

Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques?

Supplements
to the
Journal for the Study
of Judaism

Editor

Benjamin G. Wright, III

Department of Religion Studies, Lehigh University

Associate Editors

Hindy Najman

Department of Religious Studies, Yale University

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies, KU Leuven

Advisory Board

A.M. BERLIN – K. BERTHELOT – R. BLOCH – G. BOHAK – J.J. COLLINS –
J. DUHAIME – K. HOGAN – P.W. VAN DER HORST – O. IRSHAI –
A.K. PETERSEN – S. MASON – J.H. NEWMAN – M.R. NIEHOFF – M. POPOVIĆ –
I. ROSEN-ZVI – J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN – M. SEGAL – J. SIEVERS –
G. STEMBERGER – L.T. STUCKENBRUCK – J.C. DE VOS

VOLUME 166

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.com/jsjs

Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques?

A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes

Edited by

József Zsengellér



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rewritten Bible after fifty years : texts, terms, or techniques? : a last dialogue with Geza Vermes / edited by József Zsengellér.

pages cm. — (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism, ISSN 1384-2161 ; volume 166)

Includes indexes.

This conference was organized in the native country of the *Etzesgeber* (the man of the idea) in Budapest on 10-13 July 2011”.

Summary: “Rewritten Bible After Fifty Years presents the papers of a conference on the meanings and usages of the term Rewritten Bible introduced by Geza Vermes in 1961. Leading scholars of the topic discuss their new insights and ideas comparing with Vermes’ initiative, whose participation on this conference was unfortunately the last chance for a life dialogue with him on this topic. Apart from the terminological discussions and comparisons several case studies widen the scope of the notion of Rewritten Bible/ Scripture and rewriting as a genre and technique”—Provided by publisher.

ISBN 978-90-04-26815-9 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-27118-0 (e-book) 1. Bible. Old Testament—Criticism, interpretation, etc., Jewish—Congresses. I. Vermes, Geza, 1924–2013. II. Zsengellér, József, editor of compilation.

BS1225.52.R49 2014
221.6—dc23

2014006967

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual ‘Brill’ typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 1384-2161
ISBN 978 90 04 26815 9 (hardback)
ISBN 978 90 04 27118 0 (e-book)

Copyright 2014 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Nijhoff, Global Oriental and Hotei Publishing.
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.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

List of Abbreviations	vii
Preface	xi

PART 1

Defining of Rewritten Bible 1

The Genesis of the Concept of “Rewritten Bible”	3
<i>Geza Vermes</i>	

PART 2

Redefining of Rewritten Bible 11

Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment? Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture	13
---	----

Anders Klostergaard Petersen

Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment	49
--	----

Jonathan G. Campbell

Crossing the Borders from “Pre-Scripture” to Scripture (Rewritten) to “Rewritten Scripture”	83
---	----

Eugene Ulrich

Rewritten Scriptures as a Clue to Scribal Traditions in the Second Temple Period	105
--	-----

Sidnie White Crawford

Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture	119
---	-----

George J. Brooke

Rewritten Bible and the Vocalization of the Biblical Text	137
---	-----

Stefan Schorch

PART 3

Case Studies 153

Inner Biblical Rewritings 155

Reuse of Prophecy in the Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets. Rewriting and Canonization	157
--	-----

István Karasszon

On the Battlefield and Beyond: The Reinterpretation of the Moabite-Israelite Encounters in 2 Chronicles 20	167
<i>Előd Hodossy-Takács</i>	

Early Jewish Rewritings 181

Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture and Scripture-Like Texts	183
<i>Emanuel Tov</i>	
Apocryphon of Jeremiah C from Qumran: Rewritten Prophetic Text or Something Else?	203
<i>Balázs Tamási</i>	
Between Rewritten Bible and Allegorical Commentary: Philo's Interpretation of the Burning Bush	221
<i>Steven D. Fraade</i>	
Philo's Life of Moses as "Rewritten Bible"	233
<i>Finn Damgaard</i>	
Josephus' "Rewritten Bible" as a Non-Apologetic Work	249
<i>Marton Ribary</i>	
Josephus' Rewriting of Genesis 24 in <i>Ant.</i> 1.242-255	267
<i>Christopher T. Begg</i>	

Later Rewritings 293

Can We Apply the Term "Rewritten Bible" to Midrash? The Case of <i>Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer</i>	295
<i>Rachel Adelman</i>	
Adam or Adams? Genesis and the Mythical Anthropology in the <i>Writing without Title on the Origin of the World</i> from Nag Hammadi (NHC II,5)	319
<i>Csaba Ötvös</i>	
Samaritan Rewritings: The <i>Toledot</i> in Samaritan Literature	345
<i>József Zsengellér</i>	
Index of Ancient Sources	359
Index of Modern Authors	378

List of Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
ANESSUP	Ancient Near Eastern Studies Supplement
<i>ArOr</i>	<i>Archiv orientální</i>
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BCE	Before the Common (or Christian) Era
BCNHE	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi section études
BCNHT	Bibliothèque copte de Nag Hammadi section textes
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>BHQ</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BO	Biblia et Orientalia
BSRS	Biblical Studies and Religious Studies
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CE	Common (or Christian) Era
CIS	Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
<i>DSSR</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i>
ECCA	Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity
<i>ErIsr</i>	<i>Eretz Israel</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

HBM	Hebrew Bible Monographs
HBS	Herders biblische Studien
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>JA</i>	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JCC	Jewish Culture and Contexts
<i>J ECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JESHO</i>	<i>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JPS	Judea & Samaria Publications
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRAS</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSUP	Journal for the Study of Judaism Supplement Series
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSUP	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSUP	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series
JSPSUP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JThS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LD	Lectio divina
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
LXX	Septuagint
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuagintaunternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
NBS	Numen Book Series
NHMS	Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplementum
<i>NT</i>	<i>New Testament</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBC	Orientalia Biblica et Christiana

OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OG	Old Greek
OPDT	Oklahoma Project for Discourse and Theorie
OTF	Oriental Translation Fund (New Serie)
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PACS	Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series
<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research</i>
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestina Exploration Quarterly</i>
PS	Pseudepigrapha Series
PTS	Patristische Texte und Studien
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
RS	Religion and Society
SAC	Studies in Antiquity & Christianity
SAM	Sheffield Archaeological Monographs
SCS	Septuagint Commentary Series
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Séries
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</i>
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBTh	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SDSS	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SGM	Sources gnostiques et manichéennes
SHAJ	Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions (Numen Supplements)
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SPB	Studia Post-Biblica
SPhilo	<i>Studia Philonica</i>
SSam	Studia Samaritana
SSLL	Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics Series
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
STI	Studies in Theological Interpretation
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter

<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplementum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZThK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Preface

One of the major topics of recent research in Second Temple Judaism is “Rewritten Bible.” The designation was introduced in 1961 by Geza¹ Vermes in his book *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*.² Its meaning and content has been debated intensively in the last decade.

Contributing to this debate and celebrating the birth of the idea, a conference was organized in the native country of the *Etzesgeber* (the man of the idea) in Budapest on 10–13 July 2011: “*Rewritten Bible*” after 50 years: *Texts, Terms, or Technics? International Conference on the Phenomenon of “Rewritten Bible.”* The conference was organized by the Chair of Biblical Theology and History of Religions of the Theological Faculty of the Gáspár Károli Reformed University Budapest and the Association of Hungarian Hebraists. The conference was also supported by the OTKA project NN 76606.

Geza Vermes gave the opening lecture, and other prominent scholars who had contributed earlier to the major aspects of the debate were invited as key speakers. Most of them accepted the invitation and several other scholars answered positively to the call for papers. Vermes and I were excited that several Hungarian scholars were prepared to give lectures. This was due to the importance of the topic but also to the good opportunity to discuss the problem with its Hungarian initiator.

At that time we did not know that this conference would be the last chance to meet and work together with Vermes. He was enthusiastic about having this conference and being invited to Budapest where he enjoyed the warm hospitality and celebration. During the production of this volume he intensively e-mailed with me and asked for drafts of the manuscript. He wrote that he had signed a contract with Oxford University Press to write a new book concerning this topic.³ In his last e-mail, written some days before his passing, he wrote in Hungarian: “Thank you very much the consignment, it will be extremely useful for me. The volume is impressive, more than 400 pages.”⁴

Unfortunately Geza Vermes died before the publication of this volume. Therefore the subtitle should have been modified by inserting the word “last” to indicate the unrepeatable moment we shared. Hereby we dedicate this volume to his unforgettable

1 This first name is originally Géza in Hungarian, but Vermes chose to use its easier form in English spelling Geza for this volume too. (E-mail: 9. November 2012.)

2 Vermes, Geza, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (SPB 4. Leiden: E.J. Brill 1961; second, revised edition, 1973).

3 To be entitled “Writing and Rewriting the Bible in the Age of Jesus” (20. February 2013.).

4 “Nagyon koszonom a kuldemenyt, ami rendkivil hasznos lesz szamomra. A kotet imponalo. Tobb mint 400 oldalas.” (10. April 2013.)

memory, shaped by his scholarly achievements, brilliant ideas, and encouraging personality.

This volume collects most of the papers delivered at the above mentioned conference. The material was divided into three main parts. In the first Vermes presents the origin and reason of the idea of the phenomenon “Rewritten Bible” in which he replies to his critics. Essays in the second part focus on the refinement of the phenomenon and its implications. The third part presents case studies on different periods from the Persian period to the late middle ages and early modern period.

I express my gratitude to the editors of JSJ Supplements who kindly accepted this book for publication in the series; especially to Benjamin Wright III who gave invaluable editorial help and advice during the preparation of the manuscript. Special thanks are due to Edina Zsengellér-Kekki who kindly prepared the indices of the volume.

József Zsengellér

Budapest, 19 August 2013

PART 1

Defining of Rewritten Bible



The Genesis of the Concept of “Rewritten Bible”

Geza Vermes

Introduction

Over the last couple of decades an increasing number of publications saw the light of day on the subject of the “Rewritten Bible”. While diverse views were aired in these studies, they all had one point in common: they all credited me with coining the idiom “Rewritten Bible” in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* in 1961 (hence *S&T*).¹ Then last year, on 14 November to be precise, I received an e-mail from Professor József Zsengellér in which he announced the plan of celebrating the golden jubilee of the “Rewritten Bible” in the form of an international conference in Budapest and kindly invited me to be the guest of honour and deliver the opening lecture. I promptly and gratefully agreed. After all it does not often happen that, contrary to the gospel statement, one is treated as a prophet in one’s country of birth.

So on accepting the charming invitation and offering a keynote speech on the genesis of the idea of the “Rewritten Bible,” I quickly set out to acquaint myself with the numerous recent publications devoted to the subject, which included even a small book² as well as a bunch of essays.³

The first shock I experienced was the realization that the notion, which over fifty years ago I thought was quite clear, seemed to the majority of the more recent practitioners nebulous and confused, and lacked methodological precision. Some objected to the inclusion of certain texts, in particular the Palestinian Targums to the Pentateuch, in the “Rewritten Bible” concept. Others deplored the absence of legal texts. My younger colleagues were fair enough not to criticize me for not dealing with certain Dead Sea manuscripts, especially the Temple Scroll, which were not yet available for study in 1961. They insisted, however, mostly correctly, that today the relevant Qumran texts should be considered in any up-to-date treatment of the subject. But on the whole, with the exception of a few experts, first and foremost

1 Vermes 1961. Second, revised edition, 1973.

2 White Crawford 2008.

3 For a detailed list, see Zahn 2010, 334–336.

Philip Alexander⁴ and Moshe Bernstein,⁵ many of the recent researchers did something that I can best describe by employing an English neologism: “they moved the goalposts,” that is to say, after the beginning of the game, they altered the target to suit the interest of their inquiry. The main change of perspective concerned the boundaries of the research, which nowadays is almost exclusively restricted to the Qumran material. This has not always been so, nor should it be the case, as I will endeavor to show in the remainder of this paper.

Basic Idea of the Rewritten Bible

Those who are not familiar with *S&T* might easily imagine that the “Rewritten Bible” plays a pivotal part in it. In fact, it constitutes only the second of the four main sections of the book, the other three being “The Symbolism of Words,” “Bible and Tradition” and “Theology and Exegesis.” The second section is said to describe “the structure and purpose of *the re-writing of the Bible*”⁶ and comprises two essays on the life of Abraham. The first is defined as a retrospective historical study, starting with the medieval work, the Book of the Upright (*Sefer ha-Yashar*) and tracing back the traditions attested in it to literary sources of the Second Temple era. The second essay, entitled a progressive historical study, began with the then freshly released Qumran Genesis Apocryphon and followed the interpretative developments to the age of the Midrash, Targum and Talmud. I designated it as an enquiry “into the motives, exegetical or doctrinal, which originally prompted interpreters to develop, and even to supplement, the biblical narrative.”⁷ The slightly more detailed exposition of the concept “Rewritten Bible,” extending over eight lines, figures in the concluding paragraph of chapter 4:

In order to anticipate questions, and solve problems in advance, the midrashist inserts haggadic developments into the biblical narrative— an exegetical process which is probably as ancient as scriptural interpretation itself. The Palestinian Targum and Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities, Pseudo-Philo and Jubilees, and the recently discovered Genesis

4 Alexander 1987.

5 Bernstein 2005.

6 Vermes 1961, 10.

7 Vermes 1961, 68.

Apocryphon . . . , each in their own way show how the Bible was rewritten about a millennium before the redaction of the *Sefer ha-Yashar*.⁸

If by any chance there is someone in this learned gathering who is not fully familiar with the “Rewritten Bible” syndrome, let me give just one example. In Genesis 12:13 Abraham, the father of the Jewish people and prototype of righteousness, is said to have married Sarah, his sister, or if we follow Genesis 20:12, his half-sister, degrees of union strictly forbidden by the Law (Lev 18:19; 20:17). In order to avoid the suspicion that the Jewish people originated from an incestuous marriage, the re-writers of the Bible inserted into the text a gloss, which diluted in advance the meaning of the term “sister.” In Genesis 11:29 the Pseudo-Jonathan Targum makes of Sarah, not Abraham’s sister, but his niece, the daughter of his brother, whom he could take as his wife according to general custom. The same re-writing occurs also in Josephus: “Aran (Abraham’s brother) left two daughters, Sarah and Melchah . . . Abraham married his niece Sarah” (*Ant.* 1.151). Finally, just in case some ultra-pious group (like the Qumran Essenes) objected to matrimony between uncle and niece, another re-writer redefined the relationship and turned Sarah into Abraham’s first cousin. In Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen 20:12 Abraham identifies Sarah as “the daughter of my father’s brother.”⁹

Circumstances of the Research

S&T came out in 1961, but its typescript was handed over to the publishers two years earlier. The eight essays it contains were all produced in the second half of the 1950s and the preliminary research and thinking started immediately after the publication in 1953 of my doctoral dissertation on the historical framework of the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁰ In those almost prehistoric days I was doing research part-time under the aegis of the French National Research Centre, and was simultaneously assistant editor of the periodical *Cahiers Sioniens*, whose small staff included also a very gifted young French lady Hebraist, Renée Bloch. Having until then focused on Qumran, I decided to broaden my field to include ancient Jewish Bible interpretation and she, while preparing a major dictionary article on Midrash,¹¹ took particular interest in the Palestinian Targums,

8 Vermes 1961, 95.

9 See chapter ‘Bible and Midrash’ in Vermes 2010, 67–68.

10 Vermes 1953.

11 Bloch 1957, cols. 1263–1280.

including the fragments from the Cairo Genizah, first made available by Paul Kahle in 1930.¹² Sadly, our collaboration did not last long as Renée aged 31, tragically perished in 1955 when the El Al airplane on which she was flying from Paris to Lod mistakenly entered the Bulgarian airspace, and was shot down by two Bulgarian fighters with the loss of all on board. So the academic venture originally planned as a work of collaboration had to be pursued by me alone.

With the wisdom of hindsight, I can now realize how enormously lucky I was. After an initial stage of research in the field of the Targums and the realization of the significance of Josephus's Jewish *Antiquities* for the study of ancient Jewish biblical interpretation, two epoch-making novelties emerged in 1956. A substantial part of the Qumran Genesis Apocryphon, an Aramaic paraphrase of several chapters of Genesis, probably composed in the second century BCE, was published by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin.¹³ In the same year, the late Alejandro Diez Macho announced the identification of the Vatican Codex Neofiti as a complete version of the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum, containing not only the full text, but also a substantial amount of variant readings recorded in marginal and interlinear notes. Targumic studies received a gigantic new stimulus.

The story of Codex Neofiti is extraordinary in itself. Copied at the beginning of the sixteenth century, it was gathering dust in one of the annexes of the Vatican Library, miscatalogued as Targum Onkelos. Its "discovery" is handed down in two versions. The official account states that in 1949 two Spanish Semitists, Jose Maria Millas Vallicrosa and Alejandro Diez Macho came to the conclusion that the manuscript was not Onkelos. Then along came a seven-year long odd silence on the subject, followed by a short note in 1956 in a Spanish periodical revealing the sensational discovery.¹⁴ Finally ten years after the original find, Diez Macho discussed in detail Targum Neofiti at the 1959 international Old Testament Congress in Oxford.¹⁵

But I know also an oral tradition, which is somewhat different and more amusing. According to it sometime in the late 1940s, Alexander Sperber, a specialist of Targum Onkelos, went to consult Codex Neofiti, catalogued as Onkelos, and quickly realized that it was something else. He immediately lost interest, but knowing that Diez Macho was investigating the Palestinian Targums, advised him to have a look at this false Onkelos. He did so and in

12 Kahle 1930.

13 Avigad and Yadin 1956.

14 Diez Macho 1956, 446–447.

15 Diez Macho 1960.

due course published the most important Targum text between 1968 and 1979.¹⁶ Thanks to the generosity of Kahle and Diez Macho, who never dreamt of a closed shop policy, I was given a photocopy of the manuscript long before its appearance in print, and I made copious use of it in several chapters of *S&T*.

Let me mention also another lucky quasi-discovery. While preparing a paper on Moses in inter-Testamental literature, which appeared in 1954,¹⁷ I accidentally came across the Latin work, the *Book of Biblical Antiquities* mistakenly attributed to Philo of Alexandria. This first century CE book retells with interpretative accretions the scriptural story from Adam to David. Although available since the sixteenth century from a printed edition,¹⁸ it was largely ignored by students of Jewish Bible interpretation. For me it represented a major revelation and I used it as an important source in *S&T*. In a minor way I can claim to have put Pseudo-Philo on the academic map.

Aim of the Research

The overarching aim of my research project was to establish that haggadic exegesis, that is to say the study of the narrative and doctrinal elements in Bible interpretation, could be approached historically. The view current up to the middle of the twentieth century was that, while halakhah or legal exegesis by definition is a historical phenomenon, and is handed down by more or less reliably named and dated authorities, the nature and purpose of the haggadah could less easily fit into an historical perspective. Such a view can possibly be defended if the evidence is limited to rabbinic midrash. But what happens if in addition to rabbinic haggadah we have recourse also to well-dated pre-rabbinic sources, such as Jubilees, Qumran, Josephus, the New Testament and Pseudo-Philo? *S&T* was meant to give a positive answer to this question, and I would like to believe that it has done so effectively. Hence the topic of the present conference.

16 Diez Macho 1968–1979.

17 Vermes 1954.

18 The original edition was produced by Johannes Sichardus, printed in Basle in 1527 by Adamus Petrus. Two new editions of the Latin text were issued in the last century: Kisch 1949 and Harrington, Cazeaux, Perrot and Bogaert 1976–1979. For an English translation, see James 1917; reissued with a Prolegomenon by Louis Feldman Ktav, New York, 1971. For an annotated German translation, see Dietzfelbinger 1975.

Challenges Addressed to the Concept

Yet at the end of this paper, I cannot resist the urge to deal briefly with four criticisms addressed to me in the past.

1. The exclusion of legal material from my survey is explained by the subtitle of *S&T*—"Haggadic Studies." But I accept that future treatment of the "Rewritten Bible" should include the whole field of Jewish Bible interpretation.
2. Whereas it is perfectly legitimate to investigate the Dead Sea Scrolls within the framework of the "Rewritten Bible," I believe it would be a gross mistake to restrict the area of investigation to documents from Qumran. A priceless mine of well-dated information is contained in the *Antiquities* of Josephus and in Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. And this may be the bee in my bonnet, the works gathered under the umbrella of the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum are ideal sources for the study of the "Rewritten Bible". In fact, the so-called Fragmentary Targum and the marginalia of Codex Neofiti represent, in my view, exegetical accretions detached from the full text of the Palestinian Aramaic paraphrase.
3. The question has been raised whether the "Rewritten Bible" corresponds to a process or a genre? In my view, it verifies both. The person who combined the biblical text with its interpretation was engaged in a process, but when his activity was completed, it resulted in a literary genre.
4. Finally, some colleagues found the phrase, "Rewritten *Bible*" anachronistic. It is maintained by Dead Sea Scrolls scholars that Second Temple Judaism had no clear idea of either "Bible" or "canon". These concepts, they claim, were not determined before the age of the Mishnah. For this reason rewritten or reworked "Scripture" has been suggested as a more suitable substitute. Frankly, replacing "Bible" by "Scripture" strikes me as a mere quibble. The issue at stake is, however, more than verbal subtlety.

Academic scepticism concerning the existence of a Bible canon in the Second Temple period fails to pay sufficient attention to the 'canon' of Josephus. In *Against Apion* (1.38–41) he firmly states that among the Jews *twenty-two* books, no more, no less, enjoyed special respect and authority. Without citing individual titles, Josephus lists the five books of Moses, thirteen books of the Prophets and four books of hymns and wisdom. According to St Jerome, too, the figure of twenty-two was commonly held by Jews to represent the number of books in the biblical canon. So it can be assumed that the traditional Palestinian Hebrew canon of the Bible was already in existence in the late first century CE, or maybe even in the first century BCE.

I suggest therefore that we stick with the “Rewritten *Bible*” and let the music of the argument begin.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip. 1987. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Avigad, Nahman and Yadin, Yigael. 1956. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*. Jerusalem: Magness Press.
- Bernstein, Moshe. 2005. Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness? *Textus* 22: 169–96.
- Bloch, Renée. 1957. Midrash. Columns 1263–80 in *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Vol. V, Paris: Letouzey.
- Dietzfelbinger, Christian. 1975. *Pseudo-Philo: Antiquitates Biblicae*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.
- Diez Macho, Alejandro. 1956. Una copia de todo el Targum jerosolimitano en la Vaticana. *Estudios Biblicos* 16: 446–47.
- . 1960. The recently discovered Palestinian Targum. Pages 222–45 in *Congress Volume Oxford 1959*. VTSup 7. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1968–1979. *Neophyti 1: Targum Palestinense Ms de la Biblioteca Vaticana I–VI*. Madrid – Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Harrington, Daniel J., Cazeaux, Jacques, Perrot, Charles. and Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. 1976–1979. *Pseudo-Philon, Les Antiquités Bibliques I–II*. Paris: Cerf.
- James, Montague Rhodes. 1917. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. London: SPCK.
- Kahle, Paul. 1930. *Masoreten des Westens II*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Kisch, Guido. 1949. *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame.
- Vermes, Geza. 1953. *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda*. Tournai – Paris: Desclée.
- . 1954. La figure de Moïse au tournant des deux Testaments. *Moïse, l'homme de l'alliance (Cahiers Sioniens)* 8: 63–92.
- . 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. SPB 4. Leiden: E.J. Brill (Second, revised edition, 1973).
- . 2010. *Jesus in the Jewish World*. London: SCM Press.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.E. Eerdmans.
- Zahn, Molly M. 2010. Rewritten Scripture. Pages 334–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of The Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

PART 2

Redefining of Rewritten Bible



Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment?¹

Typological Reflections on the Phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture²

Anders Klostergaard Petersen

Introduction

Before I address the specific topic of my essay, which pertains to the relationship that exists in terms of authority between rewritten texts and their scriptural antecedents, I shall take a look at the history of scholarship on rewritten Bible—or Scripture as it has come to be called during the last decade. From this discussion I shall proceed to present my understanding of the notion as I have lately developed it.³ Since serious challenges have recently been raised against the continued use of the term, it is incumbent upon us that we not only argue for the heuristic value of retaining the notion but also that we are capable of repudiating the criticism. The reflections of the first two parts allow me to set the scene for the final discussion of different forms of authority exhibited by texts captured under the umbrella term: rewritten Scripture. In this manner, the ultimate thrust of the essay is to take up the thorny question of authority asserted by rewritten Scripture and offer a solution that goes against the grain of prevalent strands of current scholarship. Before entering the discussion of the first main section, I shall briefly elaborate on individual points pertaining to each of the three main sections and point out how the sections relate to each other.

¹ In memory of my erudite and close colleague, dear and generous friend, Professor Dr. Friedrich Avemarie, 19.10.1960–12.10.2012, who gave so much to others and yet had so short a life.

² I want to express my gratitude to Professor Geza Vermes, who kindly provided me with a copy of his paper given at the Budapest Conference: “Rewritten Bible” after 50 years: Texts, Terms, or Technics? International Conference on the Phenomenon of “Rewritten Bible”, Budapest 10–13 July 2011. Vermes has allowed me to make use of his paper for this essay for which I am very grateful. Additionally, I want to thank Professor George J. Brooke for valuable comments on the part of my paper concerned with the history of scholarship on the subject.

³ Petersen 2007. For my most recent discussion of the topic, see Petersen 2010; Petersen 2012, and my forthcoming essays, Petersen 2013 which are specifically aimed at broadening the category by locating it in the wider context of rewriting authoritative texts, which is a far more prevalent phenomenon found not only in literature but in arts in general.

In recent research on the topic, it has become an almost truism that texts belonging to the category of rewritten Scripture do not attempt to replace their scriptural antecedents, but, on the contrary, strive to make the authority and content of their scriptural predecessors present in new contexts as a form of applied hermeneutics.⁴ Ben Zion Wachholder is among the few who have argued in favour of an alternative view, since he understands rewritten Scripture to be engaged in the attempt to replace their scriptural predecessors.⁵ I shall argue that estimated on their own neither of these two view-points suffices. Although initially it may sound contradictory, I shall contend that the two views are complementary, but that they cast light on different facets of the problem in question.⁶ In fact, I shall argue that when seen from different perspectives both points of views may be plausible. Such a suggestion is metaphorically speaking parallel to the famous duck-rabbit picture of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* and the staircase example of Alan Chalmers' *What Is This Thing Called Science?* In the Wittgensteinian example the spectator depending on his or her cultural habits and perspective inclinations, may see the image as either a duck or a rabbit. In Chalmers' example, the staircase contingent on the applied perspective may be viewed from either beneath or from above.⁷ In the same manner, texts exhibiting rewritten Scripture may be understood as an attempt to make authoritative texts of the past present in new contexts; yet, at the same time, they may also by virtue of being rewritings justifiably be viewed as engaged in the attempt to functionally replace their scriptural antecedents. In this case the difference in perspective depends on whether one focuses on aspects pertaining to content, form, function or authorial intent. The discussion, however, becomes more complicated if one acknowledges that the group of texts attributed to the category does not constitute a homogenous entity, but comprises a diversity of texts which differ considerably with respect to the claims they are making in terms of authority. With regard to content some texts make more extravagant claims in terms of authority over against their textual predecessors than others do. To substantiate the argument I shall have recourse to texts which have not traditionally

4 See among others Alexander 1988, 116; Najman 2003, 46–50; Himmelfarb 2006, 54f; Brooke 2010, 52f.

5 One of the few who have argued against such a view is Ben Zion Wachholder who emphasises how rewritten scriptural texts aim to replace the authority of their antecedents, see Wachholder 1985 and Wachholder 1997.

6 A similar view is now argued by Zahn 2010, 331.

7 Wittgenstein 2001, Part II, §11; Chalmers 1999, 6.

been discussed in terms of rewritten Scripture, but which I shall argue, qualify even to be assigned to the category.

Some Further Elaboration

As already mentioned this article is divided in three main sections. In part one I shall give an outline of the decisive phases in the history of scholarship on rewritten Bible which until a decade ago was the traditional term used to designate a number of Jewish texts of the late Second Temple period.⁸ As far as I have been able to tell from the scholarly literature, there has been no previous attempt to delineate the history of scholarship. Since the present volume not only aims to further the discussion of the notion but also to celebrate the half centennial since Geza Vermes' coinage of the category, I think it is useful to provide a history of research. It can only be provisional, since I have not had the opportunity to talk with all of the involved scholars, nor would I claim to have a complete view of all literature published on the topic during the last 50 years. However, I do claim to cover the main contours of the previous debate. An additional argument for providing a history of research has to do with my overall focus. Since problems pertaining to the discussion of the authoritative status of rewritten Scripture are closely linked to the history of research on the term, it is obvious to initiate the examination by paying closer heed to this history.

In part two, I shall discuss what I conceive to be the major obstacles against the continued use of the term and the theoretical horns to be dealt with if we want to retain the concept. This is all the more necessary in a scholarly situation in which not only new texts are being added to the category but also texts which originate in contexts that lie conspicuously outside the scope of

8 When referring to the older phases of the history of scholarship on the term I shall use the time-honoured notion rewritten Bible, whereas I shall apply the category rewritten Scripture when referring to the recent phrasing of the concept. Despite the heuristic value of Vermes' original coinage of the term, I think that the objections that have been put forward against this phrasing of the concept are too weighty to allow for its continued use, see VanderKam 2002, 43-52f; Campbell 2005, 49f; Petersen 2007, 287-289; Crawford 2008, 2-10; and Zahn 2011, 1-11. I capitalise Scripture in the expression 'rewritten Scripture' in order to emphasise the authoritative, but not necessarily canonical status of the base texts that are being rewritten. As to authority, the base text is authoritative in the sense of being accorded special importance in a given cultural and social context, which leads to the fact that it may give rise to subsequent rewritings. The expression rewritten Scripture does not indicate anything about the status of the rewritten composition which may or may not strive to become Scripture.

literature that Vermes originally imagined the concept to embrace. When, for instance, gnostic texts such as the Gospel of Judas and the Gospel of the Saviour or the New Testament gospels are being included in the category,⁹ it becomes the more crucial that we know what we are talking about if we want to avoid a situation where the notion becomes a *signifiant flottant* and, therefore, useless as part of scholarly nomenclature. Far from being alarmed by this development characterised by the inclusion of an increasing number of texts in the category, I welcome the situation as a sensible advancement. I think it would be more problematical in terms of theory of science if the concept—as the dominant parts of the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the term has it—could only be used with respect to a limited number of Jewish texts of the late Second Temple period. For the same reason I am sceptical against the trajectory in recent scholarship which, whether deliberately or not, tends to reserve the discussion of the concept primarily to Qumran texts.¹⁰ If we are only able to apply the concept to a limited number of Jewish texts from a particular period, it becomes difficult to ward off the criticism that we have created an ideological construct ultimately used to safeguard a ‘parochial’ form of scholarship from being intruded by outside influence whether it be in the form of other texts or another mode of theorising. And even if we were to object to such criticism as unreasonable, we would still have to enquire about the analytical value of a category that can be applied to a few texts only. Would such a concept void of comparative value constitute more than a textual self-reflection of the very texts claimed to be examined? Therefore, I think it is sensible to refine the concept in terms of comparative capability and scope. To the extent, however, that the notion is elevated to a comparative category which may be used cross-culturally with respect to other texts which also share the element of rewriting authoritative textual antecedents, it is imperative that we know how to go about it analytically. This discussion takes me to the last main section in which

9 As far as I have been able to tell, Jonathan Campbell was the first scholar to suggest the inclusion of New Testament texts in the category. In his 2005 essay, he mentions texts such as Acts 7 and Hebrews 11 in the context of “rewritten Bible” and argues that they are akin to Ben Sira 44–49, see Campbell 2005, 50.

10 I concur with the overall aspirations of the recently edited book by Alexander, Lange and Pillinger 2010, which applies the concept to texts such as, for instance, the Homeric Songs which traditionally have not been discussed from the perspective of rewritten Scripture. See also the forthcoming edited volume by myself, in which the term in a number of essays is used not only with respect to ancient texts but also modern ones, just as it by virtue of a more comprehensive notion of text is applied to examples from musicology and arts.

I shall focus on one particularly moot question in previous scholarship on the term.

In part three, I shall by way of a few suggestive examples develop a tentative typology that will enable us to differentiate between different forms of authority which pertains to the relationship between texts and their scriptural predecessors. In a recent article on rewritten scripture, Molly Zahn has put forward a view similar to the one I am endorsing. Zahn emphasises how crucial it is to distinguish between functional replacement and notions of literal or physical replacement and makes the acute observation that: “as long as the pragmatic perspective is maintained, it does seem appropriate to say that rewritten texts, especially those with strong authority claims, in certain ways do seek to replace the texts that they rewrite.”¹¹

I concur with Zahn’s view, but there are two points that I would like to elaborate. First, it is crucial to examine what in Zahn’s claim is referred to as “in certain ways.” By acknowledging the differences that may exist between texts traditionally accorded the category, Zahn implicitly points to the need for further differentiations. How is it that some texts from the functional point of view may be seen to replace their scriptural predecessors while others do not? Additionally, this call for a differentiation also points to the need for clarifying the relationship between the different view-points. How is it possible that a text from one perspective may be seen to replace that of its scriptural antecedent, when viewed from another angle it may be understood to faithfully endorse the authority of its predecessor?

Second, I think it is important to differentiate between different texts not only with respect to their claims to authority in terms of function but also with regard to how they instantiate their interpretations over against those of their scriptural antecedents. In other words, the functional aspect is important but we also need to pay heed to the semantics of the texts under scrutiny. Whereas my first point may appear obvious, the second one is perhaps not as evident. This may have to do with the fact that the texts traditionally discussed under the rubric are not particularly polemical against their scriptural predecessors. If, however, we include a number of other texts in the category which have not traditionally been subsumed under the nomenclature such as, for instance, the New Testament gospels, it may be more obvious also to take the semantic dimension into account when discussing the moot question of the relationship in terms of authority between rewritten texts and their scriptural antecedents. In fact, it may well be that the inclusion of other texts may help us to shed new light on the texts that traditionally constituted the category.

11 Zahn 2010, 331.

Although the relationship with regard to authority may be conceived of in different ways with respect to content, form, function and reception,¹² and yet again, these aspects may as I have already indicated be thought of in different fashions, I shall focus on the element of rewriting *per se*. Rewriting of Scripture may become authoritative as is well known from cases such as Deuteronomy, Books of Chronicles, and the Book of Jubilees, but in this essay I am not focusing on the relationship that exists between rewritings and their subsequent history of reception, although that may not be entirely independent of the relationship which I want to highlight. It is the textual semiotic dimension of what instantiates the rewriting in the first place and the interconnected question how the rewritten text relates in terms of authority to its scriptural base text on which I shall focus. One may, of course, contravene against such an approach that it is artificial to study texts independent of the social contexts in which they as social action came to exert influence. George Brooke, for instance, has with reference to Gérard Genette made the argument that texts should not be studied without paying close heed to their function. With reference to Edward Said, Brooke advocates the view that:

Since we know that texts demand to have readers and hearers, and are not entities sufficient in themselves, it is necessary to take into account that they “have ways of existing that even in their most rarified form are always enmeshed in circumstance, time, place, and society—in short, they are in the world, and hence worldly,” as Edward Said has remarked.¹³

Although I acknowledge Brooke's argument, I think he takes it too far by placing too much emphasis on the actual hearers or readers of the text, thereby, ignoring the aspect that before a text comes to be used in specific cultural and social contexts it already by virtue of its textual qualities constitutes an act of communication between the two textually embedded instances of author and reader, that is, enunciator and enunciatee. To avoid misunderstandings, I am not making claims as to the possibility of attaining access to the extra-authorial instance, i.e. the historical author. What a given author or group of writers may have thought of when engaging in rewritings of authoritative texts

12 The variety of ways that may exist in terms of conceptualising the relationship between rewritten scriptures and their textual predecessors has been well captured by Zahn 2010, in her state of art article on rewritten Scripture, although she does not mention reception as an additional important dimension.

