexandria and adopted it in Palestine.⁸⁰ We simply do not know.

Let me conclude this “Jewish” section by making a few observations on two major questions—canonization and the place of the priestly scribes—in order to see if our findings may contribute somewhat towards their clarification. I start with the canon. Following a recent study by Armin Lange, we can say that in the Jewish literature of the period from Alexander the Great to 175 B.C.E. the Pentateuch (46%), Prophets (24%) and Psalms (15%) are the most quoted and alluded to books of the later Old Testament. In the period from Jason to Pompey this remains the same, with the Pentateuch having 33%, the Prophets 33% and the Psalms 13%, but we now also see a number of exegetical texts and translations, which means that certain books have gained in authority.⁸¹ Moreover, as Arie van der Kooij notes on the basis of a comparison of the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira 39:1–3 and the Prologue to the same book, there is not only a tripartite division of “the Law, the prophets and the other books of our ancestors,”⁸² but also a much

⁷⁹ Josephus, *A.J.* 18.16 (Sadducees); Origen, *Cels.* 1.49 (Samaritans and Sadducees) and *Comm. Matt.* 17.29, 35–36; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 1.9.2 (Samaritans); Jerome, *Comm. Matt.* 22.31 (Sadducees).

⁸⁰ A. Kasher, “Political and National Connections between the Jews of Ptolemaic Egypt and Their Brethren in Eretz Israel,” in *Eretz Israel and the Jewish Diaspora* (ed. M. Mor; Lanham: University Press of America, 1991), 24–41.

⁸¹ A. Lange, “From Literature to Scripture: The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library,” in *One Scripture or Many? Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives* (ed. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 5–107; see also E. Ulrich, “Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament,” in *The Biblical Canons* (ed. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 57–80.

⁸² The case for a tripartite division in 4QMMT is still hotly debated, cf. Ulrich, “Qumran,” 66–71; K. Berthelot, “4QMMT et la question du canon de la Bible hébraïque,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill,

greater emphasis on the significance of ancestral books than in previous Jewish literature.⁸³ we have not yet reached the stage of a closed canon, but we are getting there.⁸⁴ The fact that these ancestral books also acquired the status of “holy books” may well have contributed to the closure of the canon: once a certain number of books have been considered “holy,” it must be more difficult to give others that status. Given the fluidity of the biblical texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls, it may be important to note in this respect that the expression “holy book” has not been found in Qumran.⁸⁵

The rise of the term “holy book” in Judaism should perhaps also be taken into account in the debate about the nature of the textual tradition of the Old Testament. When Adam van der Woude (1927–2000), the founder of the Groningen Qumran Institute, retired in 1992, Florentino and I organised a small farewell symposium. Its proceedings incorporated the valedictory lecture of Adam, in which he argued that the pluriform texts of Qumran and elsewhere went together with a more or less uniform, proto-Masoretic text in the temple in Jerusalem, which was supervised by the priests. His main arguments were that the *Letter of Aristeas* states that the (third-century B.C.E.) text of the Septuagint was taken from the temple in Jerusalem and that the “author of Chronicles, for all the rectifications and alterations of his *Vorlage*, apparently based himself on the proto-Masoretic text of the books of

2006), 1–14; G.J. Brooke, “‘Canon’ in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. P.S. Alexander and J.-D. Kaestli; Lausanne: Éditions de Zèbre, 2007), 81–98 (84–87, 94–96); R.G. Kratz, “Mose und die Propheten: Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection* (ed. García Martínez, Steudel, and Tigchelaar), 151–76; H. von Weissenberg, *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function, and the Meaning of the Epilogue* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 204–6; D.R. Schwartz, “Special People or Special Books? On Qumran and New Testament Notions of Canon,” in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (ed. R. Clements and D.R. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 49–60, and the contribution by Émile Puech in this volume.

⁸³ A. van der Kooij, “The Canonization of Ancient Books Kept in the Temple of Jerusalem,” in *Canonization and Decanonization* (ed. A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 17–40 and idem, “Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and Hasmonean Politics,” in *Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers and de Jonge), 27–38.

⁸⁴ See also van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 260; S. Dempster, “Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon,” in *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (ed. C.A. Evans and E. Tov; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2008), 87–127.

⁸⁵ On the canon in Qumran see most recently Brooke, “‘Canon’ in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls”; E. Tigchelaar, “Wie haben die Qumrantexte unsere Sicht des kanonischen Prozesses verändert?” in *Qumran und der biblische Kanon* (ed. J. Frey and M. Becker; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2009), 65–87.

Samuel and Kings.”⁸⁶ Although not referring to van der Woude’s position, Adrian Schenker has recently also stressed the influence of the Jerusalem priests on MT and their controlling position regarding the text. However, he sees MT as a younger form of a Hebrew *Vorlage* that was used by the translators of the Septuagint.⁸⁷

If Schenker’s idea is right, and it certainly seems highly plausible, we may assume a uniform text until about the beginning of the second century B.C.E. As we know, the temple contained an old library, the tradition of which went back at least to the times of Josiah.⁸⁸ The report of the discovery of the Book of the Law during the latter’s reign connects this event with the bringing out of silver and gold from the treasuries of the temple.⁸⁹ Such a connection of books with valuable metals might seem strange to us. Yet it was not uncommon in antiquity and shows that books were long seen as precious objects.⁹⁰ This suggests that there were, at most, only a few copies of the same books in the temple library,⁹¹ which, together with van der Woude’s “priestly doctrinal authority” (but I would rather say: “scribal doctri-

⁸⁶ A.S. van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity: Reflections on the Transmission of the Text of the Old Testament,” in *Sacred History and Sacred Texts in Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of A.S. van der Woude* (ed. J.N. Bremmer and F. García Martínez; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 151–69 (167).

⁸⁷ A. Schenker, “Hebraica veritas bei den Siebziger? Die Septuaginta als älteste greifbare Ausgabe der hebräischen Bibel (erörtert am Beispiel von 2Chr 1, 13),” in *Septuaginta* (ed. K. Karrer and Kraus), 426–38 (437f.).

⁸⁸ For books in the temple see 1 Sam 10:25; 2 Kgs 22:8–10; 2 Macc 2:13–15; Josephus, *A.J.* 3.38, 4.304, 5.61, 11.154–155, 337; S. Talmon, “The Three Scrolls of the Law that Were Found in the Temple Court,” *Textus* 2 (1962): 14–27; A.F.J. Klijn, “A Library of Scriptures in the Temple?” in *Studia Codicologica* (ed. K. Treu; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1977), 265–72; Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 236–39. All this evidence and bibliography is overlooked by S. Schorch, “Communio lectorum: Die Rolle des Lesens für die Textualisierung der israelitischen Religion,” in *Die Textualisierung der Religion* (ed. J. Schaper; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 166–84 (174–76).

⁸⁹ 2 Kgs 22:4–10; 2 Chr 34:14; Josephus, *A.J.* 10.57–58.

⁹⁰ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 238–239, to whose Persian and Assyrian examples we may add that Heraclitus (ca. 500 B.C.E.) deposited his book in the temple of Artemis of Ephesus (Diog. Laert. 9.6), that the Maccabees deposited valuable documents in the treasury of the Temple (1 Macc 14:49), and that Philo of Byblos (*FGrH* 790 F 1) quotes Sanchuniaton as having collected his information from records in temples and their *adyta*.

⁹¹ Incidentally, this would also explain the fact that the priestly scribes did transmit their knowledge mostly orally rather than by ways of written texts, cf. R. Horsley, *Scribes, Visionaries and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2007) passim; M. Popović, *Reading the Human Body: Physiognomics and Astrology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Hellenistic-Early Roman Period Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 218–19 (with detailed bibliography).

nal authority”),⁹² must have limited the proliferation of textual variants and thus makes it likely that the tradition in Jerusalem remained pretty uniform at least until the early second century B.C.E.⁹³ With the preeminent position of the temple, it seems also plausible to suppose that its textual tradition continued to remain influential afterwards, as the importance of Jerusalem in the *Letter of Aristeas* shows, despite the proliferation of texts elsewhere. Should its supremacy after the fall of the temple not be connected with that earlier situation?

It has gradually become clearer that a closed canon does not necessarily mean a fixed text.⁹⁴ On the other hand, as we argued, a “holy book” will perhaps be less easy to change than other books, however authoritative. Now if we follow Karel van der Toorn in the importance to be attached to the role of the scribal class in the production, conservation and “publication” of the authoritative books of the Jews,⁹⁵ we may wonder what happened to that class in the period between Antiochus’ defilement of the temple and its destruction in 70 C.E. The careful investigation by Christine Schams of all passages mentioning the priestly scribes in the Second Temple period has demonstrated that they are mentioned no longer as playing a part in the production of “holy books” in that period. For their eclipse she has adduced no less than thirty-one reasons.⁹⁶ I would like to add two passages, which she has not discussed. First, there is no mention of the priestly scribal class during Judas’ restoration of the Temple after its defilement and plundering by Antiochus IV in the 160s B.C.E.,⁹⁷ although he “chose blameless priests who were devoted to the law” (1 Macc 4:42). Second,

⁹² Van der Woude, “Pluriformity and Uniformity,” 168.

⁹³ P. Michalowski, “The Libraries of Babel: Text, Authority, and Tradition in Ancient Mesopotamia,” in *Cultural Repertoires: Structure, Function and Dynamics* (ed. G. Dorleijn and H. Vanstiphout; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 105–29 (118) even notes that many Near Eastern libraries had only one or two tablets of the great epics, but not the full compositions.

⁹⁴ As was already stressed by J.P. Hyatt, “The Dead Sea Discoveries: Retrospect and Challenge,” *JBL* 76 (1957): 1–12 (6), reprinted in *The Society of Biblical Literature Presidential Voices in the Twentieth Century* (ed. H.W. Attridge and J.C. VanderKam; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 95–106 (100).

⁹⁵ Van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*, 96–108 and passim; similarly, Horsley, *Scribes*.

⁹⁶ C. Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second Temple Period* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); see also still D.R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 89–101.

⁹⁷ 1 Macc 1:56 (destruction), 4:36–58 (renovation); Posidonius *FGrH* 87 F 109; Josephus, *A.J.* 12.256, cf. P.F. Mittag, *Antiochos IV. Epiphanes: Eine politische Biographie* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2006), 225–81.

when Jonathan lists the politico-religious elite of Judea in his letter to the Spartans, he mentions “the high priest, the *gerousia* and the priests” but not the scribes (1 Macc 12:6). Their absence will hardly have been chance, as in 161 B.C.E. Judas rejected the overtures of Alcimus and Bacchides (1 Macc 7:11), whereas a sizable group of scribes went out to negotiate with them, who were subsequently murdered, sixty in all.⁹⁸

Now the eclipse of the priestly scribal class, the *Letter of Aristeas*, the Prologue to the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira, and the new terminology of “holy book(s),” all date from the second half of the second century B.C.E. This means that they postdate the dramatic occupation of the temple by Antiochus. From this time onwards we seem to witness an increasing status of the scrolls of the Pentateuch themselves. This is suggested not only by their splendid appearance in the *Letter to Aristeas* (above) but also from Josephus’ mention that in the early 50s C.E. riots occurred under Cumanus when a Roman soldier destroyed a scroll (or scrolls?) of the Law (*B.J.* 2.229–231; *A.J.* 20.115–117). The splendour of the temple copy, as witnessed by its presence among the spoils of the temple in the Roman triumphal procession (above), also attests to the importance of the outward form of the Pentateuch. A last illustration of this changing attitude to the scrolls is the fact that in the second and third centuries C.E. the rabbis were confronted with the attitude that holy texts defile the hands, even though they did not understand this belief.⁹⁹

To conclude: the rise of the “holy book,” the growing material importance of the biblical scrolls, the observable transfer of authority from the traditional producers of authoritative texts, the “scribes of the temple,”¹⁰⁰ to the texts themselves and the eclipse of the priestly scribal class may well be interrelated. Yet we simply have not enough

⁹⁸ 1 Macc 7:12–16; Josephus, *A.J.* 12.396–397, cf. Schams, *Jewish Scribes*, 116–21; É. Nodet, “Asidaioi and Essenes,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 63–87 (77–79); Horsley, *Scribes*, 81f.

⁹⁹ M. Goodman, *Judaism in the Roman World: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 69–78.

¹⁰⁰ For this expression of Xerxes and Antiochus III see Josephus, *A.J.* 11.128 and 12.142, respectively. For the later history of the scribes see C. Hezser, *The Social Structure of the Rabbinic Movement in Roman Palestine* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 467–75; Goodman, *Judaism in the Roman World*, 79–90.

information about the period to reach firm conclusions or to trace the dynamics of this development in any detail.

5. EARLY CHRISTIANITY

It may surprise but nowhere in the New Testament do we find the expression “holy book” in the singular.¹⁰¹ Rather than *hierai graphai*, which we often find in Philo, but rarely in Josephus, Paul uses the expression *hagiai graphai* in his letter to the Romans: “the gospel of God, which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the *hagiais graphais*, ‘holy writings’” (1:2). The combination may well have been invented by Paul himself in order to avoid Philo’s usage of *hierai graphai* for the Old Testament. In post-Pauline Christian literature the expression became rather successful, but, as was the case with the Maccabean *hagia biblia*, neither before Paul nor after him does it occur a single time in pagan literature; similarly, Paul’s *nomos hagios*, “holy law,” in Romans (7:12) occurs only once before in the *Letter of Aristeas* (§45) but afterwards also only in Christian authors. Admittedly, Paul uses the expression *hê graphê*, “the Scripture,” but these passages all refer, as could be expected, to the Pentateuch or the books of the Prophets, with the single exception of Elijah (Rom 11:2), of course also a prophet.¹⁰²

The only other “holy” term in the New Testament we find in 2 Timothy (3:15) where “Paul” writes to “Timothy”: “how from childhood you have known the *hiera grammata* that are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.” Once again the term must refer to the Old Testament, and the fact that the author (1:3) mentions the worship of God by his ancestors perhaps suggests that both the author and the receiver of this letter are of Jewish descent.¹⁰³ Moreover, the fact that the combination *hiera grammata* is often found in

¹⁰¹ G. Schrenk, “βίβλος, βιβλίον,” in *TWNT* 1 (1933): 613–20, a very useful survey.

¹⁰² Note also the reference to *hê graphê* of Isaiah in *4 Macc.* 18:14. For the date of *4 Macc.* (ca. 100 C.E.), see now Bremmer, *Greek Religion and Culture*, 209–11.

¹⁰³ This should perhaps be taken into account in the discussion of the Jewishness of Timothy, cf. S.J.D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1999), 363–77.

Philo and Josephus, but hardly ever in contemporary pagan authors outside an Egyptian context, may well point to an Egyptian author.¹⁰⁴

It is clear, then, that the earliest Christians did not yet have an authoritative writing they called the “Holy Book.” But although they usually continued with the Jewish usage of referring to their authoritative writings in the plural, they introduced some subtle changes. The first, as we have seen, was the popularisation of the qualification *hagios*, “holy,” but the second was a more technical one. From the second century onwards the Christians started to use the codex instead of the Jewish roll for their authoritative writings, even though we still have more second-century Old Testament codex papyri than New Testament ones, especially from Psalms.¹⁰⁵ The origin of the codex is hotly disputed, but the starting point of any discussion should be the fact that *codex* is a Latin word, which originally referred to a Roman reality:¹⁰⁶ in the beginning a “block of wood,” but subsequently “tablets of parchment,” as first found in Martial (1.2.3), which was “published” about 100 c.e.¹⁰⁷ However, the parchment codex hardly was very popular, and the earliest Egyptian Christian papyrus codices, the only ones for which we have any evidence, seem to have been modelled on the shape of Roman legal documents, the *tabulae*.¹⁰⁸

After the bloody Jewish revolt of 115–117 the need to distinguish themselves from the Jews must have been pressing for the early believ-

¹⁰⁴ Philo, *Contempl.* 78; *Gig.* 195; *Praem.* 79; *Spec.* 2.238, 259; *Mos.* 1.23, 2.290, 292. Josephus, *A.J.* 1.13, 13.167–168, 20.265; *C. Ap.* 1.54, 1.127, 1.228. Egyptian context: Hecataeus *FGrH* 264 F*5; Menander *FGrH* 783 F 1 (p. 792.3); Strabo 17.1.5; Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.228; in general, Burkhardt, *Inspiration*, 75–79.

¹⁰⁵ See the survey in L. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2006), 209–29, who also judiciously discusses the beginning of the codex (43–93); Hurtado has summarized and updated his results in “Early Christian Manuscripts as Artifacts,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon* (ed. C.A. Evans and H.D. Zacharias; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 66–81. Hurtado’s results have been refined and sometimes corrected by R.S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books in Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 70–90. For the popularity of Psalms see also D.G. Martinez, “The Papyri and Early Christianity,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. R. Bagnall; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 590–622 (593).

¹⁰⁶ Varro apud Nonius 535M; Seneca, *De brevitate vitae* 13.4.

¹⁰⁷ R. Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 441.

¹⁰⁸ This is demonstrated now by E.A. Meyer, “Roman Tabulae, Egyptian Christians, and the Adoption of the Codex,” *Chiron* 37 (2007): 295–347, which clearly appeared too late for W.A. Johnson, “The Ancient Book,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology* (ed. Bagnall), 256–81 (265–67: “The Codex”). The Roman origin is also stressed by J.L. de Miguel Jover, “El humilde nacimiento del Códice,” *Myrtia* 10 (1995): 157–76.

ers in Jesus. That may well have been the initial reason why they started to use the codex for their authoritative writings instead of the (sc)roll: what could have been safer than the same appearance as Roman legal documents? Other reasons, such as that it was easier to travel with, may have played a role too: the relatively small size of the second- and second/third-century gospels certainly points into that direction.¹⁰⁹ It is clear, though, that the decision “to go codex,” so to speak, must have been taken unanimously by the early Christians, as there is virtually not a single early Christian canonical text found on rolls or scrolls, whereas we do have papyri of paracanonical texts, such as the Shepherd of Hermas or a Gospel Harmony, on rolls.¹¹⁰ And indeed, such a unanimity was still feasible in the earlier second century when there seem to have been only relatively few Christian copying centres, which were probably limited to big cities such as Rome, Antioch, Alexandria and Caesarea, whereas in the third century the uncontrolled copying of the gospel manuscripts for private use would steadily increase.¹¹¹ Incidentally, the preference for the codex also enabled the text-critical studies of Origen, whose employment of the tabular presentation in his *Hexapla* would perhaps not have been impossible but certainly much more difficult and less effective in a scroll.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ S.D. Charlesworth, “Public and Private: Second- and Third-Century Gospel Manuscripts,” in *Jewish and Christian Scripture* (ed. Evans and Zacharias), 148–75 (156).