13 Brooke 2010, 50.

we do not have access to. This acknowledgement, however, should not prevent us from reflecting upon the problem of the rewriting in terms of a semiotic phenomenon which pertains to the relationship between authoritative texts and their subsequent rewriting in new forms of writing. Nor does it preclude us from recognising that texts “are always enmeshed in circumstance, time, place, and society;” but rather than examining actual receptions of texts we may also focus on the rewriting with respect to its intended audience understood as an intra-textual phenomenon reconstructed in light of the cultural and social conventions available at the time of communication of the text.¹⁴ Hence, I am not referring to the phenomenon of implied author and reader which designates the textual instances that any actual reader may fill out at any time. Nor am I designating, when talking about the intended audience, a textually constructed instance identical with the historically, empirical audience to whom the text was directed. Instead, I am referring to the textually constructed audience as it may be inferred on the basis of the cultural and social conventions judged to be pertinent in the context in which the text originated. In sum, I am not making claims as to how the actual, empirical author and audience understood the text in terms of authority. I am solely raising the question of authority as it pertains to the relationship between base text and scriptural rewriting as a semiotic phenomenon.

History of Scholarship

It is fifty years ago—as we have all come to know through József Zsengellér’s excellent idea to organise a conference to celebrate the occasion—since professor Geza Vermes felicitously coined the concept of rewritten Bible: ‘felicitously’ by virtue of the subsequent extensive, scholarly use of the notion. As far as I have been able to tell from the history of scholarship which either has been using the term or has reflected upon its use, the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the notion can advantageously be divided into four phases. These phases are artificial in the sense that they are not a direct reflection of an inherent,

14 This is the approach underlying much of Umberto Eco’s semiotic work. See, for instance, Eco 1979, 130–135; Eco 1992, 64–66, and the distinction he makes between interpretation and use of texts in Eco 1990, 57–63, and the importance he attributes to acknowledging the element of codes in interpretation of texts. Over against Eco’s use of the concept of codes, I would modify the notion by speaking of conventions which to a lesser degree signify a 1:1 relationship between the sign and its reference.

forward moving development in the history of scholarship. In fact, as we shall see, they have by and large been determined by historical contingencies. Nevertheless, they are representative of what I consider to be a useful way of projecting order onto the history of scholarship. The phases, however, do have an empirical grounding to the extent that they are characterised by important, developments in the wider study of late Second Temple Jewish literature.

The First Phase: from 1961 to the Mid-Eighties

Subsequent to Vermes' coinage of the term in 1961 in his book *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, the notion had limited repercussions in scholarship. Certain events had to take place in order for the concept to become a pervasive scholarly term. It is important to notice, however, that in his original formulation of the concept Vermes did not provide the category with a definition in the strict sense. The lack of a clear definition may account for some of the confusion pertaining to the precise status of the concept as respectively a genre or a textual strategy which has lingered on in subsequent discussions.¹⁵ In the initial formulation of rewritten Bible, Vermes after having examined the medieval manuscript *Sefer ha-Yashar* (approx. 11th Century CE) in light of the notion of rewritten Bible characterised the concept by arguing that: "In order to anticipate questions, and to solve problems in advance, the midrashist inserts haggadic development into the biblical narrative—an exegetical process which is probably as ancient as scriptural interpretation itself."¹⁶

There are two things to observe in Vermes' formulation. First, on the basis of this characterisation the scholars who subsequently have argued in favour of understanding the notion as a textual strategy rather than a genre have a firm ground. In the original use of the category, Vermes did not indicate that rewritten Bible should be conceived of as a definite and distinct genre of Jewish literature. Second, his use of *Sefer ha-Yashar* implies that he did not intend the concept to be constrained to Second Temple Jewish literature only. In fact, the comprehensive use of the notion to designate a textual strategy found in works dating both to the late Second Temple period and the medieval period should have made scholars alert to the fact that the category constitutes a more prevalent phenomenon than is often assumed. The concept should not only be taken as a prime characteristic of late Second Temple Jewish literature.

In subsequent formulations of the concept, however, Vermes provided ammunition for those scholars who have opted for understanding the notion

15 Petersen 2007, 284f.

16 Vermes 1961, 95.

in terms of genre.¹⁷ In his contribution to the New Schürer, for instance, he did not hesitate to speak of rewritten Bible as a distinct and definite genre conceived to include the following writings: Josephus' Antiquities, Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum, the Book of Noah (1Q1 and 19bis), the Testament of Kohat (4QTQahat), the Testament of Amram (4QAmram^{a-e}), a Samuel Apocryphon (4Q160), and the Martyrdom of Isaiah. In the context of rewritten Bible, Vermes also mentions the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and the Lives of the Prophets, but the discussion of these texts has been located in another chapter, since they are conceived to have been subjected to Christian adaptations. The Books of Chronicles which most scholars nowadays tend to include in the category of rewritten Scripture are treated in the New Schürer under the rubric of haggadic midrash or historical midrash, but are simultaneously said to embody the same exegetical technique as that found in later writings such as the Book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon.¹⁸

I think it is fair to say from Vermes' different formulations over the years that he endorses an understanding of rewritten Bible which includes both of the components which have loomed as a bone of contention in recent debates.¹⁹ In Vermes' view, rewritten Bible constitutes both a genre and a textual strategy or process. In his Budapest lecture, Vermes confirmed this interpretation by claiming that "the person who combined biblical studies with its interpretation was engaged in a process, but when his activity was completed, it resulted in a literary genre."²⁰

The Second Phase: from 1984 to the Mid-Nineties

The second phase in the history of scholarship evolved in the mid-eighties, when increasing scholarship was being invested in the field of late Second Temple Judaism. The limited application of the term in textual studies of early Jewish literature which had characterised the first phase changed considerably from this point on. A crucial factor in this development was the publication in 1985 of the two volumes of the Charlesworth edition of the Pseudepigrapha which decisively contributed to a renewed and vibrant scholarly interest of

17 In recent years Bernstein 2005 and Segal 2005 have been the most outspoken advocates of such an understanding. Both of them, however, accept the inclusion of legal texts in the category.

18 Vermes, Millar and Goodman 1986, Vol. 2, 346–348.

19 Cf. chapter "Biblical Midrash," in Vermes, Millar and Goodman 1986, Vol. 3, 308–341, 308, and Vermes 1989, 187*.

20 Vermes in this volume, see page 6 above.

what at that time was designated Jewish pseudepigraphal literature. By their use of the notion rewritten Bible, George Nickelsburg, Daniel Harrington and Philip Alexander in different publications contributed significantly to the subsequent prevalence of the term as a scholarly concept in studies of Second Temple literature. At the same time, their different focus on the concept as respectively a genre and a textual strategy came to exert important influence on subsequent scholarship, which felt obliged to make a choice between the two options. Their work had all been stimulated by their simultaneous cooperation in the Charlesworth Pseudepigrapha project.

In his essay "Retelling the Old Testament" published in 1988, Philip Alexander adhered to Vermes' original understanding of the notion by only including the Genesis Apocryphon, the Book of Jubilees, the first 11 books of Josephus' Antiquities, and the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, thus excluding as most scholars have done since the Palestinian Targumic literature (not to speak of *Sefer ha-Yashar*) which Vermes had included in the category.²¹ At the same time, Alexander argued for an understanding of the concept in terms of a genre. He provided nine extensive characteristics and claimed that any text to be included in this particular genre should possess all nine characteristics. In fairness to Alexander, he acknowledged that his genre definition was of a rather loose nature, since "the characteristics do not differentiate the genre singly, but only as a collection."²² Basically, Alexander's understanding was an elaboration of Vermes' characteristics of the notion. He emphasised how the term was meant to designate narrative texts. It neither included theological treatises nor legal texts. Additionally and importantly for my purpose, Alexander pointed out that the rewritten texts were never meant to replace their scriptural antecedents. Finally, he highlighted the close relationship that exists between rewritten texts and their scriptural predecessors by emphasising how rewritten texts closely follow their scriptural base texts. He concurred with Vermes that rewritten texts "offer 'a fuller, smoother and doctrinally more advanced form of the sacred narrative.'"²³

21 Alexander 1988. In his paper at the Budapest conference Vermes pointed out that he thinks that the exclusion of the Targumic material of subsequent scholarship from the discussion of rewritten Bible has been detrimental to the debate: "And this may be the bee in my bonnet, the works gathered under the umbrella of the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum are ideal sources for the study of 'Rewritten Bible.' In fact, the so-called Fragmentary Targum and the marginalia of Codex Neofiti represent, in my view, exegetical accretions detached from the full text of the Palestinian Aramaic paraphrase." (above on page 6).

22 Alexander 1988, 119.

23 Alexander 1988, 117 quoting Vermes, Millar and Goodman 1986, vol. 3, 305.

George Nickelsburg and Daniel Harrington, in contrast, moved in a conspicuously different direction. Not only did they include a considerably greater number of texts under the rubric but they also spoke of rewritten Bible as a 'textual strategy' rather than a genre.²⁴ Ever since this point, it has been a continuous bone of contention whether the category should be thought of in generic terms or as a textual strategy. Both views have as we have seen a basis in Vermes' original and subsequent works. Be that as it may, it was the understanding of the notion as a textual strategy that allowed scholars like Nickelsburg and Harrington to classify an increasing number of texts under the rubric. With a growing number of texts being included in the category the way was paved for the subsequent development which also with the publication of the Charlesworth edition of Jewish Pseudepigrapha incited renewed interest in non-canonical forms of Judaism.

The Third Phase: from the Mid-Nineties to the Millennium

The third phase that took its beginning in the mid-nineties is marked by the growing prevalence of the term in scholarly publications. Although an increase in use is not necessarily a token of a transition that legitimates the reification of a new phase of research, I think it is legitimate to place a caesura around 1995. With the complete publication of the Qumran texts and especially the texts of Cave Four in the beginning of the nineties, the way was paved for a renewed consideration of the applicability of the term. Along with an increasing number of texts that came to be included under the sobriquet in addition to the four originally ones characterised as rewritten Bible by Vermes, this phase

24 In addition to the texts included in the category by Vermes and Alexander (with the notable exception of Josephus' *Antiquities*, which, however, is treated in a separate chapter by Harold Attridge), Nickelsburg accorded 1 En 6–11; 12–16; 65–67; 83; 106–7; the *Book of Giants* (4QEnGiants^{a–f}); the *Apocalypse of Moses*; the *Life of Adam and Eve*; Philo the Epic Poet; Theodotus the Epic Poet; Ezekiel the Tragedian; 1 *Esdras* 1–4; additions to the Book of Esther; the catalogue of Davidic compositions in 11QPs^a; *Baruch*; the *Epistle of Jeremiah*; and the *Prayer of Azariah* and the *Song of the three Young Men* to the genre, see Nickelsburg 1984, 89f. Harrington added even more texts to the category by also including the *Temple Scroll*; the *Assumption of Moses*; the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah*; and the *Ascension of Isaiah*. Additionally, Harrington proposes that: "the restriction to Palestinian writings taking the flow of the biblical narrative as their structural principle is admittedly artificial, since there is a good deal of possible biblical interpretation in 1 *Enoch*, the other Qumran writings, 4 *Ezra*, 2 *Baruch*, etc.," see Harrington 1986, 239. The inclusion of some of Philo's works in the category has also been suggested by Peder Borgen who proposed to include the *Life of Moses* and the *Exposition of the Laws* among rewritten Bible texts, see Borgen 1984, 234, and Borgen 1997, 63–79.

of scholarship was also marked by a break with his understanding, a break already anticipated by Harrington's inclusion of the *Temple Scroll* in the category. Whereas Vermes in his original and subsequent publications had emphasised that only texts of a narrative nature were suitable candidates for being included in the category, an increasing number of scholars began to classify texts of a legal character such as, for instance, the *Temple Scroll* as representatives of rewritten Bible.²⁵ At the same time as this phase has been characterised by the growing influence of the texts from Cave Four, the texts which were discussed in relation to the rubric during the second phase of scholarship faded into the background. This applies especially to the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo and the Antiquities of Josephus. Once in a while it is difficult to avoid the impression that the discussion of rewritten Scripture from this time on became a primarily Qumran phenomenon.

The Fourth Phase: from the Millennium unto Today

The final and present phase was initiated approximately a decade ago and has been characterised by two very different trajectories. Whereas rewritten Bible in one dominant current is applied to an increasing number of texts, including, for instance, texts of the nascent Christ-movement, the other line of scholarship has been marked by different forms of scepticism—verging on dismissal—towards the term. The first trajectory may be seen as an extension of the line of scholarship marking the third phase by its continuous inclusion of new texts into the category. The second trajectory is likewise dependent on research characteristic of the third phase, but it has moved in a remarkably different direction. It bears on the implications of scriptural texts from Qumran, especially texts found in Cave Four. One of the greatest impacts of the texts from Cave Four has been the questioning of time-honoured categories such as 'biblical' and 'canonical'. Scholars like Shemaryahu Talmon, James VanderKam, Robert Kraft, Eugene Ulrich and Florentino García Martínez to name just a few among others have made it palpably clear that there was neither a closed, nor even a fixed tripartite canon prior to the late first century and early second century CE at the earliest.²⁶ Secondly, it has also become obvious that the scriptural texts were in a greater state of flux than had hitherto been

25 See among others Swanson 1995, 227; Dimant 1999, 50; Brooke 2000, 779. The inclusion of legal material into the category has also been accepted by Vermes who in his paper at the Budapest conference acknowledged that: "I accept that future treatment of the "Rewritten Bible" should include the whole field of the Jewish Bible" (see above page 6).

26 Talmon 2010, 421f.439; VanderKam 2002, 52f; Kraft 2007a and Kraft 2007; Ulrich 1999, 17.31.59f; García Martínez 2010, 20f.

recognised by scholarship. Thirdly, this line of scholarship has made it clear that the continuum comprising texts exhibiting scriptural adjustments, amplifications, conflations, embellishments, harmonisations, omissions, rearrangements and supplementations with respect to scriptural predecessors was considerably more complex than previously could have been acknowledged. Fourthly, it became clear that the rewriting of Scripture was not only a phenomenon pertaining to differences between allegedly canonical and non-canonical texts but also an intra-biblical matter as Deuteronomy and the Books of Chronicles vividly demonstrate.

For these reasons some scholars while wanting to retain the idea included in the original concept, replaced Bible with Scripture and, therefore, began to speak about rewritten Scripture.²⁷ If no Bible existed at the turn of the Common Era how could one possibly speak about rewriting it? Replacing Bible with Scripture was a way of providing remedy for this problem. Other scholars have favoured alternative terminology such as parabiblical or parascriptural literature,²⁸ and recently it has been suggested that the discussion can be advanced by introducing Gérard Genette's distinction between hypertext and hypotext. In Genette's terminology, the hypertext constitutes any text united in a textual relationship with an earlier text A (the hypotext) "upon which it is grafted in a manner that is not a commentary".²⁹ George Brooke for one has argued in favour of applying Genette's terminology to the subject.³⁰ From my view, the alternative terminology suffers from two problems regardless of whether we are talking about paratextual literature, hypotexts or hypertexts.

27 Among the first to do this was VanderKam 2002, 42f. Cf. Flint 2003, 272; Campbell 2005, 49; Petersen 2007, 286–288; White Crawford 2008, 6.

28 For arguments in favour of designating the texts para-something without the ending 'biblical' or 'scriptural', see Zahn 2011, 103–105; cf. Campbell 2005, 66. The term parabiblical was originally introduced by Ginsberg 1967, 574, whereas parascriptural was brought forward by Robert Kraft in his presidential address at the SBL in 2006, see Kraft 2007, 18. To avoid a too close relationship between the category and Jewish literature as well as religious connotations pertaining to Scripture, Armin Lange in the wake of Gérard Genette has proposed to replace the two terms with 'paratext' and 'paratextual', see Lange 2010, 17. These terms, however, suffer from the fact that in his later work Genette took paratext and paratextual to refer to textual elements such as titles, subtitles, prefaces, postfaces, etc., whereas he used hypertext to designate what he originally termed paratext, see Genette 1997, 3, in contrast to his earlier work Genette 1992, 82. In this manner, a return to the older terminology of Genette may cause more confusion than contributing to create conceptual clarity.

29 Genette 1997, 5.

30 Brooke 2010.

Firstly, it does not make clear that not only are we dealing with a form of intertextuality connecting different texts with each other but also that the texts that are being rewritten are perceived to be authoritative. Secondly and closely connected to the first point, the alternative terms do not highlight that the rewritten texts are borrowing authority and in some cases usurping it from the texts which they are rewriting.³¹ If we are leaving out the aspect of authority indicated by the term, I do not see any point in retaining rewritten Scripture as a category, since it may just as well be replaced by the more common notion of intertextuality.

About the same time as some scholars began to question the appropriateness of retaining 'Bible' in the phrasing of rewritten Bible, other voices notably uttered by scholars such as Moshe Bernstein and Michael Segal argued in favour of adhering to a more rigid understanding of the concept in line with Geza Vermes' original notion (once again excluding the Palestinian Targumic literature and the *Sefer ha-Yashar*).³² To Bernstein it was decisive to prevent the concept from becoming a *signifiant flottant* being accorded such a wide scope of meaning that almost any Jewish text of the era could be encapsulated in the category. Bernstein acknowledged the fact that in the words of Carol Newsom "echoes of the biblical text haunt virtually all of the new literary compositions of this period" by making a distinction between the rewriting of biblical texts and rewritten Bible, but his aim was clearly of a reformist nature.³³ Only at one point did he want to diverge from Vermes' understanding, namely with respect to the inclusion of legal texts in the category.

Although some differences may be found between the views of Bernstein and Segal, they endorse a view that is very similar. Parallel to Bernstein, Michael Segal underlines the similarities found between earlier examples of rewriting in 'biblical' texts and later texts of the Second Temple period, while also acknowledging the element of authority as important: "Rewriting, as opposed to creative composition, is characteristic of this corpus of religious literature in which later writers always looked to the past to suggest new ideas in the present and for the future. Rewriting was thus the rule and not the exception."³⁴ In Segal's understanding what distinguishes earlier examples of rewriting from

31 On this point I disagree with Armin Lange, who claims that the use of Scripture in the nomenclature ties the discussion not only to Jewish but also to religious texts which he perceives as a problematical constraint, see Lange 2010, 16. If, however, we define Scripture as any text which is being attributed cultural authority this problem disappears.

32 Bernstein 2005 and Segal 2005.

33 Bernstein 2005, 195. The quote from Newsom stems from Newsom 2004, 6.

34 Segal 2005, 28.

the works of the late Second Temple period is the extent which the rewriting takes. Whereas in the earlier period one may find rewritings of individual laws, prophecies, or narrative passages, the further one moves into the latter part of the Second Temple period the more extensive becomes the scale of rewriting, since entire works such as Chronicles, Book of Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and 1 Esdras rewrote complete literary works.³⁵

In total, the fourth phase which constitutes the present situation is characterised by considerable scholarly diversity in terms of the application of the rubric. Some scholars are increasingly sceptical towards the use of the concept, while others without further ado apply the notion to an increasing number of texts, including some that are either marginal to or even lying outside the more specific context of late Second Temple Jewish literature. Finally, some scholars in a reformist attempt to purify the use of the concept have—with one or two changes—pleaded for a return to Vermes' original use of the notion.

Challenges to the Continued Use of the Notion

With this brief overview of the history of research in mind, I shall now turn to a few points where I have developed my understanding since the 2007 article. First, I continue to think that Bible should be replaced with Scripture in the nomenclature, since the arguments against using Bible have neither been reduced nor weakened over the past couple of years. On the contrary, the growing acknowledgement of the lateness of the final formation of the Jewish Bible as well as the increasing appreciation of the fluidity of scriptural writings as late as the first century BCE and, perhaps, for some writings even later should make us reluctant to use Bible with respect to this period. Secondly, as we have already observed it is also problematical with the term Bible, since it can only be used with respect to a particular group of writings. In this case, the term risks becoming a reduplication of that which it was meant to explain. Additionally, to the extent that the phenomenon of rewritten Bible is a biblical phenomenon as well, it is misleading to use the term, since it suggests a relationship existing between biblical and non-biblical writings, but not one which is also found among biblical writings proper. In this regard, it is a wise decision to follow recent scholarship by replacing the term, but only to the extent that we are able with new terminology to retain the element of authority in the expression. Otherwise, we may simply replace it by using the more prevalent term of intertextuality. Thirdly, I have become increasingly hesitant

35 Segal 2005, 28.

about using the term 'rewritten' as the other element of the composite in the expression. Sidnie White Crawford among others has forcefully argued that if the texts of the books traditionally designated biblical were not fixed in the period under discussion, but rather were of a pluriform nature the term rewritten may, indeed, be called into question.³⁶ If a fixed text did not exist, how can one possibly speak about it as being rewritten? Fourthly and, perhaps, more challenging to the element of 'rewritten' in the expression, is the fact that hardly any text is not in some sense of a rewritten nature. Like other signs, texts do not evolve *ab ovo*, but are, in fact, always presupposing an existing tradition to which they may relate in different ways, covering a spectrum that consists of a polemical stance at the one end of the axis and a loyal and embracing one at the other end. In this sense every text—despite the emphasis it may place on its own novelty and originality—is partaking in a perpetual riverrun of tradition, since texts by the act of rewriting respond to existing textual and, hence, cultural tradition. This may be a semiotic triviality, but as most banalities nevertheless a fact.³⁷ In light of such a view, it becomes redundant—verging on the superfluous—to claim for a text that it is of a rewritten nature. However, that is only one side of the problem. If all texts, whether deliberately or not, are rewriting previous texts, it is obviously misleading to single out a special category as being of a rewritten nature.

With these critical comments in mind, can there one may justifiably ask be any sustainability in retaining the notion if we have dismissed both elements of the composite? Yes, indeed, I shall argue, but in order to retain the concept it is crucial that we not only specify its meaning but also the level of analysis to which it may be applied. As long as we know what we are doing analytically and can see both theoretical and empirical gains from the undertaking, I do not see any problems in staying with the term. The more so, since the potential objection that we have created an artificial category with no 1:1-relationship with the texts under examination, is of no bearing. Analytical constructs never constitute an unmediated reflection of reality. They are representative of an active modeling on blurred reality that enables us to make differentiations and, hence, to advance understanding. If rewritten Scripture, underpinned by a clear theoretical perspective, enables us to conceive of a particular segment of reality, that is, the spectrum captured by the theoretical outlook, then we are definitely in a better situation than proceeding without the concept.

36 White Crawford 2008, 5.

37 For an extensive discussion of this argument of sign production as a continuous semiotic riverrun, see Petersen 2011.

I concur with the line of scholarship that conceives of rewritten Scripture as a “textual strategy” rather than a generic designation, although I am still prepared to acknowledge that from an *etic* perspective one could possibly conceive of the notion as a genre classification, although I no longer think that such an understanding moves the discussion forward.³⁸ Scholars, however, who favour a perception of the concept in terms of a generic designation, take it to be located at the *emic* level of analysis which I believe is a mistake. Surely, the six examples of literature (including the Targums and *Sepher ha-Yashar*) to which Vermes originally assigned the classification are already too diverse in terms of genre to be attributed the same generic rubric at the *emic* level of analysis—if genres are understood to share a number of properties with respect to content, form and function. Contrary to my own previous work, I think it is more promising to acknowledge that we are dealing with the more comprehensive phenomenon of intertextuality, although of an excessive nature and with a special focus on the aspect of authority.

Moshe Bernstein has rightly objected that such an understanding risks turning our concept into “an excessively vague all-encompassing term.”³⁹ That may well be, but in light of my previous considerations I do not think it really constitutes a problem. On the contrary, the use of the notion risks becoming narrow—verging on scholarly insularity—in terms of theoretical scope if it can solely be applied to one particular body of literature and even within this body of texts to a relatively few writings only. Again, I shall insist on the point that it is the theoretical perspective underlying the use of the term that prevents it from becoming a floating signifier. That the category may be applied to a great number of texts is not a valid objection as long as the theoretical stance safeguards the concept from becoming excessively vague. In addition, to retain the concept we also need to repudiate the criticism raised against the term that ultimately the concern with authority conceals theological interests which, although legitimate by themselves, prevent the term from being used outside the guild of people exhibiting these concerns. If it cannot be shown that we are dealing with a more comprehensive textual phenomenon which involves both of the aspects that have loomed largely in the previous discussion of rewritten Scripture, it is difficult to see how these two objections can be rejected. I think that the challenges that have been raised against the generic understanding

38 This was essentially the argument I put forward in Petersen 2007. At that time it was crucial for me to emphasise how the acknowledgement of rewritten Scripture concerned modern interests in intertextuality rather than a genre appreciation among Jews of the late Second Temple period.

39 Bernstein 2005, 187.

carry so much weight that one has to let go of this notion. If, however, we concede that we are examining just another form of intertextuality, what is the point of retaining the notion rather than abandoning it by replacing it with the concept of intertextuality?

I think there is good reason to hold on to the category as a scholarly term, since it may analytically, advantageously be taken to designate one particular and excessive type of intertextuality, namely the one that exists between an authoritative scriptural antecedent and its subsequent reuse in any type of rewriting. This move simultaneously allows us to elevate the concept to a category of comparative and cross-cultural value. At a conference on *Contextualising Rewritten Scripture* held at the University of Aarhus in 2010, I asked colleagues from art history, classics, history, literature and musicology to use the concept in order to explore the theoretical and empirical gains they would achieve by the application of it to their particular fields of expertise. At the same time, the idea was to examine how their work could facilitate progress in the field in which the notion originally had been developed. Thus, in a forthcoming conference volume there are essays on, for instance, Vergil's *Aeneid* as a piece of rewritten Scripture of the Homeric Songs, on medieval church music as rewritten pieces of scriptural antecedents, on Shakespeare's rewriting his authoritative scriptural predecessors, etc.⁴⁰ Does such a sweeping use of the concept make the category superfluous by rendering it excessively vague? I do not think so, since the underlying theoretical perspective informing the use of the category makes it clear that we are engaged with the more comprehensive phenomenon of intertextuality, but with a special focus on the aspect of authority.

As indicated by the previous discussion, the element of authority will not suffice as sole criterion for defining rewritten Scripture. We have already noted how every text is in a sense a piece of rewritten Scripture in so far as it is engaged in the rewriting of antecedent texts. To the extent that it rewrites particular traditions as against others, one could argue that every piece of writing in this broad sense exhibits the category of rewritten Scripture, since only traditions attached cultural significance by the writer would qualify as candidates for being rewritten. Such an understanding, however, would render the concept superfluous. Therefore, it makes good sense to keep that element which has been a constituent feature in the previous scholarly discussion, namely that texts representative of rewritten Scripture are characterised by rewriting scriptural predecessors in a manner that exhibits a continuum of harmonisations, insertions, omissions and variations with respect to their antecedents,

40 See Petersen 2013.

but without explicit commenting on the intertextual relationship between base text and the rewriting such as is found in commentary literature. In this manner, we should acknowledge that, on the one hand, the act of rewriting authoritative texts is in its most comprehensive sense characteristic of all text production, while, on the other hand, it may for analytical reasons be sensible to draw a distinction between different types of rewriting, where rewritten Scripture would qualify as one particular case of the broader phenomenon. Thus, we may take the notion to designate a textual strategy by which any text rewrites one or more authoritative textual predecessors by closely following the structure of its base text(s), but without making explicit comments on the intertextual relationship that exists between them.

Such an understanding, however, calls for at least two typological specifications. First, it is vital to clarify the implications of what it means to closely follow the base text, since such a characterisation is in need of further differentiation. The differentiation called for is ultimately a matter of placing heuristically useful caesura on a continuum that will enable us to distinguish between different degrees of textual proximity with respect to the relationship between rewritten texts and their scriptural predecessors.⁴¹ Second, it is important to stipulate the relationship that exists in terms of authority between text and base text. It is to the latter question that I shall now turn my attention.

Scriptural Rewritings and the Question of Authority

In scholarship on rewritten Scripture it constitutes as I have already noted an almost truism that the texts rewriting scriptural antecedents do neither strive to challenge nor to replace their textual predecessors. Philip Alexander, for instance, in his important study of rewritten Bible contends that: "Despite the superficial independence of form, these texts are not intended to replace, or to supersede the Bible."⁴² Although scriptural rewritings may accord authority to their own textual creations by borrowing the attributed authority from the authoritative texts which they are engaged in rewriting, the subsequent texts are in the time-honoured scholarly understanding providing either supplementary or complementary interpretation. According to this view, rewritten Scripture does not challenge the authority of the texts which are being rewritten.

41 See my forthcoming essay "The Gospel of Judas," 2012, in which I provide a provisional differentiation between texts which to different degrees share the element of closely following the base text.

42 Alexander 1988, 116.

George Brooke who has devoted much perceptive work to this question of replacement or supplementation, has propagated the view that there is a reciprocal relationship in terms of authority between the scriptural predecessors and their subsequent rewritings. He highlights this insight by arguing that, on the one hand, the rewritings bask themselves in the authority of the texts they are rewriting, while, on the other hand, they also contribute to the enhancement of authority on the part of the scriptural antecedents by virtue of rewriting them.⁴³ In this manner, he contends that not only do rewritten texts borrow authority from their scriptural antecedents but they also contribute to the bestowal of authority on them.⁴⁴ Brooke supports his argument by promulgating the obvious view that the very fact that a text is engaged in the rewriting of an authoritative textual antecedent excludes the possibility that the same text would undermine the authority from which it obtains its own derivative authority. It would, indeed, be a self-destructive strategy in terms of gaining authority for what one is writing if at the same time one undercuts that very authority one is striving to attain. As self-evident as this argument may appear, I have recently become increasingly reluctant towards this more irenic fashion of conceptualising the relationship between rewritten Scripture and scriptural antecedents. Brooke, of course, is right in his general assertion that it would not make sense for a text to borrow authority from a scriptural predecessor while at the same time undermining that authority it attempts to assert for itself. Yet, I am not sure whether this assessment necessarily leads to Brooke's conclusion that rewritten scriptural texts:

do not seem to have been composed to replace the authoritative sources which they rework, all operate some kind of interpretative strategy (however veiled that might be), they can only offer one interpretation at a time in their re-presentations of the scriptural text, and they tend themselves not to be cited explicitly elsewhere as authoritative (though Jubilees is an obvious exception here—perhaps it may have been known as a rewritten text by some people and thought not to be such by others).⁴⁵

I think Brooke's view holds true for some texts such as, for instance, those parts of Josephus' *Antiquities* which qualify as rewritten Scripture (strictly speaking, *Ant.* 1.1–11.296), the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Biblical Antiquities of*

43 Brooke 2005, 96.

44 Brooke 2010, 51f.

45 Brooke 2002 33. Cf. Najman 2003, 45f.

Pseudo-Philo (*LAB*). The understanding, however, becomes problematical when it is turned into a general and constitutive element of the category of rewritten Scripture, as Brooke also seems to acknowledge by pointing to the special nature of Jubilees. I think that this understanding underestimates the variety of possibilities available in the relationship between rewritten texts and scriptural antecedents with regard to the element of authority. To a great extent this discussion depends on what exactly is meant by replacement.

It may well be that rewritten texts do not aim to replace their scriptural predecessors in any straightforward manner as Brooke and others have emphasised, but I do not see how at the outset it can be excluded that some rewritten scriptural texts at the cost of their authoritative predecessors, in fact, do strive to appropriate for themselves the authority of the antecedents. Additionally, if one is prepared to grant this possibility, it opens for a spectrum of options within which works belonging to rewritten Scripture by their degree and mode of rewriting the base text may exhibit greater or lesser extents of criticism over against their authoritative predecessors. If by replacement one can also understand the act of surpassing or exceeding one's scriptural predecessors with respect to claims to authority, it cannot be excluded that some rewritten texts did attempt to supersede their authoritative base texts. Such supersession does not imply the abrogation of the base text in a straight-forward manner, but it does move the understanding in the direction of acknowledging that some rewritten texts could render their scriptural antecedents superfluous and of less value in terms of authority.

Textual Fidelity, Elaboration, Supersession or Encroachment?

Perhaps this argument becomes more understandable if we allow ourselves to include other texts in the reflections than the quartet of writings which traditionally constituted the primary empirical evidence for the discussion. Yet, even the Book of Jubilees demonstrates how a too bombastic negation of the aspect of replacement faces interpretational problems. In fact, the text bears witness to how some rewritten works with respect to the question of authoritative relationship between textual predecessor and rewriting both aim to have their cake and eat it. When, for instance, it is stated in Jubilees that "This is because I (the angel of presence) have written it (the celebration of the feast of *Shebuot*), in the book of the first Law which I wrote for you, so that you might observe it in each of its appointed times, one day per year" (6:22; cf. 2:24; 30:12.21), the text obviously affirms the status of the laws of the Genesis-Exodus

account which it narrates (Gen 1–Ex 19).⁴⁶ At the same time, however, the first Law did not suffice, since the revelations provided not only by God but also dictated from heavenly tablets by the angel of presence to Moses are needed. The first Law is not considered deficient in the sense that it was wrong and, therefore, in need of replacement, but since it has given rise to false calendrical practices the corrections of these, provided by Jubilees, are decisive. The book vehemently protests against any calendar which is not exclusively built on the 364 days' solar calendar (cf. 6:35–38).

From the perspective of Jubilees, the corrections it provides are not of a new date, since the text does not introduce novel traditions over against contemporaneous interpretations of the base text. Orchestrated as revelatory discourse, Jubilees reveals what has been written on the heavenly tablets from primordial time, thereby assigning them a superior status over the laws found in its scriptural antecedents.⁴⁷ By its affirmation of the first Law, Jubilees emphasises that no discrepancy exists between the first Law and the revelations provided by God and the angel of presence. At the same time, however, the book virtually replaces the first Law by adding a new interpretative lens through which it claims the first Law has to be grasped. In this manner, Jubilees does not replace its legislative antecedents in a straightforward fashion. Yet, it does claim that the calendrical laws understood to be included in the Genesis-Exodus narrative cannot be properly perceived, unless they are unlocked by the interpretative key provided by Jubilees. In this fashion, the book is representative of the broader phenomenon of scriptural *deuterōsis*, whereby secondary texts claim to constitute the right interpretation to the primary texts. Obviously, the same observation applies to those traditions which Jubilees adds to its scriptural predecessors. When, for instance, the text remedies for the lack of an account of Abraham's birth and youth in the Genesis narrative by filling out this narrative lacuna (Jub 11:14–12:8), it supersedes its antecedents by providing a more complete story. Although the kind of rewriting to which Jubilees belongs, may superficially be considered to take up secondary position, in practice it is the authoritative text which is subordinated the secondary writing. It becomes the authoritative filter through which the former writings have to be interpreted. This does not only pertain to the pragmatic function of the text but is also evident at the level of content.