¹¹⁰ This fact should be taken into account in the discussion of the rise of the Christian canon, for which see now, with extensive bibliographies, K. Greschat, “Die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons: Fragestellungen und Themen der neueren Forschung,” *VF* 51 (2006): 56–63 and C. Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 215–335; see also *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (ed. Alexander and Kaestli); *Canon and Canonicity* (ed. E. Thomassen; Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum, 2010). I had already written this note when I saw that Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 74–79 thinks in the same direction.

¹¹¹ Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 171–74. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 89–90 suggests that the unanimous change from (sc)roll to codex among the Christians may have taken place in the second half of the second century under the influence of the church of Rome. But it is hard to imagine why that church would have taken this decision at that time and why all the other churches would have immediately followed suit.

¹¹² For Origen see now A. Grafton and M.H. Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), 86–132, who overlooked the important observations on tabular presentations by J. Mansfeld in *Aëtiana: The Method and Intellectual Context of a Doxographer, Volume 1: The Sources* (J. Mansfeld and D.T. Runia; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 111–20 and idem, “Doxographical Studies, Quellenforschung, Tabular Presentation and Other Varieties of

Given that the authors of the New Testament wrote in Greek we will now first look at the subsequent Greek evidence. For our purpose it is not necessary to analyse the whole development of the Christian vocabulary for the Bible in a detailed manner. It is enough to note here a strikingly new development. At the end of the second century, the apologist Theophilus (*Autol.* 2.13, 19, 21) not only uses the Pauline expression *Hagia Graphê*, “Holy Scripture” in the singular, when referring to the Old Testament, but he also introduces the term *Theia Graphê*, “Divine Scripture,” when referring to God’s creation of man and cosmos (2.10, 18, 22, 24), thus trumping the Jewish expression. Similarly, in a letter to Victor of Rome (189–199 C.E.) his contemporary Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, claims to have studied *pasa Hagia Graphê*, “all of the Holy Scripture” (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.24.7). Clement of Alexandria (*Stromata* 2.23.144.4), who never uses the expression *hierai graphai* or *bibloi*, follows Theophilus for the Old Testament, but in his *Stromata*, dating from about 200 C.E., he also uses the term to refer to the New Testament (1.3.24.4; 3.5.42.5; 6.17.149.2). His pupil Origen does the same. Although he usually uses *Theiai Graphai*, in his *Contra Celsum* he also uses *Theia Graphê* to refer to the Old (4.44, 7.12) and the New Testament (8.3; note also *Comm. Jo.* 1.15.86; 5.6.1.1, ed. C. Blanc; *Or.* 23.5; *Philoc.* passim), but he can also speak of *pasa Theia Graphê*, “all of the Divine Scripture” (*Princ.* 4.3.5). Similarly, Hippolytus often speaks of the *Theiai Graphai* but also mentions once *Theia Graphê* (*Comm. Dan.* 1.31.3).

This usage of the plural *Theiai Graphai* starts to change in the fourth century. Eusebius still uses the plural compared to the singular in the relation of 10 to 9 (out of 188 instances) and Basil 3 to 2 (out of 47, but he uses 54 times *Hagia Graphê*, never the plural). Athanasius, who also uses *Hagiai Graphai* (30 times, never the singular), employs singular and plural usage more or less equally (out of 208) and Chrysostom, who occasionally uses the terms *Hagia/i Graphê/ai* (23 times), slightly over 3 to 2 (out of 480). Gregory of Nazianzus, however, uses the plural already four times as much as the singular (out of 12; never *Hagiai Graphê/ai*), and Gregory of Nyssa even five times as much (out of 59, but 54 times *Hagia/i Graphê/ai*). We can see from these numbers that

Comparativism,” in *Fragmentsammlungen philosophischer Texte der Antike—Le raccolte dei frammenti di filosofi antichi* (ed. W. Burkert et al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 16–40.

there still is not a uniform terminology, but we also notice the advancing of the terms *Theia Graphê* and *Hagia Graphê*, the latter perhaps influenced by Paul's usage.

There are two reasons in particular that seem to me important for this development. First, around 200 C.E. the debate about the canon of the Old and the New Testament had reached more or less a consensus. There still was some quarrelling about the occasional book, such as Esther, the Shepherd of Hermas or the *Apocalypse of Peter*, but the main corpus had been closed.¹¹³ This must have made it easier to imagine the collection of biblical books as a whole. Secondly, technology had also advanced. Whereas the third century could only produce a codex with the four Gospels and Acts (*P. Chester Beatty 1* and *P. Vindob. G. 31974*: ca. 250 C.E.),¹¹⁴ and Eusebius mentions a codex with, probably, four Gospels (*Hist. eccl.* 7.15.4),¹¹⁵ the later fourth century came up with the megacodex, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus, which contained all the books of the Bible, produced, perhaps, in a scriptorium in Alexandria.¹¹⁶ These megacodices will also be responsible for the fact that in his famous 39th Festal Letter for the Easter of 367 C.E. Athanasius attaches so much weight to the order of the Bible books, which would have been unthinkable if he had known only separate codices for individual books of the Bible.¹¹⁷

¹¹³ For the state of the debate about the *Fragmentum Muratori* see Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie*, 229–36, who could not yet know J.J. Armstrong, “Victorinus of Pettau as the Author of the Canon Muratori,” *VC* 62 (2008): 1–34, whose discussion has established almost certainly its third-century date with Victorinus as author.

¹¹⁴ For a more detailed discussion of this interesting codex, which was probably produced outside a Christian copying centre, see Charlesworth, “Public and Private,” 163–67.

¹¹⁵ Note that T.C. Skeat's idea of a second-century four-gospel codex has now been refuted by S.D. Charlesworth, “T. C. Skeat, P⁶⁴⁺⁶⁷ and P⁴, and the Problem of Fibre Orientation in Codicological Reconstruction,” *NTS* 53 (2007): 582–604.

¹¹⁶ Cf. P.-M. Bogaert, “Aux origines de la fixation du canon: Scriptoria, listes et titres,” in *Biblical Canons* (ed. Auwers and de Jonge), 153–76; J.J. Brogan, “Another Look at Codex Sinaiticus,” in *The Bible as Book: The Transmission of the Greek Text* (ed. J.J. Brogan and O. O'Sullivan; London: British Library, 2003), 17–32, both overlooked by D. Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway, N.J.: Gorgias, 2007). For the slightly later Codex Alexandrinus see S. McKendrick, “The Codex Alexandrinus or the Dangers of Being a Named Manuscript,” in *The Bible as Book* (ed. Brogan and O'Sullivan), 1–16.

¹¹⁷ As was already observed by T. Zahn, *Athanasius und der Bibelkanon* (Leipzig: Erlangen, 1901), 9; for this important Letter see most recently Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie*, 224–28; N.A. Pedersen, “The New Testament Canon and Athanasius of Alexandria's 39th Festal Letter,” in *The Discursive Fight over Religious*

However, such codices were relatively rare and too expensive for most Christians.¹¹⁸

This rising status of what we now can call the Bible also appeared in other ways. From the later fourth century onwards, the Christians started to pay more attention to the covers of their Holy Book, and illuminated Bible manuscripts were now not far away.¹¹⁹ This rising status also appears from the fact that Jerome warns people not to touch a Gospel (not the Bible, which must still have been rare) with unwashed hands (*Comm. Matt.* 2.6), and both he and Chrysostom mention people with Gospels suspending from their necks as powerful amulets.¹²⁰

Texts in Antiquity (ed. A.-C.L. Jacobsen; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2009), 169–78.

¹¹⁸ For our scarce information regarding the costs of copying books see E. Dekkers, “Des prix et du commerce des livres à l’époque patristique,” in *Opes Atticae: Miscellanea philologica et historica = Sacris Erudiri* 13 (ed. M. Geerard et al.; Steenbrugge: In Abbatia S. Petri, 1990): 99–115; S. Mratschek, “Codices vestri nos sumus. Bücherkult und Bücherpreise in der christlichen Spätantike,” in *Hortus Litterarum Antiquarum: Festschrift für Hans Armin Gärtner zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. A. Haltenhoff and F.-H. Mutschler; Heidelberg: Winter, 2000), 369–80; Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 50–69.

¹¹⁹ J. Lowden, “The Beginnings of Biblical Illustration,” in *Imaging the Early Medieval Bible* (ed. J. Williams; University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), 9–59 and idem, “The Word Made Visible: The Exterior of the Early Christian Book as Visual Argument,” in *The Early Christian Book* (ed. W.E. Klingshirn and L. Safran; Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2007), 13–47; H.L. Kessler, “The Word Made Flesh in Early Decorated Bibles,” in *Picturing the Bible: The Earliest Christian art* (ed. J. Spier; New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 2007), 141–68.

¹²⁰ Jerome, *Epist.* 60.11; Chrysostom, *Hom.* 19.14 (PG 49.196). See also A. Harnack, *Über den privaten Gebrauch der heiligen Schriften in der alten Kirche* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1912), 70–71; E.A. Judge, “The Magical Use of Scripture in the Papyri,” in *Perspectives on Language and Text* (ed. E. Conrad and E. Newing; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 339–49; J. Vezin, “Les livres utilisés comme amulettes et comme reliques,” in *Das Buch als magisches und als Repräsentationsobjekt* (ed. P. Ganz; Wiesbaden: in Kommission bei Harrassowitz, 1992), 100–15 (103–5); G. Horsley, “Reconstructing a Biblical Codex: The Prehistory of MPER n.s. XVII. 10 (P. Vindob. G 29 831),” in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologen Kongresses Berlin* (ed. B. Kramer et al.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 473–81; L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, “De magie van het Woord: De Schrift als amulet,” in *Joden, christenen en hun Schrift: Een bundel opstellen aangeboden bij het afscheid van C.J. den Heyer* (ed. C. Houtman and L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte; Baarn: Ten Have, 2001), 85–98; T. Wasserman, “P⁷⁸ (P.OXY. XXXIV 2684): the Epistle of Jude on an Amulet?” in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World* (ed. T. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 137–60; C. Rapp, “Holy Texts, Holy Men, and Holy Scribes. Aspects of Scriptural Holiness in Late Antiquity,” in *Early Christian Book* (ed. Klingshirn and Safran), 194–222; and, especially, T. de Bruyn, “Papyri, Parchments, Ostraca, and Tablets Written with Biblical Texts in Greek and Used as Amulets: A Preliminary List,” in *Early Christian Manuscripts: Examples of Applied Method and Approach* (ed. T.J. Kraus and T. Nicklas; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 145–90.

Moreover, from the fourth century onwards, representations of Christ, the evangelists, other apostles and even saints frequently display them with an open book, usually a Gospel, in their left hand. This iconography becomes replaced with a closed Gospel from the sixth century onwards, a clear sign of its increasing adoration.¹²¹

Yet our Western tradition does not derive from the Greek branch of the Christian church, but from its Latin side, and that is where we will continue our investigation. Unlike in Greece, in Rome books did play a role in religious life, witness the Sibylline Oracles, Etruscan *libri fatales* or *libri pontificales*.¹²² In line with the structure of Roman religion, however, there was no free access to these important books, but the senate kept them under lock and key. The best-known example of Roman “holy books” is in the work of the Greek Plutarch, who in his biography of Numa (22) describes how two sarcophagi were found on the *Ianiculum* that contained the body of Numa and his *hierai bibloi*.¹²³ The expression, though, is fairly late and the terminology of a Greek outsider: in Latin, we have no *liber sacer*, no *liber sanctus*.

It is Tertullian in whose work we already find all the subsequent terminology, even if not all with the same weight.¹²⁴ His main term is *scriptura*, which may have been felt to be the closest to Greek *graphê*, as the term for the books of the Bible or the Bible itself. Tertullian sometimes uses the term in the singular without any qualification as referring to the whole of the Scriptures, but that usage is rare (*Virg.* 16.1; *Mon.* 4.4). Other times he uses the plural *Scripturae* (*Prax.* 2.1, 17.2), which was of course occasioned by the plurality of books that comprised the later Bible. Yet to make things absolutely clear to

¹²¹ As is persuasively argued by A. Petrucci, *Writers and Readers in Medieval Italy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 22–30, although not without making some mistakes regarding the nature of sacred books.

¹²² H. Cancik, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 2:88–114.

¹²³ For the event see most recently Speyer, *Bücherfunde*, 51–55; K. Rosen, “Die falschen Numabücher: Politik, Religion, und Literatur in Rom 181 v. Chr.,” *Chiron* 15 (1985): 65–90; E. Gruen, *Studies in Roman Culture and Roman Policy* (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 158–70; A. Willi, “Numa’s Dangerous Books: The Exegetic History of a Roman Forgery,” *MH* 55 (1998): 139–72; M. Peglau, “Varro und die angeblichen Schriften des Numa Pompilius,” in *Hortus Litterarum Antiquarum* (ed. Haltenhoff and Mutschler), 441–50. The only two other occasions where Roman authoritative writings are called “holy books” are also in the work of a Greek author: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 10.1.4.3, 11.62.3.8.

¹²⁴ See the careful investigation of J.E.L. van der Geest, *Le Christ et L’Ancien Testament chez Tertullien* (Ph.D. diss., Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1972), 4–16.

Christians and pagans, Tertullian introduced several qualifications. First, and used least, he introduced the combination *Scriptura Sancta* or *Sancta Scriptura*, both in the singular and plural.¹²⁵ More often, like his contemporary Theophilus, he uses *Scriptura Divina* or *Scripturae Divinae*,¹²⁶ which was followed by Cyprian,¹²⁷ whereas Lactantius introduced *Sacra Scriptura* or *Sacrae Scripturae*.¹²⁸ At first, this combination was not that successful, and Ambrose, Rufinus, Augustine and Jerome all preferentially use the combination *Divina(e) Scriptura(e)*, which therefore appears to be *the* favourite term in Late Antiquity. Yet when we count the medieval hits in the Brepols Library of Latin Literature, we can see that the combination *Sacra(e) Scriptura(e)* is about twice as much favoured by medieval authors as *Divina(e) Scriptura(e)* or *Sancta(e) Scriptura(e)*.

This development went together with another one. It would last to the later sixth century before the West received its first megacodex, the *Codex Grandior*, with all the books of the Bible, a so-called pandect, which Cassiodorus produced on his family estate Vivarium near Naples.¹²⁹ Unfortunately, it has not survived, but it is generally agreed that the beautiful Codex Amiatinus, one of the three pandects produced in Northumbria around 700, was influenced by Cassiodorus' project.¹³⁰ For a long time, one-volume Bibles were relatively rare, and it was especially the scriptorium of Tours that regularly turned out two Bibles a year in the first half of the ninth century.¹³¹ Early in 800 its abbot Alcuin presented such a Bible to Charlemagne and the

¹²⁵ Plural: *Carn. Chr.* 20.1; *Jejun.* 9; *Idol.* 1.2. Singular: *Jejun.* 6.2.

¹²⁶ Tertullian, *Apol.* 39; *Spect.* 3; *Or.* 22; *Bapt.* 18; etc.

¹²⁷ Cyprian, *Hab. virg.* 10; *Unit. eccl.* 7; *Laps.* 7, 15, 21; *Dom. or.* 5, 8, 32, *Mort.* 9, 23, etc.

¹²⁸ Lactantius, *Inst.* 4.5.8–10; 5.2.14; 7.14.7; *Epit.* 44.1.

¹²⁹ Cassiodorus, *Institutiones* 1.12.3, 1.14.2, 40.6–7, cf. J.W. Halporn, "Pandectes, Pandecta, and the Cassiodorian Commentary on the Psalms," *RBén* 90 (1980): 290–300.

¹³⁰ For a full description see now L. Alidori et al., eds., *Bibbie miniate della Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana di Firenze* (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2003), 3–58; see also M. Gorman, "The Codex Amiatinus: A Guide to the Legends and Bibliography," *Studi Medievali* III 45 (2003): 863–910, to be read with the comments by P.-M. Bogaert, *RBén* 116 (2006): 135. For single leaves of the Ceolfrid Bible, one of the two other pandects, see *The Book Collector* 31 (1982): 501f.

¹³¹ M.C. Ferrari, "Der älteste touronische Pandekt. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 8847 und seine Fragmente," in *Analecta Epternacensia: Beiträge zur Bibliotheksgeschichte der Abtei Echternach* (ed. L. Deitz; Luxembourg: Bibliothèque nationale de Luxembourg, 2000), 17–27.

next year another one for his palace in Aachen.¹³² These codices were extremely precious, wonderfully illuminated and much too expensive for the common man: they were typically prestige objects that ended up in the libraries of popes, princes and important monasteries, and that is why some of them have survived the ravages of time.¹³³ One of the two Carolingian Bibles that were not produced in Tours contains a poem by Alcuin, which shows that he was well aware of the novelty of having a complete Bible in one volume.¹³⁴

The arrival of the Vikings, who burned down St Martin's Abbey in Tours several times in the second half of the ninth century, put an end to this production, and it would last to the first thirty years of the thirteenth century before "a one-volume format was adopted as the usual format for the Vulgate."¹³⁵ The reasons for this development have not yet been fully investigated, but one of the factors must have been the fact that the production of one-volume, portable Bibles with a fixed sequence of the books and the introduction of standard chapter numbers became more common because of "compression of letter form and layout, and the preparation of thinner parchment," a development starting around 1160.¹³⁶ It can hardly be chance that we now also see the noun *Biblia* fastly becoming popular. It is rather strange, but the origin of the term, now a Latin feminine singular instead of the previously Greek neuter plural, for the, arguably, most influential book

¹³² D. Ganz, "Mass Production of Early Medieval Manuscripts: The Carolingian Bibles from Tours," in *The Early Medieval Bible: Its Production, Decoration and Use* (ed. R. Gameson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 53–62; R. McKitterick, "Carolingian Bible Production: The Tours Anomaly," in *Early Medieval Bible* (ed. Gameson), 63–77; L.M. Ayres, "A Fragment of an Italian Giant Bible from San Benedetto di Polirone and Its Position within the Genealogy of the Italian Giant Bibles," *Aev* 81 (2007): 365–67.