The primordial nature accorded to the laws of Jubilees over against those revealed in the first Law highlights the text's superior status over the scriptural

46 Translations from Jubilees are taken from Wintermute's translation in the Charlesworth 1983–1985.

47 Cf. Najman 2010, 52, which is a reprinted version of an article from 1999.

predecessors which it rewrites. Pentateuchal laws are often said to derive from the heavenly tablets transmitted by Jubilees (see, for instance, 16:28–30; 28:6; 30:8–10; 32:10–15). This is no replacement in the sense of an abrogation of the claims of the base text, but certainly it is a way by which Jubilees appropriates for itself a higher degree of authority over against that of the scriptural predecessors. This changes the order of the authoritative relationship between base text and subsequent rewriting. By virtue of reproducing from heavenly tablets and transmitting to Moses “both what (was) in the beginning and what will occur (in the future), the account of the division of all of the days of the Law and testimony” (1:4, cf. 1:26–29; 2:1), Jubilees becomes primary Scripture, whereas the Genesis-Exodus narrative is attributed the role of interpretative supplement.⁴⁸ The same applies to those instances in which the Book of Jubilees rewrites the Genesis-Exodus narrative. By its asserted temporal precedence over against the scriptural antecedents, Jubilees becomes an improved version of the Genesis-Exodus account. Given its self-acclaimed divine priority over the Genesis-Exodus narrative, it is difficult to see how its intended audience should only conceive of it in terms of an interpretative supplement. The scholars who argue against the idea of replacement are right to emphasise the continued authority ascribed by the Book of Jubilees to its scriptural predecessors. Yet, they underestimate the superior nature which Jubilees claims over against its base text. The book epitomises a text which by virtue of rewriting an authoritative predecessor strives to supersede it in terms of authority both with respect to content and to pragmatic function.

Such an understanding becomes as already indicated even more apparent if we take other texts into account which have not traditionally been considered from the perspective of rewritten Scripture. I think it is obvious to discuss the New Testament gospels in this context, since they also exemplify texts which not only closely follow their base text in terms of structure but also share the constitutive element of the category, namely the rewriting of authoritative predecessors without any explicit commenting on the intertextual relationship

48 Najman 2010, 54, is among the scholars, who strongly opposes the replacement thesis, but, in fact, I think she comes close to the understanding of the textual relationship between Jubilees and its base text that I am endorsing, when she argues that: “. . . *Jubilees* belongs to a family of texts that claims an equivalent or perhaps even a higher authority than that accorded Mosaic revelation insofar as the heavenly tablets were revealed prior to Sinaitic revelation.” See also Najman 2003, 44–47, which is more outspoken in its critique against the replacement thesis.

between the two.⁴⁹ Irrespective of the question of Q, it is incontestable that the Gospel of Matthew rewrites its Marcan base text by exhibiting a number of features such as adjustments, amplifications, conflation, embellishments, omissions, rearrangements and supplementations which at the level of content are understood to be prime characteristics of rewritten Scripture. It is certainly reasonable to think of Matthew as an extended version of Mark's Gospel, since Matthew reiterates Mark by recounting more or less the same macro-narrative, but in different and important respects develops, elaborates, and changes the story of its scriptural antecedent. This is evident already in the beginning of the gospel, where Matthew amplifies the Marcan narrative by telling what went before Jesus came to John the Baptist to undergo a baptism for the remission of sins.⁵⁰

It is well-known how Matthew in the narrative of the birth of Jesus and the subsequent escape to Egypt establishes a close connection between Jesus and the story of Moses:⁵¹ a relationship that plays an important role throughout the Gospel of Matthew. Although a number of changes may be found in Matthew over against the Marcan base text, Matthew is by and large loyal to its *Vorlage*. Rather than changing its scriptural antecedent as such, Matthew generally amplifies it by telling a gospel that constitutes an elaborated version of Mark. For instance, the story of the temptation in Matthew is located at the same place in the narrative as in Mark, since it immediately follows the anointment of Jesus (4:1, cf. Mark 1:12). However, there is an important difference between the two accounts in terms of their narrative function. In Mark, Jesus becomes an actualised Christ through his 'heavenly baptism' in which he is not only bequeathed with the spirit but is also assigned by a heavenly voice to be the beloved son of God (1:11).⁵² Since this is conceived as the drawing up of a contract between God and Jesus, the scene is only accessible to Jesus and to no

49 In my view, the emphasis placed on the element that rewritten Scripture exemplify texts that do not explicitly comment on their scriptural predecessors exclude the inclusion of, for instance, Philonic texts under the nomenclature. However, the exclusion of such texts from the category is a matter of degree, since they do share a number of important elements with rewritten Scripture proper. Additionally, the decision to exclude such texts from the category proper is located at the etic level of analysis for heuristic reasons in order to enhance analytical refinement. In principle, there is nothing that prevents such texts from being included. It would only entail the use of a more comprehensive category at the cost of typological sophistication.

50 For an extended version of this argument, see Petersen 2013a.

51 For an extensive discussion of this, see Brown 1993, 52–54, 107f. 112–116, 162f.

52 For the precise semiotic difference between actualisation and realisation, see the relevant entries in Greimas and Courtés 1979, as well as Greimas 1983, 27–29.

other persons in the narrated world of the text, i.e. the narratee.⁵³ At the level of the enunciation, however, this knowledge is obviously also conveyed by the narrator to the narratee.⁵⁴

Matthew, in contrast, places the establishment of the contract between God and Jesus already at the time of the birth of Jesus (1:18). Joseph is told by an angel of God that not only has Mary become pregnant by the holy spirit but also that Joseph shall give the future son the name Jesus, since he shall save his people from their sins (1:20f). Thereby, the narrative function of not only the 'baptism with the spirit' but also of John's preceding water baptism of Jesus is changed. In Matthew, the anointment with the spirit serves as the point in the narrated world of the text where Jesus, at least to John the Baptist and possibly to the bystanders as well, is proclaimed to be the beloved son of God (3:17). In this manner, the anointment serves as a public proclamation of Jesus in the Gospel's narratee.

A similar change in understanding pertains to John's baptism of Jesus. Since Jesus in Matthew has already become an actualised Christ from his birth, John's baptism for repentance does not really make sense with respect to Jesus. Why should he be baptised for the remission of sins, if already from birth he has become an actualised Christ? In principle, the author of Matthew, as later the Gospel of John will do, could have deleted the scene from his gospel, but he retains it. However, it is obvious from the narrative point of view that he does not know what to do with it: "And John tried to prevent him, saying: "I need to be baptized by you, and are you coming to me?" But Jesus answered and said to him: "Permit it to be so now, for thus it is fitting for us to fulfil all righteousness." Then he allowed him" (3:14f).⁵⁵

Despite this significant difference between Mark and Matthew in terms of the narrative instantiation of Jesus as an actualised Christ, the scene of the temptation in both gospels serves as a testing of Jesus. In so far as he is conceived to have entered into a contractual relationship with God—whether at birth (Matthew) or at the 'heavenly baptism' (Mark)—the narrative of the temptation highlights the implications of Jesus' new status by testing his ability to comply with the contractual demands. The only real difference between the two narrative scenes with respect to content is the fact that Matthew has

53 For the anointment of Jesus as the establishment of a contractual relationship between Jesus and God, see Davidsen 1993, 266–271.

54 See Davidsen 1993, 25–28, for the crucial difference between the levels of the enunciation and the enunciate, that is, the narratee.

55 Translations from the Bible are if not otherwise indicated taken from the New King James Bible.

amplified the Marcan version by depicting the temptation as a tripartite and escalating event culminating with the devil taking Jesus to a high mountain (3:9–11).

The same parallelism in terms of both narrative function and content is found in the scene of trial in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mark 14:32–42; Matt 26:36–46). It constitutes the other end of that narrative arch which takes its beginning in the scene of the ‘heavenly baptism’ and the subsequent temptation and stretches across the narrative all the way to the scene of trial and the subsequent climax of the crucifixion. Prior to the crucifixion, Jesus is once again tested on his ability to comply with the contractual demands. Unlike the scene of temptation, he is no longer tried by his ability to avoid transgressing divine prohibition (a conflict between willing to do and not being allowed to do). Instead he is tried on his ability to fulfil divine command (a conflict between ought to do and not wanting to do): “O my father, if this cup cannot pass away from me unless I drink it, your will be done; nevertheless not as I will, but as you will” (Matt 23:39b–c). In this manner, the scene of trial paves the way for Jesus’ ultimate test to prove that, indeed, he was the son of God, that is, his sacrificial death on the cross.

This will take us to our final example demonstrating the narrative closeness between Mark and Matthew. In contrast to the later Gospels of Luke and John, Jesus’ giving up his spirit on the cross in Mark and Matthew is narrated in a conspicuously similar fashion. Unlike Luke and John, where Jesus utters three divergently different sayings, in Mark and Matthew he is represented as only expressing one word on the cross. In both texts Jesus utters in a quotation from Ps 22:2 as his last word: “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me” (Mark 15:34; Matt 27:46). As indicated by these examples, Matthew is on the central points of the narrative structure loyal to Mark as its scriptural predecessor which to a great extent is embraced. However, we are still confronted with the question of how we should conceive of the relationship between the two in terms of authority. Is Matthew loyally endorsing Mark or should it rather be thought of as an excessive form of engulfment—verging on textual cannibalism—through which Matthew comes close to absorbing the Marcan text by incorporating it into its own rewritten text, and where exactly does that leave its predecessor?

Unlike the Book of Jubilees, Matthew does not explicitly refer to Mark as the “first Law,” but by positively incorporating the Marcan text into its own narrative, it affirms it as authoritative Scripture. At the same time, however, by virtue of being a rewritten and narrative amplification of Mark, Matthew implicitly claims to be a more complete and, therefore, superior version compared to the Marcan base text. Had Mark sufficed as a gospel, so the underlying *raison*

d'être of Matthew, there would have been no need to for Matthew to create a new and improved gospel, in which vast amounts of material not contained in Mark were added. Although Matthew implicitly by virtue of being an enhanced reconfiguration of Mark arrogates to itself a superior status at the expense of Mark (a fact also to be seen from the subsequent *Wirkungsgeschichte* of the New Testament gospels where Matthew came to have precedence over Mark), it does not explicitly aspire to replace its decisive scriptural antecedent. On the contrary, it epitomises a seemingly irenic incorporation of Mark into a larger narrative framework; but, thereby, Matthew *de facto* became involved in the act of textual cannibalism, since it came to replace Mark as a more complete version of the gospel. This applies to the levels of both function and content.

Before coming to a conclusion, I shall take a brief look at the Gospel of John. Due to constraints of space I shall leave out Luke although it would be interesting to include it as representative of an intermediary position between Matthew's overwhelmingly loyal textual engulfment of Mark and John's virtual deconstruction of the Synoptic tradition.⁵⁶ The more so, since Luke, metaphorically speaking, with respect to its scriptural predecessor may epitomise a position comparable to the one held by Jubilees in terms of authority with regard to its scriptural antecedents. Be that as it may, unlike Matthew which does not engage in direct polemic with Mark the situation is different, when we proceed to John. It is difficult to ignore the polemical stance involved in the author's recasting of the Synoptic tradition regardless of the question which particular texts the author had at his disposal; a question I shall not venture to take up in this context.⁵⁷ The very fact that Jesus already in the prologue of John's Gospel is portrayed as a realised Christ (1:1–3, 14, 18) exerts decisive influence on the subsequent narrative which essentially deconstructs the account found in the Synoptic gospels. John not only defies pivotal elements in the narrative of the Synoptic gospels by omitting them but he also writes over other narrative sequences by attributing them a new and different function. John's omission of the baptism of Jesus is a conspicuous example.

At the narrative point, where the Synoptic gospels narrate John's baptism of Jesus and the subsequent anointment of Jesus with the spirit (Mark 1:9–11; Matt 3:1–17; Luke 3:21f), John noticeably posits a counter-narrative. Rather than having John the Baptist baptising Jesus with a baptism for the remission of sins, the gospel author has John designate Jesus as the "lamb of God who takes

56 For the differences between Mark and Matthew, on the one hand, and Luke, on the other, with respect to the portrayal of Jesus in terms of ancient notions of gender and sexuality, see Petersen 2011a, 59–61.

57 See Barrett 1978, 42–54.

away the sin of the world" (1:29, cf. 1:36). This, of course, is compliant with the basic argument of John's Gospel, namely that Jesus is already a realised Christ from before the creation of the world, wherefore it does not make sense to have him undergo a baptism for the remission of his sins. In fact, it would be narratively self-contradictory to have the realised Christ forgiven for his past sins. Therefore, the gospel author also changes the subsequent story of Jesus' "baptism with the spirit." Rather than having a heavenly voice acknowledge Jesus as the beloved son of God, the Gospel already in the prologue emphasises Jesus as the only begotten son (1:14.18). John, however, does not omit the motif of the spirit descending upon Jesus, but he transposes the action in terms of the subject of doing to John the Baptist who recognises Jesus as the one upon whom the spirit from heaven has descended: "I saw the spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it remained upon him" (1:32). In fact, the heavenly voice also appears in John, but it is directed to John the Baptist rather than to Jesus: "But he who sent me to baptize with water said to me: "Upon whom you see the spirit descending, and remaining on him, this is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit" (1:33b–e). Unlike the Synoptic gospels, where the heavenly voice either instantiates (Mark) or designates (Matthew and Luke) Jesus as the beloved son, in John's Gospel it is John the Baptist who points out Jesus as the son of God by claiming that this is what he has seen and testified (1:34). In sum, this rewritten version of the scene of baptism of the Synoptic gospels serves to downplay the importance of not only John the Baptist but also, and more importantly, of the baptism of Jesus. John is reduced to the narrative role of testifier. He is neither Christ, nor Elijah or the prophet (1:21–25). Since Jesus already from before creation is conceived to be a realised Christ, baptism has lost its meaning as intrinsic to Jesus' narrative development. At the level of the enunciation, the prologue has already made it clear to the narratee that Jesus is the realised begotten son of God, wherefore neither an initiation nor a designation is needed. The same applies to the level of the enunciate or the narrate, where the idea of a realised Christ who would undergo baptism for the remission of sins is meaningless.

The implications of this understanding have important ramifications for the subsequent narrative. In contrast to the Synoptic gospels, John does not conceive of the relationship between Jesus and God in contractual terms understood in the sense that Jesus through a particular tripartite sequence of actions (calling, performance, and sanction) successfully obtains the status of the contractual goal, that is, Jesus becoming a realised Christ. Although John also formulates the relationship between Jesus and God in the light of a contractual structure his way of phrasing the contract presupposes that Jesus already from before creation inhabits the status of being Christ, and secondly,

that the contract consists in Jesus being sent to the world to deliver a particular message. Whereas the Synoptic gospels have Jesus qualify himself as contractual servant before God as contractual lord in terms of a progressive development of his being, John omits crucial narrative elements pertaining to such a contractual understanding. For instance, it is noticeable that John leaves out the scene of temptation found in all three Synoptic gospels, but the omission is understandable in light of John's overall Christology. The same applies to the scene of trial which John does not delete but rather deconstructs. At the narrative point, where the Synoptic gospels have Jesus enter the Garden of Gethsemane, John conspicuously leaves out any mention of it. However, he does add his own version of the 'scene of trial', but in the context of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Subsequent to his entry, Jesus teaches Philip and Andrew about the grain of wheat that falls into the ground and dies. As part of this teaching, Jesus proclaims that his soul is troubled and that he does not know what to say (12:27). However, rather than as in the Synoptic gospels, where Jesus prays to God that He shall take away the cup of his impending death (Mark 14:35; Matt 26:39.42.44; Luke 22:42), Jesus in John defiantly refutes this possibility (thematized in 12:27b) by emphatically proclaiming that: "But for this purpose I came for this hour" (12:27c). Additionally, at this point John introduces the heavenly voice which sanctions Jesus' action by predicting that he shall be glorified: "Then a voice came from heaven, saying: "I have both glorified it and will glorify it again" (12:28c). The glorification designates not only Jesus' status of being as Christ before his incarnation and subsequent to his resurrection but also God's recognition of Jesus as a realised Christ (cf. 17:4f).

My final example from this patently brief list characteristic of John's deconstruction of the synoptic tradition is the last of the three words that John puts in the mouth of Jesus. In dire contrast to the Jesus of Mark and Matthew, John does not have Jesus exclaim in despair why God has forsaken him. On the contrary, John's Jesus triumphantly proclaims that: "It is finished (τετέλεσται)" (19:30b). Since John has Jesus conceive of his mission as a proclamation which he has been called to deliver to the world, the cross in John's Gospel constitutes the point that brings Jesus' testimony to an end. However, it does not as in the Synoptic gospels mark the decisive test whereby Jesus qualifies himself as Christ. Therefore, John may also designate Jesus' death on the cross by the verb ὑψοοῦν (cf. 3:14; 8:28; 12:32) which emphasises the cross as the turning point for the return of Christ to his heavenly home.

This cursory pinpointing of central elements in John's Gospel highlights a conspicuous difference to the synoptic tradition. In comparison with our previous examination of Matthew, it vividly demonstrates another type of relationship between rewritten Scripture and authoritative antecedent. Similar to

other texts belonging to the category, John borrows authority from the scriptural predecessors which he ventures to rewrite. Unlike our previous examples, however, John does not attempt to enhance the authority of this tradition. It may well be that the author of this gospel by virtue of rewriting an authoritative tradition contributes to its continuous authority in the sense that this particular tradition ultimately bestows his own text with authority. Yet, John's Gospel lives from its deliberate attempt not only to detach itself from this tradition by its markedly different narrative but also to encroach itself upon this tradition. Whereas Matthew may be seen as a form of textual cannibalism over against its predecessor, John may be interpreted as a virtual infringement on its antecedents. It not only strives to replace the previous tradition but also to deconstruct it by a complete recasting of it which annihilates the structural logic of the previous authoritative tradition.

A Brief Conclusion

By way of three main sections, I have examined the history of scholarship on rewritten Bible, the major obstacles and theoretical horns for retaining the concept, and, finally, the provisional basis for typological distinctions between different forms of authority existing between rewritten Scripture and their scriptural antecedents. In conclusion, I think that the analytical gains from retaining rewritten Scripture as a scholarly term are greater than abandoning the concept, that is, if one by virtue of replacing Bible with Scripture is prepared to acknowledge that there was no fixed Bible at the time when the texts that traditionally have been subsumed under the sobriquet came into existence. Second, one needs also to make this terminological change in order to limit the dangers of scholarly emic categories which eventually come to support disciplinary parochialism. If rewritten Scripture can only be used as a scholarly term in the context of late Second Temple Jewish texts, I think the notion should be dismissed, since it comes close to interpretative redundancy.

Similar to the problems pertaining to the use of Bible in the conceptual coinage, there are problems related to the other part of the category, that is, the notion of rewritten. If all texts are to a greater or lesser degree rewriting already existing tradition, what is the point of retaining a notion that appears not to recognise this crucial insight as if the element of rewriting were the property of some text over against others? Also at this point, I think it is crucial that scholars who continue to employ the term acknowledge that all texts, whether deliberately or not, are engaged in some kind of rewriting, since cultural traditions do never emerge *ex nihilo*, but are presupposing existing tradition to

which they in a wide array of different fashions are reacting. On the basis of such recognition, it is important to acknowledge that we are facing an *etic* concept which for heuristic reasons may be applied to one particular segment of a spectrum which principally covers all texts. Hence, we are not talking about a genre situated at the *emic* level of analysis, nor are we talking about a textual strategy, although this may be the case for some of the texts belonging to the category.

There have been recent attempts to invent new nomenclature at the expense of the time-honoured concept. Yet, I do not see how they can contribute to solving the problems pertaining to the traditional use of the category. In fact, one may see this quest for new terminology as ultimately resulting from a flawed philosophical effort in the context of theory of science which conflates different levels of analysis with each other. New terminology may transpose problems, but it does not solve them, since the problems rise from the empiricism to which the category is being applied and the theorising in which it is embedded rather than from the concept itself. The magic, to paraphrase Jonathan Z. Smith, lies in the conceptual use of the category and is not intrinsic to its name.

For these reasons, I have come to a different heuristic understanding of the concept which also slightly differs from my own previous use. Rather than pursuing the quest for new vocabulary, I think it is advantageous to retain Vermes' coinage with the slight modification that Bible should be replaced with Scripture—a proposition currently endorsed by the majority of scholars who want to maintain the thrust of Vermes' original category. However, we should also emphasise that it is useful to uphold the category only on the premise that we are capable of resolving the problems which have been put forward against it.

In light of these considerations, I endorse the view that rewritten Scripture designates a particularly excessive type of intertextuality which is found not only with respect to texts of Second Temple Judaism but in a variety of other contexts as well. For this reason, I have argued that the term advantageously may be taken to other contexts and be applied to texts of other areas, other times, and other material such as music, painting, sculpture, etc. Rewritten Scripture highlights the phenomenon of texts that borrow authority from scriptural predecessors by rewriting them; but this phenomenon covers a wider class of texts in which we may refine our classification by further heuristically distinguishing between texts that do not explicitly comment on their relationship with respect to the authoritative antecedents (rewritten Scripture proper) and texts that explicitly relate to their scriptural predecessors. Needless to say, we may find texts that belong to both categories such as, for instance,

the Gospel of Matthew. With respect to Mark, Matthew epitomises the class of rewritten Scripture, whereas it with regard to 'Jewish Scripture' is representative of the second class of texts. In terms of authority existing between antecedent and rewritten Scripture, I have underlined that this question ultimately legitimising the use of the notion may be situated at different levels such as content, form, and/or function.

For future work on this topic, I think it is urgent that we invest more time in focusing on the examination of the different types of authority that may exist. I have promulgated the view that some kind of aspectualism may be justified. What from one perspective may be seen to constitute a form of textual poaching or even engulfment may from another perspective just as justifiably be understood to embody a loyal appropriation or endorsement. Finally, I have by way of a few examples attempted to provide a rudimentary typology for thinking about authoritative relationships that may exist between rewritten Scripture and their authoritative predecessors; but far more work needs to be done on this intriguing subject.

Contrary to the majority of scholars who have argued against the idea of a 'replacement thesis', whereby rewritten Scripture is understood to ironically embrace the authority of its antecedent, I have by way of a few illustrative examples emphasised how rewritten Scripture may exhibit a variety of different possibilities. At the level of content and function, I have over against prevalent strands of scholarship underlined a spectrum of options that stretches from loyal embracement (*LAB*, Antiquities, and the Genesis Apocryphon) over textual cannibalism (Book of Jubilees and Matthew) to encroachment (Gospel of John). Far from covering the entire spectrum of possibilities, these three positions designate particularly potent possibilities opening space for a number of intermediary positions (for instance, the Gospel of Luke). However, these are only initial ruminations. Far more work needs to be done with respect to both thick interpretation at the level of textual analysis and thorough theorising at the level of explanation.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip S. 1987. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barrett, C. Kingsley. 1978. *The Gospel according to St. John. An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2. ed. Philadelphia, Penn.: Westminster John Knox Press.

- Bernstein, Moshe J. 2005. 'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category which has Outlived Its Usefulness? *Textus* 22: 169–96.
- Borgen, Peder. 1984. Philo of Alexandria. Pages 233–282 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M.E. Stone. CRINT 2.2. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- . 1995. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. NTSup 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Brooke, George J. 2000. Rewritten Bible. Pages 777–781 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002. The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible. Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: British Library.
- . 2005. Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process. Pages 85–104 in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran 15–17 January 2002*. Edited by E.G. Chazon, D. Dimant and R.A. Clemens. STDJ 58. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. Hypertextuality and the “Parabiblical” Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 43–64 in *In the Second Degree. Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature*. Edited by P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pillinger. Leiden: Brill.
- Brown, Raymond E. 1993. *The Birth of the Messiah. A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. 2005. 'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique. Pages 43–68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003*. Edited by J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen. LSTS 52. London: T & T Clark.
- Chalmers, Alan. 1999. *What Is This Thing Called Science?* St. Lucia, Queensland: University of Queensland Press.
- Charlesworth, James H. 1983–1985. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday.
- Davidson, Ole. 1993. *The Narrative Jesus. A Semiotic Reading of Mark's Gospel*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Dimant, Devora. 1999. The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism. Pages 43–59 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller. SBLEJL 15. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Eco, Umberto. 1979. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

- . 1990. *The Limits of Interpretation*. Advances in Semiotics. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- . 1992. Overinterpreting Texts. Pages 45–66 in *Interpretation and Over-interpretation*. With Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler and Christine Brooke-Rose. Edited by S. Collini. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flint, Peter W. 2003. Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran. Pages 269–304 in *Emmanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emmanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul; Robert A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman, and W.W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill.
- Genette, Gérard. 1992. *The Architext: An Introduction*. Translated by J.W. Lewin. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1997. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Translated by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky. Stages 8. Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska Press.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien. 1983. *Du sens II. Essais sémiotiques*. Paris : Éditions du Seuil.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien and Courtés, Joseph. 1979. *Sémiotique. Dictionnaire raisonné de la théorie du langage*. Paris: Hachette.
- Harrington, Daniel J. 1986. The Bible Rewritten (Narratives). Pages 239–247 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. 2006. *A Kingdom of Priests: Ancestry and Merit in Ancient Judaism*. JCC. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kraft Robert A. 2007. Pursuing the Para-Scriptural by Means of the Pre-Scriptural. (Paper delivered at University of Toronto 11 April 2007. Available at the internet on the following address: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/rak//temp/toronto1/jpgs/toronto-1-2007.html>—seen 10.01.2012).
- . 2007a Para-mania: Beside, Before and Beyond Bible Studies. *JBL* 126: 5–27.
- Lange, Armin. 2010. 'In the Second Degree': Ancient Jewish Paratextual Literature in the Context of Graeco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature. Pages 3–42 in *In the Second Degree. Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature*. Edited by P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pilling. Leiden: Brill.
- Martínez, Florentino García. 2010. Rethinking the Bible—Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 19–36 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by M. Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden: Brill.
- Najman, Hindy. 2003. *Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. *Past Renewals. Interpretative Authority, Renewed Revelation and the Quest for Perfection in Jewish Antiquity*. JSJSup 53. Leiden: Brill.
- Newsom, Carol A. 2004. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: Brill.

- Nickelsburg, George W.E. 1984. The Bible Rewritten and Expanded. Pages 89–156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M.E. Stone. CRINT 2.2. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2007. Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism. Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hillhorst, É. Puech and E. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. Review of *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Period*. By Sidnie White Crawford, *Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008. *DSD* 17: 115–119.
- . 2011. “Invention” and “Maintenance” of Religious Traditions: Theoretical and Historical Perspectives. Pages 129–160 in *Invention, Rewriting, Usurpation. Discursive Fights over Religious Traditions in Antiquity*. Edited by J. Ulrich, A.-C. Jacobsen and D. Brakke. ECCA 11. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- . 2011a. Auf der Suche nach einem Rahmen zum Verständnis der Konzeption von Geschlecht und Sexualität im frühen Christentum. Pages 33–66 in *Männlich und weiblich schuf Er sie. Studien zur Genderkonstruktion und zum Eherecht in den Mittelmeerregionen*. Edited by M. Morgenstern, Ch. Boudignon, Ch. Tietz. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 2012. The Gospel of Judas: A Scriptural Amplification or a Canonical Encroachment? Pages 245–282 in *Judasevangelium und Codex Tchacos. Studien zur religionsgeschichtlichen Verortung einer gnostischen Schriftsammlung*. Edited by E.E. Popkes and G. Wurst. WUNT 279. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.
- . 2013. Preface. The Prevalence of Rewritten Scripture in Cultural Production and From Moses to Matthew: Rewritten Scripture as an Epitome of Semiotic Riverrun. in *Contextualising Rewritten Scripture: Different Approaches to the Rewriting of Scripture and the Attribution of Authority to Rewritings in Art, Literature and Music*. Edited by A.K. Petersen. Leiden: Brill (forthcoming).
- . 2013a. From Moses to Matthew: The Prevalence of Rewritten Scripture. In *Contextualising Rewritten Scripture: Different Approaches to the Rewriting of Scripture and the Attribution of Authority to Rewritings in Art, Literature and Music*. Edited by A.K. Petersen. Leiden: Brill (forthcoming).
- Segal, Michael. Between Bible and Rewritten Bible. Pages 10–29 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. SDSS. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Swanson, Dwight D. 1995. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of nQT*. STDJ 14. Leiden: Brill.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. 2010. The Crystallization of the “Canon of Hebrew Scriptures” in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran. Pages 419–442 in idem *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible. Collected Studies*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

- Ulrich, Eugene, 1999. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans and Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C. 2002. The Wording of Biblical Citations in some Rewritten Scriptural Works. Pages 41–56 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: British Library.
- Vermes, Geza. 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism. Haggadic Studies*. SPB 4. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1989. Biblical Interpretation at Qumran. *Eretz Israel* 20: 185*–188*.
- Vermes Geza, Millar, Fergus, and Goodman Martin. 1986. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion 1985. The Relationship between 11QTorah (The Temple Scroll) and the Book of Jubilees: One Single or Two Independent Compositions. *SBL Seminar Papers* 1985 24: 205–216.
- . 1997. *Jubilees* as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commandment. Pages 195–211 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1985*. Edited by M. Bernstein, F.G. Martínez and J. Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill.
- White Crawford, Sydnie. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2001. *Philosophical Investigations. The German Text, with a Revised English Translation*. Translated by G.E.M. Anscombe. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zahn, Molly M. 2011. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture. Composition and Exegesis in 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011. Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology. Pages 93–119 in *Changes in Scripture. Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala and M. Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- . 2010. Rewritten Scripture. Pages 323–336 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment¹

Jonathan G. Campbell

Introduction

Geza Vermes and Rewritten Bible

Geza Vermes introduced the designation Rewritten Bible fifty years ago to denote a small number of Jewish texts composed between the second century BCE and eleventh century CE that substantively rewrite existing biblical books: *Sefer ha-Yashar*, the Palestinian Targums, Josephus' *Ant.* 1–11, Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, *Jubilees*, and the *Genesis Apocryphon*.² Since then, both the term and the concept behind it have undoubtedly proved fruitful in elucidating one important way in which late Second Temple Jews interpreted authoritative scriptural texts which they believed they had inherited from divinely inspired prophetic figures of the antique past.³ Indeed, as will become clear, this study is indebted to Vermes and other scholars who have contributed to the resultant Rewritten Bible debate during the past five decades.

-
- 1 I am grateful to József Zsengellér for the invitation to contribute to this volume and the preceding Budapest conference; indeed, it is an honour to be part of the Rewritten Bible debate originally sparked by my former *Doktorvater*, Geza Vermes. I would also like to thank Tony Gelston, Dan Harrington, and Dwight Swanson for feedback on earlier versions of this chapter.
 - 2 Vermes 1961, 67–126; the medieval *Sefer ha-Yashar* does not feature in subsequent discussion. Contrary to Alexander (1988, 99) and Petersen (2007, 291), Bernstein (2005, 173, note 4) rightly observes that Vermes 1986 does not add any works to his original list. However, Vermes 1989, 187 allows that what are now called 1QWords of Moses (1Q22), 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b} (4Q378–9), 4QBirth of Noah^{a-c} (4Q534–6), and 4QVision of Samuel (4Q160) might also be included; among these, only 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b} is sufficiently well preserved to make a judgement, as we shall see.
 - 3 On older scholarship's lack of interest in late Second Temple exegesis, see Bernstein 2004, 216–21. On Scripture's purported antiquity, see Barton 1986, 59–62; it seems universally assumed in surviving evidence, though often passed over (e.g. Petersen 2007, 287) or deemed insignificant (Zahn 2011, 98, note 17) by scholars. More generally, speaking of *authoritative works* undifferentiatedly or as coterminous with Scripture is unhelpful, for other kinds of literary authority existed—whether non-scriptural books with broad appeal (e.g. Ecclesiasticus and 1 Maccabees) or others containing partisan teachings (e.g. *Community Rule*, Matthew).

Recent Discussion

Nevertheless, there has been considerable disagreement over the years about Rewritten Bible's nature and extent, with several longstanding and not-so-longstanding issues being prominent of late.⁴ First, the dominant view that Rewritten Bible is best regarded as a literary genre has been both affirmed and called into question. Second, insofar as the consensus concerning the Jewish canon that obtained when Vermes coined the appellation has since broken down, with many now maintaining that late Second Temple Jews had no *Bible* but rather *Scripture*,⁵ it has been argued that the label *Rewritten Scripture* should replace *Rewritten Bible*. Third, how much of a *Vorlage* has to be rewritten, and with what degree of intensity, for a work to count as Rewritten Bible or Rewritten Scripture is disputed. And fourth, the publication of previously unknown so-called Parabiblical Texts or New Pseudepigrapha from Qumran during the past two decades has problematized the precise delineation of Rewritten Bible's boundaries.⁶ The latter factor, in particular, led Emanuel Tov to state recently that "what constitutes a rewritten Bible text is actually less clear now than it was a few years ago."⁷

This Study

Hence, we shall here undertake a preliminary re-examination of Rewritten Bible by asking whether the name is best retained, amended, or abandoned in scholarly discourse.⁸ This is not merely terminological hair-splitting, for, the more accurate and nuanced our nomenclature, the more accurate and nuanced it is to be hoped that our grasp of the underlying literary and historical *realia* will be.⁹ What is required, therefore, as Moshe Bernstein has noted, is an understanding of Rewritten Bible that can *both* make sense of the complex underlying data *and* function with sufficient precision to be heuristically valuable.¹⁰ With that goal in mind, this paper will, first, ask if the works to which

4 Zahn 2010 provides a fuller overview.

5 Ulrich 2002 further justifies the terminological distinction between *Scripture* (purportedly ancient compositions not yet precisely delimited) and *Bible* or *canon* (such works once precisely delimited).

6 See relevant DJD volumes dubbed *Parabiblical Texts* by the editors, as well as VanderKam and Flint (2002, 203–4) for *New Pseudepigrapha*. See also note 8 below.

7 Tov 1998, 337. Although *rewritten Bible*, *Rewritten Bible*, *Rewritten Scripture*, and *rewritten Scripture* occur in scholarly literature, we adopt *Rewritten Bible* and *Rewritten Scripture* below for consistency's sake, except when citing others who do not.

8 Campbell 2005 and Zahn 2011 critique a wider range of scholarly nomenclature.

9 Thus, Zahn 2010, 324.

10 Bernstein 2005, 195–6; this important observation recurs below.

the name is commonly applied constitute a genre.¹¹ Second, whether the amended Rewritten Scripture can usefully replace Rewritten Bible will be considered. Third, we shall examine the suggestion that Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture is best viewed as the designation for a textual process. Fourth, a comparison will be made with several works not normally brought into the debate. Insofar as they are relevant to all these matters, furthermore, various Qumran compositions, including some only fully published since 1991, will feature as appropriate. Fifth, on the basis of our discussion, several deductions will be made relating to these several key issues outlined immediately above. And finally, a brief conclusion will close our study.

Rewritten Bible: A Generic Classification?

Bible and Rewritten Bible

We shall consider here, then, whether Rewritten Bible is best viewed as a literary genre, for most scholarly usage has treated it so.¹² The assumption has been that late Second Temple Jews had a Bible and that, among non-biblical works, there existed a genre that can be called Rewritten Bible. Vermes himself sometimes speaks of a genre in that way:

[The *Genesis Apocryphon*] belongs . . . to the genre represented by Jubilees, Josephus' *Antiquities*, Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicorum*; i.e. writings in which scriptural narrative and midrashic developments are amalgamated to form a 'rewritten bible'.¹³

11 Brooke 2010 has recently argued that, before considering Rewritten Bible, the range of compositions of which it forms a part should be examined, and this makes sense as *one* way of approaching the subject. But it should not preclude the *complementary* approach that begins with Rewritten Bible and moves outwards to other materials, especially if Rewritten Bible dovetails with more than one larger literary body. Indeed, Zahn (2011, 115) offers the picture of a Venn diagram in which a given Rewritten Bible text (e.g. *Jubilees*) can be located at "the intersection of all the different categories in which it participates" (narrative, "para-Genesis," apocalypse, pseudepigraph, and Scripture in *Jubilees'* case). This study will highlight in due course the intersection between so-called Rewritten Bible works and several items excluded from the larger body of material to which it is normally thought to belong.