¹³³ H.L. Kessler, *The Illustrated Bibles from Tours* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

¹³⁴ *Alcuini Carmina* LXIX.27–28 = E. Duemmler, *Poetae Latini aevi Carolini* I (Berlin: Apud Weidmannos, 1881), 288: *Continet iste uno sancto sub corpore codex / Hic simul hos totos, munera magna dei.*

¹³⁵ L. Light, "French Bibles c. 1200–30: A New Look at the Origin of the Paris Bible," in *Early Medieval Bible* (ed. Gameson), 155–76 (157).

¹³⁶ As observed by R.H. and M.A. Rouse, "Statim invenire: Schools, Preachers, and New Attitudes to the Page," in *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century* (ed. R.L. Benson and G. Constable; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 200–25 (221); see now also C. de Hamel, *The Book: A History of the Bible* (London: Phaidon, 2001), 114–39; R. Miriello, "La Bibbia portabile di origine italiana del XIII secolo," in *La Bibbia del XIII secolo* (ed. G. Cremascoli and F. Santi; Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2004), 47–77.

of the Western world is still obscure. Our oldest examples come from library catalogues from twelfth-century Spain and Italy,¹³⁷ and Southern Italy is conceivably the area where the transformation of Greek *biblia* into Latin *Biblia* did take place. In the thirteenth century we see the term suddenly appearing in chronicles and other learned studies:¹³⁸ clearly, the Bible greatly profited from the profound transformations of the framework of written culture in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, which made reading and writing much easier than before.¹³⁹

Yet the first examples do not usually speak of *Sacra Biblia*, and we have to wait to the Reformation before people start to speak of a “Holy Bible.” Martin Luther still called his influential 1534 translation: “Biblia, das ist, die gantze heilige Schrift,” and he was followed in this respect by the earliest printed English editions, of whom Coverdale in 1535 uses the expression “The Byble: that is the holy Scrypture of the Olde and New Testament” and Taverner in 1539 “The Most Sacred Bible.”¹⁴⁰ Although the French could already read *La Saincte Bible en Francoys* in 1534 (printed in Antwerp),¹⁴¹ it is only in 1568 that we find *The . holie . Bible conteynyng the olde Testament and the newe*, the first edition of the version known as the “Bishops’ Bible.” In 1571 the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury ordered copies

¹³⁷ P. Lehmann, *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, V (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1962), 4–5 quotes W. v. Hartel, *Bibliotheca patrum Latinorum Hispaniensis*, I (Vienna: A. Hölder, 1887), 125–26 (Spain: *la biblia glosada, Biblia, Biblia maior/minor*), 104–5 (*quedam pars bible*); G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn: Cohen, 1885), no. 119 (Montecassino: *biblia I*) and 124.2 (Steterburg: *liber bibliae*).

¹³⁸ Chronicles: M. Duchet-Suchaux and Y. Lefèvre, “Les noms de la Bible,” in *Le Moyen Age et la Bible* (ed. P. Riché and G. Lobrichon; Paris: Beauchesne, 1984), 13–23 (19); add Salimbene de Adam (1221–1288), *Cronica*, ed. Scalia, 115.6, 188.6, 668.18 and 900.26. Studies: Stephanus de Borbone (1190/95–ca. 1261), *Tractatus de diversis materiis praedicabilibus*, ed. Berlioz and Eichenlaub, Prol. 54; pars 1, t. 5, c. 8, l. 1244; pars 1, t. 7, c. 6, l. 836 and pars 1, t. 7, c. 7, l. 889; Conradus de Mure (1210–1281), *Fabularius*, ed. Van de Loo, p. 187.251, 326.17; Thomas Aquinas (1225–1274), *In IV Sententiarum*, ed. Busa, d. 6, q.2, art. 2, quest. 1, resp. ad argum. 1, l. 1; Guilelmus Durandus (1237–1296), *Rationale divinorum officiorum* (ed. Davril and Thibodeau), VI, c. 137, par. 1, l. 9.

¹³⁹ See the classic study of Petrucci, *Writers and Readers*, 132–144, recently updated by P. Chastang, “L’archéologie du texte medieval: Autour de travaux récents sur l’écrit au Moyen Âge,” *Annales: histoire, sciences sociales* 63 (2008): 245–69.

¹⁴⁰ For Coverdale see most recently G. Latré, “The 1535 Coverdale Bible and its Antwerp Origins,” in *The Bible as Book: The Reformation* (ed. O. O’Sullivan; London: British Library, 2000), 89–102.

¹⁴¹ For early French and other Bibles see *Bibbia: Catalogo di edizioni a stampa 1501–1957* (Rome: Istituto centrale per il catalogo unico delle biblioteche italiane e per le informazioni bibliografiche, 1983).

of this Bible to be placed in every cathedral and, as far as possible, in every church; even ecclesiastical dignitaries had to exhibit a copy in their households.¹⁴² The triumph of the “Holy Bible” was now well on its way.

6. CONCLUSION

It is time to draw some conclusions. We have seen that the Greeks did not yet have a “holy book,” whereas the Egyptians did. From them the expression was taken over by the Jews, who in turn influenced the early Christians. These trumped the Jews by introducing the expression “divine book,” which in the course of the Middle Ages lost ground to the expression *Sacra Scriptura*. That is why we have a Holy, not a Divine, Bible, a terminology that now scores more than 4,450,000 hits on Google.¹⁴³ Given the enormous success of Western colonisation and civilisation in the nineteenth century, it is perhaps hardly surprising that even the Muslims, who never call the Qur’an “Holy” in Arabic but only use epithets like *Karim*, “Noble,” also started to call the Qur’an “Holy” in English translations. Although there already appeared an anonymous *The Holy Koran, commonly called the Alcoran of Mohammed* in London in 1826, the process accelerated in former British India from the early twentieth century onwards.¹⁴⁴ The term “Holy Quran” now scores 2,100,000 hits on Google.

Even contemporary Judaism has not been left wholly untouched by this success. Whereas in the ideological ping pong game between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity,¹⁴⁵ the latter preferred the codex

¹⁴² A.S. Herbert, *Historical Catalogue of Printed Editions of the English Bible 1525–1961* (London: United Bible societies, 1968), 70.

¹⁴³ Google was accessed on 25 September 2008.

¹⁴⁴ J. Jomier, “Le sacré dans le Coran,” in *L’expression du sacré dans les grandes religions, II* (ed. J. Ries et al.; Louvain-la-Neuve: Université catholique de Louvain, 1983), 339–85 (363–64; epithets) and (369–70; British India); Mohammad Abul-Hakim Khan, *The Holy Qur’an* (Patiala: Rajinder Press, 1905); idem, *The Holy Quran with English Translation* (Madras: Addison Press, 1915); Maulvi Muhammad Ali, *The Holy Qur-án* (Woking: The “Islamic Review” Office, 1917); Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Holy Qur’an: Translation and Commentary* (Lahore: Sh. Muhammad Ashraf Publishers, 1934–1937).

¹⁴⁵ For the competition between Jews and Christians in the area of the book see also the very stimulating observations of G. Stroumsa, *The End of Sacrifice: Religious Transformations of Late Antiquity* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2009), 28–55.

above the (sc)roll, and the former rejected the Septuagint because of Christian usage of it, Jews nowadays also use the expression “the Holy Torah,” as the 59,400 Hebrew-written hits on Google show, although they did not do so in Late Antiquity. In fact, the combination *Torah qedoshah* does not occur before *Seder Eliyyahu Zuta* chapter 10, composed after the redaction of the Babylonian Talmud and most likely after the ninth century. There it says that God gave the “Holy Torah” to “Holy Israel.”

Finally, the success of the Bible as a holy book is even such that we can now refer to an authoritative reference book in a specific field as its Bible. I have therefore no doubts that students of the Dead Sea Scrolls soon will refer to Florentino’s *Qumranica Minora* as their Bible,¹⁴⁶ but it may still take a while before they will refer to it as their “holy book.”

APPENDIX 1: THE ETYMOLOGY OF “CANON”¹⁴⁷

In the most recent detailed discussion of the birth of the canon of the New Testament, Christoph Marksches calls the word “canon” an “ursprünglich wohl semitisches Fremdwort” and connects it to Hebrew *qane*, which originally meant “Schilfsrohr,” then “Leuchterschaft” and eventually “Messrohr, Messrute, Massstab,” after which it was taken over by the Greeks.¹⁴⁸ The connection of κανών with Hebrew *qanèh* is traditional and can already be found in Gesenius and Heinrich Lewy’s book on Semitic *Fremdwörter* in Greek,¹⁴⁹ although Lewy (1863–?1933) suffered from a “tendance véritablement ‘pan-

¹⁴⁶ F. García Martínez, *Qumranica Minora* (2 vols.; ed. E.J.C. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

¹⁴⁷ The most interesting study of the early development of the term “canon” is presently J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (Munich: Beck, 1992), 103–29, who based his findings on the material collected by H. Oppel, *KANON: Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des Wortes und seinen lateinischen Entsprechungen (regula—norma) = Philologus*, Suppl. XXX.4 (1937).

¹⁴⁸ Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie*, 236. B. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 289–93 also refers to Hebrew *qane*, but does not offer any considerations about the nature of the connection.

¹⁴⁹ W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1828), 717–18; H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen* (Berlin: Gaertner, 1895), 133.

sémitique,” as Émilia Masson rightly observed.¹⁵⁰ The word κανών entered Greek very early, and it already occurs several times in the *Iliad* where it can mean “the stave that preserves the shape of a shield” (VIII.193, XIII.407) or “a weaver’s rod” (XXIII.761). In Sophocles (fr. *474.5 Radt) and Euripides (*Tro.* 6; *HF* 865; fr. 376.1 Kannicht) it can be “the plumb-line” used by masons and carpenters, a usage also seen in a work titled *Canon* by the famous sculptor Polyclitus around the middle of the fifth century B.C.E.¹⁵¹ In other words, its main meaning is “a straight rod,” which is not surprising, as the word is derived from κάννα, “reed, cane” (*Arundo Donax*), which is already attested in fifth-century B.C.E. comic authors and is derived from Akkadian *qanû*.¹⁵² But why would the Greeks have derived the name of a part of their shield or weaving equipment, let alone the measuring stick, from the Phoenicians, as Masson suggests?¹⁵³ Our evidence points to a different direction. As Burkert has observed, a series of Greek words, such as *titanos*, “lime,” *gypson*, “plaster” and *plinthos*, “clay-brick,”¹⁵⁴ all derive from Akkadian building terminology.¹⁵⁵ He persuasively also connects κανών with these terms. Therefore, our “canon” derives from a series of Akkadian terms relating to craftsmanship, which must have been imported by masons into ancient Greece, probably via Anatolia,¹⁵⁶ at a date no longer determinable.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁰ É. Masson, *Recherches sur les plus anciens emprunts sémitiques en Grec* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1967), 16.

¹⁵¹ A. Stewart, “The Canon of Polykleitos: A Question of Evidence,” *JHS* 98 (1978): 122–31 (122–23); J. Pollitt, “The Canon of Polykleitos and Other Canons,” in *Polykleitos, the Doryphoros, and Tradition* (ed. W.G. Moon; Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1993), 19–24; A. Stewart, “Nuggets: Mining the Texts Again,” *AJA* 102 (1998): 271–82 (273–75).

¹⁵² Comic authors: Cratinus, fr. 210; Pherecrates, fr. 69; Eupolis, fr. 218 Kassel-Austin; Aristophanes, V. 394. Etymology: Masson, *Recherches*, 48.

¹⁵³ Masson, *Recherches*, 48.

¹⁵⁴ Its Akkadian origin is also noted by M.L. West, *The East Face of Helicon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 39 n. 153 and J.P. Brown, *Israel and Hellas* (3 vols.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995–2001), 1:16, 76, 83–85, 332; 2:293, 314; 3:287.

¹⁵⁵ Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution*, 38–39.

¹⁵⁶ Anatolian influence on early Greek building techniques has now been demonstrated by J.C. Wright, “The Formation of the Mycenaean Palace,” in *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer* (ed. S. Deger-Jalkotzy and I.S. Lemos; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006), 7–52 (28–33).

¹⁵⁷ I am grateful to Marten Stol for reading this Appendix and to Suzanne Lye for correcting its English.

APPENDIX 2: THE BIBLE IN ETHIOPIA

I had already written the main text above when I came across the article by Geoffrey Rowell, the third Bishop of Gibraltar in Europe (sic), “The Bible needs interpreters but reflects the common faith of the whole Church,” in *The Times*, June 20, 2008. Here he describes a university expedition which he led to the northeastern highlands of Ethiopia some thirty years ago. His words may well describe the situation in many Christian monasteries in East and West in Late Antiquity and the earlier Middle Ages, and deserve to be quoted:

Our aim was to explore this remote region and record the ancient churches, both built and hewn out of rock, their treasures and particularly their manuscripts. Ethiopian Christianity, which dates back to the 4th century, is largely a manuscript culture. We did not ask when we came to a church, ‘Do you have manuscripts?’ but ‘What manuscripts do you have?’ There were always the Gospels, the Epistles of St Paul, sometimes other books of the Bible, various services books and lives of the saints. In no church did we find a complete Bible. The reason was soon obvious. A manuscript Bible is vast and expensive. Only the richest monasteries might possess one, and it might well occupy several folio volumes. Not until printing was invented did it become possible for churches to have a whole Bible, and so to know the sequence and order of the books of the Old and New Testaments. Even after that time was needed for printing and paper to become so fine and small that it was possible to hold up a Bible and say ‘This is the Word of the Lord.’¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁸ For information and comments I am most grateful to audiences in Groningen, Aarhus, Montreal, Ottawa, London (Ontario) and Nijmegen as well as to Ra’anan Boustan, Rolf Bremmer, Zeev Elitzur, Henk Jan de Jonge, Fred Leemhuis, Peter van Minnen, Nils Arne Pedersen, Mladen Popović, Victor Schmidt, Jacques van der Vliet and, especially, to Jitse Dijkstra, Ton Hilhorst and Eibert Tigchelaar. Ward Blanton kindly corrected my English, and, as always, Eline Veldt was a great help in preparing the manuscript.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G., 78
 Abegg, M., 182
 Aitken, J.K., 49
 Aland, K., 108
 Alexander, P.S., 194–96, 198–200, 349
 Ali, A.Y., 357
 Ali, M.M., 357
 Alidori, L., 354
 Allegro, J.M., 22, 74
 Armstrong, J.J., 251
 Asheri, D., 331
 Assmann, J., 358
 Atkins, E.M., 263
 Auld, A.G., 52, 107
 Aune, D.E., 311, 319
 Auwers, J.-M., 130
 Ayres, L.M., 355
- Bacher, W., 99
 Bagnall, R.S., 348, 349, 352
 Baillet, M., 237
 Bartelmus, R., 233
 Barthélemy, D., 128, 131
 Barr, J., 146
 Barton, J., 48, 306
 Barton, S.W., 128
 Bauckham, R., 231
 Baumgarten, A.I., 60, 61, 198, 208, 213
 Baumgarten, J.M., 33, 194
 Beale, G.K., 310
 Beard, M., 339
 Becker, G., 356
 Beckwith, R.T., 57
 Bedenbender, A., 150, 152, 153
 Beentjes, P.C., 58, 59, 62, 68, 135
 Begg, C.T., 230
 Ben Zvi, E., 249
 Ben-Dov, J., 155
 Bengtsson, H., 214
 Berg, J.A. van den, 308
 Bergren, T.A., 260
 Bernabé, A., 330, 332, 333
 Bernstein, M.J., 29, 30, 43, 75, 80, 81,
 122
 Berrin, S., 212, 213, 215, 216
 Berthelot, K., 121, 122, 125, 126, 342
 Beyer, K., 155, 174, 184
- Bickerman, E., 337
 Black, M., 165
 Blanchard, Y.-M., 308
 Blenkinsopp, J., 61
 Bloch, R., 337
 Block, D.I., 233, 234
 Boccaccini, G., 149, 150, 153, 255
 Bockmuehl, M., 198, 255
 Bøe, S., 229, 321, 322
 Bogaert, P.-M., 127, 134, 351, 354
 Borgen, P., 254
 Bosch, L.P. van den, 327
 Botte, B., 127
 Boustan, R., 339
 Bowden, H., 330
 Bowley, J.E., 78
 Brady, M., 237, 238
 Braun, O., 117
 Bremmer, J.N., 16, 100, 290, 329, 330,
 332, 335, 347
 Broek, R. van den, 335
 Brogan, J.J., 351
 Brooke, G.J., 4, 5, 29–31, 44, 45, 47, 48,
 51–53, 66, 69, 75, 81, 85, 122, 157,
 201–3, 206–10, 212, 216, 219, 220,
 222, 228, 229, 237, 241, 250, 251, 343
 Broshi, M., 144
 Brown, J.P., 359
 Brownlee, W.H., 209
 Bruce, F.F., 328
 Brutti, M., 64
 Bruyn, T. de, 352
 Buhl, F., 99
 Bultmann, C., 328
 Burkert, W., 188, 329, 331, 333, 359
 Burkhardt, H., 284, 285, 336, 340, 341,
 348
- Cacciari, A., 137
 Callaway, 209, 210
 Campbell, J.G., 185
 Cancik, H., 353
 Cavell, S., 257
 Charlesworth, J.H., 198, 210, 214, 215
 Charlesworth, S.D., 349, 351
 Chastang, P., 356
 Cherian, J., 48

- Civil, M., 98
 Clements, R.E., 232
 Cohen, N.G., 254, 340
 Cohen, S.J.D., 347
 Collins, J.J., 12, 15, 32, 38, 44, 49, 64,
 163, 165, 167, 173, 174, 186, 188, 189,
 198, 210, 218, 225, 254, 260
 Cook, E.M., 78
 Cook, S.L., 233
 Colpe, C., 328
 Corley, J., 59
 Cothenet, É., 229
 Cowley, A.E., 135
 Cross, F.M., 22–24, 38, 209, 223

 Daniélou, J., 101
 Davidson, A., 257
 Davies, P.R., 202, 209, 210, 220–24
 Davila, J.R., 81
 De Troyer, K., 337
 DeConick, A.D., 52
 DeFilippo, J., 255
 Dekkers, E., 352
 Dempster, S., 343
 Denny, F.M., 328
 Dhorme, É., 130
 Di Lella, A.A., 58, 59, 135, 136
 Dieleman, J., 333, 334
 Dimant, D., 32, 155, 157, 159, 164, 166,
 175, 176, 199, 231, 232, 236, 237, 238,
 239, 242, 246
 Dohmen, C., 311
 Dorival, G., 122, 127–29, 133
 Doudna, G.L., 213–15
 Drawnel, H., 168
 Duchet-Suchaux, M., 356
 Duncan, J.A., 23, 88
 Duval, R., 117