12 Thus, Docherty 2004, 28–31.

13 Vermes 1986, 321; see also Vermes 1989, 187. Vermes 1979, 314–21 argues for a late Second Temple canon akin to the Rabbinic Bible.

However, since it is Philip Alexander and Moshe Bernstein who have argued this approach most fully, their positions must be reviewed before evaluating Rewritten Bible's efficacy as a generic designation.¹⁴

A Rewritten Bible Genre

In his classic 1988 study, Alexander addressed confusion around Rewritten Bible at that time by isolating its chief characteristics as he saw them through consideration of four primary texts: *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Pseudo-Philo, and *Ant.* 1–11. By examining the relationship between several passages and their *Vorlagen* (*Jub* 8:10–10:35/*Gen* 10:1–11:19; *Jub* 33:1–20/*Gen* 35:22; 1QapGen 20:33–22:26/*Gen* 13:1–14:24; *LAB* 39:1–40:9/*Judg* 10:17–12:7; and *Ant.* 1.222–23/*Gen* 22:1–19), more particularly, Alexander produced a list of nine traits:¹⁵

- (a) Rewritten Bible texts are narratives, which follow a sequential, chronological order . . .
- (b) They are . . . free-standing compositions which replicate the forms of the biblical books . . .
- (c) . . . these texts are not intended to replace, or to supersede the Bible . . .
- (d) Rewritten Bible texts cover a substantial portion of the Bible . . . Rewritten Bible texts are centripetal: they come back to the Bible again and again . . .
- (e) Rewritten Bible texts follow the Bible serially . . . but they are highly selective in what they present . . .
- (f) The intention of the texts is to produce an interpretative reading of Scripture . . .
- (g) The narrative form of the texts means . . . that they can impose only a single interpretation on the original . . .
- (h) . . . the narrative form also preclude[s] making clear the exegetical reasoning . . .
- (i) Rewritten Bible texts make use of non-biblical tradition and draw on non-biblical sources . . .

14 Alexander 1988 and Bernstein 2005. Nickelsburg 1984 is often contrasted with this approach (e.g. Bernstein 2005, 178–9; Petersen 2007, 292) because he employs Rewritten Bible for several genres. However, though it goes unnamed, one of them—“running paraphrases of longer and shorter parts of the Bible, often with lengthy expansions (*Jubilees*, *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Biblical Antiquities*)” (1984, 89–90)—is virtually identical to that of Vermes, Alexander, and Bernstein, though they prefer to reserve the name Rewritten Bible for it exclusively (and Nickelsburg omits *Ant.* 1–11 presumably because it appears elsewhere in Stone's edited volume).

15 An abbreviated version of Alexander 1988, 116–8 follows.

These shared characteristics convinced Alexander that Rewritten Bible constitutes a genre, and his influential list still acts as a starting-point for discussion.¹⁶ It must be admitted, however, that these traits now seem at least partially problematic. In addition to narrative Rewritten Bible works (trait a), for example, legal compositions like the *Temple Scroll* arguably exhibit equivalent characteristics, as we shall see. While the *Vorlage*'s sequence of material remains dominant (a, e), there is always minor¹⁷ and sometimes major¹⁸ departure from it. Similarly, the derived work's form is not always that of its antecedent (b),¹⁹ and the question of replacement is more complex than Alexander allows (c).²⁰ Even the requirement that a substantial portion of a *Vorlage* be rewritten (d) leaves open what counts as substantial. And other traits (f, g, h, i) are not unique to Rewritten Bible.²¹

Nevertheless, Alexander's analysis leaves little doubt as to what a Rewritten Bible text is: an intense rewriting of a sizeable portion of biblical text to which the former remains closely attached in a "centripetal" relationship (trait d). *Jubilees*, for instance, though following its antecedent with varying degrees of expansion, addition, or omission, remains closely keyed to its *Vorlage* throughout. Since demonstrating this without quoting swathes of primary material—something impossible in a short study like this—is difficult, the following table must suffice:

Genesis/Exodus	Content	Jubilees
Gen 1–5	primeval history	2–4
6–11	Noah cycle	5–10
12–25	Abraham cycle	11–23
26–50	Jacob and his descendants	24–45
Exod 1–16	figure of Moses	46–50

16 Thus, Docherty 2004, 29–31 and White Crawford 2008, 10.

17 See below page 67 for Gen 22:1–19 in *Ant.* 1. 222–237.

18 See Swanson 1995 on the *Temple Scroll*.

19 Although the rewritten entity normally provides narrative for narrative and law for law, its overall genre can be different to its predecessor's.

20 As Zahn 2010, 331 notes, while the *Vorlage* was not normally physically replaced, the derived work nonetheless often replaced the antecedent's understanding of the subject matter.

21 The hidden nature of Rewritten Bible's exegesis (trait h), for instance, applies to the *Hodayot* (Hughes 2006) and portions of the *Damascus Document* (Campbell 1995).

At the same time, *Jubilees* is not simply another edition of Gen 1:1–Exod 16:1 but a new literary entity in its own right. Through this and his other examples, therefore, Alexander maintains that there existed in late Second Temple times certain Rewritten Bible works distinct from other literature.

Like Alexander, but with post-1991 Qumran materials available, Bernstein has insisted more recently that Rewritten Bible constitutes a genre, noting with approval that the works originally identified by Vermes “share a certain scope and comprehensiveness”²² in their aggadic development of biblical material. The genre is best understood narrowly, in other words, as comprising works in which a significant portion of text is interpretatively rewritten but largely retains the antecedent’s sequence and structure. As with Alexander, Bernstein gives Rewritten Bible a clarity that distinguishes it from other exegesis, adding to narrative Rewritten Bible only 4QReworked Pentateuch^{a23} and 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a–e} among recently published Qumran texts.²⁴ He does, though, as hinted earlier, make one major adaptation by allowing that the *Temple Scroll* is the legal equivalent of narrative Rewritten Bible: the latter’s “rearrangements, harmonisations, and interpretative additions” are paralleled by the former’s “juxtaposition of laws on similar topics, the clarification of missing details in the laws, and the resolution of implicit contradictions.”²⁵

Bernstein laments that many have, in contrast, abandoned this precise understanding by moving in one of two unsatisfactory directions. The first widens Rewritten Bible’s scope beyond works with a sustained attachment to their *Vorlagen*, seeing it instead as an “activity or process”²⁶ or “general

22 Bernstein 2005, 174.

23 Bernstein views 4QReworked Pentateuch^a as “substantially different generically” (2005: 181) from 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b–e} and consequently considers the former alone to be Rewritten Bible (2005, 181–2, 196–7). See further below note 93.

24 Bernstein also describes 1–2 Chronicles as “certainly an example of rewritten Bible” (2005, 173, note 4) according to Vermes’ criteria. But Vermes (1979, 326), as well as Alexander (1988, 100), actually denotes 1–2 Chronicles as a mere “prototype” of Rewritten Bible, perhaps because it is unlikely that a Bible containing 1–2 Samuel/1–2 Kings yet existed when 1–2 Chronicles was composed (circa 300 BCE).

25 Bernstein 2005, 195 and, similarly, Swanson 1995, 227 and Dimant 1999, 50; by including the Palestinian Targums and *Ant.* 1–11, of course, Vermes 1961 implicitly incorporated legal material too. Yet, Bernstein 2005, 174–5 excludes the Palestinian Targums on the grounds that no translation can belong to the Rewritten Bible genre, “for almost any translation that is not hyperliteral could merit such an appellation” (175); this sits uncomfortably with his inclusion of *Ant.* 1–11, however, at least part of which almost certainly depends on a Hebrew *Vorlage*. See further below page 69.

26 Bernstein 2005, 177–8, quoting Harrington 1986, 243.

umbrella term."²⁷ As an example, Bernstein points to Daniel Harrington who apparently includes *Life of Adam and Eve*, *1 Enoch*, *Testament of Moses*, and *Ascension of Isaiah* among others; he also points to a study by George Brooke who, though defining Rewritten Bible constructively,²⁸ proceeds to include recently published Qumran compositions—4QDiscourse on the Exodus/Conquest Tradition (4Q374), 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^{a-e} (4Q385, 385b-c, 386, 388, 391), 4QNon-canonical Psalms A-B (4Q380-1) among others—with a much looser relationship to their antecedents.²⁹ Turning Rewritten Bible “into an excessively vague all-encompassing term”³⁰ in this manner, Bernstein maintains, reduces our capacity to distinguish between different kinds of dependence on the Bible, of which Rewritten Bible, properly understood, is only one. Compositions which do not rewrite the Bible so much as take biblical events or characters as the springboard for new literary creations (e.g. *1 Enoch*, 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^{a-e} [4Q385-6, 385b, 388]), for instance, are better termed *parabiblical* works.³¹ The second departure from Vermes goes in the opposite direction, restricting Rewritten Bible to texts like the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch and *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts.³² Bernstein’s objection here is that bringing together compositions with such “limited additions, omissions and slight changes”³³ achieves little, for these minor alterations merely produce fresh editions of existing works and are best referred to as *revised* Bible.³⁴ By offering these important distinctions, Bernstein believes he is able to employ Rewritten Bible as a generic appellation that is more sharply defined and of greater heuristic value than the non-generic alternatives he critiques.

Problems with a Generic Definition

Alexander and Bernstein have certainly contributed much to the Rewritten Bible debate, not least by insisting, like Vermes, that the works concerned must interpretatively rewrite their *Vorlagen* in a substantial and sustained manner.

27 Bernstein 2005, 187, citing Brooke 2000, 780.

28 Bernstein 2005, 186 quotes Brooke 2000, 778 as follows: “Rewritten Bible texts are those which follow closely their scriptural base text and which clearly display an editorial intention that is other than or supplementary to that of the text being altered.”

29 See Harrington 1986 and Brooke 2000.

30 Bernstein 2005, 187, referring to Brooke 2000.

31 Bernstein 2005, 188 (note 31), 196, following White Crawford 1999, 1.

32 Bernstein refers to Tov 1994 here, though Tov (2008, 387-8) now extends Rewritten Bible to the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees*. On 4QReworked Pentateuch^{a-e}, more generally, see again note 23.

33 Bernstein 2005, 181.

34 Bernstein 2005, 190-3, following what is now Segal 2005.

Their number is small, therefore, even after the full publication of Qumran manuscripts, for Rewritten Bible thus understood is distinct from other types of literature, including, not only what Bernstein calls revised Bible and parabiblical works, but also lemma-style commentary.³⁵ All of the latter entail rewriting the Bible in the broadest sense. But as Bernstein emphasizes, the academy is better served when our language makes sharper distinctions than that: “the more specific the implications of the term, the more valuable it is as a measuring device.”³⁶ Yet, several factors arguably render it unsatisfactory to think of Rewritten Bible specifically in generic terms.

First, Alexander’s nine traits set up a circular argument in which pre-selected works determine the genre’s characteristics; a different selection yields different results.³⁷ That is borne out by Susan Docherty’s recent study in which she maintains that, since *Joseph and Aseneth* reflects eight traits (a–c, e–i), the ninth (d) should be discarded to allow the work’s inclusion within the genre.³⁸ It is further confirmed by Bernstein who, as seen, expands one trait (a) to include legal as well as narrative compositions. One response to this objection might be to point out that such circularity is inherent to all genres, as recent genre theory has shown vis-à-vis modern literature. Indeed, Brooke makes the following twofold point:³⁹

First, there is the idea that no single text will ever contain all the characteristics of a particular genre; thus no single text by itself can ever act as the defining work of a kind of literature. Second, once a particular composition is seen as belonging to a particular genre . . . so the genre inevitably changes, even if only in relatively minor ways.

But it is doubtful that we possess the “literary competence”⁴⁰ to recognize late Second Temple genres with the sophistication necessary to render such an approach fruitful. Ancient Jewish authors, after all, unlike their Graeco-Roman counterparts, do not address such questions.⁴¹ And surviving literature is necessarily partial and, as far as Qumran manuscripts are concerned, frequently

35 Thus, Alexander 1988, 116–8.

36 Bernstein 2005, 195.

37 Petersen 2007, 290 (note 12) makes a similar point.

38 Docherty 2004.

39 Brooke 2010, 341–2, drawing on Perloff 1989.

40 See further Barton 1996, 8–19.

41 Note, similarly, Petersen 2007, 302.

damaged at the crucial *incipit*. Even what can be gleaned of likely late Second Temple attitudes suggests a weak sense of genre, at least regarding Scripture.⁴²

Second, in contrast to *Jubilees* or *Ant.* 1–11, which can be seen as Rewritten Bible in their entirety, it is important to take account of compositions with only a portion of Rewritten Bible. For example, assuming that 4QReworked Pentateuch^{a–e} represent copies of either a single work or similar but not identical pieces, we find nonetheless that only 4QReworked Pentateuch^a reflects the rewritten phenomenon identified by Vermes, Alexander, and Bernstein, whereas 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b–e} merely exhibit minor revisions.⁴³ Similarly, 4QGenesis Commentary A 1 1:1–2:5a constitutes a rewritten version of Gen 6:3–8:18, though elsewhere this work contains other types of material, including explicit exegesis containing *peshet* and pronominal interpretation formulae.⁴⁴ Insofar as genre, strictly speaking, pertains to whole works, these Rewritten Bible units within compositions that overall do not qualify as Rewritten Bible undermine the existence of a specific Rewritten Bible genre.⁴⁵

Third comes the diversity of works normally included, even when Rewritten Bible is defined rigorously, for, as Daniel Harrington observed twenty-five years ago,⁴⁶ variations in form, subject matter, style, and theological emphases in *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, 4QApocryphon of Joshua, 4QReworked Pentateuch^a, Pseudo-Philo, and *Ant.* 1–11 preclude viewing them as generically unified. Even if, in contrast to older scholarship, we highlight function and status as crucial to the determination of genre,⁴⁷ *Jubilees*, purporting to be revealed antique Mosaic Scripture, is radically different to *Ant.* 1–11, presenting itself as a non-scriptural retelling of the scriptural story contemporary with author and audience. In Harrington's words:⁴⁸

... it is tempting to place all these books . . . under the broad literary genre of 'Rewritten Bible,' but unfortunately the diversity and complexity of the materials will not allow it.

42 Thus, Barton 1998, 1–7.

43 See again note 23.

44 See further below page 68.

45 For a similar dilemma vis-à-vis *peshet*, see Campbell 1995, 20–1 and Campbell 2013, 250–3.

46 Harrington 1986.

47 Thus, Brooke 2010, 334–5.

48 Harrington 1986, 243.

If the scope of the word genre is enlarged to accommodate such diversity, we end up with a generic catch-all of limited heuristic value.⁴⁹

A fourth factor concerns Bernstein's recent related argument that the best way to avoid a similarly over-loose understanding of Rewritten Bible itself is to view it precisely as a genre—not a textual process which is the main alternative and which, for Bernstein, as noted, inevitably entails an all-encompassing vagueness.⁵⁰ There is no doubt that some opting for that alternative employ an unhelpfully broad notion of Rewritten Bible. Thus, Brooke in one study, as noted earlier, includes compositions that loosely supplement their antecedents rather than rewrite them.⁵¹ But seeing Rewritten Bible as the name for a textual process does not *per se* require one to treat it in that manner. We shall look more closely below, therefore, at whether Rewritten Bible can be viewed as the name for a textual process.

Summary

We should welcome the precision and clarity injected by Alexander and Bernstein into the Rewritten Bible debate that originated with Vermes. But their use of the term specifically as a generic label remains problematic for the reasons given. Fortunately, a generic understanding may well be unnecessary for ensuring that Rewritten Bible is tightly defined and heuristically valuable. We shall turn, therefore, to the main alternative—that Rewritten Bible designates a textual process—in due course.

Rewritten Bible or Rewritten Scripture?

Bible and Scripture

Beforehand, it makes sense to consider the suggestion that Rewritten Scripture is a better label than Rewritten Bible, for an additional problem with Rewritten Bible, regardless of whether it denotes a genre, is its inherent twofold assumption that late Second Temple Jews had a Bible and that no Rewritten Bible work was part of it. When Vermes introduced the designation, it was natural to distinguish between the Bible and non-canonical rewritings of biblical material

49 Zahn 2011, 115, like Brooke 2010, 341–2, recommends drawing on genre theory for a more nuanced approach to this diversity. But the Venn diagram she offers as a result, though helpful in other respects, moves beyond genre proper to a range of overlapping literary features; see above note 11.

50 Petersen 2007, 297–8 shares this assumption.

51 See above page 55.

because he assumed, like most at the time, that late Second Temple Jews possessed a canon akin to the Rabbinic Bible.⁵² Compositions like *Jubilees* and *Ant.* 1–11, in other words, were defined as much by the fact that they stand outside a canon as by the fact that they constitute rewritings thereof. The same clear-cut distinction between Bible and Rewritten Bible is taken for granted by Alexander⁵³ and has recently been asserted by Bernstein.⁵⁴ The appellation Rewritten Bible thus employed clearly “implies something . . . secondary in authority”⁵⁵ to the canonical books being rewritten.

Both aspects of the assumption, however, are difficult to maintain, for, as observed earlier, many since the 1980s have concluded that late Second Temple Jews had no Bible but rather Scripture.⁵⁶ Early proponents held that, while the Pentateuch was canonical, other writings comprised an open-ended body of purportedly antique prophetic works to which new compositions might occasionally be added; more recently, it has been proposed that the Mosaic corpus too was open-ended.⁵⁷ Such a reconstruction explains well various facets of late Second Temple evidence, including the publication of Enochic material, *Jubilees*, 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b}, Daniel, and other texts with supposed links to ancient scriptural heroes, as well as the acceptance of such materials as Scripture in exegetical literature from the period. More generally, it means, not only that some Scriptures were themselves rewritings of older scriptural sources, but also that precisely which books counted as the Torah and Prophets changed over time within and between communities.⁵⁸ In any case, the lack of

52 This is implicit in Vermes 1961, 1–10, 67–126 and explicit in Vermes 1986, 321.

53 Alexander 1988, 103, 112.

54 Nevertheless, Bernstein’s position could be clearer: he states that his “working assumption is that any composition that appears to be based on what we now call the Bible and meets the criteria set out in this essay can be said to belong to the category ‘Rewritten Bible’” (2005, 172, note 3); yet he insists elsewhere *both* that if any work “is [or was intended to be] a biblical text, then it is not rewritten Bible” (2005, 175) *and* that “[o]ne group’s rewritten Bible could very well be another’s biblical text” (2005, 175), as though *Jubilees*, for instance, might simultaneously be Bible (and therefore not Rewritten Bible) for one community and Rewritten Bible (and hence not Bible) for another.

55 Brooke 2002, 31.

56 See again note 5 for the distinction.

57 Barton (1986, 1–94 and 2013), for example, reflects such a development; see also Campbell 2000 and 2012; and Ulrich 2003a and 2010.

58 Thus, White Crawford 2008, 9 holds that Esther was rejected at Qumran. *Jubilees*, in contrast, almost certainly functioned as Scripture for the community, although Ulrich 2003b, 22 suggests that others rejected it as “obviously wrong” because of its promulgation of a distinct liturgical calendar.

a late Second Temple canon is now widely asserted, as is the suggestion that the terms *Bible* and *canon* should give way to *Scripture* or *Scriptures*.⁵⁹

Scripture and Rewritten Scripture

It would seem to follow that *Rewritten Scripture* is a more accurate label for late Second Temple works hitherto called *Rewritten Bible*, and this proposal has been made frequently of late.⁶⁰ Indeed, Anders Petersen highlights several advantages afforded by such a change:⁶¹ (i) *Rewritten Scripture* allows for a more reciprocal relationship between “authoritative texts and the writings they occasion;”⁶² (ii) it makes it easier to acknowledge that rewritten entities like the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* possessed scriptural authority for some late Second Temple Jews; and (iii) the new term renders redundant the old distinction between inner-biblical and extra-biblical exegesis insofar as the interpretative phenomenon in 1–2 Chronicles vis-à-vis its antecedents, for instance, is essentially the same as that in *Jubilees* vis-à-vis its *Vorlagen*.⁶³ We might add that the amended appellation allows for the possibility that rewritings of texts outside the later Rabbinic canon might qualify as *Rewritten Scripture* too.⁶⁴ Given such factors, recent discussion has increasingly accepted that *Scripture* and *Rewritten Scripture* in late Second Temple Judaism were intertwined and, more particularly, that various *Rewritten Scriptures*—including *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a–b}, and 1 Esdras—were themselves scriptural.⁶⁵

This apparently close relationship between *Scripture* and *Rewritten Scripture*, coupled with recent publication of Qumran manuscripts evincing a relatively mild reworking of their antecedents, has led to the inclusion of a

59 For instance, Collins 2002, 55; and Trebolle 2006, 549.

60 Thus, Brooke 2002, 31–2; Petersen 2007, 286–8; VanderKam 2002a, 43; White Crawford 2008, 6–7.

61 Petersen 2007, 287–8; among these, Petersen (288) suggests somewhat anachronistically that we might “think of Matthew’s rewriting of Mark in terms of . . . rewriting *Scripture*.” See below note 113.

62 Petersen 2007, 287.

63 For so-called inner-biblical exegesis, see the survey in Levinson 2008, 95–181. As Levinson (2008, 177, note 37) notes, Auld 1994’s proposal that a lost common source lies behind 1–2 Samuel/1–2 Kings and 1–2 Chronicles has not been widely followed; on 1–2 Chronicles, see again note 24.

64 Thus, Zahn 2011, 109–10 states: “a reworked version of Genesis or Exodus could be labelled ‘*Rewritten Scripture*,’ but so too could a reworked version of 1 Enoch or *Jubilees*, works that were equally considered ‘scriptural’ at the time.”

65 See, for instance, VanderKam 2002a and 2002b; for 1 Esdras, see Williamson 2011.

wider range of materials within Rewritten Scripture than was generally the case for Rewritten Bible. Thus, Brooke proposes that there is a “sliding scale of affinity and dependence” between Scripture and Rewritten Scripture.⁶⁶ Building on that suggestion in an analysis of rewritten pentateuchal Qumran traditions, White Crawford envisages a broad spectrum of Rewritten Scriptures: at one end come works with minimal rearrangement of a base composition (e.g. pre-Samaritan Pentateuch), in the middle are those with such rearrangements plus modest additions (e.g. *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts),⁶⁷ and at the other end lie materials that embody rewriting so substantial that new compositions are effectively created (e.g. *Temple Scroll*). The first two types, by constituting new editions of existing scriptural works, presumably shared their antecedents’ scriptural status; compositions in the third tend to make claims to scriptural authority as strong as their *Vorlagen*, White Crawford observes, and at least some such claims were accepted at Qumran and/or elsewhere.⁶⁸

The Shortcomings of the Rewritten Scripture Label

Now, viewing the boundary between Scripture and Rewritten Scripture as porous makes sense given the likely lack of a late Second Temple canon, not least since it encourages us to take seriously the scriptural status of, say, *Jubilees*. Similarly, envisaging a broad spectrum of Rewritten Scriptures is initially attractive: it places long-known examples (e.g. *Jubilees*) within the wider context of late Second Temple scribal activity by taking into account the full range of Qumran evidence now available, especially the pre-Samaritan and *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts so central to recent debate. Yet, the amended Rewritten Scripture as currently employed may not be an unalloyed improvement in terminology for several reasons.

First comes the difference between the modest revision found in the likes of the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch and 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-e}, on the one hand, and the fully-fledged rewriting evidenced in *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* on the other. If that difference were solely a quantitative one pertaining to the amount of rewriting involved, there would be good reason to see both as more or less intense manifestations of the same thing. However, the difference is also arguably qualitative, for the fully-fledged rewriting found in *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* produces, not revisions of existing works, but new compositions with significant changes to their *Vorlagen*’s scope and voice.⁶⁹ White

66 Brooke 2002, 36.

67 See note 23 above.

68 White Crawford 2008, 12–3.

69 On scope and voice, see Segal 2005, 20–7 and Zahn 2008, 328–33.

Crawford's spectrum of rewriting is perhaps better viewed as a continuum of different sorts of scribal activity, therefore, ranging from precise copying at one end, through revised editions of existing pieces and Vermes-like fully-fledged rewriting, to the creation of documents penned *de novo*.⁷⁰ Of course, scholars are free to bring together examples from some or all these activities under one label, if they choose. But each does something distinctive and arguably merits its own appellation for the sake of accuracy in academic discourse.

Second, whereas Rewritten Bible generally implied, however anachronistically, non-*biblical* status, Rewritten Scripture always requires clarification as to the rewritten entity's *scriptural* status. If it includes both *Jubilees* and *Ant. 1–11*, in other words, the term necessitates an additional inner-scriptural/extra-scriptural exegetical distinction analogous to the old inner-biblical/extra-biblical one that it simultaneously renders redundant: *Jubilees* is a manifestation of Rewritten Scripture that itself claims scriptural status but *Ant. 1–11* is an instance where that is clearly not so.⁷¹ To be sure, Rewritten Scripture's ambiguity in this regard would be merely annoying if the Scripture element clearly always pertained only to the antecedent work's status, as Molly Zahn has recently argued is—or at least should be—the case.⁷²

Third, however, much recent Rewritten Scripture discussion in practice combines the *Rewritten* and *Scripture* elements of the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch, 4QReworked Pentateuch^{a–e}, the *Temple Scroll*, and *Jubilees*, with appeal to the notion of a continuum, as already noted, on which both Scriptures and Rewritten Scriptures appear side by side. Indeed, Petersen, as seen, welcomes this reciprocity, while Brooke has even recommended abandoning a clear distinction between Scripture and Rewritten Scripture altogether.⁷³ But while it is tempting to follow such suggestions when it comes to the revisions embodied in the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch and most *Rewritten Pentateuch* manuscripts,

70 See further van der Toorn 2007, 109–41.

71 We could, on analogy with Rewritten Bible, restrict Rewritten Scripture to works without scriptural authority, but a new name for Rewritten Scriptures that do possess such authority would then be needed.

72 Zahn 2010, 329–30 and 2011, 109. In an aside, nevertheless, Zahn acknowledges that Rewritten Scripture implies a unique bond between scriptural text and rewritten entity (2011, 110 note 58):

“If in the future we develop a clear way of distinguishing between scriptural and authoritative-but-not-scriptural works, and we have evidence that texts in the latter group were rewritten with the same methods and purposes as scriptural texts, then the suitability of the term “*Rewritten Scripture*” may have to be revisited.”

We shall return to the latter possibility presently.

73 Brooke 2009, 25–7.

as well as to fully-fledged rewritings like the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* making new scriptural claims, it is difficult to see how such suggestions relate to rewritten works like Pseudo-Philo and *Ant.* 1–11. In those cases, after all, the relationship to Scripture is not particularly reciprocal and, in any case, the secondary works concerned are non-scriptural.⁷⁴ As though aware of this difficulty, White Crawford's recent analysis is effectively restricted to pentateuchal Qumran compositions with a direct or indirect scriptural claim, rendering problematic the relationship to her spectrum of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, for instance. While that work obviously belongs with *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* at the most intense end of her continuum, White Crawford nonetheless states that it falls "only peripherally within the bounds of our definition" of Rewritten Scripture inasmuch as it does not "claim the authority of the base text."⁷⁵ We see here, then, the conflation of separate, if overlapping, phenomena that cannot easily be placed on the same spectrum: *rewrittenness* and *scripturality*. Molly Zahn, though expressing herself differently, has recently made a similar observation by warning against eliding the issue of literary dependency (*rewrittenness*) with that of authority (*scripturality*).⁷⁶

Summary

In the context of late Second Temple Judaism, it probably makes sense to speak of Scripture rather than canon, and it certainly makes sense to note that various works—only some of which were themselves scriptural—were rewritings of scriptural compositions in a narrowly defined sense. The question of a given text's rewritten nature is of a different order to whether it also functioned as Scripture, therefore, and, more importantly, we shall see below that it is also distinct from whether its *Vorlage* had scriptural status. In other words, while recent discussion of Rewritten Scripture tends to view *rewrittenness* and *scripturality* as two sides of the same coin, they are in fact distinguishable, if overlapping, phenomena. Since eliding them in the label Rewritten Scripture is such a mixed blessing, as we have seen, we will consider in due course where de-coupling them might lead us. Meanwhile, it is reasonable to say that Rewritten Scripture, though a superficial improvement on Rewritten Bible, fails to provide sufficiently nuanced terminology with which to represent

74 As Mason 2002, 119 notes, for example, Josephus did not view, nor expected others to view, *Ant.* 1–11 as Scripture.

75 White Crawford 2008, 14.

76 Zahn 2011, 102 states: "the question of a given work's *literary* connection with a book of the Bible must be asked, and answered, independently of questions about that work's *authoritative status* or lack thereof."

accurately the complexity of the primary sources concerned, especially if it is employed simultaneously to denote revised editions (e.g. pre-Samaritan Pentateuch), substantial rewritings constituting new works (Pseudo-Philo), compositions claiming scriptural status (*Jubilees*), and others that clearly do not (*Ant.* 1–11).

Rewritten Bible and Rewritten Scripture: Names for a Textual Process?

The Main Alternative

Be that as it may, let us now turn to the notion that, behind the compositions known variously—and unsatisfactorily—as Rewritten Bible or Rewritten Scripture, there lies what has been called an “exegetical process,”⁷⁷ “kind of activity or process,”⁷⁸ or “textual strategy.”⁷⁹ Apart from seeing the phenomenon as a rather indistinct “category or group”⁸⁰ or “general umbrella term,”⁸¹ this, as already noted, is the main alternative to viewing it generically. In his original study, in fact, Vermes described Rewritten Bible as an “exegetical process.”⁸²

But it is Daniel Harrington’s 1986 discussion that is the classic statement of this approach. Like Alexander, he wrote before the widespread questioning of the existence of a late Second Temple canon and, unsurprisingly, does not adopt Rewritten Scripture as a replacement. However, he does offer a clear and concise non-generic understanding of the works called Rewritten Bible as he sees them. For Harrington, more precisely, Rewritten Bible comprises a relatively small number of compositions which “take as their literary framework the flow of the biblical text itself and apparently have as their major purpose the clarification and actualization of the biblical story.”⁸³ They include *Jubilees*, the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Temple Scroll*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Pseudo-Philo, and *Ant.* 1–11.⁸⁴ Taken together, these works are too diverse to

77 Vermes 1961, 95.

78 Harrington 1986, 293.

79 Petersen 2007, 285, 292.

80 White Crawford 2008, 12.

81 Brooke 2000, 780.

82 Again, Vermes 1961, 95. As Petersen 2007, 289–91 notes, Vermes oscillates between Rewritten Bible as an exegetical process and a generic classification.

83 Harrington 1986, 239.

84 In a postscript to his study, Harrington explains that he is tempted to add the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah*, *Life of Adam and Eve*, and *Ascension of Isaiah* to the list. But in admitting that

comprise a single genre in his estimation, as remarked earlier. After all, “*Jubilees* and *Assumption of Moses* are formally apocalypses,” for instance, while *Ant.* 1–11 purports to be Josephus’ own “precise version of the Bible.”⁸⁵ Rewritten Bible as a consequence is better considered to reflect a “kind of activity or process”⁸⁶ in which the underlying biblical book is handled in a particular way, with the secondary rewritten compositions derived from it crucially taking “the flow of the biblical text itself” as “their literary framework.”⁸⁷

Despite the mismatch between Harrington’s appeal to narrative flow here and his inclusion of the non-narrative *Temple Scroll*, it is clear that his description echoes much of what those arguing for Rewritten Bible as a genre have asserted regarding its core characteristics. More to the point, *pace* both Bernstein as described above and others,⁸⁸ Harrington appears *not* to include *1 Enoch*, various unspecified Qumran writings, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and Philo within Rewritten Bible. While he does admittedly state at the outset of his essay that distinguishing the latter compositions from Rewritten Bible works is somewhat artificial, he nonetheless goes on to exclude them from the remainder of the discussion, presumably because in those cases the underlying biblical narrative does not form the basis for the derived work’s structure and flow in the manner required.⁸⁹ Contrary to common perception, therefore, Harrington does not adopt a loose definition of Rewritten Bible but rather treats it as a circumscribed textual process. The case he makes, furthermore, demonstrates that describing Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture as such a process does not *per se* rule out a narrow understanding of what is involved.

A Surprising Commonality

Indeed, the phenomenon that Harrington sees at the core of what he calls the textual “activity or process” of Rewritten Bible is in essence not that different to what Alexander and Bernstein say lies at the heart of what they deem to be the Rewritten Bible genre. To merit the label Rewritten Bible, that is, a work

these works are “less obviously keyed to the structure and flow of the biblical narrative” (1986, 246), he tends towards not doing so.

85 Harrington 1986, 243.

86 Harrington 1986, 296.

87 Harrington 1986, 239.

88 See above pages 54–5, as well as Docherty 2004, 48 and Petersen 2007, 293.

89 Harrington 1986, 239. Though it is possible to read Harrington’s words here differently, his cautious attitude towards the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah*, *Life of Adam and Eve*, and *Ascension of Isaiah*—all documents arguably less difficult to assimilate to his understanding of Rewritten Bible than *1 Enoch*, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, or Philo—suggests otherwise; see again note 84.

must first and foremost be a rewriting of a *Vorlage*, the close detailed influence of which remains determinative for the rewritten entity, notwithstanding the assorted omissions, rearrangements, expansions, and additions to be found in the latter, and despite the fact that the derived work exists as a discrete text in its own right. Some compositions can be deemed to be the result of such a textual process, while others cannot.

If so, nothing substantive would appear to be lost in holding a textual process, not a genre, to be constitutive of the works known as Rewritten Bible—or, more recently, Rewritten Scripture—as long as that process is carefully defined. Where it is, then, despite the fears of Bernstein noted earlier, compositions merely taking a scriptural figure or event as the springboard for a new work (e.g. *1 Enoch*, *Tobit*) do not constitute Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture. Neither, we might add, do materials that simply summarize selectively the broad sweep of all or part of the scriptural story, creating a pastiche of scriptural language and ideas in the process (e.g. CD 2–3, Acts 7).⁹⁰ Likewise, from this perspective, the reworkings created through relatively minor rearrangements and additions of the sort found in the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch and most *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts do not count as Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture, for the new editions of existing works that result are qualitatively, not just quantitatively, different from what is found in the likes of *Jubilees* or *Ant.* 1–11. Similarly, the textual process underlying Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture understood in this way is quite distinct from the lemma-style commentary familiar from the so-called Pesharim, Philo, and Rabbinic midrash.

To get the most out of the concept behind the term Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture, an intense form of rewriting is required, one which produces a work or part-work with a separate identity to that of its predecessor, despite requiring the derived piece to remain closely keyed to the antecedent item. Taking another of Alexander's examples, we can see this textual process at work in *Ant.* 1.222–237, where Josephus rewrites Gen 22:1–19, omitting details here, eliding others there, filling in lacunae, and solving problems, all the while retaining his *Vorlage*'s basic structure and flow.⁹¹ The closeness of that relationship is even more evident when a larger portion of material—Gen 22:1–25:11 in *Ant.* 1.222–256—is held in view:⁹²

90 Cf. Campbell 2005, 48.

91 See Alexander 1988, 111–6.

92 For *Ant.* 1.222–56, see further Christopher Begg's chapter in this volume.

Genesis	Content	Antiquities
22.1–19	near-sacrifice of Isaac	1.222–236
22.20–4	descendants of Nahor	1.153
23.1–20	Sarah's death and burial	1.237
24.1–67	marriage of Isaac & Rebecca	1.242–55
25.1–6	Abraham, Keturah and their offspring	1.238–41
25.7–11	death & burial of Abraham	1.256

It is equally clear that *Ant.* 1.222–256 is no mere new edition of Gen 22:1–25:1 but, as we saw with *Jubilees* in an earlier section, a new literary entity in its own right.