 Eberhardt, B., 339
 Ego, B., 238
 Elgvin, T., 163
 Elledge, C.D., 131, 139
 Elliger, K., 209
 Epstein, I., 104
 Eshel, E., 156, 167, 168
 Eshel, H., 23, 156, 215
 Evans, C.A., 122
 Eybers, I.H., 163

 Fabry, H.-J., 68, 197, 198
 Falk, D.K., 43, 79, 156, 241
 Ferrari, M.C., 354
 Festugière, A.-J., 330, 335

 Finkelstein, I., 114
 Fishbane, M., 29, 228
 Fitzmyer, J.A., 145
 Flanagan, J., 243
 Fletcher-Louis, C., 257
 Flint, P.W., 32, 45, 77, 96, 117, 129, 136,
 161, 163, 165, 167, 173, 174, 182, 186,
 188, 189
 Fournier-Bidoz, A., 69
 Fowden, G., 334, 335
 Fowler, R.L., 330
 Fraade, S., 194
 Fraser, P.M., 254, 334
 Frey, J., 38–40, 318
 Fried, L.S., 93

 Ganz, D., 355
 García Martínez, F., 3, 4, 11, 23, 30, 33,
 35–39, 42, 64, 73, 78, 123, 130, 133,
 153, 156, 173, 177, 181, 183–85, 204,
 205, 229, 238, 239, 242, 244, 246, 254,
 296, 358
 Gardiner, A., 334
 Garnet, P., 198
 Geest, J.E.L. van der, 353
 Genette, G., 43
 Gerber, C., 341
 Gesenius, W., 358
 Geus, C.H.J. de, 35
 Giesen, H., 314, 317, 318, 323
 Gilbert, M., 68, 135
 Goff, M., 49
 Goodblatt, D., 67
 Goodenough, E.R., 255
 Gooding, D.W., 115
 Goodman, M., 207, 346
 Gorman, M., 354
 Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., 77
 Goulet, R., 254
 Grabbe, L.L., 58
 Graf, F., 331, 332
 Grafton, A., 349
 Greenberg, M., 231, 232, 233
 Greenfield, J.C., 168
 Greschat, K., 349
 Griffin, M.T., 263
 Griffith, S.H., 308
 Grossman, M., 46
 Gruen, E., 340, 353
 Gunkel, H., 224
 Guttenberger, G., 319

 Hackmann, H., 328
 Hadot, P., 257

- Hahn, F., 317
 Haller-Mayer, M., 163
 Hallo, W.W., 93, 98
 Halperin, D., 233
 Halpern, B., 223
 Halporn, J.W., 354
 Hamel, C. de, 355
 Haran, M., 77, 98
 Hardin, C., 117
 Harnack, A., 352
 Harrington, S.J., 75
 Harris, W., 330
 Hartel, W. v., 356
 Hartenstein, J., 325
 Hartman, L., 165
 Harvey, P.B., 62
 Hay, D.M., 254
 Heger, P., 204, 208
 Hempel, C., 11, 156, 193, 194, 198,
 199–201, 207
 Hengel, M., 38
 Henrichs, A., 330–33, 335, 340
 Herbert, A.S., 357
 Herbert, E.D., 251
 Hezser, C., 346
 Hieke, T., 310, 314, 321–23
 Hilgert, E., 254
 Hilhorst, A., 20, 341
 Hilhorst, T., 35
 Hogeterp, A., 10, 11
 Hollander, H.W., 144, 270
 Hordern, J., 332
 Horgan, M.P., 42, 46, 211, 212, 218, 220,
 221
 Horsley, G., 352
 Horsley, R.A., 41, 255, 344, 345, 346
 Horst, P.W. van der, 338
 Hoskisson, P.Y., 93
 Huber, K., 318
 Hughes, J.A., 48
 Hultgren, S., 34
 Hurllet, F., 340
 Hurtado, L., 348
 Hyatt, J.P., 345
 Hyvärinen, K., 131

 Jacoby, F., 334, 336
 Jaeger, W., 255
 Jaffee, M., 262
 Jakob, A., 309
 Jassen, A., 32, 239, 240
 Jastrow, M., 177, 178, 181, 185
 Jeremias, G., 224
 Jeremias, J., 61

 Johnson, W.A., 338, 348
 Johnston, S.I., 331, 332
 Jokiranta, J., 51, 194, 211, 217
 Jomier, J., 357
 Jonge, H.J. de, 229
 Jonge, M. de, 144
 Jongkind, D., 351
 Judge, E.A., 352
 Junod, E., 138

 Kaestli, J.-D., 349
 Kahn, M.A.-H., 357
 Karrer, M., 321, 322
 Kasher, A., 342
 Kessler, H.L., 352, 355
 Keulen, P.S.F. van, 112
 Kim, A., 83
 Kippenberg, H.G., 55
 Kister, M., 196, 207, 231
 Kittel, R., 106
 Klein, A., 233
 Klijn, A.F.J., 35, 344
 Knauf, E.A., 93
 Knibb, M.A., 8, 9, 45, 146, 147, 150, 152,
 153, 166, 198, 199
 Knoppers, G.N., 62
 Kooij, A. van der, 5, 6, 14, 56–60, 64, 65,
 69, 89, 170, 234, 342, 343
 Kooten, G.H. van, 14, 15, 292, 307, 319
 Koperski, V., 56, 135
 Korpel, M.C.A., 105, 107
 Kowalski, B., 321
 Kraft, R.A., 167
 Kratz, R.G., 343
 Kugel, J.L., 156, 261
 Kugler, R.A., 198

 Labahn, A., 63
 Lanczkowski, G., 328
 Lange, A., 25–28, 40, 47, 56, 58, 60, 79,
 156, 159, 162, 170, 241, 342
 Latré, G., 356
 Lebram, J.-C.H., 69
 Leemans, J., 135
 Lefèvre, Y., 356
 Lehmann, M.R., 135
 Lehmann, P., 356
 Leiman, S.Z., 97, 206
 Leipoldt, J., 328
 Lemaire, A., 125
 Levenson, J.D., 232
 Levering, M., 161, 328
 Lewy, H., 358
 Lieberman, S.J., 93

- Lietaert Peerbolte, L.J., 352
 Light, L., 355
 Lightfoot, J., 338
 Lim, T.H., 56, 122, 124, 125, 210, 212,
 213, 217, 219, 222, 224
 Lloyd, A.B., 331, 332
 Lowden, J., 352
 Lubbe, J., 23
 Lupieri, E.F., 314
 Lust, J., 235, 237, 242–45, 251

 Magness, J., 225
 Manning, G.T., 229
 Mansfeld, J., 329, 349
 Marböck, J., 69
 Markschies, C., 349, 351, 358
 Martens, J.W., 256
 Martinez, D.G., 348
 Mason, E.C., 23
 Mason, S., 230
 Masson, É., 359
 Mastin, B.A., 47
 McDonald, L.M., 242, 309
 McKendrick, S., 351
 McKirahan, R.D., 256, 262
 McKitterick, R., 355
 Meer, M.N. van der, 102, 243
 Meisner, N., 315
 Mendels, D., 67
 Mertens, M., 336
 Metso, S., 162, 194, 196–200, 202, 206
 Metzger, B.M., 309, 358
 Meyer, E.A., 348
 Meyer, M., 335
 Michalowski, P., 345
 Middendorp, T., 68
 Migne, J.-P., 101
 Miguel Jover, J.L. de, 348
 Milik, J.T., 126, 133, 138, 144, 147, 155,
 156, 160, 194–96, 205, 220
 Millar, F., 339
 Minnen, P. van, 334
 Miriello, R., 355
 Mitchell, D.C., 23
 Mitsis, P., 255
 Mittag, P.F., 345
 Mittmann-Richert, U., 40, 159
 Moor, J.C. de, 106
 Moore, C.A., 134
 Morenz, S., 328
 Moyise, S., 310, 320
 Muddiman, J., 306
 Mueller, J.R., 231

 Mulder, O., 68
 Mratschek, S., 352
 Müller, F.M., 327
 Müller, U.B., 314
 Muraoka, T., 160
 Murphy, C.M., 174

 Najman, H., 13, 14, 31, 239, 241,
 253–55, 257, 260, 262, 275
 Nam, R.S., 83
 Nauta, R., 348
 Neubauer, A., 135
 Newsom, C.A., 23, 49, 50, 193
 Nickelsbrug, G.W.E., 42, 143, 144, 147,
 150–52, 154, 157, 165, 166, 260
 Nicklas, T., 15, 310, 314, 319, 320
 Nihan, C., 338
 Nikiprowetzky, V., 255
 Nitzan, B., 211
 Nock, A.D., 335
 Nodet, É., 28, 124, 346
 Nogalski, J., 96
 Norden, E., 335
 Norton, G.J., 117
 Nuchelmans, J., 339

 Obbink, D., 332
 Odell, M.S., 233
 Oeming, M., 311
 Oesch, J.M., 105, 106, 311
 Oppel, H., 358
 Orton, D.E., 61
 Osten-Sacken, P. von der, 193

 Parker, D.C., 100, 207
 Parker, R.C.T., 282, 332
 Parry, D.W., 78, 173, 174, 185
 Patmore, H.M., 235, 243
 Patton, C.L., 233
 Paul, A., 175, 188
 Pedersen, N.A., 351
 Peglau, M., 353
 Peters, D.M., 156, 168
 Peters, F.E., 328
 Petersen, A.K., 31, 43, 47, 53, 206, 227,
 228, 230, 240, 248, 249
 Petrucci, A., 353, 356
 Pfann, S., 196
 Pfeiffer, S., 335
 Piovanelli, P., 330
 Ploeg, J. van der, 73
 Pohlmann, K.-F., 233
 Polak, F.H., 112

- Pollitt, J., 359
 Popović, M., 12, 344
 Prigent, P., 312, 317, 323
 Pucci Ben Zeev, M., 340
 Puech, É., 8, 14, 15, 20, 32, 57, 117, 121,
 124, 125, 128–31, 133, 135–38, 147,
 156, 159, 163, 164, 167, 173, 174,
 176–88, 190, 343
 Qimron, E., 33, 34, 57, 121, 123, 124,
 225, 226
 Quaegebeur, J., 334
 Quasten, J., 97

 Rabin, C., 33
 Räisänen, H., 328
 Rajak, T., 334, 337, 340
 Rapp, C., 352
 Reed, A.Y., 336
 Rehm, M., 115
 Riedweg, C., 332, 333, 337, 340
 Rochberg-Halton, F., 95
 Rohde, E., 339
 Roloff, J., 314
 Roo, J.C.R. de, 137
 Rosen, K., 353
 Rouse, M.A., 355
 Rouse, R.H., 355
 Rowell, G., 360
 Rowland, C., 40
 Rudnig, T.A., 233
 Ruelle, C.-E., 335
 Rüger, P., 133
 Ruiten, J. van, 319
 Ruiz, J.-P., 320, 322
 Ruiz Bueno, D., 101
 Rupp, E.G., 328
 Russel Christman, A., 234
 Ryholt, K., 334,

 Sanders, J.A., 309
 Sanderson, J.E., 23, 250, 251
 Sängler, D., 321
 Sarna, N.M., 97, 98
 Satran, D., 231
 Sawyer, J.F.A., 328
 Scatolini, S.S., 243
 Segal, M., 29, 75, 78, 79, 81, 82, 84, 85
 Segert, S., 155, 157
 Schams, C., 61, 62, 65, 66, 345
 Schaper, J., 62
 Schattner-Rieser, U., 176, 178, 180, 182
 Schechter, S., 33, 135

 Schenker, A., 112, 344
 Schiffman, L.H., 32, 44, 169, 214
 Schnabel, E.J., 61, 65
 Schniedewind, W.M., 156
 Schofield, A., 202, 203
 Scholtissek, K., 324
 Schorch, S., 344
 Schrader, L., 68
 Schrenk, G., 347
 Schuol, M., 340
 Schüssler Fiorenza, E., 309, 318
 Schwagmeier, P., 229, 234, 238, 243,
 248, 250, 251
 Schwartz, D.R., 33, 125, 154, 343, 345
 Shemesh, A., 194
 Shepherd, D., 166
 Shutt, R.J.H., 315, 337
 Silberman, N.A., 114, 219
 Skeat, T.C., 351
 Skehan, P.W., 23, 58, 59, 136
 Smith, M., 32, 232
 Smith, W.C., 328
 Soggin, J.A., 103
 Sparks, K.L., 96
 Speyer, W., 330, 353
 Spilsbury, P., 230
 Stadelmann, H., 68
 Stegemann, H., 38, 196, 197, 224, 236
 Steinsaltz, A., 206
 Sterling, J.A., 254
 Stern, M., 64
 Steudel, A., 22, 124, 175
 Stewart, A., 359
 Stone, M.E., 168, 231, 260, 325
 Strauss, L., 256
 Strawn, B.A., 198
 Stricker, B.H., 336
 Striker, G., 256
 Stromberg, J., 247
 Strong, J.T., 233
 Stroumsa, G.G., 55, 357
 Strugnell, J., 34, 57, 73–75, 81, 121, 123,
 124, 225, 226, 232, 236
 Stuckenbruck, L.T., 147, 167, 173, 174,
 184
 Sundberg, A.C., 136
 Swanson, D.D., 75

 Talmon, S., 27, 28, 77, 133, 203, 204,
 205, 207, 251, 344
 Talshir, Z., 112
 Taylor, R.L., 328
 Thackeray, H.St.J., 338

- Thomassen, E., 349
 Tigchelaar, E.J.C., 9–11, 14, 15, 20, 22,
 33, 42, 78, 133, 155, 159, 173, 177,
 181, 183–85, 194, 198, 201, 243, 251,
 343
 Tilly, M., 312–15
 Tobin, H., 254
 Toepel, A., 174
 Tomasino, A.J., 128
 Toorn, K. van der, 55, 57, 60, 61, 63, 93,
 334, 338, 339, 343–45
 Tóth, F., 316, 317
 Tov, E., 6, 7, 11, 24, 26, 29, 66, 73–79,
 82–84, 88, 90, 98, 102, 105, 112, 139,
 158, 160, 173–75, 185, 196, 199, 203,
 207, 208, 250, 338
 Trebolle Barrera, J., 7, 14, 21, 30, 132,
 141, 230, 241, 242
 Trever, J.C., 47
 Trobisch, D., 100
 Tromp, J., 229
 Tworuschka, U., 328

 Ulland, H., 320
 Ulrich, E., 20–23, 27, 28, 77–79, 102,
 105, 121, 122, 141, 145, 160, 161, 182,
 202, 203, 235, 247, 249, 342
 Unnik, W.C. van, 311

 Van Damme, D., 99
 Van Voorst, R.E., 328
 Vanhoye, A., 320, 321
 VanderKam, J.C., 31, 32, 44, 45, 47, 57,
 63, 64, 122, 131, 138, 143–45, 147,
 200, 203, 214, 225, 237
 Vander Waerd, P., 256
 Vázquez Allegue, J., 53
 Veltri, G., 94
 Vermes, G., 42, 194–201, 296
 Vervenne, M., 22
 Vezin, J., 352
 Vogelsang, J.M., 320, 323

 Wacholder, B.Z., 33, 34, 81, 155, 156,
 157
 Wahl, H.M., 233
 Wasserman, T., 352
 Watts, J.W., 63
 Weber, M., 334
 Weiss, H.-F., 61, 68
 Weissenberg, H. von, 122, 343
 Weitzman, S., 156
 West, M.L., 333, 359
 Wevers, J., 27
 White Crawford, S., 29, 43, 73–76, 78,
 83–86, 248, 249
 Willi, A., 353
 Williams, M.H., 349
 Wills, L.M., 40
 Wilson, G.H., 96
 Windisch, H., 309
 Winiarczyk, M., 332, 335
 Winston, D., 257
 Wischmeyer, O., 336
 Wise, M.O., 44, 78, 210, 225
 Witulski, T., 318, 319
 Wolfson, H., 254
 Woude, A.S. van der, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27,
 28, 35, 49, 73, 202, 343–45
 Wright, B.G., 40, 145, 231, 238, 246,
 260, 338
 Wright, J.C., 359

 Yadin, Y., 81
 Younger, K.L., 93

 Zahn, T., 351
 Zauzich, K.-Th., 333
 Zenger, E., 96
 Zimmerli, W., 232, 233
 Zinn, K., 334
 Zurro Rodrigues, E., 105

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

1. HEBREW BIBLE/OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Genesis</i>	82, 338	24:11	84
1–20	81	24:17	90
1	256	24:18	84
2–3	256	25	84
2	82	30	82
2:7	307	33:19 (LXX)	269, 279
5:22	168	33:23 (LXX)	286
5:24	168		
6:1–2	165	<i>Leviticus</i>	29, 82, 137, 269
6:1–4	165	1–10	81
6:9	168	11–26	82
12:4–5	81	11–27	82
13	166	15:14–15	85
13:15 (LXX)	279	17:13	169
14	166	18:5 (LXX)	269
14:18–22	182	18:25–29	85
15:6 (LXX)	276	19:1–4	85
17:8 (LXX)	279	19:9–15	85
21	82	23:38	139
21:10 (LXX)	276	23:42–43	75
24:7 (LXX)	279	23:44	75
25–48	82	24	75
28:6	84	24:1–2	75
30:26	83	24:20–22	85
32	82	25:39–43	85
		<i>Numbers</i>	24, 29, 76, 102, 137, 338
<i>Exodus</i>	22, 23, 29, 82, 137, 206, 269, 338	1–36	82
8–39	82	4:47–49	85
9:16 (LXX)	276	5	85
13:17–22	73	6	85
14	222	7	85
15	85, 90, 223	14	82
19–24	82	18–26	81
19–26	82	20:17–18	76
19:6 (LXX)	60	22–24	104
19:17	84	22:2 (LXX)	290
20	83	24:15–17	22
20:18	22	24:7 (LXX)	287
20:21	88	24:16	182
20:22–23:33	96	25	59
21–22	82	25:1	104
23:7	139	25:12–13	70
23:19b	77	25:6–13	59
24:12	84	25:12–13	59