Questions Remaining

The above state of affairs, if an accurate description of the matter, may allow us to provide additional clarity on several contentious issues. The first concerns portions of Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture in compositions that are predominantly something else, for giving up a generic approach means that it can be more straightforwardly acknowledged that part of a work can reflect the textual process concerned just as much as a whole composition. We saw this above, for instance, vis-à-vis 4QGenesis Commentary A 1 1:1–2:5a and its rewriting of Gen 6:3–8:18. Similarly, the content of 4QReworked Pentateuch^a appears to be another example of the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture textual process, unlike 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b–e} with which that manuscript is normally associated. But this does not in itself constitute grounds for deeming the former a separate composition unconnected to the latter, as Bernstein and Segal have unconvincingly argued.⁹³

A second issue pertains to how much of a *Vorlage* must be rewritten for the end result to count as Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture inasmuch as those adopting a generic approach are reluctant to accept that the rewriting of a small work or short section of a longer one constitutes Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture.⁹⁴ Yet, where a textual process is to the fore, a composition like *Joseph and Aseneth* can be seen as an example of Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture. This is not because it reflects the required number of generic traits, as Docherty proposes, but because it forms an intense rewriting of Gen 41–49 that remains more closely keyed to that *Vorlage* than has generally been

93 Bernstein 2005, 181–2, 195–6 and Segal 2005; cf. Petersen 2007, 296 (note 29) and Zahn 2008, 327 (note 41). See also above note 23.

94 Thus, Alexander 1988, 117 and Bernstein 2005, 177.

recognised, as Docherty also maintains.⁹⁵ We can see in the *Testament of Moses*, similarly, a relatively small block of material (Deut 31–34) that has been rewritten through the textual process described earlier.⁹⁶

The basic outline of the Testament of Moses follows the pattern of those chapters [Deut 31–34] to such an extent that the Testament of Moses may be considered a virtual rewriting of them.

Hence, as long as there is sufficient material in the secondary work to be able to deduce that the textual process of Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture has taken place, there is no reason to withhold the label from it.

Third, we noted above a tendency in much discussion of the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture phenomenon to dismiss translations as possible examples. This position is almost impossible to maintain without serious methodological contradiction, however, for, while many since Vermes have omitted the Palestinian Targums from the debate, they have usually included 1QGenesis Apocryphon and *Ant.* 1–11. The most sensible approach would seem to be to allow that, as long as the markers of the relevant textual process are present, the additional factor of translation from one language into another presents no barrier to the inclusion of a work, or part-work, under the rubric of the rewriting phenomenon.

Summary

The least unsatisfactory way of employing the problematic language of Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture is to reserve it for those compositions and part-compositions among the array of late Second Temple literature dependent on Scripture that have the distinct relationship to their scriptural *Vorlagen* described above. Indeed, if a common thread emerges from key studies over the years, from Vermes' original analysis of Rewritten Bible to more recent discussion of Rewritten Scripture, it is arguably the recognition that a relatively small number of sources exhibit a particular kind of circumscribed textual process. In that process, the *Vorlage* remains dominant for the secondary piece's structure and flow, while the derived work is no mere revised edition of its predecessor but a new distinct composition. The temptation to include minor revisions producing new editions of existing texts, though understandable given the scholarly focus on the wealth of Qumran data published since 1991, should be resisted. And the opposite tendency to subsume

95 See again Docherty 2004.

96 Priest 1983, 923.

within Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture what Bernstein and others call parabiblical texts, compositions that do not exhibit rewriting proper but take a scriptural event or personage as the inspiration for a work produced *de novo*, should likewise be resisted.

Rewriting: A Widespread Late Second Temple Phenomenon?

Distinguishing Rewriting from Scripturality

Nonetheless, despite the summary above, we are still left with nomenclature to denote the textual process of Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture that is unsatisfactory for the reasons already given. If, as observed on several occasions, our terminology should as far as possible accurately reflect the underlying historical and literary *realia*, that ought not to be the end of the matter. Consequently, we shall now return to the proposal to separate two issues—scripturality and rewrittenness—that have been largely intertwined in the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture debate hitherto. The hope is that, by focusing on rewriting and thus casting our net more widely, we may throw additional light on the rewriting phenomenon, for the textual process described in the last section is evident in other late Second Temple writings that generally feature only on the periphery of scholarly discussion, if at all.⁹⁷

Revised Editions of non-Scriptural Works

Before considering several examples, however, it is worth pausing first to note that it is not hard to find non-scriptural parallels to those works recently—but, if our earlier argument was valid, unhelpfully—placed by some scholars at the less intense end of a spectrum of Rewritten Scripture. Thus, the publication of previously unavailable Cave 4 material in recent decades has demonstrated that several Qumran sectarian compositions underwent a process of revision, including the *Damascus Document* (CD, 4QD^{a-h}, 5QD, 6QD), *War Scroll* (1QM, 4QM^{a-g}), and *Community Rule* (1QS, 4QS^{a-j}, 5QS).⁹⁸ Although the incomplete nature of the evidence precludes certainty, variations between Cave 1 and Cave 4 versions of the *Community Rule* have led Sariana Metso, for instance, to prioritize 4QS^{b,d} over 1QS when it comes to determining earlier and subsequent editions.⁹⁹ Similarly, Greek Ecclesiasticus can be viewed as a revised edition of

97 See again note 11 above.

98 See further Duhaime 2004; Hempel 2000; and Metso 2007.

99 Metso 2007, 15–9.

its antecedent, Hebrew Ben Sira, albeit via a process of translation.¹⁰⁰ Clearly, therefore, the phenomenon dubbed *revised Bible* by Segal and Bernstein vis-à-vis 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-e} and similar materials can be paralleled in Ecclesiasticus and Qumran sectarian works—even though, however authoritative they were in other ways, neither the latter nor their antecedents constituted Scripture in late Second Temple times.¹⁰¹ This is all largely stating the obvious, of course. But by way of analogy to what follows, it is worth highlighting that the scribal activity that produced revised editions of *scriptural* books was commonly practiced in relation to *non-scriptural* compositions as well.¹⁰²

Non-Scriptural Works Rewritten

In view of the above, indeed, it will be no surprise to find that the fully-fledged textual process of rewriting is likewise evidenced widely. However, because this factor has been neglected in the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture debate hitherto, as mentioned, we shall look at several examples.

We may turn first to the rewriting of the *Letter of Aristeas* and 1 Maccabees in *Ant.* 12–13, for Josephus handles these compositions in the same way that he treats scriptural material in *Ant.* 1–11. Notwithstanding omissions, adjustments, expansions, and additions enabling Josephus to make the end-result comport with his own outlook and purpose, these base texts are interpretatively rewritten in *Ant.* 12–13 with their structure and flow remaining dominant. The *Letter of Aristeas* is paraphrased in *Ant.* 12.1–118, for instance, with assorted minor and major changes.¹⁰³ And Josephus depends primarily on 1 Mac 1:14–13:42 for his account of the middle decades of the second century BCE in *Ant.* 12.241–13.214, omitting some material, expanding other parts, rearranging, and inserting extraneous traditions as needed.¹⁰⁴ Although it is difficult to demonstrate this adequately without citing swathes of primary material, a comparison of the appearance of five letters in 1 Macc 10:18–12:23 in *Ant.* 12.226–13.170 is usefully illustrative:

100 Wright 1989 provides further detail.

101 See again note 3.

102 Tov 2006 highlights evidence for both in Qumran scriptural and non-scriptural manuscripts.

103 Thus, Downing 1980a, 162–5, drawing on Pelletier 1962.

104 See Francis 1984 and Feldman 1994.

1 Maccabees	Antiquities
10: 18–20	13.45
10: 25–45	13.48–57
11:30–37	13.126–128
12: 6–18	13.166–170
12:20–23	12.226–227

Here and elsewhere in *Ant.* 12–22, the sources employed are not Scripture, for “books like 1 and 2 Maccabees are later and separate”¹⁰⁵ non-scriptural entities for Josephus. Nonetheless, his handling of the *Letter of Aristeas* and 1 Maccabees is no different to his treatment of scriptural sources in *Ant.* 1–11: Josephus “continues his narrative to the present [in *Ant.* 12–22] treating books such as Pseudo-Aristeas and 1 Maccabees the same way that he treats biblical material.”¹⁰⁶

Another example is *4 Maccabees* 5–17, where the gruesomely detailed account of the martyrdom of seven brothers and their mother, probably penned in the late first century BCE or early first century CE, constitutes a thorough reworking of the briefer and older story in 2 Maccabees 3–7.¹⁰⁷ Although many of the latter’s details have been altered in the former, and notwithstanding *4 Maccabees*’ distinct philosophical style, it is clear that *4 Maccabees* follows the sequence and structure of 2 Maccabees, as the following arrangement shows.¹⁰⁸

2 Maccabees	Content	4 Maccabees
3.1–3	Conditions under Seleucus IV	3.20–1
3.4–40	Temple treasury attacked	4.1–14
4.7–10	Hellenizing reforms	4.15–20
5.1–26	Occupation of Jerusalem	4.21–3
6.1–11	Judaism suppressed	4.24–6
6.18–31	Eleazar’s martyrdom	5.1–6.30
7.1–40	Seven brothers’ martyrdom	8.1–14.10
7.41	Mother’s martyrdom	14.11–17.1

105 Mason 2002, 125.

106 Mason 2002, 126.

107 On dating 2 Maccabees and *4 Maccabees*, see Nickelsburg 2005, 106–10, 256–9.

108 DeSilva 2006, xxx.

Further examination demonstrates at the same time that the writer of *4 Maccabees*:¹⁰⁹

conflates characters and developments in order to state more concisely episodes that are of secondary importance to his oration (thus he can be seen to abridge 2 Macc 3:1–6:17), while amplifying and embellishing that part of the story that is most germane to his topic (thus he expands on 2 Macc 6:18–7:42).

While there is a close relationship between 2 Maccabees and *4 Maccabees* throughout most of the latter, in other words, *4 Maccabees*' author abbreviates, expands, and supplements his main source according to his own outlook and purpose.¹¹⁰

Lastly, it is worth looking briefly at two New Testament books, Matthew and Luke, both of which, it is widely believed, independently used Mark so that the latter's content and structure remain visible.¹¹¹ Matthew reproduces nearly all of Mark, for example, variously rearranging, omitting, abbreviating its traditions, while also adding material of its own that, in part, almost certainly came from a source (the so-called Q) shared with the author of Luke. Matthew thus adds infancy narratives (Matt 1–2), five sections of distinctive teaching (Matt 5–7, 10, 13, 18, 24–5), and resurrection appearances (Matt 28). As with Mark, nonetheless, Jesus' Galilean ministry comes to an end with Peter's confession (Matt 16:16–19//Mk 8:29–30), and the whole story then climaxes in Jesus' final week in Jerusalem (Matt 21–27//Mk 11–15). In a similar way, though drawing on a smaller proportion of Mark, Luke follows the latter, adding birth narratives (Lk 1–2) and resurrection appearances (Lk 24), though most of the supplementary teaching appears in one block (Lk 9:51–18:14), placed between the equivalent of Mark 9 and 10, rather than scattered throughout.¹¹²

In all these cases, we see a rewriting in which a *Vorlage* remains constitutive for the rewritten entity, though the derived work constitutes a new composition, not a revised edition of its predecessor, and though we can be confident that neither *Vorlage* nor secondary work were scriptural for author or original

109 DeSilva 2006, xxxi provides a comparable schematization.

110 As Docherty 2004, 28–9, 35, 37 notes, by abbreviating here and expanding there, the authors of *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* and *Joseph and Aseneth* acted similarly.

111 Powery 2009 provides an overview of the so-called Synoptic Problem.

112 For a tabular representation of these relationships, too extensive to be included here, see Coogan 2010, 2266.

audience.¹¹³ Apart from the latter factor, more particularly, we can also see that *Ant.* 12–13, *4 Maccabees*, Matthew, and Luke seem indistinguishable in terms of the intense rewriting they exhibit when compared to *Jubilees*, 1QGenesis Apocryphon, Pseudo-Philo, and *Ant.* 1–11, the four exemplar texts analysed in Alexander’s classic study mentioned earlier.

Rewriting and Redaction

Now, it is fair to say that most discussion of the above examples has been conducted in the language of sources and redaction in contrast to Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture works, where analysis is predominantly expressed precisely in terms of rewriting. There are exceptions, of course. In one study of Mark in Matthew and Luke, for example, Gerald Downing speaks of sources and redaction, *not just* for the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels and, by way of comparison, for the *Letter of Aristeas* in *Ant.* 12, *but also* when appealing to Joshua/Judges in *Ant.* 5 as a further comparison.¹¹⁴ Upon reflection, indeed, rewriting of the narrowly defined sort described immediately above and in the preceding section *is* a type of redactional activity in which a dominant source remains determinative in a particular way for the secondary entity. It seems that such rewriting—a *textual process* in which rewritten Composition B remains closely keyed to antecedent Composition A—was a wider late Second Temple phenomenon than is normally acknowledged. Furthermore, since the range of literature evincing such a textual process extends beyond works with a scriptural *Vorlage*, as so much of the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture debate hitherto fails to acknowledge, the suitability of the amended label Rewritten Scripture is arguably as doubtful as that of the more obviously anachronistic Rewritten Bible.¹¹⁵

Summary

One important procedure by which late Second Temple scribes regularly expanded the “long-duration texts”¹¹⁶ they received and passed on was through a circumscribed textual process of rewriting. That process can be seen in a

113 The Synoptic Gospels, though later assuming scriptural and eventually canonical status for Christians, are best viewed as authoritative in a different way—comparable to Qumran sectarian works—at the time of their composition. See notes 3 and 61.

114 Downing 1980a and 1980b. Though Petersen 2007, 288 draws a similar parallel with the Gospels, see above note 61.

115 See note 72 for Zahn’s adumbration of this point merely as a theoretical possibility.

116 Carr 2005, 10 employs this useful phrase to denote all literature thought worthy of preservation and adaptation by a given community or culture.

range of compositions that has come down to us, *irrespective* of the status, scriptural or otherwise, of either *Vorlage* or derived work. Such texts include, not just those that have featured prominently in the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture debate over the past fifty years (e.g. *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and *Ant.* 1–11), but also others that have not done so (e.g. *4 Maccabees*, *Ant.* 12–13, and Matthew).

Four Interrelated Deductions

This Analysis

Thus far, we have considered a wide range of both primary sources and secondary viewpoints. It seems reasonable at this juncture, therefore, to make several interrelated deductions on the basis of our analysis, bearing in mind the guiding principle, emphasized several times already, that our terminology should as far as possible reflect the underlying data's complexity in order to be heuristically valuable. The comments below are not designed to be prescriptive, however, but rather to offer pointers to further and fuller discussion.

Rewritten Bible

Rewritten Bible is unsatisfactory as a generic designation, for the diversity of works usually included, even on a narrow definition, is too wide to constitute a meaningful genre given our current limited grasp of the literary culture of late Second Temple Jews. While it might nonetheless be thought an option to retain the term to designate the narrowly defined textual process that is the main non-generic alternative approach, this too is problematic given the probability that late Second Temple Judaism had no Bible but rather Scripture. Indeed, the likely lack of canonical boundaries means that some so-called Rewritten Bible works themselves enjoyed scriptural status, contrary to the assumptions underlying much past and some recent discussion.

Rewritten Scripture

That factor has led to the adoption of the alternative Rewritten Scripture, either as a broad umbrella term or to denote a specific textual process. In the former case, it covers a much wider range of material than Rewritten Bible—from minor revisions to fully-fledged rewritings and even so-called parabiblical texts—but thereby becomes an overly loose label of little heuristic value. To be sure, the narrower definition of Rewritten Scripture as a textual process, by including rewritings of scriptural works outside the later Rabbinic Bible and by encouraging the acknowledgement that some Scriptures are

themselves Rewritten Scripture, is broad in scope compared to the standard remit of Rewritten Bible. But it has the advantage of allowing us to dispense with a certain anachronistic inner-biblical/extra-biblical exegetical distinction. Nevertheless, even as the name for a carefully defined textual process, Rewritten Scripture unhelpfully forces us to make an additional inner/extra-scriptural exegetical distinction because some so-called Rewritten Scriptures neither claimed nor were granted their *Vorlagen's* scriptural status. Since the academic enterprise is best served by terminology that highlights such important distinctions within the primary sources, rather than subsuming them in a pool of more or less undifferentiated data, Rewritten Scripture turns out to be not much of an improvement on Rewritten Bible.

A Textual Process

Still, it seems safe to conclude that the compositions variously known as Rewritten Bible or Rewritten Scripture are best viewed as resulting from a particular sort of textual process or exegetical strategy in which rewritten Composition B remains closely keyed to antecedent Composition A. Although the works concerned do not constitute a genre, as noted, they do appear to be manifestations of a type of scribal activity in which the derived work, though retaining a centripetal relationship to its *Vorlage*, nonetheless constitutes a distinct composition in its own right. This observation reflects a crucial common denominator arguably lying at the heart of studies by Vermes, Harrington, Alexander, Bernstein, and others. It is advisable, as a result, to avoid Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture terminology for minor revisions found in the likes of the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch and most *Reworked Pentateuch* manuscripts from Qumran, for, in these cases, as with the divergent editions of Ben Sira/Ecclesiasticus or sectarian Qumran compositions, we see a different kind of scribal activity that merely produces new versions of existing works.

The Rewriting of Long-Duration Texts

There is a tendency in both older and more recent scholarship to see the Rewritten and Bible/Scripture elements in the Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture appellation as mutually dependent—as though it were the canonicity/scripturality of the former *per se* that uniquely inspired the rewriting evident in the latter and as though the latter's rewritten nature were inseparable from the former's canonical/scriptural authority. But this is difficult to maintain when we broaden our horizon beyond the limits of those works normally included in the debate. Indeed, the chief characteristic of the compositions normally called Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture appears to dovetail with the broader phenomenon of the rewriting of a diversity of "long-duration

texts,¹¹⁷ including both widely circulating non-scriptural materials (e.g. 1 Maccabees and the *Letter of Aristeas* in *Ant.* 12–13) and more partisan pieces (e.g. Mark in Matthew and Luke).¹¹⁸ Since, in contrast, even recent discussion of Rewritten Scripture views the relationship between the *Vorlage* and rewritten entity as something intertwined with *both* the scriptural status of the former *and* the latter's dependence on that status, the term *Rewritten Scripture* would again seem to be as problematic as Vermes' original label that it is supposed to replace.

Future Research

If so, we need to take greater account of the fact that the kind of rewriting evident in so-called Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture works fits into a broader scenario in which a wide range of long-duration texts were subjected to the same kind of textual process. An important question for future research, therefore, is what core features or key functions, if any, all such texts have in common. More particularly, if essentially the same exegetical strategy long recognized vis-à-vis *Jubilees* and *Ant.* 1–11, for instance, is also at work in *4 Maccabees* and Matthew, then observations about the interdependency of *Vorlage* and derived work expressed specifically in terms of the former's scriptural status require rethinking.¹¹⁹ In pursuing these questions, of course, what remains distinctive about specific types of rewriting—whether of sectarian works, popular non-scriptural literature, or scriptural compositions—may become clearer. But what each of these might be called is a matter best left for another discussion, although it may in a limited sense be reasonable to speak of *Rewritten Scripture* for some texts in the same way that others might simultaneously be described as *Rewritten Sectarian Work* or *Rewritten Popular Narrative*.

Conclusion

By engaging with recent issues in the debate, this chapter has sought to comment on the accuracy and efficacy of the terminology employed for the works routinely known as Rewritten Bible/ Rewritten Scripture. We have found that the main participants in that debate, past and present, have all contributed something positive. Bernstein's proposition that Rewritten Bible should be defined as tightly as possible to maximize its heuristic value is crucial, for

117 See note 116 again.

118 See above note 11.

119 See again note 115.

example, as is Harrington's argument that in essence a textual process lies at the heart of the rewriting phenomenon. The more recent observation of Brooke, Petersen, VanderKam, White Crawford, and others that the original appellation Rewritten Bible is anachronistic, given the likelihood that late Second Temple Jews had Scripture, not canon, is similarly persuasive. At the same time, attempts to portray Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture as a genre remain unconvincing, while Rewritten Scripture as a replacement for Rewritten Bible arguably obfuscates as much as it illuminates. Most significantly, we have seen that the circumscribed textual process found in so-called Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture works is also evident within a wider range of late Second Temple literature than is normally acknowledged. This important factor has received little attention hitherto, presumably because of the overriding interest of scholars in Scripture and its interpretation in general and because of the focus on recently published scriptural and Scripture-related Qumran manuscripts in particular. To counter these tendencies, and to encourage a fuller grasp of the rewriting phenomenon in late Second Temple Judaism, it is helpful to separate the *Rewritten* and *Bible/Scripture* elements and even, at least temporarily, to put on hold Rewritten Bible/Rewritten Scripture language altogether. However, this should most emphatically *not* be taken to show that Vermes' original idea introduced fifty years ago has somehow been unproductive, for, on the contrary, our analysis demonstrates that its introduction has been a great success. But as is often the case with good ideas, it has led us in a direction that could not have been predicted at the outset.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip S. 1988. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Auld, Graeme. 1994. *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible's Kings*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Barton, John. 1986. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel After the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd.
- . 1996. *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Second edition. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd.
- . 1998. What is a Book? Modern Exegesis and the Literary Conventions of Ancient Israel. Pages 1–14 in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel*. Edited by J.C. de Moor. Leiden: Brill.

- . 2013. The Old Testament Canons. Pages 145–64 in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol 1*. Edited by J. Schaper and J. Carlton-Paget. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 2004. The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the History of Early Biblical Interpretation. Pages 215–37 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Edited by H. Najman and J.H. Newman. JSJSup 83. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2005. 'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness? *Textus 22*: 169–196.
- Brooke, George, J. 2000. Rewritten Bible. Pages 777–81 in vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . 2002. The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible. Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London/New Castle: British Library/Oak Knoll Press.
- . 2009. New Perspectives on the Bible and its Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 19–37 in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*. Edited by D. Dimant and R.G. Kratz. FAT II 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010. Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Pesher. *Dead Sea Discoveries 17*: 332–57.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. 1995. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20*. BZAW 228. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2000. 4QMMT^d and the Tripartite Canon. *Journal of Jewish Studies 51*: 181–90.
- . 2005. 'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique. Pages 43–68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003*. Edited by J.G. Campbell et al. LSTS 52. London: T&T Clark.
- . 2012. Josephus' Twenty-two Book canon and the Qumran Scrolls. Pages 19–45 in *The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki*. Edited by G.J. Brooke, D.K. Falk, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and M. Zahn. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2013. Scriptural Interpretation at Qumran. Pages 242–66 in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol 1*. Edited by J. Schaper and J. Carlton-Paget. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carr, David M. 2005. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coogan, Michael D., ed. 2010. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible*. Fourth edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Collins, John J. 2002. The Literature of the Second Temple Period. Pages 53–78 in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Studies*. Edited by M. Goodman. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- DeSilva, David A. 2006. *4 Maccabees*. SCS. Leiden: Brill.
- Dimant, Devorah. 1999. The Scrolls and the Study of Early Judaism. Pages 43–59 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*. Edited by R.A. Kugler and E. Schuller. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Docherty, Susan. 2004. *Joseph and Aseneth: Rewritten Bible or Narrative Expansion?* *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 35: 27–48.
- Downing, F. Gerald. 1980a. Redaction Criticism: Josephus's *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels, Part 1. *JSNT* 8: 46–65.
- . 1980b. Redaction Criticism: Josephus's *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels, Part 2. *JSNT* 9: 29–48.
- Duhaime, Jean. 2004. *The War Texts: 1QM and Related Texts*. CQS 6. London: T & T Clark.
- Feldman, Louis H. 1994. Josephus' Portrayal of the Hasmonians Compared with 1 Maccabees. Pages 41–68 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by F. Parente and J. Sievers. SPB 41. Leiden: Brill.
- Francis, Fred O. 1984. The Parallel Letters in Josephus' *Antiquities* and in 1 Maccabees. Pages 161–74 in *Tradition as Openness to the Future: Essays in Honor of Willis W. Fisher*. Edited by F.O. Francis and R.P. Wallace. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Harrington, Daniel J. 1986. The Bible Rewritten (Narratives). Pages 99–120 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Hempel, Charlotte. 2000. *The Damascus Texts*. CQS 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hughes, Julie A. 2006. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. STDJ 59. Leiden: Brill.
- Levinson, Bernard M. 2008. *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mason, Steve. 2002. Josephus and His Twenty-two Book Canon. Pages 110–27 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Metso, Sarianna. 2007. *The Serekh Texts*. CQS 9/LSTS 62. London: T & T Clark.
- Nickelsburg, George W.E. 1984. The Bible Rewritten and Expanded. Pages 89–156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M.E. Stone. Assen/Philadelphia: van Gorcum/Fortress Press.
- . 2005. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah*. Second edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Pelletier, André. 1962. *Flavius Josephus, Adapteur de la Lettre d'Aristée*. Paris: Cerf.
- Perloff, Marjorie. 1989. Introduction. Pages 3–10 in *Postmodern Genres*. Edited by M. Perloff. OPDT 5. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Petersen, Anders K. 2007. Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon: Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism? Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino: Dead*

- Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez.* Edited by A. Hilhorst, É. Puech and E.J.C. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill.
- Powery, Emerson, B. 2009. Synoptic Problem. Pages 429–34 in vol. 5 of *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by K. Doob Sakenfeld. Vols. 1–5. Nashville: Abingdon Press (2006–9).
- Priest, John F. 1983. Testament of Moses. Pages 919–34 in vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Vols. 1–2. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd.
- Segal, Michael. 2005. Between Bible and Rewritten Bible. Pages 10–29 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. SDBS. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Swanson, Dwight. 1995. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: the Methodology of nQT*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1994. Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen–Exod. Pages 111–33 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- . 1998. Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch. *DSD* 5: 334–54.
- . 2006. The Writing of Early Scrolls and the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture. *DSD* 13: 339–47.
- . 2008. Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere. Pages 369–93 in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*. Edited by M. Karrer and W. Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen; Mohr Siebeck.
- Trebolle, Julio. 2006. Canon of the Old Testament. Pages 548–63 in vol. 1 of *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by K. Doob Sakenfeld. Vols. 1–5. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006–9.
- Ulrich, Eugene. 2002. The Notion and Definition of Canon. Pages 21–35 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 2003a. The Non-Attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT. *CBQ* 65: 202–214.
- . 2003b. From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness. *DSD* 10: 3–25.
- . 2010. The Jewish Scriptures: Texts, Versions, Canons. Pages 97–119 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- VanderKam, James, C. 2002a. The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works. Pages 41–56 in *The Bible as Book*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London/New Castle: British Library/Oak Knoll Press.

- . 2002b. Questions of Canon viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 91–109 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- VanderKam, James C., and Peter W. Flint eds. 2002. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
- Van der Toorn, Karel. 2007. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vermes, Geza. 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1979. Torah Scholarship. Pages 314–55 in vol. 2 of *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. Vols. 1–3. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1977–1987.
- . 1986. Biblical Midrash. Pages 308–41 in vol. 3.1 of *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman. Vols. 1–3. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1977–1987.
- . 1989. Bible Interpretation at Qumran. *Eretz-Israel* 20: 184–91.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. 1999. The ‘Rewritten Bible’ at Qumran. *Eretz-Israel* 26: 1–8
- . 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Williamson, Hugh G.M. 2011. 1 Esdras as Rewritten Bible? Pages 237–49 in *Was 1 Esdras First?: An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Wright, Benjamin G. 1989. *No Small Difference: Sirach’s Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text*. SCS 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Zahn, Molly M. 2008. The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above? *DSD* 15: 315–339.
- . 2010. Rewritten Scripture. Pages 323–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology. Pages 93–119 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala and M. Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Crossing the Borders from “Pre-Scripture” to Scripture (Rewritten) to “Rewritten Scripture”

Eugene Ulrich

Introduction

Recent scholarship recognizes two undisputed facts: (1) Virtually all the books of the Hebrew Bible are the late literary results of a complex evolutionary process of composition. (2) There were other interpretive books authored in the late Second Temple period that were composed using the Scriptures as their basis. The latter had a double function: (a) to acknowledge and implicitly proclaim that a certain book recognized as scriptural was an important fundamental work to use as a basis for, and lend authority to, updated interpretation, and (b) to steer current and future interpretive views in a certain direction. That is, there were books clearly considered authoritative Sacred Scripture (though their text could still develop), and there were new compositions based on the scriptural text but understood by the author (and presumably at least originally by the community) as a new non-scriptural work, a work we could categorize as Scripture-based religious literature.¹ This paper seeks to explore the features of the two types of works, to discern the boundaries between them as well as the criteria for distinguishing them from each other, and to explore how the features of later “rewritten Scripture” may relate to earlier “pre-Scripture,” that is, to the early stages in the composition of the books that became the Scriptures.

Since this limited study attempts to cover all the Law and the Prophets in a short space, I must necessarily paint with broad, impressionistic strokes, leaving many details and nuances unaddressed. But I should articulate four assumptions:

¹ A specific example is Ben Sira: more than a half century later, his grandson says in the Prologue (7–12) that “my grandfather Jesus, who had devoted himself especially to the reading of the Law and Prophets [i.e., the Scriptures, . . . wrote] something pertaining to instruction and wisdom. . . .” He thus distinguishes Scripture from religious “literature,” and his grandfather was composing *literature* (though it would later be seen as Scripture by certain Jews and Christians).

1. The Torah was recognized as authoritative Scripture by the end of the fourth century BCE at the latest, since it was translated into Greek in the early third century. The Prophets, which included Psalms and eventually Daniel, were similarly recognized during the next century or so.
2. The scriptural text forms that are witnessed in the Scrolls, the MT, the SP, and the LXX were circulating and used in the third to first centuries BCE and thus must be considered genuine forms of Scripture.
3. Thus, the types of editorial work observable in those witnesses must be considered legitimate and within the bounds of scriptural transmission. They serve as criteria for acceptable features of revision within the boundaries of legitimate scriptural development.
4. The books of the Ketuvim were known as literature toward the end of the Second Temple period, but there is little textual evidence for them and little evidence that they were widely considered Scripture yet. Thus, this paper focuses only on the Law and the Prophets.

The attempt to delineate the borders, however, is sometimes perplexingly protean. When one crosses the border between one sovereign nation and another, the border is usually quite clearly marked and officially noted. But other parts of the boundaries are at times disputed and rather difficult to discern in more remote areas, such as in a body of water, a dense forest, or rugged mountainous terrain.

The establishment by a community of a canon of Scripture—that is, an official definitive list of which books are (and therefore, which books are not) in the supremely authoritative collection—is an attempt to delineate such a border. But the *books* that constitute the rabbinic and Christian canons were formed *before* the Great Divide (i.e., during the Second Temple period), whereas the clearly delineated *canons* were fixed only in the period *after* the Great Divide (i.e., after one or both Jewish Revolts).² That, plus the fact that probably much less than five percent of ancient textual witnesses to Israel's religious literature survives, makes problematic the effort to determine which texts were considered Scripture and which were not at the time of the transition to rabbinic Judaism and the birth of Christianity.

2 The term “the Great Divide” was coined by the late Shemaryahu Talmon (2000, 14). It refers to the watershed between “the waning of the biblical epoch,” the older period when development in the Hebrew Scriptures was still practiced, and “the onset of the ‘Age of the Sages,’” the later period when only the rabbinic collection of texts was transmitted with no further alteration to the Hebrew. The date is not precisely known but “should probably be located in the late first or in the second century CE.”

I Scripture (Rewritten)

Yet another facet emerges to make the effort even more problematic: Many if not virtually all books of the Bible are themselves “rewritten Scripture.” They have a history of being rewritten; their composition was achieved through a series of developing stages of rewriting. The MS evidence retrieved from the latter half of the Second Temple period as well as the evidence of the SP, the LXX, and the writings of Josephus document “new and expanded” editions for a number of the books which now comprise the Bible.³

The features of the “rewriting” tolerated within the bounds of legitimate revision of the scriptural books can be deduced from the examples of revision within MSS generally admitted to be scriptural, that is, the forms of the scriptural texts encountered in the Scrolls, in the MT, in the SP, and in the LXX. Those features of rewriting can then be articulated and can help serve to discern the boundaries between Scripture and “rewritten Scripture.”

A *Evidence in the Scrolls of the Rewriting That Produced Revised Editions*⁴

In analysing the changes in variant forms of scriptural texts it is good to keep in mind four different and mutually independent levels of variation: orthography, individual textual variants, isolated insertions, and new editions. The first two generally play no part in our discussion, since they are seldom significant enough to demonstrate intentional rewriting of a book;⁵ focus should be primarily on new editions and to a certain extent on texts with a number of major isolated insertions. An examination of the evidence shows that the Scrolls, the MT, the SP, and the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG each display rewritten forms of various books, enhanced either by a number of major insertions or especially by a new edition. Some of the books that appear in the Scrolls in revised form are the following:

3 It is important to remember that in antiquity it was the book, not a specific form of the book, that was Scripture or canonical; see Bruce Metzger (1987, 269–70) and Eugene Ulrich (2002, 31–32).

4 For the evidence in the scrolls that show rewriting in the MT see the next section.

5 Neither orthographic insertion of *matres lectionis* that simply facilitate traditional reading nor individual variants that are simply errors or clarifications play a role. But as Stefan Schorch’s contribution in this volume demonstrates, *matres* directing vocalization and thus interpretation can have serious effects. Either systematically repeated intentional insertion of *matres* to redirect interpretation or a sustained pattern of variants would invite analysis.

Exodus (MT → 4QpaleoExod^m)

The base text of Exodus as preserved in the MT appears in a revised, expanded edition in 4QpaleoExod^m.⁶ The purpose of that revision was primarily to expand the text in two ways: to show Moses' obedience by reporting that he actually carried out the commands of the Lord, the execution of which was merely tacitly assumed in the MT, and to supplement the narrative with details reported in Deuteronomy that were not found in the base text of Exodus.

Numbers (MT → 4QNum^b)

The text of Numbers as in 4QNum^b, where extant, preserves five major expansions that occur in the SP of Numbers but are lacking in the MT. In three further places where reconstruction can be relied on, the 4QNum^b-SP agreement is similar; there are no examples contrary to this repeated pattern. As in 4QpaleoExod^m, the purpose of this expanded edition was to supplement the narrative with details reported in Deuteronomy that were not found in the base text of Numbers.

Samuel (MT → 4QSam^a)

There are more than ten isolated insertions in 4QSam^a which are lacking in the MT.⁷ But the insertions show no consistent pattern to suggest a revised edition. Rather, the scroll contains a slightly later, but generally superior, textual tradition of the book.⁸

Jeremiah (4QJer^{b,d,OG} → 4QJer^{a,c,MT})

4QJer^{b,d} and the OG display an early edition of the book, and the MT, 4QJer^a, and 4QJer^c display a subsequent, intentionally expanded edition. Emanuel Tov and Pierre-Maurice Bogaert have outlined convincingly the characteristics by which the revised edition goes beyond the earlier: both editorial and

6 The full editions of the biblical scrolls from Qumran can be found in the DJD volumes. For a convenient single-volume resource for all the biblical transcriptions and their textual variants, see *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls* (Ulrich 2010).

7 The MT also shows three similar insertions, which suggests that they were inserted after the split between the 4QSam^a and MT traditions.

8 Ulrich 2007. Some scholars see variant editions in the Book of Samuel in 4QSam^a, MT, or LXX (e.g., 1 Samuel 1; 1 Samuel 11:1^{mit}; 2 Samuel 24; or the whole book); see Stanley D. Walters (1988) and Emanuel Tov (1999, 433–55). Anneli Aejmelaeus (2007a) detects “conflation” of the Samuel tradition and Chronicles in 4QSam^a chapter 24. But I do not find a new *edition* in any of these Samuel passages, since many of the individual variants are minor, routine, contextual, ambiguous, or simply errors, and since they seem to have been produced sporadically and probably at different times rather than by a single scribe with a single purpose. See Ulrich 2012a.

exegetical aspects. Under editorial aspects Tov lists the rearrangement of text, the addition of headings to prophecies, the repetition of sections, etc. Under exegetical aspects, he lists the clarification of details in the context, the explicitation of material that was implicit, minor harmonistic additions, and the emphasizing of ideas found in other parts of the book.⁹ Thus the new edition of Jeremiah exhibits yet another purpose: to amplify the entire book by routine minor explicitation, clarification, lengthened forms of titles, etc., plus a major rearrangement for the order of the Oracles Against the Nations. This would contrast with the expansion by infrequent, large-scale harmonization as in 4QpaleoExod^m. It should be noted that the earlier edition formerly known only through the LXX is in fact based on a variant Hebrew *Vorlage* (similar to 4QJer^{b,d}). Thus, the OG was a faithful translation of a different Hebrew text; and this, with the similar phenomena in 4QDeut^a and 4QSam^b, gives strong support for the claim that also in other cases the LXX edition was a faithful translation of a Hebrew text containing that variant edition, even though the Hebrew is no longer preserved.

Psalms (MT → 11QPs^a)

The Psalms MS 11QPs^a contains nine compositions beyond those in the MT, which suggests that it is a later form than that preserved in the MT.¹⁰ It also shows a different ordering of the last third of the psalms, which indicates that the order of the last part of the Psalter was not yet fixed. The purpose of 11QPs^a was evidently to include additional psalms composed in the biblical style (as opposed to contemporary hymns such as the Hodayot) and to emphasize both the Davidic composition of the Psalter and his inspiration from the Most High.¹¹

B Evidence in the MT of the Rewriting That Produced Revised Editions

Genesis (? → MT, SP, LXX)

The ages of the pre-diluvian and post-diluvian ancestors have been revised not only in the MT, but in the SP and the LXX as well. Each of the three text

9 Tov 1981; 1999, 363–84; Bogaert 1994.

10 “David’s Compositions,” which may at an earlier stage have served as a colophon prior to the addition of the subsequent Psalms 140, 134, and 151AB, may have been intended as a biblical parallel to the glorifying recitation of Solomon’s wisdom in 1 Kgs 5:9–14 [4:29–34 Eng.].

11 “All these he uttered through prophecy which had been given him from before the Most High” (11QPs^a 27:11). This claim to prophetic inspiration may well have been the factor that brought about the transition of the humanly composed hymnbook of the temple to a divinely inspired book of Scripture.

traditions was revised in a different way from a common source that is no longer preserved. The cause was the combination of independent, contrasting chronologies from two separate sources: the *sepher toledoth* and the flood narrative.¹² The purpose of the three attempts at revision was to avoid the chronological incongruities of having pre-diluvians still alive during and after the flood, and to avoid having post-diluvians still alive after Abraham's death. Thus, the purpose was avoiding inconsistencies and revising chronological problems.

Exodus (OG → MT)

The account of the construction of the Tabernacle in Exodus 35–40 appears in two variant editions in the OG and the MT. Though the textual history is complex, in general the OG presents the earlier edition, and the edition transmitted in the MT was probably produced to bring the order and wording of the execution more in line with the order and wording of the commands in Exodus 25–31.¹³ Thus, the purpose was tidying up and re-alignment for better order.

Joshua (4QJosh^a → MT)

The order of the text of Joshua in 4QJosh^a, with the building of the first altar in chapter 4 at Gilgal is most plausibly explained as the earliest preserved form of the narrative. The order in the SP-MT-LXX, with the altar's placement in chapter 8 (after 9:2 in the LXX) at Mount Gerizim or Mount Ebal, appears to be a rearrangement of narrative sequence to support a religious claim regarding the chosen sacred site.¹⁴

Judges (4QJudg^a → MT)

4QJudg^a highlights the addition in the MT of an episode with a prophetic appearance. Due to the single fragment of this MS that is preserved, the claim that the MT was a new and expanded *edition* would exceed the evidence, but the MT clearly exhibits a significantly expanded form of the passage.¹⁵ The purpose of the insertion seems to be to reiterate the book's theology of a cyclic pattern to the history of Israel's rebelliousness vs. God's salvation, and perhaps to emphasize that the book belongs among "the Prophets."

12 Klein 1974; Hendel 1998, 61–80.

13 Aejmelaeus 2007b.

14 Ulrich 2012b; Charlesworth 2009.

15 I agree with Julio Treballe Barrera (1989; 1995) that 6:7–10 is a later insertion; see Ulrich (2010, 255). The views of Richard S. Hess (1997) deserve consideration, but I do not find them persuasive.

Samuel (OG → MT)

In the David-Goliath story (1 Samuel 17–18) the *Vorlage* of the OG presents an earlier edition of the passage with its own integrity and its own specific viewpoint. The MT has been intentionally expanded beyond the OG account with a narrative containing identifiably different types of material and different David-traditions.¹⁶ The purpose was presumably to preserve and not lose alternate traditions of the way David joined Saul's entourage.

Isaiah (1QIsa^a → MT)

Comparison of 1QIsa^a with the MT of Isaiah highlights seven isolated insertions lacking in 1QIsa^a but added in the MT. Comparison of the LXX with the MT shows two further insertions in the MT.¹⁷ These nine insertions constitute a total of fifteen verses secondarily added in the MT.

Jeremiah (4QJer^a → MT)

In addition to the evidence of 4QJer^{b,d}-OG (see the discussion in section *I.A.* above), the late third- or early second-century BCE MS 4QJer^a may also expose a major insertion of two paragraphs into the MT. The original scribe's text moved directly from Jer 7:29 to 8:4. More than a century later a Herodian scribe squeezed 7:30–34 and 8:1–3 (eight entire verses) into the text with three lines of tiny script interlinearly, four lines down the left margin, and one line upside-down in the bottom margin.¹⁸ Since it is such a large passage, since its prose interrupts two poetic verses, and since the material is not necessary to the context, I would classify the passage as a secondary insertion into the earlier short text.¹⁹ On this view the purpose would be, as in the MT of Isaiah just noted, to amplify the prophetic text with additional oracles.²⁰

Ezekiel (P967-OL → MT)

The text of Ezekiel in Greek Papyrus 967 and OL Wirceburgensis exhibits a shorter and differently arranged text (chapters 36–38–39–37–40) in comparison with the MT-LXX, possibly due to differing eschatological views. Either

16 Barthelemy, Gooding, Lust, and Tov 1986.

17 Ulrich 2001; Ulrich and Flint 2010, 2:89–91. For one of these insertions (Isa 40:7ab–8a) the short LXX agrees with 1QIsa^a, thus providing double attestation that the MT is expanded.

18 Tov 1997, 155 and Plate XXIV= Ulrich 2010, 559.

19 Tov considers the possibility of a later addition but decides for an accidental omission later filled in by the second scribe.

20 A similar example of additional oracles can be seen in Ezek 12:26–28; 32:25–26; and 36:23c–38.

arrangement (with 38–39 before or after 37) could be plausibly argued as earlier vs. later, but the longer text of 36:23c-38 in the MT—using a different Hebrew style while the Greek uses proto-Theodotonic terminology—appears to be an addition designed to prepare for the new order of chapter 37 before 38–39 as in the MT.²¹ Thus, though this example could be listed in section *I. D.* below, it more probably belongs here.

Daniel (? → MT, LXX)

Chapters 4–6 of Daniel as in the MT and as in the LXX diverge widely. They are both based on an earlier, similar “core” story but now display expanded editions, each amplified with several different, repeated types of enhancing details of the story. The purpose of the expansions appears to be to embellish the narrative, to emphasize certain points, and to make the story more vivid.²²

Psalms (4QPs^{a,q} → MT)

Both 4QPs^a (the oldest Psalms MS) and 4QPs^q attest Psalm 31 followed directly by Psalm 33. This double attestation makes it likely that the MT tradition inserted Psalm 32 secondarily into its present place.²³

C *Evidence of Rewriting in the SP*

Genesis (? → MT, SP, LXX). See section *I. B.* above.

Torah (4QpaleoExod^m-4QNum^b → SP)

The expanded Jewish textual form of the Pentateuch as witnessed in 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b was accepted by the Samaritans and used as their text. On the presumption that the SP is the more developed of the forms, it shows two differentiating features. First, the extra commandment regarding the altar on Mount Gerizim (after Exod 20:17[17a] and Deut 5:21[18]) was added by someone or some group celebrating the north. Second, the perfect בחר (whether already in the common tradition or secondarily changed by the Samaritans)²⁴

21 Lust 1981; 2003; Tov 1999, 397–410.

22 Ulrich 2011.

23 Moreover, the placement of Psalms 133 and 134 near the end of 11QPs^a may indicate the revised order of these two Psalms in MT, which groups them with the rest of the Psalms of Ascent. For an alternative view of 4QPs^a and 4QPs^q see Emanuel Tov’s contribution to this volume.

24 Schenker (2008) argues that Neh 1:9 as well as several MSS of the LXX, the OL, and the Bohairic and Sahidic show that the perfect בחר was the earlier form of the tradition, and

was used to refer to Gerizim as the place which Yhwh “chose” to have his name dwell there, as opposed to the imperfect **יְבַחֵר** which was used to refer to Jerusalem as the place which Yhwh “will choose.” Thus the purpose of this variant form was to make the religious claim for the proper place of worship. The SP reading “Mount Gerizim” in Deut 27:4 is probably related to the revisions described for “Joshua” in section *I. B.*²⁵

D *Evidence in the LXX of Rewriting in Its Hebrew Vorlagen*

The preserved evidence in this section is from Greek MSS alone, but, as was seen in the case of 4QJer^{b,d}-OG for Jeremiah plus the witness of 4QDeut^a and 4QSam^b, it is quite likely that the new editorial work was done at the Hebrew stage rather than during the Greek transmission.

Genesis (? → MT, SP, LXX). See section *I. B.* above.

Kings (MT → OG?)

There are several large divergences between the MT and the LXX of 1 Kings. A major and sustained divergence regards the chronologies presented, but the divergences extend to a number of assorted varia—meriting the label “Miscellanies”—and the situation is sufficiently complex that scholars still debate whether parts of the LXX precede their MT counterparts.²⁶ However the direction of influence is decided, there is clear editorial intent to revise the text.

Daniel (MT → OG)

In addition to the secondarily expanded editions of Daniel 4–6 in both MT and OG mentioned above in section *I. B.* (? → MT, OG), the OG further expands the book with the stories of Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, the Prayer of Azariah, and the Prayer of the Three Youths. The purpose appears to be simply to add other circulating episodes to the long-growing Danielic cycle.²⁷

that the imperfect **יְבַחֵר** was the revised form. I thank Gary Knoppers for alerting me to this article.

25 Ulrich 2012b; Charlesworth 2009.

26 Montgomery 1953; Gooding 1976; Treballe Barrera 1980; Tov 1999, 549–70; Crawford, Joosten, and Ulrich 2008, 359.

27 In addition to the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242) see *Pseudo-Daniel*^{a-c} (4Q243–245) and perhaps *Four Kingdoms*^{a-c} (4Q552–553a).

Esther (MT → OG)

The LXX of *Esther* contains six large “Additions” (A–F) beyond the form in the MT; most of the Additions (except perhaps B and E) were already in the Hebrew *Vorlage*.²⁸ Their purpose was to fill out the Hebrew story, to add episodes, and to include frequent use of the divine name, which is absent from the MT version.

E *The Rewriting Features Visible in Manuscripts of the Books of Scripture*

In time, certain books of early Israel’s literature reached the general forms we could recognize as the books of Genesis, Exodus, etc.,²⁹ and they were eventually accepted as Scripture. This probably began to happen by the fourth century BCE at the latest, since the Torah was deemed essential and thus translated into Greek in the early third century. Many examples have been presented in sections I. A–D. of the revisional features by which an early edition of a book became a “new and expanded edition” of that same book. These must be considered legitimate features of revising books of Scripture that remain “Scripture” and that do not cross the border to “rewritten Scripture.” Some of these features are:

1. revising chronological problems to avoid inconsistencies (Gen)
2. realigning the order of the execution of commands to agree with that of the original commands (Exod)
3. supplementing one narrative with additional details from another book (Exod, Num)
4. rearranging the sequence of an event to support the claim for a sacred site (Josh)
5. inserting a prophetic appearance to reiterate the book’s theology and strengthen its prophetic claim (Judg)
6. inserting an alternate form of the story for completeness (Sam)
7. chronological and various other revisions (Kgs)
8. occasionally inserting verses of additional prophetic material (Isa)
9. frequent expansions of phrases, insertion of verses, plus major rearrangement (Jer)
10. rearranging the sequence of one chapter due to eschatological views (Ezek)

²⁸ Paton 1908; Moore 1977; Tov 1999, 538n7.

²⁹ That is, as the basic form of the full biblical book, as opposed to, e.g., only the Yahwist’s strand, the plague narratives, the Tabernacle Account, etc.

11. adding more Psalms; emphasizing Davidic authorship and divine inspiration (Pss)
12. inserting repeated examples of narrative embellishment to enhance the story (Dan 4–6)
13. inserting additional stories to a growing cycle (Dan-Additions)

All these features maintain, even while expanding, the spirit of the book being revised; they do not cross the border and become a different composition.

II Rewritten “Pre-Scripture”

Whereas in this volume I should be trying to clarify, instead I introduce a new complexity: many of the biblical books had a history of literary development prior to their being considered “Scripture.” With a few possible minor exceptions, such as perhaps Obadiah and Ruth, there is no non-rewritten Scripture. Let us focus for a moment on “pre-Scripture”—the early literary forms of the traditions that eventually became acknowledged as Scripture.

While keeping in mind the difference between the first period of the developing composition of the books prior to the Great Divide and the second period during which the Hebrew text ceased to grow after the Great Divide, it is essential to distinguish two phases within that first period of developing composition. I think it can be safely claimed that generally no ancient author thought he was setting out to write a book of “Scripture.”³⁰ The ancient authors most likely assumed that the works they were composing were, in their early phase, what we should describe as religious literature. In a number of such works of religious literature God would be reported as speaking to humans. It was only later, in a second phase, when attribution to those human authors may have been forgotten, that sufficiently influential leaders or a significantly large community would have acknowledged and received the works as somehow attributable to God—God’s word to the on-going community.³¹

Thus, we should differentiate between an early phase of a composition as religious literature and a later phase of that work as Sacred Scripture, even if it was still developing.³² In the early phase, subsequent scribes would have felt

³⁰ See note 1.

³¹ Ulrich 2003.

³² For a discussion of various factors that characterized the shift from literature to Scripture, see Ulrich (2003).

more free to rewrite, reformulate, reinterpret books, since they were anonymous communal, traditional literature. But once the book was considered as Sacred Scripture in the later phase, scribes—as the evidence shows us—still felt free to rewrite, reformulate, and reinterpret, but they did so on a scale that was much more circumscribed.

It may prove helpful to present an example. Source and redaction critics combined with text critics have identified about a dozen major stages in the development of the Book of Exodus and their presumed purposes that we might consider:³³

<i>Literary stage</i>	<i>Purpose</i>
1. Early recollections of escape	to recall and pass on the memory of an important event
2. Developed escape narrative in G	to combine “Egyptian” with “Canaanite” origins for tribal unity ³⁴
3. The Yahwist account	national epic, state origins, to celebrate “where we came from”
4. The Elohist account	national epic reformulated in the north after division
5. The redactor of J + E	to resume “all Israel” combined origins after loss of north
6. The P narrative	post-destruction re-theologizing of traditions
7. The P legal material	major block of legal material added
8. The redactor of P + JE	to preserve all major versions; basic book of Exodus
9. Heb. <i>Vorlage</i> of OG with 35–40	earliest preserved edition of recognizable book of Exodus ³⁵

33 For simplicity’s sake, I use the general proposals of the Documentary Hypothesis (J, E, P), Noth (1981), and Gottwald (1985). The details presented for this development are not particularly important; reformulations or corrections of the stages or their rationales will most likely simply shift the details while still maintaining or even multiplying the successive types of development.

34 See Noth’s (1981) five combined themes of G (the *Grundlage*) plus Gottwald’s (1985) reconstruction of Israel’s beginnings, which envisions the uniting of one group who had escaped from Egypt with a second group of dissenting Canaanites to form “all Israel.”

35 Stage 9 could well be the same as stage 8.

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 10. MT Exodus | revised edition of 35–40 to match execution with commands |
| 11. 4QpaleoExod ^m | revised edition adding expansions of “biblical” material |
| 12. Samaritan Pentateuch | “corrected” version of 4QpaleoExod ^m stressing Mount Gerizim |
| 13. 4QPentatech ³⁶ | various expansions beyond 4QpaleoExod ^m |

It appears unlikely that any of the early stages (1–7) would have been considered Scripture at the time. Tribal history or national epic (2–5), yes, and perhaps even national constitution or authoritative law (6–7). But it is only with the redaction of P + JE (8) that we get a recognizable form of the Book of Exodus. During the early phases large-scale changes in the literature were not only possible but evidently successful and welcomed.

A point to stress here is that stages 1–8 involved large-scale reformulations of the traditions that were possible because the people welcomed the updating of their communal literature to stay abreast of their new socio-historical or socio-religious situations.

In contrast, stages 9–13 each involve only relatively modest revisions, all within the spirit and the general shape of the Book of Exodus. It is not surprising that the dividing line is approximately the fourth century BCE (after post-exilic P), when the Book of Exodus would probably have been widely seen as part of the Torah, that is, now Scripture. The translation of the Torah into Greek in the early third century BCE requires that the Torah would already have been recognized as essential authoritative Scripture for all Jews.

This contrast is important in the discussion of the borders between “Scripture” and “rewritten Scripture.” Apparently, broader freedom was used when dealing with “literature,” but more restricted freedom when dealing with “Scripture.” It will be helpful to compare the features employed in the rewriting involved in “pre-Scripture” with those employed in works of later “rewritten Scripture.”

36 I consider at least 4Q364 and 4Q365 (“4QRP^{b,c}”) as developed editions within the boundaries of the Pentateuch; see section III. A.

III “Rewritten Scripture”

A *The Rewriting Features Visible in Works of “Rewritten Scripture”*

The four principal works usually viewed as parade examples of possible “rewritten Scripture” are 4QReworked Pentateuch, Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and the Genesis Apocryphon.³⁷ 4QReworked Pentateuch, however, is increasingly recognized, not as a new work of “rewritten Scripture,” but as Scripture,³⁸ that is, “4QPentateuch.” It has been only moderately expanded beyond the already longer text tradition used as the basis of the sp.³⁹ It appears intended to supplement, rather than supplant, an earlier form of the Pentateuch.⁴⁰ This judgment is corroborated by the contrasts that follow. The salient features visible in these works are:

4QPentateuch (4Q364, 365)

- moderately large expansions
- no new speaker
- makes no new claim to divine revelation
- same scope and setting as the Pentateuch
- same arrangement as the Pentateuch (but 4Q365 juxtaposes Numbers 27 and 36)⁴¹
- same theological agenda as the Pentateuch (but 4Q365a has an expanded festival calendar with new feasts and 364-day calendar)

Jubilees

- large-scale expansions
- new speaker (the angel of the presence quoting God)
- new claim to divine revelation
- new scope⁴² (Genesis + parts of Exodus)

37 Crawford 2008; Falk 2007; Brooke 2002; 2010; Zahn 2008; 2010; 2011a; 2011b.

38 Ulrich 1994/1999; Segal 2000; Tov 2009. See also Petersen’s (2010) review of Crawford (2008).

39 Crawford 2008; 2011, 57.

40 Zahn 2010, 331.

41 The scriptural 4QNum^b also appears to rearrange Num 27:2–11 to fit with chapter 36; see Jastrom (1994, 262–64) = Ulrich (2010, 170–71, 174). The manner of juxtaposition in 4QNum^b, however, is somewhat different from that in 4Q365; but the juxtaposition in both is due to the similarity in topic, the inheritance by the daughters of Zelophahad.

42 “Scope” refers to the extent of the composition between its beginning and end points: does the new composition share the same beginning and end with either the Pentateuch

- same arrangement as Genesis–Exodus, but new structure with addition of the Jubilee periods
- new theological agenda (legal interpretation; 364-day calendar; Patriarchs observe Mosaic Torah)

Temple Scroll

- large-scale expansions (e.g., instructions for the temple)
- new speaker (God in first person, 45:14)
- new implicit claim to divine revelation (God speaking directly)
- new scope (Exodus 34–Deuteronomy 23)
- new arrangement (thorough-going rearrangement and harmonization of legal materials)
- new theological agenda (instructions for the temple; exegetical interpretation through “conflation, harmonization, and clarification;”⁴³ expanded festival calendar with new feasts and 364-day calendar)

Genesis Apocryphon

- large-scale expansions (e.g., Noah’s birth, description of Sarai’s beauty and her non-defilement by Pharaoh, plus expansions from Jubilees and 1 Enoch)⁴⁴
- new speakers (first-person Enoch, 5:3; Lamech, 2:3; Noah, 6:6; Abram, 19:14)
- makes no (preserved) new claim to divine revelation for the entire book, but revelations occur through visions;⁴⁵ the Aramaic language indicates that it is “non-scriptural”
- new scope (Genesis 5 or 6–15)
- same general arrangement as Genesis (but a few minor rearrangements)
- new theological agenda (“to combine the equally authoritative traditions of Genesis, Jubilees, and 1 Enoch into a whole.”⁴⁶

or one of its books? That would presumably be the case if the new composition were intended as a new edition of the earlier book.

43 Crawford 2008, 102.

44 See Crawford 2008, 107.

45 For example, 1QapGen 6:11, 14.

46 Crawford 2008, 126–27. See also the analysis by Nickelsburg (2003), described in Machiela (2009, 6–7). Machiela singles out four tendencies or techniques noted by Nickelsburg: an Enochic perspective (1QapGen 19:25), an “eschatological *Tendenz*,” revelation through “Enoch and symbolic dream-visions,” and a “psychologizing interest.”

B *An Important Distinction*

We have been exploring the question of a work's status or identity: that is, whether a new form of a scriptural book is truly "Scripture" (even if a new edition of it), or whether it has crossed the border and is to be considered a new composition. It is important, however, to distinguish between the *identity* of that new form (i.e., whether it should be named a revised "Genesis–Exodus" or rather "Jubilees") and its *scriptural status* (i.e., whether the new form is recognized by the community as endowed with scriptural authority).

Unfortunately, for most books it is difficult to demonstrate that they were accorded scriptural status, although there are indicators with various levels of strength. An exact citation with a formulaic introduction is a strong indicator: "As God said through Isaiah the prophet" (CD 4:13), or "As it is written" (1QS 5:15). Citation as an authoritative work with or without a formulaic introduction is also a strong indicator, as are commentaries on a book and translation of a book. A large number of copies (e.g., for the Torah, Isaiah, Psalms, Jubilees, 1 Enoch) is a less strong but still valuable indicator.

According to the two criteria distinguished above—that is, was the borderline "rewritten" book a copy of the same book upon which it is based, and was it accorded scriptural status?—the compositions align themselves thus:

Composition	Same Book?	Scriptural Status?
4QPentateuch	yes	apparently, yes
Jubilees	no	apparently, yes
Temple Scroll	no	possibly, but no indicator
Genesis Apocryphon	no	no

47 4Q365 is quoted by the Temple Scroll, and Crawford (2008, 47, 56–57) suggests that 4Q364 frg. 3 ii may be a source for Jub 27:14, 17; see also Zahn (2010, 330). Another indicator of scriptural status is Neh 10:35[34 Eng.], which lists "the wood offering . . . as it is written in the Torah"; see Crawford (2008, 91–92). The wood offering does not appear in the received MT Torah, but it does appear in an expansion in 4Q365, which suggests that Nehemiah's "Torah" agreed with 4Q365 rather than the MT. This suggestion is further strengthened by the parallel phenomenon shown by the Chronicler, whose text of Samuel was not the MT but rather agreed with 4QSam^a against the MT.

48 Jubilees is quoted in 4Q228 1 i 9 (cf. 1 i 2) and referred to in parallel with the Law of Moses (CD 16:2–4).

49 The Temple Scroll appears intended to supersede laws in the Pentateuch; see Zahn (2010, 331).

50 The Temple Scroll makes its own internal claim through divine speech; but there are, to my knowledge, no indicators from external sources that it was accorded scriptural status; see also Crawford (2008, 102).

C *The Features Postulated for “Pre-Scripture” Compared to Those in “Rewritten Scripture”*

Some of the features postulated in Israelite literature in its early stages (“pre-Scripture”) display a bolder approach to reworking and rewriting than is seen in the preserved MSS which were presumably recognized as Scripture. Granted that it is impossible to know at what point the religious literature became viewed as authoritative Scripture, it may be helpful to compare the features of rewriting in “pre-Scripture” with those in “rewritten Scripture.” Noted above in section III. A. were some of the prominent features of “rewritten Scripture”; those features are listed below with similar examples that scholars have proposed for early phases of what eventually became Scripture, i.e., “pre-Scripture”:

large-scale expansions

- addition of Genesis 1–11 prior to the national epic
- addition of the P legal material within the Pentateuchal narrative
- addition of II-Isaiah, III-Isaiah, and Isaiah 36–39 to Isaiah 1–33
- addition of Ezekiel 40–48 to Ezekiel 1–39
- addition of Daniel 7–12 to Daniel 1–6

new speaker

- God speaking through Moses replaced the anonymous priestly recorder of Lev 1:2b–7:37 once the editorial insertions Lev 1:1–2a and Lev 7:38 were added⁵¹
- the third-person narration in Daniel 1–6 changed to the first-person in Daniel 7–12⁵²

new claim to divine revelation

- The personification of Wisdom in Proverbs 1–9 mediates God’s revelation
- Daniel 7–12 makes a noticeably stronger claim to revelation than 1–6

new scope

- prefixing Genesis 1–11 to the patriarchal narrative created a new scope

⁵¹ Ulrich 2003, 9.

⁵² The second half of the book is narrated in the first person, but with occasional switches to third person, as in 10:1. Evidently, the wisdom tales in Daniel 1–6 may not have been regarded as scripture before the apocalyptic chapters 7–12 were combined, since (1) Ben Sira makes no mention of Daniel, and (2) 1 Maccabees mentions, not quoting as Scripture but alluding as models for martyrdom to “Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael . . . saved from the flame” and “Daniel . . . delivered from the mouth of the lions” (1 Macc 2:59–60); but it does not refer to the highly charged chapters 7–12; see Ulrich (2003, 16–18).

- insofar as an early form of the national epic comprised the story from the promise to the patriarchs to the gaining of the land, the insertion of Deuteronomy constituted a new scope
- the addition of Second and Third Isaiah constituted a new scope to that book
- the addition of Daniel 7–12 constituted a new scope to that book

new arrangement or new structure

- the combination of the Prologue-Epilogue with the Dialogue of Job created a new structure
- prefixing Proverbs 1–9 to the more proverbial 10–31 gave the book a new structure

new theological agenda

- a quite different theological perspective introduced by P
- addition of the P legal material within the Pentateuchal narrative
- addition of Second Isaiah to First Isaiah replaced doom with salvation
- addition of Daniel 7–12 to Daniel 1–6 brought a new apocalyptic perspective

Conclusion

What are the criteria for legitimate enhancement of scriptural books? What are the criteria which ensure that the revised book remains a true form of the same composition with the same title as the base book, and which prevent its crossing the border and thus constituting a new work that should have a different title?

The principal criteria can be gleaned from the many examples of a new edition of the same scriptural work observable through comparison of the scriptural Scrolls, the MT, the SP, and the OG (see sections *I. A–D*). Although these variant editions (including the 4QPent^{b,c}) show a range of re-editing, the size and the amount of revision is relatively moderate, and the revision maintains the spirit of the original. In each case there is no inducement for scholars (except in earlier decades regarding the “Reworked Pentateuch”) to seek a new title for the new edition.

In contrast, Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, and the Genesis Apocryphon (note the new titles) have crossed the border. Each—though using parts of the Torah as its base text and profiting and benefiting from the authoritativeness of that text—has reworked its scriptural text to such a degree—through a combi-

nation of large-scale expansions, new speaker, new claim to revelation, new scope or setting, new arrangement or structure, and new theological agenda—that everyone readily recognizes that it is a different composition deserving a different title.

One facet that, to my knowledge, is new to this discussion is that reworkings similar to those in the three “rewritten Scripture” books can be found in the redactional activity that scholars have postulated for the “pre-Scriptures,” that is, for Israel’s early religious literature that eventually developed into its Scriptures. It seems that only moderate types of revision appear in preserved scriptural manuscripts of the late Second Temple period, but this contrasts with the earlier and the later periods. The reworking and rewriting of Israel’s post-scriptural literature (with its major types of reworking) mirrors the reworking and rewriting of its pre-scriptural literature.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. 2007a. Lost in Reconstruction? On Hebrew and Greek Reconstructions in 2 Sam 24. *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 40:89–106.
- . 2007b. Septuagintal Translation Techniques—A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account. Pages 116–30 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays*. Rev. ed. Leuven: Peeters.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. 1986. *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture*. OBO 73. Fribourg, Switzerland: Éditions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. 1994. Le livre de Jérémie en perspective: Les deux rédactions antiques selon les travaux en course. *Revue biblique* 101:363–406.
- Brooke, George J. 2002. The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible. Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press.
- . 2010. Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet. *DSD* 17:332–57.
- Charlesworth, James H. 2009. What Is a Variant? Announcing a Dead Sea Scrolls Fragment of Deuteronomy. *Maarav* 16:201–12 + Plates IX–X (273–74).
- Crawford, Sidnie White. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2011. The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch. Pages 123–36 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting*

- Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period.* Edited by H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, and M. Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Crawford, Sidnie White, Jan Joosten, and Eugene Ulrich. 2008. Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deut 32:1–9, 1 Kings 11:1–8, and Jeremiah 27:1–10 (34 G). *VT* 58:352–66.
- Falk, Daniel K. 2007. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures Among the Dead Sea Scrolls.* LSTS 63. London: T&T Clark.
- Gooding, David W. 1976. *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reigns 2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gottwald, Norman. 1985. *The Hebrew Bible: A Socio-Literary Introduction.* Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Hendel, Ronald S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hess, Richard S. 1997. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of 4QJudg^a. Pages 122–28 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After.* Edited by S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans. JSPSup 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Jastrom, Nathan. 1994. 27. 4QNum^b. Pages 205–67 in *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers.* Edited by E. Ulrich and F.M. Cross. DJD XII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lust, Johan. 1981. Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript. *CBQ* 43:517–33.
- . 2003. Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel. Pages 83–92 in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered.* Edited by A. Schenker. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Klein, Ralph W. 1974. Archaic Chronologies and the Textual History of the Old Testament. *HTR* 67:255–63.
- Machiela, Daniel A. 2009. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17.* STDJ 79. Leiden: Brill.
- Metzger, Bruce. 1987. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Montgomery, James A. 1951. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Kings.* ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Moore, Carey A. 1977. *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions.* AB 44. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Nickelsburg, George. 2003. Patriarchs Who Worry about Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon. Pages 177–99 in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning*, vol. 2. Edited by J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck. 2 vols. JSJSup 80/I–II. Leiden: Brill.
- Noth, Martin. 1981. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions.* Translated by B.W. Anderson. Chico Calif.: Scholars Press.

- Paton, Lewis B. 1908. *Esther*. 1CC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2010. Review of Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. *DSD* 17:145–49.
- Schenker, Adrian. 2008. Le Seigneur choisira-t-il le lieu de son nom ou l'a-t-il choisi?: L'apport de la Bible grecque ancienne à l'histoire du texte samaritain et massorétique. Pages 339–51 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*. Edited by A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill.
- Segal, Michael. 2000. 4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch. Pages 391–99 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam, with G. Marquis. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. 2000. The Crystallization of the 'Canon of Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran. Pages 5–20 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1981. Some Aspects of the Textual and Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah. Pages 145–67 in *Le livre de Jérémie: Le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission*. Edited by P.-M. Bogaert. BETL 54. Leuven: University Press.
- . 1997. 70. 4QJer^a. Pages 145–70 in *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets*. Edited by E. Ulrich et al. DJD 15. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1999. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2009. The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the LXX and 4QReworked Pentateuch. Pages 11–28 in *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of His 65th Birthday*. Edited by A. Lange, M. Weigold and J. Zsengellér. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. 1980. *Salomón y Jeroboán: Historia de la recensión y redacción de 1 Rey. 2–12; 14*. Bibliotheca Salmanticensis, Dissertationes 3. Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia; Jerusalem: Instituto Español Bíblico y Arqueológico.
- . 1989. Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges. *Revue de Qumran* 14:229–45.
- . 1995. 49. 4QJudg^a. Pages 161–64 in *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Edited by E. Ulrich, F.M. Cross, et al. DJD XIV. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Ulrich, Eugene. 1999. The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran. Pages 77–93 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994. Repr. Pages 17–33 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill.

- . 2001. The Developmental Composition of the Book of Isaiah: Light from 1QIsa^a on Additions in the MT. *DSD* 8:288–305.
- . 2002. The Notion and Definition of Canon. Pages 21–35 in *The Canon Debate*. Edited by L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- . 2003. From Literature to Scripture: The Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness. *DSD* 10:3–25.
- . 2007. A Qualitative Assessment of the Textual Profile of 4QSam^a. Pages 147–61 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hilhorst et al. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill.
- , ed. 2010. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls*. vTSup 134. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011. The Parallel Editions of the Old Greek and Masoretic Text of Daniel 5. Pages 201–17 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*, vol. 1. Edited by E.F. Mason, S.I. Thomas, A. Schofield, and E. Ulrich. 2 vols. JSJSup 153/I–II. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2012a. David, the Plague, and the Angel: 2 Samuel 24 Revisited. Pages 63–79 in *After Qumran: Old and New Editions of Biblical Texts—The Historical Books*. Edited by H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn, and J. Treballe Barrera. BETL 246. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2012b. The Old Latin, Mount Gerizim, and 4QJosh^a. Pages 361–75 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Treballe Barrera*. in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Treballe Barrera: Florilegium Complutense*. Edited by A. Piquer Otero and P. Torijano Morales. JSJSup 157. Leiden: Brill.
- Ulrich, Eugene and Peter W. Flint. 2010. *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls*. 2 vols. DJD XXXII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Walters, Stanley D. 1988. Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1. *JBL* 107:385–412.
- Zahn, Molly M. 2008. The Problem of Characterizing the Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above? *DSD* 15:315–39.
- . Rewritten Scripture. 2010. Pages 323–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011a. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011b. Talking About Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology. Pages 93–119 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, and M. Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Rewritten Scriptures as a Clue to Scribal Traditions in the Second Temple Period

Sidnie White Crawford

Introduction

In the beginning, BQ or Before Qumran, there was order, there was certainty, there was “biblical” and there was “nonbiblical.” We knew what was what, and we could fit everything into our categories. There was “Apocrypha,” and there was “Pseudepigrapha,” and they weren’t “Bible,” and we all knew how to tell the difference. AQ, or After Qumran, those certainties began to break down. Professor Vermes, whom this conference honours, was one of the pioneers who recognized that the old categories were no longer adequate with his description of the phenomenon he called “Rewritten Bible.” Today, fifty years after Professor Vermes’s seminal article,¹ we are, if anything, less certain about our certainties, as the vista of Second Temple literature, and its treatment of its classical literature, its “Scripture,” becomes wider and wider.