27	85	3-4	103
27:11	85	3:1-5	103
29	82	4	102
29:32-30:1	76	5:2-7	102, 103
33	82	6:8	339
36:1-2	85	6:26	23
<i>Deuteronomy</i>	24, 29, 58, 76, 100, 123, 124, 137, 206, 228, 269	8:1-29	102
1-14	82	8:30-35	102, 103, 105
2	82	9:1-2	102
2:8	83	9:2 (LXX)	103
2:8-14	76	9:3-8 (LXX)	102
4:2 (LXX)	15, 312, 314	9:3-27	103
5:28-29	22, 88	24	103
5:28-31	83	24:27	103
9:4 (LXX)	269	<i>Judges</i>	58, 114, 132
11:26-30	103	4	223
12:31-13:1, 3	117	5	223
13:1 (LXX)	15, 312, 314	9:7-15	188
13:7-11	73	9:7-17	188
14	82	<i>Ruth</i>	99, 132
14:29	117	<i>Samuel-Kings</i>	29, 52
16	82	<i>1-2 Samuel</i>	58, 114, 124, 132, 206
16:13-14	76	(LXX)	76
16:14	117	<i>1 Samuel</i>	102, 277
18	48	1:22	141
18:18-19	22, 88	10:25	344
18:18-22	83	11:1	141
19	82	12:11 (LXX)	277
21-34	81	16:13	121
27:2	103	<i>2 Samuel</i>	112
29:18	220	7:8 (LXX)	279
29:19-20 (LXX)	15, 313	7:11-14	128
30:12 (LXX)	269	7:14 (LXX)	279
30:14 (LXX)	269	22:14	182
31:26	57	<i>1-2 Kings</i>	58, 99, 100, 114, 124, 132, 206
32	341	<i>1 Kings</i>	80, 91, 102, 283
32:7	122	(LXX)	6, 29, 79, 80
32:17	165	2:12	112
32:20	165	2:4-6	115
32:21 (LXX)	269	2:35 (LXX)	108-15
32:35 (LXX)	279	2:46 (LXX)	110-13
33:8-11	23, 88	2:28-9, 36-46	112
33:10	64	2:46	112
34:10	338	3-5	112
<i>Joshua</i>	31, 58, 102, 114	3-9	107
1	104	3-10	7, 105, 106, 111, 113
1:7-8	130	3-10 (LXX)	105
2	103, 104		
2:16	104		
2:22	104		

3:1	109-11	6:1 (LXX)	108
3:1 (LXX)	106, 107, 110	6:2-3	107, 108
3:2-3	109, 110, 112	6:2-3 (LXX)	107, 108
3:2-3 (LXX)	110	6:4-10	108, 109
3:3	106	6:4-10 (LXX)	108
3:4-15	107, 110, 112	6:11-13	109
3:4-15 (LXX)	107, 110	6:11-14 (LXX)	108
3:16-28	109, 110, 112	6:14	109
3:16-28 (LXX)	110	6:15-36	107, 109
4:1	110	6:15-36 (LXX)	107, 109
4:1 (LXX)	110	6:36	106
4:1-19	109	6:36-38	108
4:2-6	110	6:36-38 (LXX)	108
4:2-6 (LXX)	110	6:37-38	109
4:7-19	110-12	6:37-38 (LXX)	108
4:7-19 (LXX)	110	6:38	109
4:20	106, 109, 110	6:38 (LXX)	108
4:20-5:6	111	7:1	108
5:1	110, 111	7:1 (LXX)	108
5:1 (LXX)	110	7:1-12	109
5:2-4	109-11	7:1-12 (LXX)	109
5:2-4 (LXX)	110	7:12	108
5:5	109-11	7:12 (LXX)	108
5:6	110	7:13-14	107, 109
5:6 (LXX)	110	7:13-14 (LXX)	107, 109
5:7-8	109-11	7:14	106, 117
5:7-8 (LXX)	110	7:15-21 (LXX)	109
5:7-30	112	7:15-21.22	109
5:9	112	7:15-51	107
5:9-13	121	7:15-51 (LXX)	107
5:9-14	109, 110, 113	7:22	106
5:9-14 (LXX)	110	7:22-51	109
5:12-13	121	7:22-51 (LXX)	109
5:11-14	106	8	107, 109
5:14	107	8 (LXX)	107, 109
5:15-9:14	110, 111	8:11-12	113
5:15-9:14 (LXX)	110	9-10	107, 112
5:15-26	107, 108	9:1-9	107, 109
5:15-26 (LXX)	107, 108	9:1-9 (LXX)	107, 109
5:26	106	9:10-14	107, 109-12
5:27	107, 108	9:10-14 (LXX)	107, 109, 110
5:27 (LXX)	107, 108	9:15	106, 109-11, 114
5:28	108, 109	9:15 (LXX)	110
5:28 (LXX)	108	9:15-18	114
5:29-30	107, 108	9:16-17	106, 109-12,
5:29-30 (LXX)	107, 108		114, 115
5:30	109, 110	9:17-18	110, 114
5:31-32	108, 109	9:17-18 (LXX)	110
5:31-32 (LXX)	108	9:17-19	106
5:32	108, 109	9:17-22	109, 111
5:32 (LXX)	108	9:19	110
6	108, 109	9:19 (LXX)	110
6:1	106	9:20-21 (LXX)	110
6:1	109	9:20-22	110

9:23	106, 109–11	3:4b–14	109
9:24	106, 109–11	3:15–17	109
9:24 (LXX)	109, 110	3:15–5:2	107
9:25	106, 109, 110	4:1–5:2	109
9:26–28	107, 110–12	5:3–7:10	107, 109
9:26–28 (LXX)	107, 110	7:11–22	107, 109
10:1–13	107, 108, 110, 112	8:1–2	107, 109
10:1–13 (LXX)	107, 108, 110	8:17–18	107
10:14–22	110, 112	9:1–12	107
10:14–22 (LXX)	110	9:13–28	107, 111
10:14–29	107	9:25–26	113
10:14–29 (LXX)	107	17:7–9	62, 69
10:23–25	110, 112, 113	23:18 (LXX)	277, 278
10:23–25 (LXX)	110	25:4	124
10:26	110	25:4 (LXX)	278
10:26 (LXX)	110	34:13	63
10:26–29	112	34:14	344
10:27–29	110	35:3	63
10:27–29 (LXX)	110	36:20	99
16	319	36:22–23	99
19 (LXX)	280, 281	<i>Ezra–Nehemiah</i>	63, 65, 93, 99
19:10–14 (LXX)	280	<i>Ezra</i>	32, 93, 99
19:18 (LXX)	280	1:1–2	99
<i>2 Kings</i>		7:1–5	63
14:6 (LXX)	277, 278	7:6	61
18:13–20:19	99	7:10	56
18:37	282	7:25	180
22–23	57	<i>Nehemiah</i>	93, 99, 132
22:4–10	344	8	62, 63
22:8–10	344	8:7–8	61–63
23:21 (LXX)	278	8:13	56, 58, 62, 67, 69
24–25	99	10:35	76
<i>1–2 Chronicles</i>	7, 25, 29, 32, 52, 58, 63, 93, 99, 113, 130, 132, 206, 228	12:10–11	63
<i>1 Chronicles</i>	132	13:1–2	124
6:29–41	63	13:31	76
8:3–6	114	<i>Esther</i>	80, 91, 99, 130, 132
24:6	63	(LXX)	6, 29, 79, 80
25:8	63	4:14	133
27:32	65	9:29	180
<i>2 Chronicles</i>	132	10:2	180
1:1	112	<i>Job</i>	8, 58, 99, 130, 132, 133
1:3–13	107	15:24	125
2:1–15	107, 108	38	165
2:12–13	107, 108	42:9	185
2:16	108	<i>Psalms</i>	8, 58, 96, 99, 117, 123–26, 128–33, 135, 140, 141, 224, 249, 277, 348
2:16–17	107		
2:17	108		
3:1–4	107, 108		

1:1	129		
1:1-3	130		
2:1-2	129		
7:8-9	129		
7:18	182		
9:3	182		
17:3-4	125		
18	125		
18:14	182		
21:8	182		
31:1-2	268		
37:23-24	46		
37:32-33	123		
40:1-4	125		
41:5	125		
45	42		
45:2	42, 62, 66		
46:5	182		
47:3	182		
47:8-10	129		
50:14	182		
51	125		
57:3	182		
68:23-24 (LXX)	268		
69:22	221		
69:22-24	222		
73:11	182		
77:11	182		
78:17	182		
78:35	182		
78:56	182		
82:1-2	129		
82:6	182		
83:19	182		
87:5	182		
91:1	182		
92:2	182		
94:14 (LXX)	277		
95:7-8	124		
95:10	101		
97:9	182		
106:37	165		
106:40-41	165		
107:11	182		
107:26 (LXX)	269		
110:1 (LXX)	300		
144:10	125		
151 A-B	129		
154	125		
154:1-4	125		
154:17-20	125		
154-155	129		
155	125		
		<i>Proverbs</i>	8, 58, 99, 130, 133
		6:20 (LXX)	272
		10:30-32	131
		15:8	130
		17:15	131
		25-29	96
		31:1	281
		<i>Ecclesiastes</i>	99, 130, 131-33
		5:5	131
		6:11	131
		6:8	131
		8:14	131
		9:11	131
		11:5	131
		<i>Song of Songs</i>	99, 130, 132
		<i>Isaiah</i>	8, 96, 99, 126, 127, 131, 230, 241, 249, 277, 283, 310, 317, 320, 324, 325
		1-39	96
		1:1	99
		1:20	239
		6:1-3	317
		13:18	220
		14:14	182
		14:31	164
		14:31-32	164
		24:17	139
		26:20	250
		28:11-12 (LXX)	279
		28:16 (LXX)	277
		32:6	221
		36-39	99
		38:9-20	99
		40-55	96
		40:3	120
		40:5	239
		42:6	48
		45:21	187
		45:23 (LXX)	279
		49:8 (LXX)	279
		49:18 (LXX)	279
		52:4 (LXX)	279
		52:11 (LXX)	279
		56-66	96, 166
		58:14	239
		<i>Jeremiah</i>	8, 99, 100, 102, 126, 127, 132, 230, 241, 320
		(LXX)	76
		1	164

1:4-10	317	12:33	246
1:14	164	14:21	321
3:4 (LXX)	293	16	250, 321
4:6	164	16:30-33	250
6:1	164	16:31	250
22:24 (LXX)	279	16:47	250
44-52 (LXX)	99	23	250, 321
<i>Lamentations</i>	99, 132, 137	23:14-15	250
2:16	132	23:17-18	250
3:35	182	23:44-47	250
3:38	182	24:2-3	251
3:46	132	25-48	231
<i>Ezekiel</i>	8, 12, 99,	26-27	321
	100, 102, 126,	31	188
	127, 130, 137,	35	251
	228-50, 310,	35:11-38:14	251
	317, 320-26	36	251
(LXX)	76, 244	36-40	243
1	238, 251, 322	36:23b	243
1-24	231	36:23b-38	251
1:1-3:15	251, 317	36:23c-38	237, 243
1:4-5	323	37	190, 243, 244,
1:4-28	321		251, 321
1:5 (LXX)	323	37-43	236
1:8-10	251	37:1-14	251
2:1-3:15	321	37:26-27	321
2:9-3:4	321	38	251
3:4-5	251	38-39	243, 321
4	251	40-48	166, 243, 251,
4:5	45		321, 322
4:6	251	41	250
4:9-10	251	41:3-6	250
4:16-5:1	250	43:1-5	236
5	251	43:1-12	323
5:11-17	251	43:11	181
5:11 (LXX)	279	<i>Daniel</i>	8, 80, 91, 99,
5:12	321		102, 126, 127,
5:17	321		130, 132, 140,
7	251		167, 230, 310,
7:9-12	251		320, 324, 325
8-11	251	(LXX)	6, 10, 29, 79, 80
9:1-6	321	1:17	66
10	250, 322, 323	1:2	339
10:1-22	321	2	173
10:6-16	250	2	179
10:17-11:11	250	2:4b-7:28	182
10:18-22	323	2:19	181
11	250	2:20	182, 191
12:21-25	245	2:20 (LXX)	182, 191
12:21-28	245	2:28	181
12:23	246	2:29-6:21	180
12:24	246	2:38	180
12:26-28	243, 245, 246	2:40	180

3	134	7:13	181
3:24	126	7:14	173, 190
3:26	182	7:15	181
3:28	184	7:18	190
3:32	182	7:20	181
3:33	181	7:25	182
4	186, 188, 189	7:26	189
4–6 (LXX)	79	7:27	173, 188–90
4:2	181	8:20–21	188
4:4–18	189	8:22	188
4:7–8	180	9:2	57, 120
4:8	180	9:4–6	120
4:9	180	9:13 (LXX Theod)	277, 278
4:10	178, 188	9:25	126, 175
4:11	180, 188	10	317
4:11–17	189	10–11	188–90
4:14	182, 187, 190	10:13	125
4:17	180, 188	11:5–6	188, 190
4:18	180	11:17	180
4:19	180, 181	11:30	188
4:19–27	189	11:32	126
4:20	180, 188	11:35	126
4:20–27	189	12:10	126
4:21–22	182	13	126
4:22	178, 180, 186, 187, 190	14	126
4:22 (LXX)	184, 191	<i>Hosea</i>	96, 131
4:23	188	1:1	99
4:24	186	2:23	124
4:24 (LXX)	184, 191	2:25	280
4:25	180	6:3	48
4:27	186	14:9 (LXX)	294
4:29	180, 182, 187, 190	<i>Joel</i>	96
4:31	181, 182	<i>Amos</i>	96, 131
5:13	180	5:26	57
5:18	182	5:26–27	33
5:21	180, 182	<i>Obadiah</i>	96
5:29	180	<i>Micah</i>	96
6–7	181	4:4	239
6–10	181	<i>Nahum</i>	216, 217
6:20	177, 180	1:3b	211
6:23	184	1:3b–6	212
6:27	181	2:12–14	212
7	167, 173, 174, 179, 187, 188–90	2:13	213
7–8	189	3:1a	214
7:1–2	181	3:11	215
7:1–28	188	3:14	211
7:4–8	189, 190	<i>Habbakuk</i>	217
7:6	181	1:5	217
7:7	181	1:5 (LXX)	217
7:9	318	1:13	219, 222
7:12	181, 189		

1:17	220	<i>Haggai</i>	96
2	217	2:8	164
2:2	35, 296	<i>Zechariah</i>	96, 310, 320, 324, 325
2:3	217	2:12	163
2:4	303	<i>Malachi</i>	96
2:4b	219	2:6	168
2:5-6	217	3:23	164
2:15	219, 221, 222	3:24	136
2:16	220		
3:3	165		

2. NEW TESTAMENT

Matthew		8:2	307
2:23	128, 141	8:18-19	304
24:15	127, 175	8:20	131
Mark	100	8:34	300
10:19	137	8:36	278
Luke		9:6-7	301
4:16-21	90	9:13	278
16:16	125	9:14-16	279
16:29	125	9:15	269
16:31	125	9:17	276
24:27	125, 141	9:22-26	280
24:44	125, 141	9:25	124
John	325	9:33	278
17:53-8:11	100	10:5-8	269, 307
21	100	10:11	277
Acts		10:15	278
1:3	325	10:16	268
22:3	273	10:19	269
Romans		10:20-21	268
1:1-2	283, 291	11:2-4	280, 281, 295
1:2	267, 277, 298, 347	11:2	277, 347
1:16-17	303	11:3-4	280, 283, 295
1:17	178	11:4	290, 298
1:19-20	203	11:8	278
2:5	304	11:9-10	268
2:14	276	11:26	278
2:24	278	12:1-2	292
3:2	283, 290, 293	12:19	278, 279
3:4	278	14:11	278, 279
3:10	131, 278	15:3	278
3:19	270	15:4	277
3:21-22	302	15:9	278
3:21	277, 278	15:12	268
4:3	276	15:21	278
4:6-8	268	16:26	277
4:17	278	1 Corinthians	
7:12	347	1:7	304
		1:19	278
		1:31	278
		2:9-10	303

2:9	278	4:30	276
3:13	304	5:3	269, 307
3:19	278	5:14	269, 307
4:5	303	6:2	275
7	298		
7:7	270	Philippians	
7:10	298	3:15	304
7:12	298		
7:25	298	1 Thessalonians	
7:39–40	298	2:13	301
7:40	298	5:19–21	298
9:8	270		
9:8–9	270	2 Timothy	
14:6	298, 304	1:3	347
14:21	279	2:19	137
14:26	304	3:14–17	306
14:29–33	299	3:15	347
14:30	304	3:16	15, 267, 268 291, 292, 299, 306
14:34	270		
14:36	301	Hebrews	
15:3–4	300	4:7	124
15:3	277		
15:4	277	James	
15:25	300	1:19	137
15:45	307		
		Jude	
2 Corinthians		14–15	138
2:14–16	303		
2:17	301	Revelation	309, 310, 320–26
4:2	301	1:1	317, 318
4:10–11	303	1:3	316, 317
5:10	131, 303	1:9–20	317, 321
6:2	279	1:11	317, 318
6:17	279	1:14	318
6:18	279	1:19	317, 318
8:15	278	2–3	319, 320
9:9	278	2:14	319
12:1	304	2:18–29	319
12:7	304	4	322
		4:1–11	321
Galatians		4:6b	323
1:12	303	5:1–4	321
1:13–14	273	6:8	321
1:14	275	7:1–4	321
1:16	303	10:8–11	321
2:2	304	12:9	320
3:10	278	13:11	320
3:15–17	307	13:11–18	320
3:16	279	16:13	320
3:17	275	17	321
3:21	303	18	321
3:23	302	19:17–21	321
4:4	302	19:20	320
4:22	278	20:4–6	321
4:27	278	20:7–10	321
		20:10	320

21-22	311	22:18-19	15, 310, 311,
21:3	321		313, 314, 316
21:5-27	321	22:18	312, 314
21:9-22:5	322	22:20	317
21:22	322	22:20a	314
22:1-2	321		

3. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>Ahiqar (Aramaic)</i>	62, 65	<i>Apocalypse of Weeks</i>	144, 147,
1.1	61		151-54
<i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>		1	165, 166
10	317	1-5	151-53, 165
11:2	318	1:4	151, 165
Aristobulus	16	1:9	138
Fragment 1 Denis	301	2-5	151
Fragment 2 Denis	333	6-11	165
Fragments 2.3-4 Denis	338	6-36	152
Fragments 3-4 Denis	337	6:1-2	165
Baruch	137	12-36	146
1-5	134	12:4	148
6	137	14:8-16:8	317
Additions to Daniel		14:8-25	148
Prayer of Azariah	175	15:1	148
Bel and the Dragon	126, 134, 175	17-19	165
Song of the Three	126, 134, 175	17-36	148, 166
Young Men		17:1-18:5	165
Susanna	126, 134, 175	33:3-4	161, 170
<i>Apocalypse of Elijah</i>	303, 304	36:4	9, 148, 149
Demetrius		46:1	318
Fragments 3-4 Denis	339	72-80	148
<i>1 Enoch</i>	8, 32, 98,	81	146
	139, 141,	81:1	149
	143, 150,	81:2-3	9, 148, 149
	165, 166,	82:1	170
	168, 170,	83:11	9, 148, 149
	171, 249	85-90	148
<i>Book of Watchers</i>	8, 138, 143,	89:29-35	152
	146, 147,	90:26-27	152
	151-53, 170	90:40-42	9, 148, 149
<i>Book of Parables</i>	145, 146	91-105	146
<i>Astronomical Book</i>	8, 138, 143,	92:1	148
	144, 147,	93:6	151
	152, 153,	93:10	154
	158-60, 170	94:6-104:6	153
<i>Book of Dreams</i>	8, 138, 143,	98:4	152, 153
	147, 152	99:2	152
		99:10	152
		99:14	152
		104:9	152
		106-107	147
<i>Epistle of Enoch</i>	8, 138, 143,	<i>2 Enoch</i>	145, 146
	146, 147,	1-66	146
	151-53, 156		

67-73	146	§3	336
71-72	147	§5	336
<i>Epistle of Jeremiah</i>	8, 137	§28	336
		§30	336
<i>1 Esdras</i>	29, 127, 130,	§31	336
	132, 134	§45	347
1:39	339	§46	336
3:9	278	§121	56
		§§128-169	64
<i>4 Ezra</i>	29, 253, 257,	§§176-177	336
	258, 324, 325	§176	336
		§177	336, 338
Hecataeus of	63-64, 66	§302	315
Abdera		§305	56, 315
264 F 5	348	§307	315
264 F 23	336	§§310-311	314, 315
264 F 25	334	§312	337
<i>Jubilees</i>	1, 8, 31, 38,	§313	336
	43, 52, 63, 86,	§316	337
	138, 139, 143,	§317	336
	153, 156, 166,		
	170, 237, 249,	1-2 Maccabees	16, 134
	253		
		1 Maccabees	
1:4	139	1:56	345
1:9	139	3:48	338
1:11	165	4:36-58	345
1:13	165	4:42	345
1:14	139	7:11	346
1:26	139	7:12-16	346
2:23	131	7:33	67
4:17	148	12:6	346
4:17-18	148	12:9	119, 291, 339
4:17-22	9, 147	14:14	64
4:17-23	145	14:28	67
4:19	148	14:49	344
4:22	148	15:33-34	67
6:34	139		
7:38-39	8, 144, 168	2 Maccabees	29, 98
10:14	168	2:1-8	281
12:27	168	2:1	281
21:10	8, 144, 168	2:4-5	281, 282
21:13	169	2:13-14	129
23:16-32	154	2:13-15	119, 344
23:26	154	6:1	272
27:17	86	7:2	272
30-32	140	7:37	272
31:15	64	8:23	290, 338
50:13	139	15:9	119, 278
Judith	134	<i>4 Maccabees</i>	
		2:5	271
<i>L.A.B. 37</i>	188	4:23	272
		5:33	272
<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>	16, 25, 27, 64,	18:10	278
	66, 315, 336-38,	18:14	277, 347
	343, 345, 346		

Sirach	8, 41, 133, 134, 137, 141, 145	47 48:10 48:14–15 48:25 49 49:4 49:9 49:10 49:14 50:11–15 50:22–24 50:24 51:13–30	128 135, 136 120 135 59, 66, 69 137 130 127 8, 145 69 59 59 129, 135, 136
<i>Prologue</i>	55, 56, 60, 119, 130, 140, 273–74, 278, 342		
1–2	119		
8–10	119		
8–12	55		
24–25	119		
1–43	58		
4:11	37		
5:11	137		
6:34	68		
7:14	68		
9:15	137		
13:5b	136		
14:20–27	137		
18:33	136		
17:26	137		
19:17	137		
21:23	136		
23:23	137		
24	69		
24:10	69		
24:23	137		
27:9	136		
38–39	68		
38:24	62, 65		
38:24–39:11	62, 68		
38:32–39:11	62		
38:33	38		
39:1	134, 135, 137		
39:1–3	342		
39:1–4	58		
39:2–3	135, 136		
41:4	137		
41:8	137		
42:2	137		
44–50	58, 59		
44:20	137		
44:10	58		
44:16	8, 145		
45:17	64		
45:24–25	59, 60, 70		
45:25–26	59		
46:13	128		
		<i>Sibylline Oracles</i> 3.1	301
		<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	144
		<i>Testament of Benjamin</i> 9:1	158 144
		<i>Testament of Dan</i> 5:6	144
		<i>Testament of Jacob</i>	158
		<i>Testament of Joseph</i>	158
		<i>Testament of Judah</i> 18:1 23:1	158 144 165
		<i>Testament of Levi</i> 10:5 14:1 16:1	140 144 144 144
		<i>Testament of Naphtali</i> 4:1 5:8	144, 291 188, 291
		<i>Testament of Simeon</i> 5:4	144
		Tobit 1:6 (LXX) 14:4 (LXX VAT) 14:4 (LXX SIN)	8, 134, 158 278 163 163
		Wisdom of Solomon	134

4. DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND RELATED TEXTS

<i>Aramaic Levi Document</i>	8, 139, 155, 156, 158, 159, 162, 168, 169, 171	Bodleian b 16–17 7:4 7:5–7 7:7	139 169 169 169
----------------------------------	---	---	--------------------------

10:3	169	1Q9	250
10:5-7	169		
10:9	169	1Q16 (<i>IQpPs</i>)	129
10:9-10	169	1Q19bis	
10:10	168	2 2	182
<i>Damascus</i>	33, 45, 137, 194,	1Qap Gen ar	1, 156, 158, 166,
<i>Document (CD)</i>	201, 205, 206,	(<i>Genesis</i>	168, 170, 182
	223, 225	<i>Apocryphon</i>)	
1:5-6	45	6:11	182
1:7	67	14:17	182
1:10	45	12:17	182
1:15-17	152	19:7	180
1:19-20	131	19:14	182
2:13	181	19:25	145, 168
3:12-16	139	19:25-26	8
4:15-19	139	20:12	182
5:5	122	20:16	182
6:2	67, 68	21:2	182
6:2-3	67	21:10	182
6:7	64	21:17	182
7:14	47	21:20	182
7:14-18	4, 33, 57	22:15-16	182
7:15	34	22:21	182
7:15-16	336	22:21-22	178
7:17	34	22:31	180
7:18	34, 64		
10:6	57	1Q21 (<i>IQTLevi ar</i>)	158
11:18	139	1Q23-24	138, 158
11:20-21	130	(<i>IQEnGiants ar</i>)	
13:2	57	1Q27 (<i>Mysteries</i>)	39
14:3-5	69	1 ii 3	131
14:7	57	6 2-3	
16:1-2	139		
16:2-4	138	1QS (<i>Rule of the</i>	3, 11, 22, 137,
1QIsa ^a	88, 89	<i>Community</i>)	156, 193-95,
1QIsa ^b	88, 89		197-202, 205,
			206, 208, 224
1QpHab (<i>Peshet to</i>	12, 211, 220-23,	1:1-3	120
<i>Habakkuk</i>)	296	2:14	220
2:1-10	218	2:19-23	69
5:8-9	222	4:22	182
5:10	219	5	120, 195, 197,
6:8-12	220		199, 200
7:1-5	35, 269	5-9	196
7:1-8	212	5:1	197
7:4-5	47, 53	5:2-3	200
8	218	5:15	139
8:1-3	219	5:20-22	200
8:3-13	123	5:21-22	67
11	219, 220	6-7	199
11:2-3	219	6:7	56
11:2-8	221	6:8-9	69
11:8b-15	219	7-8	207
11:12-15	220	8:1	68

8:5-6	67	3Q12-13	158
8:14-16	120	3Q14	
8:15-9:11	200	4-9	158
8:26	199	4Q1 (4QGen-Exod ^d)	82
9:6	67	4Q2 (4QGen ^b)	82
9:11	200	4Q5 (4QGen ^e)	82
9:12	120	4Q8-8c (4QGen ^h)	81
10-11	196	4Q8b (4QGen ^{h-para})	81
10:12	182	4Q10 (4QGen ^k)	
11	195	5	81
1Q28a (1QSa)	195, 196, 198	4Q11 (4QpaleoGen-Exod ^l)	82
2:11	68	4Q13 (4QExod ^b)	82
2:11-21	69	4Q15 (4QExod ^d)	73
2:13-14	67	4Q16 (4QExod ^e)	82
1Q28b (1Qsb)	195, 196	4Q17 (4QExod-Lev ^f)	23, 82
1QM (War Scroll)		4Q22 (4QpaleoExod ^m)	23, 119
2:1-4	69	4Q23 (4QLev-Num ^a)	82
1QH ^a (Hodayot)	43, 44, 48, 50, 137, 209, 220, 222-24	4Q27 (4QNum ^b)	85
2:18	132	4Q29, 4Q30, 4Q35, 4Q38 ^{k1-3}	104
2:11	132	(4QDeut ^{b,c,h,k})	
3:17	132	4Q35 (4QDeut ^h)	88
4:9f.	221	4Q38a (4Q Deut ^{k2})	73
7:15-17	50	4Q44a	117
8:26	131	4Q47 (4QJosh ^a)	102-4
12:6-13:6	48	4Q51 (4QSam ^a)	25, 108, 119, 128, 132, 141
12:10-13	221	4Q53 (4QSam ^c)	22
12:12-13	219	4Q54 (4QKgs)	117
12:31	182	4Q54a	117
13:19	132	4Q70-72 (4QJer)	119
14:33	182	4Q73	234, 250
17:5	132	3 i	250
17:11	132	4Q74	251
1Q32 (1QNJ ar)	158, 166, 170	4Q75	251
1Q63-68	158	4Q76 (4QXII ^a)	127
1Q71-1Q72 (1QDan ^{a-b})	158, 175	4Q77 (4QXII ^b)	127
2Q3 (2QExod ^b)	73	4Q82 (4QXII ^g)	127
2Q16 (2QRuth ^a)	132	4Q89-90 (4QPs ^{g-h})	117
2Q17 (2QRuth ^b)	132	4Q101 (4QpaleoJob ^c)	130
2Q18 (2QSir)	134	4Q103 (4QProv ^b)	
2Q24 (2QNJ ar)	158, 166, 170	15	131
2Q26 (2QEnGiants ar)	138, 158	4Q104 (4QRuth ^a)	132
3Q1	250	4Q105 (4QRuth ^b)	132
3Q3 (3QLam)	132		
3Q5	237		

4Q106, 107 (4QCant ^{a,b})	77, 78, 87	4:26–27	41
4Q106 (4QCant ^a)	132	4Q173 (4QpPs ^b)	129
4Q107 (4QCant ^b)	132	4Q174 (4QFlor)	128, 191, 240
4Q108 (4QCant ^c)	132	1–2 i 11–12	64
4Q109 (4QQoh ^a)	131	1–2 i 14–ii 3	129
4Q110 (4QQoh ^b)	131	1–2 ii 7–13	128
4Q111 (4QLam)	132	1–2 ii 3	126
4Q112–4Q113	158	1–3 ii 3	175
4Q112–116 (4QDan ^{a–e})	175	4Q175 (4QTest)	22, 29, 84, 88, 119
4Q112 (4QDan ^a)	10, 175, 182, 191	1–8	22
4Q115 (4QDan ^d)	158	9–13	22
4Q117 (4QEzra)	132	10	182
4Q118 (4QChr)	132	14–20	23
4Q119 (4QLXXLev ^a)	137	21–30	23
4Q120 (4QpapLXXLev ^b)	137	4Q177 (4QCatena A)	128, 240
4Q121 (4QLXXNum)	27, 137	5–6+8 9	124
4Q122 (4QLXXDeut)	137	4Q178	
4Q124–125 (4QpaleoUnid)	130	12 1	175
4Q156 (4QtgLev)	158, 160, 166	4Q179 (4QapocrLam A)	132
1 6	181	4Q182 (4QCatena B)	
4Q157 (4QtgJob)	158, 160, 166	1 4	124
1 ii 8	182	4Q196–4Q199 (4QTob ar)	158
4Q163 (4QpIsa ^c)		4Q196	163
1 4	124	(4QpapTob ^a ar)	
4Q169 (4QpNah)	12, 211, 213, 215, 216	2 11	182
1–2 1	212	4Q198 (4QTob ^c ar)	
1–2 3	212	1	163
3–4 i 1–2	212	1 5–6	180
3–4 i 2	213	4Q199 (4QTob ^d ar)	134
3–4 i 3	213	4Q201–202 (4QEn ^{a–b} ar)	138, 158
3–4 i 5	213	4Q201–206 (4QEn ^{a–c} ar)	143
3–4 ii 1	214	4Q201 (4QEn ^a ar)	143
3–4 ii 4–6	214	i 6	180
3–4 ii 8	214	4Q203 (4QEnGiants ^a ar)	138, 158
3–4 iii 3	214	7 i 7	180
3–4 iii 6–7	214	8 4	62
3–4 iii 9	214	4Q204 (4QEn ^c ar)	
3–4 iv 3–4	215	1 vi 5	182
3–4 iv 5–6	215	1 xii 25–26	182
4Q171 (4QpPs ^a)	41, 46, 66, 129	5 ii 27	182
3:15–16	46	4Q204, 205 (4QEn ^{c,d} ar)	144
4:8–9	123	4Q204, 212 (4QEn ^{c,s} ar)	143

4Q204–207 (4QEn ^{e-f} ar)	138, 143, 158	4Q228 (4QWork with Citation of Jubilees)	139
4Q206 (4QEn ^e ar)		1 i 2	139
2–3	158	9–10	
2 ii 3	182	4Q242 (4QprNab ar)	140, 158, 173
3	138	1–3 2	182
4Q207 (4QEn ^f ar)		1–3 3	182
1 2	182	1–3 5	182
4Q208–211 (4QEnastr ar)	138, 143, 158	1–3 6	182
4Q208 (4QEnastr ^a ar)	143, 160	4Q243–244 (4QpsDan ^{a,b} ar)	186, 188–90
4Q209 (4QEnastr ^b ar)	143, 144	4Q243–245 (4QpsDan ^{a-c} ar)	156, 158, 167
23 5	181	4Q243–246 (4QpsDan)	32
23 7	181	4Q243 (4QpsDan ^a)	173
23 8	182	1 1	175
23 10	182	2 1	175
4Q210 (4QEnastr ^c ar)		2–3	191
1 ii 17	181	3	186
1 ii 19–20	182	3 2	186
4Q212 (4QEn ^g ar)	138, 158	5 1	175
1 ii 22	180	6 3	175
1 ii 23	148	11 ii	188
4Q213 (4QLevi ^a ar)	158	12	188
1 i 17	180	13	164
4Q213a (4QLevi ^b ar)	158	16 3	189
2 16	182	24 4	189
4Q213b (4QLevi ^c ar)	158	24 5	189
4Q214 (4QLevi ^d ar)	158	4Q244 (4QpsDan ^b)	173
2 9	180	1–4	191
4Q214a (4QLevi ^e ar)	158	4 2	175
2–3 ii 6	182	12	164
4Q214b (4QLevi ^f ar)	158	4Q245 (4QpsDan ^c)	10, 156, 167, 173
5–6 i 2	182	1 i 3	175
4Q219 (4QJub ^d)		4Q246 (4QapocrDan ar)	158, 167, 173, 184, 190
2:21	182	1	186, 187, 190
2:25	182	174, 188	
4Q221 (4QJub ^f)		1:3	180
1 1	182	1:6	189, 190
2:29	182	1:8	180
1 5	182	2	173, 182
2:32	182	2:1	182
1 6	182	2:2–3	189
7 7	182	2:3	180
4Q222 (4QJub ^g)		2:4	180
1 4	182	2:5	189
4Q225–227 (4QpsJub)	8, 31, 32, 138	2:6	180
4Q227 (4QpsJub ^e)	8	2:8	186
2 1–4	144		

4Q247 (<i>4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks</i>)	8, 38, 144	4Q158, 4Q364–367 (<i>4QRP</i>)	6, 7, 73, 74, 76–81, 84–87, 90, 91, 203
4Q255–264 ^a (<i>4QS</i>)	194, 195	4Q158 (<i>4QRP^a</i>)	6, 74, 78, 81–84, 90, 141
4Q256 (<i>4QS^b</i>)	195–200	6	83, 88
XXIII	195	6–8	83
4Q258 (<i>4QS^d</i>)	195–200	7–8	83
1:1	197	14	75, 76
1:2	200	4Q364 (<i>4QRP^b</i>)	6, 80, 82–84, 90
2:1–2	200	3	86
9:12	182	3 ii	85
11:15	182	3 ii 2	86
4Q259 (<i>4QS^c</i>)	120, 200	3 ii 7–8	84
4Q262 (<i>4QS^b</i>)	195	5b ii	85
4Q264 (<i>4QSⁱ</i>)	195, 196	14 1–2	84
1 3	182	14 3	90
4Q265 (<i>4QMiscellaneous Rules</i>)	194, 201	15 3–4	84
4Q266 (<i>4QD^a</i>)	33	23a–b i	76
2 ii 13	181	11–2	83
4Q268 (<i>4QD^c</i>)		4Q364–365 (<i>4QRP^{b-c}</i>)	79, 86
2 ii 5	138	4Q364–367 (<i>4QRP^{b-c}</i>)	73, 74, 77, 78, 81, 82, 141
4Q270 (<i>4QD^c</i>)	57	4Q365 (<i>4QRP^c</i>)	6, 82, 83, 85, 90, 338
2 ii 21	122	6a ii + c	75, 76, 85, 90
10 ii 17	138	23	75, 76, 86
4Q282 ^{h-i}	132	23	75
4Q291 (<i>4QWork Containing Prayers A</i>)		23 10–11	86
1 3	182	23 9–11	76
4Q298 (<i>4QcryptA Address of the Maskil to the Sons of Dawn</i>)	196	28	85
4Q299 (<i>4QMyst^a</i>)		36	85
3a ii 3–4	131	4Q366 (<i>4QRP^d</i>)	6, 82, 83, 85
4Q300 (<i>4QMyst^b</i>)	131	2	85
4Q318 (<i>4QZodiology and Brontology ar</i>)	159	4Q367 (<i>4QRP^c</i>)	6, 79, 82, 83, 85
4Q339 (<i>4QList of False Prophets ar</i>)	159	85	85
4Q342 (<i>4QLetter ar</i>)	158	22	85
4Q345–347	158	4Q378–379 (<i>4QapocrJoshua</i>)	23, 31
4Q351–352a	158	4Q378	
4Q353–359	158	(<i>4QapocrJoshua^a</i>)	
4Q360a	158	26 1	182
		26 3	182
		26 4	182
		4Q379 (<i>4QapocrJoshua^b</i>)	
		18 6	182