Vermes defined “Rewritten Bible” as characterized “by a close attachment, in narrative and themes, to some book contained in the present Jewish canon of Scripture, and some type of reworking, whether through rearrangement, conflation, or supplementation, of the present canonical biblical text.”² He included in this genre Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon, Josephus’ *Antiquities*, and the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* of Pseudo-Philo. In his definition he still assumes a clear demarcation line between “biblical” and “nonbiblical,” and also assumes the Masoretic Text, the “present canonical Jewish text,” as the base text that has been reworked. His list also indicates that he saw this genre as a wider phenomenon than just Qumran, a general Second Temple Jewish genre. Eventually, as more works from the Qumran scrolls became known, other works, such as Reworked Pentateuch and the Temple Scroll, also were suggested as part of this new genre.³

As the evidence from Qumran was fully published and more thoroughly studied, questions began to be asked concerning Vermes’s original definition. The first set of questions came from the text-critics studying the so-called

1 Vermes 1961, 67–126.

2 Vermes 1989, 185–88.

3 For Reworked Pentateuch, see Tov and White 1994. For the Temple Scroll, see Yadin 1983.

“biblical” manuscripts, led by Eugene Ulrich and Emanuel Tov.⁴ It became clear that the forerunner of the Masoretic Text was not the only, or even the dominant, text in circulation in the Second Temple period. The textual history of each canonical book was different and complicated, and needed to be studied separately. The Masoretic Text, the Septuagint, and the Samaritan Pentateuch were just single exemplars, albeit complete, of the textual history of a particular book. Although appropriate terminology has been difficult to find, the majority of text-critics recognize that the survival of the particular text forms of the Masoretic Text, the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch was not inevitable, and we need to think in terms that do not privilege those particular texts. The accompanying realization concerned the idea of canon. The canon as we know it did not exist in the Second Temple period, and so the clear demarcation between “biblical” and “nonbiblical,” which had seemed so certain, perforce had to be abandoned. Rather, terms such as “authoritative literature” and “Scripture” began to be used, to try and indicate the special status of books such as Deuteronomy or Isaiah within Judaism in that pre-canonical period.⁵

A second set of questions emerged, led by scholars such as George Brooke, about the genre “Rewritten Bible.”⁶ If there was no Bible, and there was no fixed text of those authoritative books, was it even appropriate to talk about “rewriting” or “reworking”? Was what was going on, for example, in the group of manuscripts called Rewritten Pentateuch any different than the phenomenon Michael Fishbane first identified as “inner biblical exegesis” in pre-exilic Jewish literature,⁷ or simply a later extension of the same process?⁸ How did these texts present themselves? How were they accepted by their receiving communities? What was their purpose, and the purpose of the scribes who created them? These questions and related ones are still being debated today.

My own work has concentrated on the books of the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch is a limited corpus, which seems, at a certain early point in the Second Temple period, to be considered not just as a group of individual books, but as a continuous collection, with a beginning, middle and end. Further, it was, also at an early point in the Second Temple period, accepted as

4 For convenient collections of their vast bibliography on this subject, see Ulrich 1999a and Tov 2008c.

5 For a convenient discussion of this whole question of text and canon, see Crawford forthcoming.

6 See, for example, Brooke 2002.

7 Fishbane 1985.

8 See Brooke 2001.

authoritative by the southern Judeans or Jews, and by the northern Yahwists or Samaritans. So there is no question about its authority in this time period, as there would be, say, with Chronicles or Esther.⁹ Therefore, in considering this question of “Rewritten Bible or Scripture,” the various forms of the Pentateuch may present us with more certain answers than other scriptural books that later became canonical.

In earlier writings I have focused on the text of the books of the Pentateuch, breaking down the demarcation line between “biblical” and “nonbiblical” by arguing for a spectrum of texts, in which we witness faithful scribes doing exegesis on an authoritative parent text in order to pass on a living tradition.¹⁰ This spectrum of texts begins at one end with an unexpanded, “short” text, moves through a range of expansions, and reaches recognizably new compositions. Throughout the spectrum the expanded text claims equal authority with its parent text, as do the recognizably new compositions based on some form of the parent text. I have further argued that we can see two scribal traditions or approaches at work in these texts, one a conservative approach that copied the parent text without alteration, and the other an exegetical/expansive or revisionist approach that felt free to alter and expand the parent text for exegetical purposes. Finally, on the basis of our extant evidence I have tried to locate these traditions in Second Temple Palestine, arguing that the conservative approach is Judean, at home among a certain group of scribes/priests in the Jerusalem Temple, while the second, exegetical approach had a wider geographic range, both Judean and Samaritan, centred among a certain group or groups of scribes/priests in Jerusalem and the sacred site on Mount Gerizim.¹¹

9 According to Ezra 7 and Nehemiah 8, Ezra came from Babylon to Judah bringing “the Law of Moses” with him, and proceeded to make it the law of the land. Ezra’s date is either 458 BCE or 398 BCE, depending on whether the Artaxerxes of the narrative is identified as Artaxerxes I (465–424 BCE) or Artaxerxes II (404–358 BCE). Although the historicity of the Ezra narrative is problematic, it seems to contain the historical kernel that at some point in the Persian period the Torah in the shape we now know it became authoritative for Yahweh-worshippers living in Judah and Samaria. See Leiman 1976 and McDonald 1995.

On the other hand, the books of Chronicles and Esther attained authoritative status much later; in Esther’s case its canonical status was debated well into the Common Era. Neither book seems to have achieved authoritative status at Qumran. No fragment of Esther was discovered in its caves, and there is no evidence that the Qumran community celebrated Purim. Only one fragment of Chronicles (4Q118) was discovered at Qumran, and does not parallel the received text of Chronicles.

10 See Crawford 2008.

11 Crawford 2011.

Scribal Specific Indicators

In this article I would like to turn my focus away from the textual tradition itself to look specifically at the manuscripts in which this textual tradition is found. That is, I would like to look at the codicological practices found in these manuscripts, to see if any specific practices can be found across these manuscripts, indicating a group or a school. The impetus for this investigation came from a recent article by Steve Delamarter on scribal practices in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹² According to Delamarter,

The practice of writing . . . is an expression of the already fully-developed sociology and ideology of some group at work in the last centuries before the Common Era,” and “Encoding the right meanings in the right way into a manuscript of a sacred text is neither left to chance nor performed casually in religious communities.¹³

Therefore, if Delamarter is correct, given that we are dealing with a specific scribal approach in the exegetical/expansive/revisionist group, we should expect to see certain codicological traits in common. An attempt to test this hypothesis seems warranted.

However, before beginning the investigation, three caveats are in order. First, we are dealing with Qumran manuscripts, which do not give us a representative sample of the manuscript tradition of the Second Temple period. They are limited in time (third century BCE to first century CE) and place (the caves of Qumran), and even what we have from those caves is certainly not the entire collection which was deposited there in antiquity. So we are very limited in our sample and our certainty. Second, I have used Emanuel Tov’s conservative reckoning of what he labels the “pre-Samaritan” textual tradition among the Qumran scrolls,¹⁴ just to be sure there is no disagreement as to which manuscripts should be included this investigation. Other manuscripts could well be included in the exegetical/expansive/revisionist category.¹⁵ Third, I am looking

¹² Delamarter 2010.

¹³ Delamarter 2010, 184, 187.

¹⁴ Tov 2001, 97–100. Tov’s more conservative estimate stems from his practice of counting manuscripts: “In accord with statistical probability, texts that are equally close to MT and SP in the Torah . . . are counted as MT.” Tov 2008b, 144–45. Chelica Hultinen, among others, has challenged this default position (see Hultinen 2008).

¹⁵ Hultinen 2008, 44, 82–83, 122, includes the following manuscripts as possible members of the exegetical/expansive/revisionist group: 4QGen^c, 4QGen^d, 4QGen^e, 1QpaleoLev, 4QLev^c, 4QLev^d, 4QLev^e, 4QDeut^d, 4QDeut^e, 4QDeut^f, and 4QpaleoDeut^r.

only at manuscripts that preserved whole books; that is, I am not including compositions which contain only an excerpt from an exegetical/expansive/revisionist text, such as 4QTestimonia.¹⁶

For the purposes of this paper, I will be looking at twenty-four manuscripts from Qumran. Four have been labelled by Tov as “pre-Samaritan”: 4QExod-Lev^f (4Q17), 4QpaleoExod^m (4Q22), 4QLev^d (4Q26), and 4QNum^b (4Q27).¹⁷ Two manuscripts come from the Reworked Pentateuch group, and were evidently whole manuscripts of the Pentateuch when complete: 4QRP^b (4Q364) and 4QRP^c (4Q365). I will not consider the other three manuscripts grouped under the rubric Reworked Pentateuch, 4Q158, 4Q366 and 4Q367, because there is general agreement that these are excerpted manuscripts whose purpose is uncertain. There are three manuscripts of some form of the Temple Scroll: 4QRouleau de Temple (4Q524), 11QTemple^a (11Q19), and 11QTemple^b (11Q20). Finally, I have included fifteen Jubilees manuscripts: 1QJub^{a-b} (1Q17–18), 2QJub^{a-b} (2Q19–20), 3QJub (3Q5), 4QJub^{a-paph} (4Q216–224), 4QJub^j (4Q176a, frgs. 19–20), and 11QJub (11Q12).¹⁸

Archaeological Provenances

First, let us note their archaeological provenance: the “pre-Samaritan” and Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts were only found in Cave 4. Cave 4 housed the major manuscript collection; it is located in the marl terrace within the archaeological boundaries of Khirbet Qumran. The Temple Scroll was found in Caves 4 and 11. Cave 11 also contained a major collection of manuscripts; it is located in the limestone cliffs north of the khirbeh. Jubilees has the widest archaeological range, being found in Caves 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11 (Caves 2 and 3 are

16 While these excerpted passages, which can appear in liturgical or study manuscripts, catenas, or peshar texts, can preserve important textual information, they do not demonstrate the codicological practices that scribes would have used when copying a *scriptural* or *authoritative* text.

17 Tov also includes 4QDeutⁿ (4Q41) in his count (Tov 2001, 99), but as I have shown elsewhere, 4QDeutⁿ is a liturgical or study text. White (Crawford) 1990. Tov suggests that the following manuscripts, which were published as biblical texts, may be part of this creative/free/revisionist tradition: 4QGen^{h-para}, 4QGen^k, 2QExod^b, 4QExod^d, 4QDeut^{k2}, 6QDeut[?], and 11QLev^b. Tov 2008a, 23. Of these, 2QExod^b, 4QExod^d, and 4QDeut^{k2} were probably liturgical or study manuscripts. For the others, the extant text is too small to make a judgment on their text type. It is notable that three of these manuscripts, 2QExod^b, 4QDeut^{k2}, and 11QLev^b, preserve the Tetragrammaton in paleo-Hebrew characters.

18 The critical editions of twenty-three of these manuscripts can be found in the relevant volumes of the series *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. The exception is 11QTemple^a, which was published by Yadin 1983.

limestone cliff caves north of Qumran). All of these caves contained relatively large numbers of manuscripts.¹⁹

Codicological Characteristics

In looking at the codicological characteristics of the manuscripts, I will begin with their commonalities.²⁰ There is only one: they are all written in Hebrew. This characteristic is obviously intimately connected to the compositions' claims to authority, since Hebrew is both the divine and national language, as opposed to, for example, Greek. As is well known, one of the characteristics of all of the books that became part of the Jewish canon is that they were written almost entirely in Hebrew (the exceptions being the Aramaic sections in Ezra and Daniel).

Beyond that characteristic our manuscripts do not exhibit any codicological traits entirely in common. The script of the manuscripts shows the highest percentage of commonality: twenty-four out of the twenty-five manuscripts were copied in square script. The exception is 4QpaleoExod^m, which was copied in paleo-Hebrew. It is important to notice here that the Samaritan Pentateuch was handed down in paleo-Hebrew, but it is equally important to note that other paleo-Hebrew Pentateuch manuscripts exhibit a shorter, unexpanded text (e.g. 4QpaleoGen-Exod^l, 4QpaleoDeut^r).²¹ Finally, all of the identified paleo-Hebrew manuscripts found at Qumran, with the exception of 4QpaleoJob^c, are manuscripts of the Pentateuch, perhaps indicating that the paleo-Hebrew script was reserved for books of proven authority and antiquity, and/or texts associated with Moses.²²

Paleographic Dates

Next we will consider the paleographic dates of the manuscripts, in broad strokes.²³ Of those manuscripts which have been dated by their editors, only one, 4QExod-Lev^f, comes from the third century BCE, well before the founding of the Qumran settlement c. 100 BCE.²⁴ The fact that this manuscript was

19 For a complete listing of the contents of each cave, see Tov 2002, 27–114.

20 All of the information found in the following discussion concerning scribal practices is taken from Tov 2004.

21 Ulrich 1999b, 128–29, 137–38.

22 Ulrich 1999b, 122–23. Also Tov 2004, 247. A tradition recorded in *b. Baba Batra* 14b, 15a, attributes the book of Job to Moses.

23 All the paleographical dates are taken from Webster 2002, 351–446.

24 Following Magness 2002, 63–69.

preserved and survived may indicate that it was held in high esteem by the Qumran community.

Three manuscripts are dated to the second century BCE, again before the beginning of the settlement: 4QJub^a, 4QJub^j, and 4QRouleau de Temple or RT. Note that these manuscripts are from the point on our spectrum of “recognizably new compositions,” so that we have moved a step beyond the Pentateuch already in the second century.

A plurality of the twenty-five manuscripts under consideration is dated to the first century BCE: 1QJub^a, 2QJub^a, 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b, 4QRP^b, 4QRP^c, 4QJub^b, 4QJub^d, 4QJub^f, 4QJub^g, and 4QJub^{paph}. This plurality coincides with the peak of paleographical dates in the Qumran collection as a whole, when the settlement at Qumran was flourishing.

Finally, five manuscripts are dated to the first century CE, in the decades before the destruction of the settlement in 68: 2QJub^b, 3QJub, 11QJub, and 11QTemple^{a & b}. Again, these manuscripts are all “recognizably new compositions,” rather than manuscripts of the Pentateuch. The paleographic profile of our select group of manuscripts thus mirrors the paleographic profile of the Qumran collection as a whole: a few early manuscripts were copied in the third century BCE, more come from the second century BCE; manuscripts dates climb to a peak in the first century BCE, and then taper off in the first century CE.

Writing of Divine Names

Tov dedicates a section to “Special Writing of Divine Names.”²⁵ Two of our manuscripts have a special written signal for the presence of the Divine Name in the text. 4QRP^b places a colon (two vertical dots) before every occurrence of the Tetragrammaton, while 4QRT substitutes tetrapuncta (four horizontal dots) for the four consonants of the Divine Name. The practice of the scribe of 4QRP^b appears to be idiosyncratic, appearing in no other manuscript, while the use of tetrapuncta does occur in other manuscripts.²⁶

Intentional Signs

Turning to “scribal markings and procedures,” which Tov defines as intentional signs or signals inserted by a scribe,²⁷ we find the following practices in our group of manuscripts:

25 Tov 2004, 218–20.

26 Tov 2004, 218–19.

27 Tov 2004, 178.

Correction dots: 4QRP^b, 4QRP^c, 4QJub^f, 4QJub^g, 4QJub^{paph}, and 11QT^a.²⁸ 4QJub^f also places a “box shape” around a letter, and 4QRP^c crosses out a letter.²⁹

Guide dots or strokes: 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QNum^b, 4QRP^b and 4QRP^c.³⁰

In addition, 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QNum^b both exhibit a paleo-Hebrew *waw* as a paragraph marker, and 11QT^b uses an X as a line filler.³¹ In no case do we find a scribal marking favored by a majority of the manuscripts. Thus, no discernible common tendencies in scribal markings emerge.

Deluxe Format

Next, let us consider what Tov has termed “de luxe editions,” that is, large scrolls with large top and bottom margins, a large writing block, and fine calligraphy.³² As Tov notes, only scrolls from 50 BCE onward (with one exception), when Qumran was in existence, are preserved in deluxe format. Of the twenty-five manuscripts we are considering, seven certainly or possibly preserve a deluxe format: 4QpaleoExod^m and 11QTemple^a (both certain),³³ as well as 4QExod-Lev^f, 4QNum^b, 4QRP^b, 4QRP^c, and 4QJub^d (possible). Note that the exception to the 50 BCE or later date is 4QExod-Lev^f, one of the oldest manuscripts in the Qumran collection. Although most of the other manuscripts in our group are too fragmentary to make a judgment about their format, 4QLev^d, for example, does not seem to have been copied in a deluxe format. Therefore, the scribal approach we are considering was a candidate for production in a deluxe format, but is not found exclusively in that format.

Orthography and Morphology

Finally, and most controversially, I turn to orthography and morphology. It is well known that the Qumran collection evinces a full range of orthographical and morphological practices, from very defective (e.g. 4QDeut^a) to very full. The question is whether or not these practices can be used to isolate a par-

28 Tov 2004, 189–99.

29 Tov 2004, 200–01.

30 Tov 2004, 62–65.

31 Tov 2004, 185, 210.

32 Tov 2004, 126. Tov also includes “the proto-rabbinic text form of scripture,” but, as the following remarks will demonstrate, this is not the case.

33 At the International Society of Biblical Literature meeting held in London in 2011, I learned from Ira Rabin that, according to her analysis, 11QTemple^a was not created in the Qumran area. This analysis is based on the chemical profile of the leather and the ink. The manuscript is also, unusually, copied on the flesh side rather than the hair side of the leather. I would like to thank Dr. Rabin for sharing this information with me.

ticular scribal school. Tov has taken a strong positive position on this question, while others, such as Ulrich and most recently Tigchelaar, have taken more negative positions.³⁴ Tov has identified a “Qumran Scribal Practice,” a particular set of orthographic and morphological practices, as well as a set of scribal markings or traits, that can be isolated in a certain subset of manuscripts.³⁵ Tov relies on a statistical approach to identify his subset; that is, a manuscript need not have every trait to qualify, and some traits weigh more heavily than others. Tov makes the assumption that these scribal practices are indicative of a group or school. Tigchelaar, while acknowledging the existence of a subset, suggests that, rather than a separate group or school, what is seen in it is actually a “cluster or tendency” along a spectrum of orthographical/morphological options.³⁶ I myself lean toward Tigchelaar’s understanding of a cluster or tendency along a spectrum of options, rather than a separate scribal school. Regardless, I was interested to see whether or not my group of manuscripts fell into this subset.

In Appendix 1 of his *Scribal Practices*,³⁷ Tov identifies the following manuscripts from our group as copied in his Qumran Scribal Practice: 4QNum^b, 4QJub^f, 4QRP^b, 4QRP^c, 4QRT, 11QJub, 11QTemple^a, and 11QTemple^b. Further, 4QJub^g and 4QpapJub^h are listed as “yes” with a question mark, 4QJub^d receives just a question mark, and 3QJub is a “maybe” due to insufficient evidence. Thus, twelve out of twenty-five, or one-half, are included in Tov’s subset. Checking the paleographic dates of these manuscripts, almost all are from the first century BCE, with five exceptions: 4QRT is second century BCE, and 3QJub, 11QJub, 11QTemple^a, and 11QTemple^b are first century CE.

If we look only at morphology and orthography, discarding scribal markings from the subset, a slightly different picture emerges. Using Tov’s Appendix 9,³⁸ which charts certain morphological and orthographic preferences, the following data emerges:

34 Ulrich sees spelling conventions as simply the product of a growing tendency to insert *matres lectiones* into words as the Second Temple period progressed. See Ulrich 2011, 56. Tigchelaar 2010 makes a critical assessment of Tov’s description of the “Qumran Scribal Practice.”

35 Tov 2004, 263–73. The orthographic features are explained on pp. 267–68, the morphological features on p. 268, and the scribal markings on pp. 264–66.

36 Tigchelaar 2010, 203.

37 Tov 2004, 277–88.

38 Tov 2004, 337–43.

4QRT (2nd cent. BCE): 4 out of 11 morphological features that Tov considers indicative; 3 out of 7 orthographic features.

4QNum^b (1st cent. BCE): 5 morphological features; 6 orthographic features.

4QJub^d (1st cent. BCE): 2 morphological features; 2 orthographic features.³⁹

4QJub^f (1st cent. BCE): 2 morphological features; 3 orthographic features.

4QJub^g (1st cent. BCE): 1 morphological feature.

4QpapJub^h (1st cent. BCE): 4 orthographic features.

4QRP^b (1st cent. BCE): 5 morphological features; 6 orthographic features.

4QRP^c (1st cent. BCE): 5 morphological features; 6 orthographic features.

11QJub (1st cent. CE): 3 orthographic features.

11QTemple^a & ^b (1st cent. CE):⁴⁰ 8 morphological features; 5 orthographic features.

There is a general tendency to a fuller orthography and morphology as times goes on, although 4QRT and 11QJub are exceptions at either end of the time line. The fullest examples of orthography and morphology certainly are found in 11QTemple^a & ^b, first century CE manuscripts. However, since fully half of the manuscripts we have chosen as exhibiting the exegetical/expansive/revisionist text tradition do not contain a full morphology/orthography, nor do they fall under Tov's Qumran Scribal Practice subset, we cannot say that scribes of the exegetical/expansive/revisionist text tradition prefer a full orthography or morphology.

Conclusion

Having taken our tour through the codicological features of this group of manuscripts that fall along the spectrum of the exegetical/expansive/revisionist Pentateuchal text tradition, are there any conclusions to be drawn? The overall conclusion is, I'm afraid, negative. There is no certain evidence for a particular scribal school associated with this textual approach. However, by looking at the individual pieces of evidence, we may at least make some suggestions.

1. The fact that all of our manuscripts were found in caves housing major collections may indicate the importance of this text tradition and its individual members to the Qumran community.

³⁹ 4QJub^d preserves כּוּל, but not לוֹא.

⁴⁰ Listed together because b is a copy of a.

2. The manuscripts, with one exception, were not copied in paleo-Hebrew. This may indicate that Mount Gerizim, which appears to have preserved its scriptures only in paleo-Hebrew, was not the point of origin for this textual approach. It at least points to a Judean home as well as a Samaritan one.
3. Its appearance in a fair number of deluxe editions indicates that this text tradition was held in high esteem by its copyists and collectors, as was the more conservative textual approach.
4. The peak of copying of this textual tradition occurs in the first century BCE, at a time when the Qumran settlement was flourishing. Since the Qumran manuscript dates in general peak during this period, nothing much can be made of that fact. However, it does indicate an acceptance of this text tradition by the community. Further, since copies are being made of the Pentateuchal manuscripts (i.e., not Jubilees or the Temple Scroll) in the first century BCE, after the presumed date when the Samaritan Pentateuch broke away and began its separate textual history, this textual approach was still a living tradition in Judea after its definitive split with the Samaritans.⁴¹
5. No inferences can be drawn from the morphological/orthographical data or the scribal markings, except what can generally be drawn for the manuscript collection as a whole.

In sum, the codicological evidence obtained from this particular group of Qumran manuscripts containing the exegetical/expansive/revisionist tradition of transmitting the Pentateuch offers some support for the arguments I have made elsewhere based on the text tradition itself. This textual tradition is Judean as well as Samaritan, although it was only chosen as a canonical text by the Samaritans. As such, it was probably equally at home in Jerusalem and on Mt. Gerizim, and was certainly welcomed at Qumran. Its origins are probably early in the Second Temple period, after the Pentateuch in its present shape had become authoritative, among a group of priestly scribes trained to insert their exegesis into their received text in large and small ways, in order to pass on a living tradition.

41 Crawford 2011, 131.

Bibliography

- Brooke, George J. 2002 The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible. Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E. Herbert and E. Tov. London: The British Library and Oak Knoll Press.
- . 2001. 4Q158: 4QReworked Pentateuch^a or 4QReworked Pentateuch A? *DSD* 8: 219–41.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SSSRL. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- . 2011 The Pentateuch as Found in the Pre-Samaritan Texts and 4QReworked Pentateuch. Pages 123–136 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, M. Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2012 'Biblical Text'- Yes or No? The Hebrew Bible. in *What is Bible?* Edited by K. Finsterbusch and A. Lange. CBET 67. Leuven: Peeters.
- Delamarter, Steve. 2010. Sociological Models for Understanding the Scribal Practices in the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 182–197 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* Edited by M. Grossman. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Fishbane, Michael. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Hultinen, Chelica. 2008. *An Examination of the Supposed Pre-Samaritan Texts from Qumran*. M.A. thesis. Trinity Western University.
- Leiman, Sid Z. 1976. *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence*. Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. Hamden CT: Archon Books.
- Magness, Jodi. 2002. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- McDonald, Lee Martin. 1995. *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*. Peabody MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert. 2010. Assessing Emanuel Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice'. Pages 173–208 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*. Edited by S. Metso, H. Najman and E. Schuller. STDJ 92. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Tov, Emanuel. 2001. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. 2nd rev. ed. Minneapolis/ Assen: Fortress/Royal van Gorcum.
- . 2002. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2004. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden/Boston: Brill.

- . 2008a. 4QReworked Pentateuch: A Synopsis of Its Contents. Pages in Idem, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2008b. The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert—An Overview and Analysis. Pages 128–154 in idem *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2008c. *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Tov, Emanuel and Sidnie White (Crawford). 1994. Reworked Pentateuch. Pages 187–352 in *Qumran Cave 4, VIII, Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. Edited by H. Attridge *et al.* DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ulrich, Eugene C. 1999a. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. SSSRL. Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans.
- . 1999b. The Palaeo-Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4. Pages 121–147 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. SSSRL. Grand Rapids MI/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill.
- . 2011. The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books. Pages 46–64 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, M. Marttila. BZAW 419. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Vermes, Geza. 1989. Bible Interpretation at Qumran. *Eretz Israel* 20: 184–191.
- . 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*. Leiden: Brill.
- Webster, Brian. 2002. Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judean Desert. Pages 351–446 in Emanuel Tov, *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- White (Crawford), Sidnie Ann. 1990. 4QDt^a: Biblical Manuscript or Excerpted Text? Pages 13–20 in *Of Scribes and Scrolls*. Edited by H. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T. Tobin. Lanham MD: University Press of America.
- Yadin, Yigael. 1983. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society/Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem/Shrine of the Book.

Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture

George J. Brooke

Introduction

The study and analysis of Rewritten Scripture, especially as exemplified by some compositions amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls, has become an increasingly debated and contested area. It is interesting to note immediately that the study of memory, either individual or collective or cultural, has played little or no part in the discussion; this may be somewhat surprising, since the rewritings to be found in works like Deuteronomy or 1–2 Chronicles can be fruitfully analysed in such terms,¹ and remembrance plays a significant role in several compositions found in the caves at and near Qumran.² This paper attempts to start a conversation that gives some place to memory in the consideration of Rewritten Scripture. Until now, for the Rewritten Scripture compositions from the late Second Temple period, what might be loosely referred to as the pre-canonical period, at least three schools of thought seem to have emerged.

In the first school belong those who wish to retain the label Rewritten Scripture, or possibly even Rewritten Bible, as concerning matters of genre.³ For such scholars there is some significant value in trying to articulate the literary features of such a genre. Commonly such features are to some extent pre-determined by the selection and demarcation of those compositions that are widely considered as belonging to the genre, notably *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, the *Genesis Apocryphon*⁴ and the *Reworked Pentateuch* in its various manifestations.⁵ One feature of the approach of those scholars who might be allocated

1 See, e.g., Rogerson 2009, 13–41.

2 Wold (2007, 50–63) describes the use of *zkr* and related terms in relation to the recollection of the Exodus in 4Q185, 4Q370, 4Q462, 4Q463, 4Q504, and the *Damascus Document*.

3 Of course most scholars resist categorization by others, but this group could include Alexander (1987) and Bernstein (2005). Zahn (2012, 286) defines Rewritten Scripture as “a genre that functions interpretively to renew (update, correct) specific earlier traditions by recasting a substantial portion of those traditions in the context of a new work that locates itself in the same discourse as the scriptural work that is rewritten.”

4 Some of the issues surrounding the discussion of the genre of the parts and whole of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, including the suitability of the term “Rewritten Bible,” are discussed in Bernstein 2010.

5 Those four compositions are often mentioned as having become in some way normative in scholarly discussion; see e.g., Zahn 2010, 324–25; 2011, 8.

to this category is the assumption, sometimes unstated, that a more or less authoritative form of the Torah has already come to be recognized which such compositions are using as hypotext.

In the second school belong a group of scholars who also acknowledge the key role to be played by the analysis of such compositions as the four just mentioned, but who have noticed that the literary exercise that such compositions represent is to be observed in a wide range of additional works. On the one hand such attention to breadth undermines and challenges those approaches that are concerned with neat generic classification, since the larger the family of compositions to be considered, the less possible it is to insist on distinct family features in every case: very large literary families destabilize literary genres. On the other hand broadening the basis of the discussion is commonly based on the observation, analysis and discussion of literary processes, so that the characteristic of this school of thought is attention to such processes.⁶ From such a perspective Rewritten Scripture loses its suitability as a literary genre tag and becomes a way of talking about a set of phenomena that are observable in various compositions.⁷ It is as if one is moving from the consideration of whether a particular composition can be labelled as Rewritten Bible to consideration of whether certain compositions illustrate the processes of Rewriting Scripture.⁸

In the third school we might put a smaller group of scholars who wish to combine both perspectives, arguing for the existence of certain core literary or generic features but thinking more creatively about what such features seem to indicate about the character of the transmission of tradition or traditions in the Second Temple period. Thus some who might be put in this group have tried to articulate what they consider to be characteristic features, for example, of Mosaic discourse.⁹ More broadly others have sought to describe how a range of compositions enlarge and enhance the suitable description of scriptural exegesis in the Second Temple period.¹⁰

6 Note, e.g., the contribution by Klostergaard Petersen 2007.

7 The breadth of discussion by scholars in the first volume of an ongoing project on Rewritten Bible illustrates well how Rewritten Bible can lose all sense of being a literary genre: Laato and van Ruiten 2008.

8 Note the title of the book by White Crawford 2008.

9 E.g., Najman 2003. Najman looks mainly at *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* and then uses Philo to articulate broader issues. For evaluation of some of Najman's ideas see Brooke 2010.

10 See, e.g., Zahn 2010, 323–36.

In this short contribution I wish to introduce into the discussion the concept of memory,¹¹ which I hope will illuminate as an etic analytical framework some further aspects of both particular literary compositions and also the phenomenon of Rewriting Scripture more broadly. I am concerned with both individual and collective or cultural memory, a combination that has been briefly but persuasively exploited for the study of some New Testament texts by Markus Bockmuehl.¹²

Individual Memory

The various forms of the scriptural books that have come to light in the Qumran caves have encouraged a reconsideration of some of the canons of text criticism. It is clear that there is still a place for the analysis and explanation of shared errors, but it has also become increasingly acknowledged that many textual variants, both major and minor, are the result of intentional intervention with the text, of a mind at work. In talking of memory, that is, individual memory, I wish to draw attention to three phenomena that have a role in the better understanding of Rewritten Scripture, namely that an individual scribe is necessarily involved, that there is a varied set of motivating factors behind individual involvement in the transmission of texts, and that there is a complex network of practices, both mental and physical, through which the reproduction or re-presentation of text takes place. Of course we should not forget the many-faceted problems associated with the study of individual memory as those have been highlighted in the last one hundred years,¹³ but it is possible to adopt a pragmatic approach and talk of the individual person's role in the transmission of tradition, to attempt to describe something of such a person's mental activities and mind's retention, some of which is textual.¹⁴

First, there is the role of the individual in the transmission of tradition. In whatever way scribal processes are construed, in any particular manuscript only one scribe, or perhaps only one scribe at a time, can hold the pen and craft the text. In other words there has to be a place for the activity of the individual scribe. In post-canonical practices the role of the scribe in the copying of authoritative compositions might be considered primarily and predominantly

11 A broad "history of memory" is provided by Olick and Robbins 1998, 112–22.

12 Bockmuehl 2006, 173–88.

13 See, e.g., the psychological memory studies in Erll and Nünning 2010, 215–98.

14 Atkins (2004, 1–24) begins with the neurological understanding of the individual in his pragmatic consideration of the role of memory in liturgy.

to be a matter of precise copying; the individual contribution of the copying scribe is strictly limited and put in the background. There has sometimes been a scholarly assumption that the role of scribes in earlier periods might have been similar, but more recent understanding of Jewish scribal practices in the Second Temple period has opened up the possibility for some consideration of the creative intervention of the scribe in the text that is being transmitted. There is such a thing as an exegetical variant; there are such things as literary editions of authoritative compositions, as Emanuel Tov and Gene Ulrich would agree, though perhaps with varying degrees of enthusiasm.¹⁵ All that means that an individual mind, what it remembers, how it articulates and re-articulates what it remembers, how it functions, needs to be considered as part of the process of the transmission (and development) of authoritative traditions. And by using the word ‘process’, attention to the individual scribe in relation to Rewritten Bible inevitably links these comments and observations with those who define rewriting in terms of processes.

Second, what is it that is motivating such interventions? As in so many matters in our understanding of Rewritten Scripture it is all too easy to put on anachronistic lenses to consider the evidence. Nevertheless, it certainly seems as if one motivating factor behind scribal intervention in the tradition was a felt desire for clarification of the plain meaning or simple sense of the text. But much more seems to be at play than simple sense exegesis. Amongst other factors the contemporary life setting of the author of Rewritten Scripture influences the combination of ideas that create the *tendenz* of the adjustments to the underlying tradition; an earlier text is re-presented, that is, made present again, through individual authors reflecting their own contexts of discourse¹⁶ and attempting to meet the needs of their audiences as they perceive them or desire to mould them. Such adjustments of the received tradition might be principally halakhic or even more overtly theological as they reflect or create a way of looking at the world.¹⁷ They might also indicate how an author considers his standing within a particular historical perspective and attempt to manipulate an audience towards a similar standing.¹⁸ The motivations for adjusting the received traditions in the rewriting process are ideological in one way or another.

15 See, e.g., the extended material on textual criticism and literary criticism in Tov 2012, 283–326; Ulrich 1999, 99–120.

16 For participating in ongoing Mosaic discourse see Najman 2003, 41–69.

17 See, e.g., Wold 2007.

18 E.g., in relation to the individual author’s construction of the image of the Teacher of Righteousness and the need for the reader to engage in “mnemonic mimesis”: Stuckenbruck 2007, 93.

Third, there is a complex network of practices through which the reproduction or re-presentation of texts takes place. An understanding of scribes as copyists, perhaps as mere copyists, belongs in a world in which the precise forms of written texts have come to be normative in some way.¹⁹ However, in an earlier period, which we might label “pre-canonical,” in which there is still a substantial place for orality, both in processes of memorization and transmission, there is also some room for the toleration of textual variety, even contradictions.²⁰ Some theoreticians have even supposed a developmental history of memory in which antiquity is characterized by a move from “orality to writing, though writing never fully supplanted oral transmission. This new condition enabled two important practices—commemoration and documentary recording—associated with emerging city structures.”²¹ But the processes of textual production I am considering here are more basically a combination of wider sets of what has been remembered and the narrower set of vocalisations that are part of dictation or reading.

How might all this be pictured in practice? One possible model to aid understanding can be drawn from recent study of Jesus, Q and the Gospels, especially the Synoptics.²² The model is helpful in my view partly because it allows for consideration of texts that can be widely acknowledged as exemplifying revisions of one another in some manner as such texts move towards ever increasing authority. There are thus many parallels with the Jewish textual phenomena of the Second Temple period in which revisions and rewritings are taking place in a situation in which the developing authority of certain forms of the tradition is also an issue. There is no space here to delve in any depth into this complex material, but three features can be noticed in particular though in a general fashion.