4Q383–391 (<i>4QapocrJer</i> <i>and/or psEzek</i>)	32	4Q438 (<i>4QBarkhi Nafshi^a</i>)	6 2 182
4Q383–390 (<i>4QapocrJer</i>)	38, 231, 237	4Q448 (<i>4QApocr. Psalm and Prayer</i>)	A 4b–10 125
4Q384 (<i>4Qpap apocrJer B?</i>)	32	4Q457b (<i>4QEschatological Hymn</i>)	2:3 182 2:7 182
4Q385–386, 388, 391 (<i>psEzek</i>)	13, 190, 228–32, 236–40, 242–49	4Q461 (<i>4Q Narrative B</i>)	2 66 3 3 182
4Q385		4Q482 (<i>4QpapJub?</i>)	1 1 182 8 2 182
2 10	188	4Q483 (<i>4QpapGen^a</i>)	138
4	245, 246	4Q488 (<i>4QpapApocryphon ar</i>)	158
4 1–7	246	4Q489 (<i>4QpapApocalypse ar</i>)	158 1 2 182
4 4	246	4Q490 (<i>4QpapFragments ar</i>)	158
4 4–5	246	4Q491 (<i>4QM^a</i>)	14–15 7 182 17 4 129
4 6	246	4Q492 (<i>4QM^b</i>)	1 13 182
4 7	239	4Q501 (<i>4QapocrLam B</i>)	132
6	236, 238	4Q521 (<i>4QMessianic Apocalypse</i>)	2 iii 1–2 136
6 3	250	4Q522 (<i>4QapocrJosh^c?</i>)	117
4Q385b		4Q525 (<i>4QBeatitudes</i>)	137 2 ii 137 2–3 ii 4 182 25 4 136
1	231	4Q529 (<i>Words of Michael</i>)	38, 158 1 184 1 11–14 164 1 15 164
1–2	239	4Q530–533 (<i>4QEnGiants ar</i>)	138, 158
4Q391 (<i>4QpapPsEzek^c</i>)	32	4Q530 (<i>4QEnGiants^b ar</i>)	2 ii + 6–12 14 62, 65
4Q394–399 (<i>4QMMT</i>)	8, 34, 126, 225, 342	4Q534–536 (<i>4QBirth of Noah ar</i>)	158
C	140	4Q534 (<i>4QBirth of Noah^a ar</i>)	1 i 5 140
C 8–15	123		
C 10	34, 56, 121, 123, 129, 130, 225		
C 10–11	8		
C 18–35	125		
C 27–28	123		
C 30	123		
4Q397 (<i>4QMMT^d</i>)	34		
14–21 9–10	121		
14–21 9–11	123		
14–21 10	8, 34, 121, 123		
14–21 11	122		
17	121		
17 1	123		
4Q398 (<i>4QMTT^e</i>)			
14–17 i 2	121		
14–17 i 4	121		
4Q415–418, 423 (<i>4QInstruction</i>)	39, 137, 150		
4Q422 (<i>4QParaphrase of Gen and Exod</i>)	2:9 182		
4Q434 (<i>4QBarkhi Nafshi^a</i>)			
2 10	182		

4Q537 (4QTJacob? ar)	158	4Q557 (4QVision ^c ar)	158
4Q538 (4QTJud ar)	158	4Q558 (4QVision ^b ar)	158
4Q539 (4QTJoseph ar)	158, 178	3 1	180
4Q540–4Q541 (apocrLevi? ar)	158	51 ii 4	136, 164
4Q542 (4QTQahat ar)	140, 158, 168	63 2	181
1 ii 9–13	140	65 2	182
4Q543–549 (4QVisions of Amram ar)	38, 140, 156, 158, 171	88 3	182
4Q544 (4QVisions of Amram ^b ar)		4Q558a	158
1 4	186	4Q559 (4QpapBibChronology ar)	158, 159
1 13	181	4Q560 (4QMagical Booklet ar)	158–59
4Q545 (4QVisions of Amram ^c ar)		4Q561 (4QHor ar)	159
1 ii 19	186	4Q562	158
4Q546 (4QVisions of Amram ^d ar)		7 1–2	163
6 5	182	4Q563 (Wisdom Composition)	158, 159
4Q547 (4QVisions of Amram ^e ar)		4Q564	158
4 8	181, 183	4Q565 (4QVision ^c ? ar)	158
4Q550 (4QPrEsther ^a ar)	133, 140, 158, 167	4Q566 (4QProphecy ^c ? ar)	158
5 + 5 ^a 4	180	4Q567	158
7 + 7 ^a 1	182	4Q568 (4QProphecy ^d ar)	158
4Q550c (4QPrEsther ^d ar)		4Q569 (4QProverbs ar)	158, 159
1 i 1	180	4Q570	158, 167
4Q551 (4QAccount/Story ar)	158	4Q571 (4QWords of Michael ar)	158, 164 164
4Q552–553 (4QFour Kingdoms)	10, 11, 158, 170, 173–91	4Q572–574	158
4Q552 (4QFour Kingdoms ^a)	158	4Q575a	158
1 ii 10	180	4Q583 (4QProphecy ^c)	160
1 i + 2 10	181	1 1–2	164
4Q553 (4QFour Kingdoms ^b)	158	1 3	164
4Q553a (4QFour Kingdoms ^c)	158	1 4	164
4Q554–555 (NJ ar)	38, 156, 166, 170	4Q584a-x	158
4Q554 (4QNJ ^a ar)	158	4Q585a-z	158
4Q554a (4QNJ ^b ar)	158	4Q586a-n	158
4Q555 (4QNJ ^c ar)	158	4Q587+XQ6	158
4Q556–556a (4QProphecy ^{a-b})	167, 170	5Q1 (5QDeut)	27
4Q556 (4QProphecy ^a)	158	5Q5 (5QPs)	117
1 7	163	5Q6 (5QLam ^a)	132
4Q556a (4QProphecy ^b)	158, 163	5Q7 (5QLam ^b)	132

5Q15 (5QNJ <i>ar</i>)	158, 166	11Q10 (11QtgJob)	130, 158,
5Q24	158	38:1-2	160, 166
6Q6 (6QCant)	132	11Q11 (11QapocrPs)	185
6Q7 (6QpapDan)	175	6:3	129
6Q8 (6QpapGiants <i>ar</i>)	158	11Q13 (11QMelch)	182
7+4+10	138	2:9-11	187, 191
6Q19 (6QGen? <i>ar</i>)	158	2:18	129
6Q20 (6QDeut?)	73	11Q14 (11QSM)	126, 175
6Q23 (6QWords of Michael <i>ar</i>)	158	1 ii 4	182
7Q1 (7QpapLXXExod)	137	1 ii 7	182
7Q2 (7QpapEpJer <i>gr</i>)	137	11Q18 (11QNJ <i>ar</i>)	38, 156, 158,
6:43-44	137	18 2	166, 170
7Q4 (7QpapEn <i>gr</i>)	146	11Q19 (11QT ^a)	182
1-2	138	31, 32, 43,	52, 76, 81,
7Q8, 11-14	138	86, 249, 296	86
7Q19	137	24	86
1	137	51-66	75
11Q4	234, 251	11Q20 (11QT ^b)	73
11Q5 (11QPs ^a)	66, 77, 104,	11:21-24	90
18	117, 129	11Q22	158
21:11-22:1	125	11Q24	11Q29 (11QFragment related to Serekh ha-Yahad)
27	135-37	XQpapEnoch	143
27:2	77, 129	Mur 1 (Gen)	82, 338
27:2-3	65	Sdeir 1 (Gen)	82
27:2-4	62	Mas 1c (Deut)	82
27:2-11	121	Mas 1d (Ezek)	234, 235, 251
27:4-5	129	Mas 1h (Sir)	134
27:11	125	Mas 1j (Jub/psJub)	138
	121		

5. JOSEPHUS AND PHILO

Josephus	16, 102, 273,	1:38-41	136
	286	1:38-43	127
<i>Life</i>		1:40	127
135	272	1.42	55
418	341	1.54	348
<i>Against Apion</i>	26	1.91	334
1.29	57	1.127	348
1.37-40	287	1.175	61
1.37-43	94	1.228	348
1.38	26	2.45	290
1:38-40	132	2.143	272

<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>			
1.13	348	12.146	272
1.26	341	12.240	272
1.82	341	12.256	345
1.139	341	12.267	272
2.347	341	12.300	272
3.38	292, 341, 344	12.322	175
3.81	341	12.381	272
3.105	341	12.382	272
4.71	272	12.396–397	346
4.130	272	13.167–168	348
4.303–304	292	13.297	273
4.303	341	13.372–416	213
4.304	341, 344	14.57	215
4.326	341	14.79	215
5.16–20	102	14.124	215
5.59	102	14.235	272
5.61	292, 341, 344	14.242	272
5.68–70	102	16.163	272
5.108	272	16.164	340
5.285	128	16.365	272
5.347	128	17.149	272
7.130	272	17.150	272
7.131	272	18.16	342
7.374	272	18.84	272
8.362	272	18.236	272
9.28	341	18.264	272
9.46	341	18.280	272
9.243	272	19.301	272
9.281	278	19.349	272
10.11	272	20.115–117	346
10.13	282	20.218	272
10.35	230	20.265	348
10.57–58	344		
10.58	341	<i>Jewish War</i>	
10.63	341	1.108	272
10.79	230	1.209	272
10.214	272	1.650	272
10.245–249	127	1.653	272
10.266–267	175	2.7	272
10.266–269	127	2.86	272
10.267	175, 230	2.159	338
11.110	272	2.192	272
11.128	346	2.229–231	346
11.140	272	2.393	272
11.154–155	344	3.356	272
11.231	272	6.334	272
11.329	67	7.121–157	339
11.329–339	67	7.162	339
11.337	344	7.357	272
11.338	272	Philo	16, 288, 293
12.113	337	<i>On the Life of Abraham</i>	
12.136	67	5	261
12.142	63, 272, 346	6	258, 259
		16	261

156	340	1.57	283
177	340	1.158–159	260
258	340	1.207	286
<i>On the Eternity of the World</i> 19	340	1.294	283, 197
		2.11	262, 340
		2.14	262
<i>On the Cherubim</i>		2.29–41	315
124	340	2.36	340
49	293	2.45	340
<i>On the Confusion of Tongues</i> 143	285, 293	2.48	264
		2.51–52	262
<i>On the Contemplative Life</i>		2.59	340
78	348	2.84	341
90	256	2.96	340
25	126	2.188	293–97, 340
		2.187–191	288
<i>On the Decalogue</i>		2.187	295
1	340	2.190	295
155	340	2.191	294, 296
		2.192–245	288
<i>That the Worse Attacks the Better</i>		2.246–287	289
86	286	2.246	289, 295
159	271	2.288–292	289
161	340	2.288	256
<i>That God Is Unchangeable</i>		2.290	283, 348
62	285	2.292	297, 348
99	271		
<i>On Drunkenness</i>		<i>On the Change of Names</i>	
84	272	7	285
208	340	39	294
		139	294
<i>On Flight and Finding</i>		<i>On the Creation of the World</i>	
55–56	286	3	264
		8	286
<i>On Giants</i> 195	348	<i>On Planting</i>	
<i>Who Is the Heir?</i>		36	285
159	277	63	294
258	340	<i>On the Posterity of Cain</i>	
<i>Hypothetica</i> 195	272	158	340
		169	286
<i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>		<i>On Rewards and Punishments</i>	
1.22	262	79	348
1.92	256, 257	95	287
959b	271	<i>That Every Good Person Is Free</i> 80	272
<i>On the Embassy to Gaius</i> 347	283	<i>Questions and Answers on Exodus frg. 14</i>	272
<i>On the Migration of Abraham</i>		<i>On the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel</i> 6	259
14	290, 341	<i>On Sobriety</i> 17	340
85	287		
<i>On the Life of Moses</i>	287, 291, 293		
1.23	348		
1.48	259		

<i>On Dreams</i>		2.259	348
1.207	285	4.39	294
2.221	294	4.175	340
<i>On the Special Laws</i>		<i>On the Virtues</i>	
1.315	283	34	340
2.13	272	63	283
2.151	340	95	340
2.238	348	201	340

6. MISHNAH, TALMUD, TARGUMIC AND OTHER RABBINIC AND RELATED TEXTS

'Abot 1:1	94	<i>b. Yebamot</i> 63b	136
<i>b. Baba Batra</i>		<i>Tg.</i> (2 Kgs 23:2)	65
14a	133	<i>Tg. Ps.-J</i> (Gen 15:12)	188
14b	99, 129, 130,	<i>Mekilta</i> 7	104
	231	<i>Qohelet Rabbah</i> 1:12	104
14b–15a	132	<i>Sipre</i> 64	104
<i>b. Baba Qamma</i> 92b	136	<i>Soperim</i>	
<i>b. Berakot</i> 7a	133	3:8–9	89
<i>b. Ḥagigah</i> 13a	136	3:14	89
<i>b. Megillah</i> 7a	133	3:17	89
<i>b. Niddah</i> 16b	136	4	90
<i>b. Nazir</i> 9:5	128	5	90
<i>m. 'Orlah</i> 3:9	65	<i>Yalquṭ Šimoni</i>	99
<i>Pesaḥim</i> 6b	104	'Oklah we- Oklah	99
<i>b. Qiddušin</i> 30a	65	Abarbanel (Josh 1:10)	104
<i>m. Soṭah</i> 9:15	65	R. David Kimchi	
<i>y. Soṭah</i> 7:3	103	(Josh 3:1)	104
<i>b. Šabbat</i>	261–62	R. Isaiah of Trani	
<i>m. Yebamot</i> 2:4	65	(Josh 2:22)	104
9:3	65	Malbim (Josh 1:10)	104
		Rashi (Josh 2:1)	104

7. EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

Nag Hammadi		Athanasius	
II.5	335	<i>Festal Letters</i> 39	351
II.110:30	335	Athenagoras	
II.112:12	335	<i>Legatio pro Christianis</i>	
III.2	335	4.1	332
III.69.19–20	335	Cassiodorus	
VI.6	335	<i>Institutiones</i>	
VI.63.17	335	1.12.3	354
<i>Apocalypse of Paul</i>	325	1.14.2	354
<i>Gospel of Mary</i>	325	40.6–7	354

- | | | | |
|--|----------|--|--|
| Chrysostom | | | |
| <i>Homiliae</i> 19.14 | 352 | | |
| Clement of Alexandria | | | |
| <i>Stromata</i> | | | |
| 1.3.24.4 | 350 | | |
| 1.21.131.5 | 333 | | |
| 2.23.144.4 | 350 | | |
| 3.5.42.5 | 350 | | |
| 6.17.149.2 | 350 | | |
| Cyprian | | | |
| <i>The Lord's Prayer</i> | | | |
| 5 | 354 | | |
| 8 | 354 | | |
| 32 | 354 | | |
| <i>The Dress of Virgins</i> 10 | 354 | | |
| <i>The Lapsed</i> | | | |
| 7 | 354 | | |
| 15 | 354 | | |
| 21 | 354 | | |
| <i>Mortality</i> | | | |
| 9 | 354 | | |
| 23 | 354 | | |
| <i>The Unity of the Catholic Church</i> | | | |
| 7 | 354 | | |
| Epiphanius | 231 | | |
| <i>Refutation of All Heresies</i> 1.9.2 | 342 | | |
| Eusebius of Caesarea | | | |
| <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> | | | |
| 4.26.13–14 | 127 | | |
| 5.24.7 | 350 | | |
| 6.16.3 | 118 | | |
| 7.15.4 | 351 | | |
| <i>Preparation for the Gospel</i> | | | |
| 9.29.1 | 339 | | |
| 9.29.15 | 339 | | |
| 13.12.4 | 333 | | |
| 13.14.1 | 283 | | |
| Irenaeus | | | |
| <i>Against Heresies</i> | | | |
| 2.21.1–2 | 101 | | |
| Jerome | 130 | | |
| <i>Commentariorum in Matthaeum libri IV</i> | | | |
| 2.6 | 352 | | |
| 22.31 | 342 | | |
| <i>Epistulae</i> | | | |
| 32.1 | 101 | | |
| 53.8 | 127 | | |
| 60.11 | 352 | | |
| <i>Prologus Galeatus</i> | 127, 130 | | |
| Justin | | | |
| <i>Dialogue with Tryphon</i> | | | |
| 71:2 | 101 | | |
| 72:1 | 101 | | |
| 72:4 | 101 | | |
| Lactantius | | | |
| <i>Epitome of the Divine Institutes</i> 44.1 | 354 | | |
| <i>The Divine Institutes</i> | | | |
| 4.5.8–10 | 354 | | |
| 5.2.14 | 354 | | |
| 7.14.7 | 354 | | |
| Melito of Sardis | | | |
| <i>Homilies</i> 62–64 | 99 | | |
| Origen | | | |
| <i>Against Celsus</i> | | | |
| 1.49 | 342 | | |
| 2.1–4 | 272 | | |
| 2.25–43 | 272 | | |
| 4.44 | 350 | | |
| 5.54 | 138 | | |
| 7.12 | 350 | | |
| <i>Comm. Dan.</i> 1.31.3 | 350 | | |
| <i>Commentarii in evangelium Joannis</i> | | | |
| 1.15.86 | 350 | | |
| 5.6.1.1 | 350 | | |
| 6.217 | 138 | | |
| <i>Commentarium in evangelium Matthaei</i> | | | |
| 17.29 | 342 | | |
| 17.35–36 | 342 | | |
| 28 | 99 | | |
| <i>Homiliae in Numeros</i> 28.2 | 138 | | |
| <i>Prayer</i> 23.5 | 350 | | |
| <i>Philocalia</i> | 350 | | |
| <i>First Principles</i> | | | |
| 1.3.2 | 138 | | |
| 4.4.8 | 138 | | |
| 4.3.5 | 350 | | |
| Pamphylus of Caesarea | | | |
| <i>Apology</i> | 97 | | |
| Pseudo-Cyprian | | | |
| <i>Against the Jews</i> | 98 | | |
| 25 | 99 | | |
| Tertullian | | | |
| <i>Apology</i> 39 | 354 | | |
| <i>Baptism</i> 18 | 354 | | |
| <i>The Flesh of Christ</i> 20.1 | 354 | | |
| <i>Idolatry</i> 1.2 | 354 | | |
| <i>On Fasting, against the Physics</i> | | | |
| 6.2 | 354 | | |

9	354	<i>Antidote for the</i>	
<i>Monogamy</i> 4.4	353	<i>Scorpion's Sting</i> 8.3	99
<i>Prayer</i> 22	354	<i>The Shows</i> 3	354
<i>Against Praxeas</i>		<i>The Veiling of</i>	
2.1	353	<i>Virgins</i> 16.1	353
17.2	353		

8. GREEK AND ROMAN PAGAN TEXTS

Acusilaus	330	Athenaeus	
Aelian		<i>Deipnosophists</i>	273
<i>Varia historia</i>		3.52	273
4.1	271	3.97	273
4.7	271	6.106	272
Aelius Aristides		15.6	272
8.29	334	Bolus	
<i>Παναθηναϊκός</i> 125	271	<i>Physica et mystica</i>	292
<i>Ῥοδίου περὶ</i>		2.43.2–3	
<i>ὁμονοίας</i> 567	272	Cassius Dio 54.9.10	272
Aeschines		Chrysippus 475	301
<i>Against Timarchus</i> 13	271	Cicero	263, 274
Alexander Polyhistor	339	<i>De officiis</i> 3.69	274, 275
Antiphon		Clidemus	333
<i>In novercam</i> 2	277	Cratinus	
Apollonius Dyscolus		116	272
<i>De constructione</i> 2.2.155	300	210	359
Appian		Curtius Rufus	
<i>Civil Wars</i>		<i>History of Alexander</i>	
2.7.47	272	<i>the Great</i>	97
2.10.63	272	Demon 10	282
3.7.44	272	Demosthenes	
5.13.128	272	18.259	331
<i>Mith.</i> 279	272	<i>Against Aristocrates</i> 24	278
Apsines		<i>Against Androtion</i>	
<i>Ars rhetorica</i> 372	271	6	271
Aristophanes	329	20	271
506	329	<i>I Against Boeotos</i> 12	271
<i>Birds</i>	330	<i>Against Meidias</i> 52	272
V.394	359	Dio Chrysostom	
Aristotle		<i>Orationes</i> 64.12	301
<i>Constitution of</i>		Diogenes Laertius 9.6	344
<i>Athens</i> 29.3	272	Diodorus Siculus	97
<i>Divisiones</i> 50	301	1.44.4	290, 334
<i>Politics</i> 1268b	272	1.49.3	334
<i>Rhetoric</i> 1375b18	271	1.70.9	290, 334
Arrian		1.73.4	290, 334
<i>Anabasis</i> 3.16.9	272	1.82.3	290, 334

1.95.5	290, 334	Isaeus	
1.96.2	290, 334	<i>De Pyrrho</i> 68	271
14.13.3	282	Isocrates	
14.65.2	272	<i>Aegineticus</i>	
16.24.5	272	19.5–6	329
17.110.5	272	19.45	329
34/35.1.4	290	<i>Panegyricus</i> 55	272
40.2	69	<i>Panathenaicus</i> 169	272
40.2.1	272	Julianus	
Dionysus of Halicarnassus		<i>Epistulae</i> 89b 377	272
<i>Ancient History of Rome</i>	97	Julius Africanus	
1.49.3	283	apud Syncellus	334
2.65.3	272	Lucian	
4.84.5	272	<i>Phalaris</i> 2.9	272
10.1.4.3	353	Manetho	
11.62.3.8	353	609 F 3b	334
12.16.4	272	609 F 8	334
15.9.6	272	609 T 9	334
Eupolis		Martial 1.2.3	348
218	359	Menander 783 F 1	348
Euripides		Nicolaus 68	283
376.1	359	<i>Orphic Fragments</i> (OF)	
627	329	29	333
<i>Hippolytos</i> 954	330	31 III	332
<i>Madness of Hercules</i> 865	359	43	331
<i>Daughters of Troje</i> 6	359	45	331
Galen		57–59	332
<i>Comp. med.</i> 13.995.12	300	376	333
<i>In Hip. med. off.</i>		398	333
18b.713.6	300	406	333
18b.888.18	300	433 I	332
Heliodorus		557	332
<i>Aethiopica</i>		627	330
2.28.2	335	650	331
3.8.1	335	Pherecrates 69	359
Herodotus		Philo of Byblos 790 F 1	344
<i>Histories</i>		Philostratus	
2.48.3	332	<i>Epistulae</i> 1.5	272
2.51.4	331	Plato	
2.62.2	331	<i>Critias</i> 120b	272
2.81.2	331	<i>Epistulae</i> 7.335a	332
3.82	272	<i>Epinomis</i> 985d	272
Homer		<i>Laws</i>	270
<i>Iliad</i>		4.715e	332
VIII.193	359	680a	272
XIII.407	359	793a	272
XXIII.761	359	959b	272
Hyperides		<i>Meno</i> 80e	258
<i>Adversus Athenogenem</i>			
6.6	271		
7.6.11	329		

<i>Republic</i>	270	15.1.64	272
451b	270	17.3.24	272
604b	271		
Plotinus		Suetonius	
<i>Enneades</i> 3.2.9	271	<i>Vespasianus</i> 4.5	287
Plutarch	290	Tacitus	
<i>Alexander</i> 69.8	272	<i>Histories</i>	97
<i>Aristides</i> 15.4	283	5.13	287
<i>De defectu oraculorum</i>		Thales 1	277
416C	272	Theodectas	
436F	272	72 T 3	337
<i>Lysander</i> 25.2	283	72 T 17	337
<i>Pelopidas</i> 20.7	283	Theophilus	
<i>De sera numinis</i>		<i>To Autolytus</i>	
<i>vindicta</i> 558D	301	2.6.32	334
<i>Sertorius</i> 22.5	272	2.10	350
Polyaenus		2.13	350
<i>Strategemata</i> 1.16.1	282	2.18	350
Polybius	97	2.19	350
Porphry		2.21	350
<i>De abstinentia</i> 4.22	272	2.22	350
Posidonius 87 F 109	345	2.24	350
Pseudo-Manetho		Theophrastus	
609 F 25	335	<i>Phys. Op.</i> 1	277
<i>Apotelesmata</i> 5.1	335	Thucydides	
Seneca		<i>Hist.</i>	
<i>De brevitae vitae</i> 13.4	348	2.34.1	272
Sextus Empiricus		4.118.1–3	272
<i>Against the</i>		8.76.6	272
<i>Mathematicians</i>		Varro apud Nonius	348
11.166	272	Vettius Valens	
Sextus Iulius Africanus	97	<i>Anthologies</i> 1.1	282
Sophocles		Xenocrates 222	272
474.5	359	Xenophon	
<i>Ajax</i>		<i>Anabasis</i>	
548–549	272	2.3.2	272
Strabo		5.2.14	272
<i>Geography</i>		6.5.7	272
17.1.5	348	7.8.5	272
		Zosimus apud Syncellus	336

9. PAPYRI AND INSCRIPTIONS			
Papyrus 967	230, 234, 235, 237, 242–45, 247, 249	<i>Oriens Graecae Inscriptiones Selectae</i> 56.70	334, 335
		<i>PGM</i>	
		III.424	335
Berliner griechische Urkunden (BGU)		XIII.3	335
6.12.1	333	XIII.15–16	335
<i>Chester Beatty</i>		XIII.231–233	335
1	351	XIII.341–342	335
185	231	XXIVa.1–2	335
<i>Chigiano</i>		<i>Papiri della Società Italiana (PSI)</i>	
R VII 60 manuscript	97	1149	334
<i>Derveni Papyrus</i>		<i>Suppl. Mag.</i>	
col. XXII. 7–8	333	72.i.2–3	335
<i>Fouad</i>		<i>Vindob. G. 31974</i>	351
266b	27		
266c	27		

SUPPLEMENTS
TO THE
JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM

50. YARBRO COLLINS, A. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10587 5
51. MENN, E. *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis. Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10630 8
52. NEUSNER, J. *Jerusalem and Athens. The Congruity of Talmudic and Classical Philosophy*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10698 7
53. NAJMAN, H. *Past Renewals: Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*. 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18046 8
54. COLLINS, J. J. *Seers, Sibyls & Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10752 5
55. BAUMGARTEN, A.I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10751 7
56. SCOTT, J.M. (ed.). *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10676 6
57. HENTEN, J.-W. VAN. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People. A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10976 5
58. FELDMAN, L.H. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10839 4
59. MORRAY-JONES, C.R.A. *A Transparent Illusion. The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism: A Source-Critical and Tradition-Historical Inquiry*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11337 1
60. HALPERN-AMARU, B. *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11414 9
61. HENZE, M. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar. The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11421 1
62. VANDERKAM, J.C. *From Revelation to Canon. Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Tempel Literature*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11557 9
63. NEWMAN, C.C., J.R. DAVILA & G.S. LEWIS (eds.). *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11361 4
64. LIESEN, J.W.M. *Full of Praise. An Exegetical Study of Sir 39,12-35*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11359 2
65. BEDFORD, P.R. *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11509 9
66. RUITEN, J.T.A.G.M. VAN. *Primaeval History Interpreted. The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the book of Jubilees*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11658 3

67. HOFMANN, N.J. *Die Assumptio Mosis*. Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11938 8
68. HACHLILI, R. *The Menorah, the Ancient Seven-armed Candelabrum*. Origin, Form and Significance. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12017 3
69. VELTRI, G. *Gegenwart der Tradition*. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11686 9
70. DAVILA, J.R. *Descenders to the Chariot*. The People behind the Hekhalot Literature. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11541 2
71. PORTER, S.E. & J.C.R. DE ROO (eds.). *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11609 5
72. SCOTT, J.M. (ed.). *Restoration*. Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11580 3
73. TORIJANO, P.A. *Solomon the Esoteric King*. From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11941 8
74. KUGEL, J.L. *Shem in the Tents of Japhet*. Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12514 0
75. COLAUTTI, F.M. *Passover in the Works of Josephus*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12372 5
76. BERTHELOT, K. *Philanthrôpia judaica*. Le débat autour de la "misanthropie" des lois juives dans l'Antiquité. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12886 7
77. NAJMAN, H. *Seconding Sinai*. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11542 0
78. MULDER, O. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50*. An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12316 4
79. BURKES, S.L. *God, Self, and Death*. The Shape of Religious Trans for mation in the Second Temple Period. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12954 5
80. NEUSNER, J. & A.J. AVERY-PECK (eds.). *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective*. An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning (2 vols.). 2003. ISBN 90 04 12987 1 (set)
81. COBLENTZ BAUTCH, K. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19*. "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen". 2003. ISBN 90 04 13103 5
82. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F., & G.P. LUTTIKHUIZEN. *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome*. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13584 7
83. NAJMAN, H. & J.H. NEWMAN (eds.). *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation*. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13630 4
84. ATKINSON, K. *I Cried to the Lord*. A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13614 2
85. AVERY-PECK, A.J., D. HARRINGTON & J. NEUSNER. *When Judaism and Christianity Began*. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13659 2 (Set), ISBN 90 04 13660 6 (Volume I), ISBN 90 04 13661 4 (Volume II)

86. DRAWNEL, H. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran. A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13753 X
87. BERTHELOT, K. *L'humanité de l'autre homme» dans la pensée juive ancienne*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13797 1
88. BONS, E. (ed.) *«Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice ...»*. Recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13677 0
89. CHAZON, E.G., D. SATRAN & R. CLEMENTS (eds.). *Things Revealed. Studies in Honor of Michael E. Stone*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13885 4
90. FLANNERY-DAILEY, F. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests. Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 12367 9
91. SCOTT, J.M. *On Earth as in Heaven. The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13796 3
92. RICHARDSON, P. *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14131 6
93. BATSCH, C. *La guerre et les rites de guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13897 8
94. HACHLILI, R. *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 12373 3
95. BAKHOS, C. *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13871 4
97. NEUSNER, J. *Contours of Coherence in Rabbinic Judaism*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14231 2 (Set), ISBN 90 04 14436 6 (Volume I), ISBN 90 04 14437 4 (Volume II)
98. XERAVITS, G.G. & J. ZSENGELLÉR (eds.). *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20-21 May, 2004. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14376 9
99. ROSENFELD, B-Z. & J. MENIRAV (Translated from the Hebrew by Chava Cassel). *Markets and Marketing in Roman Palestine*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14049 2
100. COLLINS, J.J. *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture. Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14438 2
101. NEUSNER, J. *Rabbinic Categories. Construction and Comparison*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14578 8
102. SIVERTSEV, A.M. *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14447 1
103. BEYERLE, S. *Gottesvorstellungen in der antik-jüdischen Apokalyptik*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13116 7
104. SIEVERS, J. & G. LEMBI (eds.). *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14179 0
105. DAVILA, J.R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha. Jewish, Christian, or Other?* 2005. ISBN 90 04 13752 1

106. BAKHOS, C. (ed.) *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13870 6
107. FELDMAN, L.H. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14906 6
108. BRUTTI, M. *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period*. History, Ideology, Theology. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14910 4
109. VELTRI, G. *Libraries, Translations, and "Canonic" Texts*. The Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14993 7
110. RODGERS, Z. (ed.) *Making History*. Josephus and Historical Method. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15008 0
111. HEMPEL, C. & J. M. LIEU (eds.) *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb. 2006. ISBN 90 04 13997 4
112. GRAPPE, Ch. & J.-C. INGELAERE (éds.) *Le Temps et les Temps dans les littératures juives et chrétiennes au tournant de notre ère*. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15058 7
113. CAPPELLETTI, S. *The Jewish Community of Rome*. From the Second Century B. C. to the Third Century C.E. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15157 5
114. ORLOV, A.A. *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15439 1, ISBN-10: 90 04 15439 6
115. MACASKILL, G. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15582 4, ISBN-10: 90 04 15582 1
116. DVORJETSKI, E. *Leisure, Pleasure and Healing Spa Culture and Medicine in Ancient Eastern Mediterranean*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15681 4, ISBN-10: 90 04 15681 X
117. SEGAL, M. *The Book of Jubilees Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15057 7, ISBN-10: 90 04 15057 9
118. XERAVITS, G.G. & J. ZSENGELLÉR (eds.). *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15700 2, ISBN-10: 90 04 15700 X
119. LiDONNICI, L. & A. LIEBER (eds.). *Heavenly Tablets*. Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15856 6, ISBN-10: 90 04 15856 1
120. ASSEFA, D. (ed.). *L'Apocalypse des animaux (1 Hen 85-90): une propagande militaire?* Approches narrative, historico-critique, perspectives théologiques. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16267 9
121. BOCCACCINI, G. & J.J. COLLINS (eds.). *The Early Enoch Literature*. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16154 2
122. HILHORST, A., É. PUECH & E. TIGCHELAAR (eds.). *Flores Florentino*. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16292 1

123. COHEN, N.G. *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings*. Evidence for a *Haftarah* Cycle in Second Temple Judaism. 2007. ISBN 978 90 04 16312 6
124. TROXEL, R.L. *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 15394 3
125. ADAMS, S.L. *Wisdom in Transition*. Act and Consequence in Second Temple Instructions. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16566 3
126. VOITILA, A. & J. JOKIRANTA (eds.). *Scripture in Transition*. Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16582 3
127. XERAVITS, G.G. & J. ZSENGELLÉR (eds.). *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira*. Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18-20 May, 2006. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16906 7
128. GROSS, A.D. *Continuity and Innovation in the Aramaic Legal Tradition*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 15284 7
129. LIED, L.I. *The Other Lands of Israel*. Imaginations of the Land in 2 *Baruch*. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16556 4
130. MARTIN HOGAN, K. *Theologies in Conflict in 4 Ezra*. Wisdom Debate and Apocalyptic Solution. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 12969 6
131. WRIGHT III, B.G. *Praise Israel for Wisdom and Instruction*. Essays on Ben Sira and Wisdom, the Letter of Aristeas and the Septuagint. 2008. ISBN 978 90 04 16908 1
132. RODGERS, Z., M. DALY-DENTON & A. FITZPATRICK MCKINLEY (eds.). *A Wandering Galilean: Essays in Honour of Seán Freyne*. ISBN 978 90 04 17355 2
133. ANISFELD, R.A. *Sustain Me With Raisin-Cakes*. Pesikta de Rav Kahana and the Popularization of Rabbinic Judaism. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 15322 6
134. BATSCH, C. & M. VÄRTEJANU-JOUBERT (eds.). *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale*. Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17518 1
135. GAMBETTI, S. *The Alexandrian Riots of 38 C.E. and the Persecution of the Jews*. A Historical Reconstruction. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 13846 9
136. BIERINGER, R., F. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, D. POLLEFEYT & P.J. TOMSON (eds.). *The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature*. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17588 4
137. KRAFT, R.A. *Exploring the Scripturesque*. Jewish Texts and their Christian Contexts. 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17010 0

138. ROSENFELD, B.Z. *Torah Centers and Rabbinic Activity in Palestine 700-400 CE. History and Geographic Distribution.* 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 17838 0
139. SCHMIDT GOERING, G. *Wisdom's Root Revealed. Ben Sira and the Election of Israel.* 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 16579 3
140. ADELMAN, A. *The Return of the Repressed: Pirqa de-Rabbi Eliezer and the Pseudepigrapha.* 2009. ISBN 978 90 04 17049 0
141. POPOVIĆ, M. (ed.), *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism.* 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18530 2
142. XERAVITS, G.G. & J. ZSENGELLÉR (eds.). *Studies in the Book of Wisdom.* 2010. ISBN 978 90 04 18612 5

ISSN 1384-2161