First, there is the matter of the relationship between the Gospel of Mark and the subsequent Gospels that used it. All the lengthy debates about arguments from order are not relevant solely to constructions of Markan priority but also to whether the similarities and differences between Mark and its synoptic counterparts express something which is essentially the same or things that

19 “Only in a written culture could a concept such as verbatim memorization emerge”: Baumgarten 1997, 123.

20 For some of the significance of the interface of orality and writing for the formation of new genres see the collection of essays edited by Weissenrieder and Coote 2010.

21 Olick and Robbins (1998), summarizing the work of others.

22 See, e.g., Kelber and Byrskog 2009; Le Donne 2009; Allison 2010. The rich collection of essays edited together by Kelber and Byrskog variously discuss oral and written processes. Though there are traces of an historicist agenda, Le Donne’s work is rewarding theoretically, especially his Chapter 4 (2009, 65–92).

are sufficiently different as to be separate compositions. With debates about Rewritten Scripture as genre still ongoing, this parallel might be helpful in encouraging a more fruitful set of descriptors to be outlined than those so far put on the scholarly table.²³

Second, there is the role of the individual Gospel writer. Though he might be inseparable from some communal context of discourse that provides the dominant parameters for what is remembered and recalled, nevertheless it is still possible to talk of an individual author or editor. For the understanding and analysis of Rewritten Scripture, the role of the author and editor also needs to be acknowledged and given an appropriate setting, whether as redactor of the *Temple Scroll* or the *Genesis Apocryphon* or as the author of the *Book of Jubilees*.

Third, there is the relation of all three Gospels not just with one another but also to the ongoing forms of the Jesus traditions, not least in oral form.²⁴ This has been much debated in previous generations, but has been repositioned in recent discussion in relation to everything from eyewitness testimony to the role of memory in the citation of scriptural passages in other sources.²⁵ For Rewritten Scripture the actual means of the transmission of text from one manuscript to another through oral or aural intermediate stages and the more general role of oral performance in the representation of tradition in any particular context, sectarian or not, needs to be set alongside the insights that can be derived from the New Testament analogies.

In this brief section I have attempted to suggest that it was indeed the case that individual authors and scribes participated in the re-presentation of the traditions that they inherited. Having admitted some of the problems of the recent study of individual memory from the outset, it is certainly time to acknowledge that some scholars have been concerned to argue over against the psychologists that “it is impossible for individuals to remember in any coherent and persistent fashion outside of the group contexts.”²⁶ There is an individual memory, an individual scribal memory, but it is in large part socially

23 Zahn (2011, 10) has argued that the “distinction between *quantity* of difference and *quality* of difference is critical to a proper understanding of the 4QRP MSS, as well as other similar works. If we classify the 4QRP MSS as copies of the Pentateuch, it should not be primarily because of their closeness to the pentateuchal text relative to other works, but because there is no *literary* or formal indication that they are anything other than pentateuchal” (italics hers).

24 See, e.g., Dunn (2000; 2003). Dunn makes no use of the work of Maurice Halbwachs on collective memory, though much of Halbwachs (e.g., 1992) seems to indirectly inform his approach.

25 A noteworthy repositioning for the purposes of this study is by Allison (2010, 1–30).

26 Olick and Robbins (1998, 109), summarizing the view of Maurice Halbwachs.

and culturally constructed, and operates within collective codes that can somehow define, endorse, and encourage certain processes and practices as normative. Individual memory and collective memory are entirely interdependent in some way.²⁷ Thus, although a suitable place must be given to the role of the individual's memory in the transmission of texts, there is a broader field of reference that also needs to be considered.

Cultural Memory

In recent years there has been some very helpful reflection on various methodological issues in relation to the analysis of the Dead Sea Scrolls.²⁸ It is interesting to note, however, that although there has been some increasing attention to sociological approaches,²⁹ little has appeared that directly addresses the explicit concern in other areas of the study of Judaism in antiquity³⁰ with collective or cultural memory.³¹ There are some exceptions for the Dead Sea Scrolls, especially two contributions to the 2004 Durham–Tübingen symposium devoted to *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*,³² and a notable essay by Philip Davies.³³

The literature on collective or cultural memory is very extensive.³⁴ The major developments within Biblical Studies concerning collective or cultural

27 Sontag (2003, 85–86) has, however, argued for the exclusive reality of individual memory (“all memory is individual”); for Sontag cultural memory is a spurious notion, though she does admit that there is “collective instruction” through which individual memory is shaped or “stipulated.” This is discussed and debated in Eyerman (2004, 161–62). Atkins (2004, 69–82) seems to take a line similar to that of Sontag, noting how individuals learn from others, who collectively provide “corporate memory.”

28 See, e.g., Davis and Strawn 2007; Grossman 2010.

29 Most notable amongst these are the contributions by Baumgarten 1997; Chalcraft 2007; Jokiranta 2010a; 2010b; and Regev 2007. In an evocative study on the culture and transmission of memory Eyerman (2004, 160) has noted wryly that “Sociologists do not often think about memory and not often enough about history.”

30 On memory in Judaism in antiquity see especially Mendels 2004.

31 E.g., nowhere is there any mention of the work and influence of Halbwachs (1992) on collective memory or Assman (1997; 2006) on cultural memory in Lim and Collins (2010).

32 Barton, Stuckenbruck and Wold 2007. See the studies by Wold and Stuckenbruck cited above.

33 Davies 2010.

34 A very helpful overview is presented by Weissberg (1999, 7–26), covering matters since the Enlightenment with deftness, such as the possible significance of the proliferation of museums, and discussing the agendas of Halbwachs and Nora. The category of “collective

memory that have developed from theories that trace their pedigrees back to Maurice Halbwachs have largely concentrated in various ways on issues to do with historiography and narrative.³⁵ That is no accident, since Halbwachs himself was concerned to construct a method that stood over against both the psychologists and psychoanalysts who had privatised memory³⁶ and also the historians who had objectified history, largely from elite perspectives. For those concerned with the study of the Hebrew Bible the prioritisation of collective memory as a way of understanding how Israel read its past has enabled the discussion of the text in the present of the authors to be asserted in a fresh manner. In particular that discussion has permitted and even encouraged the avoidance of issues concerning the historical veracity of what some texts purport to describe.³⁷ One need no longer be anxious about what happened, so much as concerned with how what is constructed as having happened is remembered and memorialised.³⁸ The remembrance of the past, its memorialisation, can serve a variety of purposes; it is not value free.³⁹

memory" is helpfully problematized by Gedi and Elam (1996) who see it as leading to lack of clarity in the consideration of both history and myth.

- 35 See, e.g., Smith (2002) who provides some helpful overview with respect to Israelite religion; see also Brenner and Polak 2009. Perhaps the cultural memory's concern with history is because, as Wellhausen noted, "history, as it is well known, always has to be constructed" (Kratz 2009, 387); on why Wellhausen has not figured large in the study of cultural memory, see Kratz 2009, 402.
- 36 In an attempt to use cultural trauma in relation to the construction of identity Eyerman (2004, 160) has also noted that "most often trauma is conceptualised on the individual level."
- 37 See the helpful comment of Schmid (2012, 46–47): "Many texts contain reworked traditions and memories that are older than themselves but did not exist in a fixed, written form. Committing them to writing was then more than and different from a mere codification of these traditions and memories. Instead, the act of writing was already an initial process of interpretation. . . . Thus Old Testament texts can be 'present' and literarily historically relevant in the modes of memory, tradition, and reception in different periods." His combination of "reworked traditions" and "memories" is especially pertinent to the argument of this essay.
- 38 See, e.g., the valuable comments by Rogerson (2009, 1–41). Basing his ideas on those of C. Lévi-Strauss, Rogerson builds on the insights of others to distinguish amongst biblical texts between "cold" and "hot" reconstructions of the past, between those that are more interested in frigid stability in their present, continuity with the past for its own sake (e.g., 1–2 Chronicles), and those that are more concerned with the warmth of "positive" change in their present (e.g., the Deuteronomistic History), internalising "the historical process in order to make it the moving power of its development" Rogerson, 2009, 29.
- 39 This is illustrated trenchantly concerning the past in Israeli pioneering museums by Katriel 1999, 118–22.

In the light of what has been taking place in the study of the Hebrew Bible, for the sectarian scrolls the study of collective memory has thus primarily been of assistance for tackling various vexed historical, or more properly historiographical, questions concerning the portrayal of the Teacher of Righteousness and his opponents in some compositions such as the *Damascus Document* and some of the so-called continuous *Pesharim*.⁴⁰ Though some scholars still try to write the history of the second century BCE from such compositions, there is acknowledgement even by them that there are major problems in undertaking such a task.⁴¹ Others, notably Philip Davies himself, have even gone so far as to declare that “there is no real historiography at Qumran.”⁴² To my mind, Davies seems to make one kind of historiography normative; the texts from the Qumran caves actually present several different kinds of ways of doing history,⁴³ though it is true that none of them are akin to the sort of annalistic chronicling of events that characterize much of the historiography that became canonical.

Be that as it may, it seems to me that because scholars of the Bible have been able to see how cultural memory works most obviously in such texts as Deuteronomy (and its related histories) and 1–2 Chronicles, compositions that are most obviously rewritings of earlier traditions, so aspects of the study of cultural memory should be applied both to the so-called Rewritten Scripture compositions and also to the processes of rewriting themselves. Along those lines Davies has drawn attention to several key features in the study of cultural memory that are in need of applying to Rewritten Scripture in some way. Davies has used the insights of Jan Assmann as a starting point for his own remarks. Assmann’s words are worth rehearsing: “Seen as an individual and as a social capacity, memory is not simply the storage of past ‘facts’ but the ongoing work of reconstructive imagination. In other words, the past cannot be stored but always has to be ‘processed’ and mediated.”⁴⁴ While it is widely acknowledged that cultural memory acts to create and strengthen social or group identity,⁴⁵ Davies has some helpful comments to make about the workings of such cultural memory, comments that can in my opinion readily be

40 See the essays by Stuckenbruck (2007; 2010), especially his overall comment: “the documents which referred to the Teacher were essentially *presentist*. Events in the Teacher’s life were remembered because they were closely bound up with the community’s self-understanding and activity. The ‘collective memory’ of the community about the Teacher was inextricably determined by *mimesis*” (2007, 93).

41 See, e.g., Charlesworth 2002; Eshel 2008.

42 Davies 2010, 31; this depends on how “real historiography” is defined.

43 See Brooke 2007.

44 Assmann 1997, 14.

45 Wold (2007) has outlined the role of the remembrance of Exodus, creation and cosmos for the construction of identity in some of the communities behind the scrolls.

applied to Rewritten Scripture: “cultural memory, like personal memory, does of course contain a good deal of genuine recollection, but it also embellishes, distorts, invents and forgets the past.”⁴⁶ There are four somewhat overlapping dimensions or processes: embellishment, distortion, invention and forgetting.

Let us briefly consider each of these four dimensions as programmatic for thinking about the phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture and its processes and attempt a crude alignment of these four strategies of rewriting with some of the characteristic principles of cultural memory as outlined by Assmann.⁴⁷ It is important to keep in mind that we are not interested in this kind of cultural memory for what we can learn about the historical circumstances of what earlier traditions purport to describe; rather we are concerned to notice how a community’s memory works to handle the traditions it receives in recognizable ways by providing implicit commentary as cultural memories are changed and adjusted. The process as a whole can be understood in terms of what Assmann has labelled “the concretion of identity,” the ways in which “the store of knowledge on the basis of which a group derives an awareness of its unity and peculiarity”⁴⁸ is reworked, normally so as to make a move which expresses the need for the strengthening or renewal of identity rather than merely a set of literary preferences.⁴⁹ The processes to which Davies has drawn attention are ways in which cultural memory works and has worked. They thus authenticate what is taking place in Rewritten Scripture in fresh ways that are not matters to frustrate the text critic faced with yet more evidence for Samaritan readings in the *Reworked Pentateuch* nor topics merely to entertain as in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, though both variant readings and audience enjoyment are possible side-effects. Rather, as processes, they are not markers of literary genres, so much as indicators of the way texts are brought into their transmitter’s present.⁵⁰ And again, such processes are not morally neutral, not value free.

First, embellishment and institutionalisation. Numerous examples of the embellishment of received tradition in Rewritten Scripture could be cited. In many comments on Rewritten Scripture scholars have noted the way that the

46 Davies 2010, 33.

47 I rely here on Assmann 1995, 125–33. His ideas are also more fully worked out theoretically in Assmann 2006. The four aspects of cultural memory to be considered in the following paragraphs are institutionalisation, obligation, organization, and the capacity for reconstruction.

48 Assmann 1995, 130.

49 For general comments on the academic discussion of the place of identity in processes of social memory see Olick and Robbins 1998, 122–33.

50 This is why Zahn (2011, 229–36) is concerned foremost with “compositional techniques and interpretive goals” rather than with genre definition.

authors and editors of such compositions extend the text that they depend upon. The effect of embellishment is often to present a more rounded or coherent version of a textual tradition and in so doing to reflect some form of the institutionalisation of a group's heritage.⁵¹ Thus embellishment is not just for literary effect but usually suggests other facets of the authoritative inheritance which are being made present to distinguish one group from another. An example of such embellishment in *Rewritten Scripture* is the way in which in the *Reworked Pentateuch* there is a not infrequent supplementation of the base narratives either with the speeches of those whose commands have been carried out, or with the fulfilment narratives supplied for those commands that are given but which in the earlier sources are not recorded as carried out. These embellishments disclose a concern with narrative consistency and coherence, which no doubt earlier authors and editors shared but left discernibly incomplete. Especially in cases where God is a character in the narrative, such an approach reflects the kind of divine consistency that promotes "stability," both social and institutional. The *Rewritten Scripture* crystallizes in a particular way at a particular time for a particular group what the tradition is understood as having sought to communicate.⁵²

Second, distortion and obligation. An example of distortion might be detected in the calendrical and chronometric views of the writers of the *Book of Jubilees*. A particular system of measuring time within years and through many periods of years is imposed on the text. It is not the case that such things are not present in the base texts of Genesis and Exodus that the author of *Jubilees* uses, but rather that such matters are "cultivated" in ways that are determined externally. The overall approach in *Jubilees* so that, for example, various patriarchal figures observe some of the halakhic implications of the Sinaitic Law before ever it was made known according to the narrative fiction of the text is a further example of such distortion of what is re-presented. Assmann has been concerned to show how cultural memory is set firmly against historicism but rather creates "a normative self-image of the group" and "engenders a clear system of values."⁵³ Thus one does not turn to *Jubilees* to discover what happened in Eden or at the flood or when Abraham entered the land, but rather to discern the value system of its author. Such values are most readily discernible when *Rewritten Scripture* "distorts" its base text.

51 Assmann 1995, 130–31.

52 Another clear example of such a process and its purpose is the embellishment of the Law of the King of Deuteronomy 17 in 11QT LVI–LIX.

53 Assmann 1995, 131.

Third, invention and organization. An example of invention would seem to be the literary construction of Abram's dream in the *Genesis Apocryphon* XIX, 14–23. Although Joseph Fitzmyer describes the text as “a lengthy embellishment of the biblical story,”⁵⁴ I am inclined to read this as invention. There is no precedent for this expansion of the text and no hint of a dream at this place in what we should probably justifiably take as the scriptural base text. This is not an extension of the text, but as Fitzmyer himself acknowledges, this seems to be an invention that is “intended to be an explanation of the lie that Sarai will have to tell to cover up the real identity of Abram, her husband. The lie is to be told in conformity with a dream accorded to Abram, and though the origin of the dream is never ascribed to God, this is certainly the implication.”⁵⁵ The invention contributes to the creation of a social identity through the enhancement of Abram's role as a patriarchal hero; the invented text frames him in the context of a view of the world in which divine intentions can be known to individuals through dreams and visions. It is in such inventions that what Assmann has called “the institutional buttressing of communication”⁵⁶ can be readily perceived. One of the principal ways in which such buttressing support takes shape is through explanation and exegesis, through commentary which in this case is implicit in the narrative reworking (as is usual in *Rewritten Scripture*). Invention and organization are also readily apparent in the extensions to the scriptural material which are evident in the *Temple Scroll*, but also in the compositions that seem to be variously related to the *Temple Scroll* in part, such as 4Q365.⁵⁷

Fourth, forgetting and the capacity for reconstruction. Forgetting should not be construed principally as negative, though some ways of presenting the past that deliberately deny what took place in order to undermine some group or other can be exceedingly destructive. Forgetting is the most notable and obvious means through which memory reconstructs the past.⁵⁸ For the most part in these few comments I am thinking of selective forgetting, rather than of some kinds of overall historical amnesia that are sometimes considered to be a feature of the contemporary twenty-first century Western worldview propa-

54 Fitzmyer 2004, 184.

55 Fitzmyer 2004, 184.

56 Assmann 1995, 131: a principle that Assmann labels as “Organization.”

57 On this see, e.g., Swanson 2004, 418–24; he asks questions about both the processes behind the production of additional material and also its authoritative status.

58 Smith (2002, 649–51) has made some intriguing observations about how and why various discourses about the divine were “forgotten” in later compositions, notably the memory of El's family and the memory of the female side of divinity.

gated in the media and popular culture. Developing the thinking of Halbwachs, Assmann has noted that “no memory can preserve the past. What remains is only that ‘which society in each era can reconstruct within its contemporary frame of reference.’”⁵⁹ Cultural memory works by selected reconstruction of the past into some kind of unified or focalised pattern to which each contemporary situation relates in its own way, sometimes “by appropriation, sometimes by criticism, sometimes by preservation or by transformation.” Rewritten Scripture as the artefactual textual evidence of particular groups at particular times discloses how such groups had a rich capacity for reconstructing the past. Abbreviation and forgetting are exemplary techniques of such reconstruction. Two examples can be briefly mentioned. First, in *Jubilees* Sarai’s cruel treatment of Hagar as in Gen 16:4–14 is entirely omitted from the description in *Jub* 14:21–24 of how Sarai offers Hagar to Abram and she conceives by him. The politics of the degradation of Hagar and Ishmael serves some purpose in one generation and its circumstances, but not in another. Second, it is well known that in his rewriting of the events at Sinai (*Ant.* 3.101–102) Josephus forgets to mention the incident of the golden calf. The politics of the people’s disobedience serves in one generation and its circumstances, but not in another.

It is commonly noted amongst those who have paid attention to the workings of cultural memory that groups, communities, peoples and nations have systems of reflexivity through which all that is remembered is appropriated. Where religion is part and parcel of social self-expression, so it is in myth and ritual in particular that cultural memory is appropriated.⁶⁰ Two further observations that are related to one another seem significant at this point. The first concerns the apparent absence of those compositions commonly labelled as Rewritten Scripture either generically or phenomenologically in what survives of the rules and rituals of the movement of which the Qumran community was a part. The second concerns the wealth of what survives amongst the manuscripts collected together in the Qumran caves; there is Rewritten Scripture in abundance. How are these two related matters to be explained? I suspect that an answer might be found in the complex character of the kind of sectarianism to be observed in this group, but that is the subject for another essay.

59 Assmann 1995, 130.

60 Hence it is important to pay attention to the role of memory in prayer and worship: see, e.g., Atkins 2004.

Conclusion

In this essay I have tried to raise the profile of memory in the consideration and evaluation of the phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture. Because of the way in which we are fortunate to have individual manuscript copies of many of the compositions with which we are concerned, it seems to me dangerous to suppose that we can explain the phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture by referring to literary works solely as abstract entities that somehow reflect the changing moods of the cultural complexities of Second Temple Judaism. Individual manuscripts require some attention being given to individual scribes, authors and editors. In so doing it is important to reckon with the mental processes of the individual in several ways, at least trying to take account of matters such as how individuals have their memories constructed by those they encounter and how scribes work to re-present compositions in ways that reflect how their own identities have been formed.

Nevertheless, for all that it is important to describe and discuss the particulars of the individual manuscripts within which Rewritten Scripture can be found and the individual scribes behind them, so it is also worthwhile to indicate how collective or cultural memory might be understood as illuminating the phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture. I have tried to indicate this by paying attention to four features in which particular rewriting strategies reflect some of the various aspects of how cultural memory works: embellishment and institutionalisation, distortion and obligation, invention and organisation, and forgetting and the capacity for reconstruction. These processes do not define Rewritten Bible more closely as a textual genre, but I believe that in some measure they improve our understanding of the processes at work in the rewriting of authoritative texts and traditions. It is still possible to endorse the need to be concerned with the analysis of a certain group of texts that clearly rewrite earlier traditions in a systematic, even sequential fashion. However, the appeal to various views about the role of cultural memory can help in describing the character of the processes of rewriting. Those processes involve a wide range of matters from attention to very specific exegetical issues to the construction and presentation of group identities.

Memory needs to be carefully defined and to be understood as including both individual and social dimensions in constructive dialogue, but it might offer one amongst several overarching categories that can describe both the minutiae of textual developments and the larger framing motivational issues that provoke full-scale rewritings.

We are left with many questions about how the movement that preserved all these compositions in their caves actually used them, but it seems to me that

the phenomenon of Rewritten Scripture is indeed partially better informed when it is recalled, in the words of Assmann, that “being that *can be remembered is text.*”⁶¹

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip S. 1987. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allison, Dale C. 2010. *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Assmann, Jan. 1995. Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique* 65: 125–33.
- . 1997. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2006. *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. (German original: *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis*. München: Beck, 2000).
- Atkins, Peter. 2004. *Memory and Liturgy: The Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Barton, Stephen C., Loren T. Stuckenbruck and Benjamin G. Wold, eds. 2007. *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)*. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. 1997. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. JSJSup 55. Leiden: Brill.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 2005. ‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness? *Textus* 22: 169–96.
- . 2010. The Genre(s) of the Genesis Apocryphon. Pages 317–43 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June–2 July 2008*. Edited by K. Berthelot and D. Stökl Ben Ezra. STDJ 94. Leiden: Brill.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. 2006. *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Study*. STI. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Brenner, Athalya, and Frank H. Polak, eds. 2009. *Performing Memory in Biblical Narrative and Beyond*. The Bible in the Modern World 25/ Amsterdam Studies in the Bible and Religion 3. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.

61 Assmann 2006, ix (italics mine).

- Brooke, George J. 2007. Types of Historiography in the Qumran Scrolls. Pages 211–30 in *Ancient and Modern Scriptural Historiography/ L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne*. Edited by G.J. Brooke and T. Römer. BETL 207. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2010. Hypertextuality and the 'Parabiblical' Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 43–64 in *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature*. Edited by P.S. Alexander, A. Lange and R.J. Pillinger. Leiden: Brill.
- Chalcraft, David J., ed. 2007. *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances*. London: Equinox.
- Charlesworth, James H. 2002. *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSLRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Davies, Philip R. 2010. What History Can We Get from the Scrolls, and How? Pages 31–46 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Contexts*. Edited by C. Hempel. STDJ 90. Leiden: Brill.
- Davis, Michael T., and Brent A. Strawn, eds. 2007. *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Dunn, James D. G. 2000. Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition. *SBLSP* 39: 287–326.
- . 2003. *Jesus Remembered*. Christianity in the Making 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Erl, Astrid, and Ansgar Nünning, eds. 2010. *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Eshel, Hanan. 2008. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State*. SDSLRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Eyerman, Ron. 2004. The Past in the Present: Culture and the Transmission of Memory. *Acta Sociologica* 47/2: 159–69.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2004. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. BibOr 18B. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute. 3rd edn.
- Gedi, Noa, and Yigal Elam. 1996. Collective Memory—What Is It? *History and Memory* 8: 30–50.
- Grossman, Maxine L., ed. 2010. *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Edited, translated and with an Introduction by Lewis A. Coser. The Heritage of Sociology. Chicago: Chicago University Press. (French originals 1941 and 1952).
- Jokiranta, Jutta. 2010a. Social Scientific Approaches to the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 246–63 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*. Edited by M.L. Grossman. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

- . 2010b. Sociological Approaches to Qumran Sectarianism. Pages 200–31 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Katriel, Tamar. 1999. Sites of Memory: Discourses of the Past in Israeli Pioneering Settlement Museums. Pages 99–135 in *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*. Edited by D. Ben-Amos and L. Weissberg. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Kelber, Werner H., and Samuel Byrskog, eds. 2009. *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2009. Eyes and Spectacles: Wellhausen's Method of Higher Criticism. *JThS* 60: 381–402.
- Laato, Antti, and Jacques van Ruiten, eds. 2008. *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24–26, 2006*. Studies in Rewritten Bible 1. Turku: Åbo Akademi University; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Le Donne, Anthony. 2009. *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David*. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Lim, Timothy H., and John J. Collins, eds. 2010. *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mendels, Doron. 2004. *Memory in Jewish, Pagan and Christian Societies of the Graeco-Roman World: Fragmented Memory—Comprehensive Memory—Collective Memory*. LSTS 45. London: T & T Clark International.
- Najman, Hindy. 2003. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. 1998. Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices. *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 105–40.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2007. Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon—Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism? Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hilhorst, É. Puech and E. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill.
- Regev, Eyal. 2007. *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. RS 45. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Rogerson, John W. 2009. *A Theology of the Old Testament: Cultural Memory, Communication and Being Human*. London: SPCK.
- Schmid, Konrad. 2012. *The Old Testament: A Literary History*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. (German original: *Literaturgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2008)

- Smith, Mark S. 2002. Remembering God: Collective Memory in Israelite Religion. *CBQ* 64: 631–51.
- Sontag, Susan. 2003. *Representing the Pain of Others*. New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. 2007. The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 75–94 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)*. Edited by S.C. Barton, L.T. Stuckenbruck and B.G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010. The Legacy of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 23–49 in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005*. Edited by E.G. Chazon, B. Halpern-Amaru and R.A. Clements. STDJ 88. Leiden: Brill.
- Swanson, Dwight D. 2004. How Scriptural is Re-Written Bible? *RevQ* 21/83: 407–27.
- Tov, Emanuel. 2012. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press. 3rd edn. revised and expanded.
- Ulrich, Eugene C. 1999. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. S.D.S.S.R.L. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Weissberg, Liliane. 1999. Introduction. Pages 7–26 in *Cultural Memory and the Construction of Identity*. Edited by D. Ben-Amos and L. Weissberg. Detroit: Wayne State University Press.
- Weissenrieder, Annette, and Robert B. Coote, eds. 2010. *The Interface of Orality and Writing: Hearing, Seeing, Writing in New Genres*. WUNT 1/260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Wold, Benjamin G. 2007. Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Exodus, Creation and Cosmos. Pages 47–74 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham–Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)*. Edited by S.C. Barton, L.T. Stuckenbruck and B.G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Zahn, Molly M. 2010. Rewritten Scripture. Pages 323–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2011. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts*. STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2012. Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment. *JBL* 131: 271–288.

Rewritten Bible and the Vocalization of the Biblical Text

Stefan Schorch

1 Vocalizing the Biblical Text

A fresco on the wall of the synagogue at Dura Europos depicts the story of Moses as a baby. The infant was put into a chest by his mother and cast among the reeds on the banks of the Nile, where Pharaoh's daughter, who is bathing, finds him. The painting consists of a series of four images. In the third, the naked princess, easily discernible by her necklet, is standing in the river beside the chest, holding the baby on her arms, while her maidens wait on the bank (see image p. 142). Clearly, the scene depicted here is based on Exod 2:5, which reads according to the Masoretic text:¹

The daughter of Pharaoh came down to bathe at the river, while her attendants walked beside the river. She saw the chest among the reeds and sent her maid to bring it (Exod 2:5 MT).

There is one obvious and significant difference between the Masoretic text and the picture. According to the Masoretic text, Pharaoh's daughter sent "her maid" (אֲמָתָהּ) to bring her the chest. In the picture, however, the princess herself enters the water and takes the boy while her maidens stand on the bank looking on. This version of the story was almost certainly not a product of carelessness or an overly active imagination, but it is based on a textual *Vorlage* which differed from the Masoretic text of Exod 2:5 with regard to the vocalization of the Hebrew consonantal framework: While the MT reads וַתִּשְׁלַח אֶת אֲמָתָהּ—“and she sent her maid,” the artist seems to have proceeded from *וַתִּשְׁלַח אֶת אֲמָתָהּ*—“and she stretched out her arm,” a reading which is well attested in some early (indirect²) vocalization witnesses, like Targum

-
- 1 Except for some minor changes, where the Hebrew text or the argument seems to have required them, biblical passages in English translation are generally from the NRSV.
 - 2 In numerous cases, the translation of the Targumim allows for a reconstruction of the vocalization of its Hebrew *Vorlage*.



FIGURE 1 *Moses found in the river. Fresco from Dura Europos synagogue*

Onkelos and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan. Both of these use “her arm,”³ which is also found in the exegetical discussions of the Tannaim.⁴ The difference in the Hebrew text between אִמָּתָה and אִמָּתָה may appear minor, but we should not let this mislead us with regard to its significance. Without a doubt, the alternative vocalizations create two narratives.⁵

That fact that two different stories emerged from alternative vocalizations of one and the same word with an identical consonantal in Exod 2:5, serves to demonstrate an important problem connected with the history of the Biblical text. Vocalization and reading are of outmost importance for the creation of the text in the mind of its reader and for the transmission of the text and its reception. Nevertheless, whereas we have manuscripts which attest the consonantal framework they only provide a very limited insight into the ways the consonantal framework was read and vocalized by readers during the Second Temple period. And given that in numerous cases an unvocalized consonan-

3 Targum Onkelos (ed. A. Sperber): ואושיטת ית אמתה; Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (ed. M. Ginsburger): ואושיטת ית גרמידה.

4 See bSota 12b: רבי יהודה ורבי נחמיה חד אמר ידה וחד אמר שפחתה—“Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Nehemia disagree: One says ‘her hand’ and the other ‘her maid.’”

5 My above remarks with regard to the vocalization of אמתה in Exod 2:5 are largely based on the masterly article by Stähli (1983), which provides many more details than I was able to include here.

tal framework was obviously open to several vocalizations,⁶ a very substantial part of the determinants of the text generally seem to have escaped our grasp.

Research into the early history of the vocalization of the Biblical text is a much neglected field;⁷ although there are some published studies dealing with the vocalization underlying the Septuagint⁸ and with the vocalization transmitted in the Samaritan reading of the Torah.⁹ This contribution will argue that research in this area would be both welcome and rewarding. Examinations of the compositions of the Rewritten Bible are required as it appears these compositions can illuminate the difficult field of Biblical vocalization on the one hand, while the study of the vocalization of the consonantal framework may shed light on the emergence of Rewritten Bible compositions on the other.

1. The origin and the early history of the vocalization of the Hebrew Bible is still a rather unknown and unexplored topic. We know very little about the ways in which certain fixed reading traditions emerged, and at which time. The Masoretic vocalization was obviously not invented by the medieval Masoretes, its origin and early transmission are still uncertain.¹⁰ Insofar the texts of the Rewritten Bible genre reflect the ways in which their respective *Vorlage* were read, these texts may help us to understand the early history of Biblical vocalization.
2. Improved knowledge of the ways in which the Biblical text was read during the Late Second Temple period may help give us a better understanding of the emergence of the texts of the Rewritten Bible genre. It is not sufficient to describe these “re-written” texts simply as products of scribal activity in the narrower sense of the word; they should in fact be viewed as products of a certain way of reading their *Vorlage* as well. After all, to some extent at least, it is the reader who creates the text.

Thus, a focus on the ways in which the Biblical text was vocalized by the authors of the Rewritten Bible texts may not only shed light on the early history of reading Biblical texts, but would appear fundamental for a more

6 Together with an analysis of the consequences, examples can be found in Schorch 2009, 169–170; also Schorch 2006.

7 See the overview provided by Tov 2012, 39–47.

8 Tov 1981, 159–174; Barr 1990; Schorch 2006.

9 Schorch 2004.

10 With respect to the emergence of the Samaritan reading tradition the picture appears somewhat clearer, see Schorch 2004, 55–62.

comprehensive understanding of the process of how the Rewritten Bible texts were created.

2 Jubilees and the Vocalization of Its 'Biblical' *Vorlage*

I would now like to make use of the Book of Jubilees as a test-case for a reading-oriented perspective on the texts of the Rewritten Bible genre.

It is a long established fact that Jubilees shares numerous textual characteristics with the Samaritan Pentateuch. In light of an analysis of the vocalization which underlies the rendering of the Biblical *Vorlage* in Jubilees it now appears that this rather general observation can—*cum grano salis*—be applied to the way in which the consonantal framework of the 'Biblical' *Vorlage* was read and understood. In not an insignificant number of cases, the vocalization which led to the text of Jubilees is paralleled by the vocalization found in the Samaritan reading of the Torah.¹¹ I would like to begin with an example which is admittedly not unambiguous with regard to the question of whether the manner in which the author of Jubilees understood the Biblical text was more determined by the consonantal framework, or more by a certain reading of the consonantal framework. The example is an illustration of the influence of reading and vocalization on the history of the Biblical text and of the fact that phenomena found in Jubilees may in fact have their roots in the reading.

It is common knowledge that Jubilees generally holds Levi in a very positive light, it even contains a fairly impartial account of the murder of Shechem's family at the hands of Simeon and Levi (Genesis 34):¹²

⁴ Simeon and Levi entered Shechem unexpectedly and effected a punishment on all the Shechemites. They killed every man whom they found in it. They left absolutely no one in it. They killed everyone in a painful way because they had violated their sister Dinah. ⁵ Nothing like this is to be done anymore from now on—to defile an Israelite woman. For the punishment had been decreed against them in heaven that they were to annihilate all the Shechemites with the sword, since they had done something shameful in Israel. ⁶ The Lord handed them over to Jacob's sons for them to uproot them with the sword and to effect punishment against them and so that there should not again be something like this within

11 For a text-critical analysis of the Samaritan reading tradition of the Torah, see Schorch 2004.

12 The Book of Jubilees is quoted according to the translation of James C. VanderKam 1989.

Israel—defiling an Israelite virgin. [. . .]¹⁷ For this reason I have ordered you: Proclaim this testimony to Israel: See how it turned out for the Shechemites and their children—how they were handed over to Jacob's two sons. They killed them in a painful way. It was a just act for them and was recorded as a just act for them.¹⁸ Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as Levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel. (Jub 30:4–6.17–18)

No such positive account can be found in the Masoretic text. On the contrary, the MT uses harsh words to criticize the attitude of Jacob's two sons, as is already expressed in Genesis 34 in a passage which describes Jacob's anger at his two sons:

Then Jacob said to Simeon and Levi, You have brought trouble on me by making me odious to the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanites and the Perizzites (Gen 34:30 MT).

In the MT version of Jacob's blessing at Gen 49:5–7, this negative attitude is even enhanced and Simeon and Levi are cursed for what they did to the Shechemites:

⁵ Simeon and Levi are brothers; weapons of violence are their swords.
⁶ May my soul never come into their council; may my honour not be joined to their company, for in their anger they killed men, and at their whim they hamstringed oxen. ⁷ Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel! I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel (Gen 49:5–7 MT).

Thus, Jubilees's perspective on Simeon and Levi departs from the Masoretic text to a considerable degree. We should therefore ask for the source of these views. As in numerous other cases, there are clues to be found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, which shares the positive judgment on the assassination of the Shechemites carried out by Simeon and Levi. Instead of the curse found in Genesis 49 of the Masoretic text, the Samaritan version reads as follows:

⁵ Simeon and Levi are brothers; their covenants terminated violence.
⁶ May my soul not interfere with their council; may my honour not be angry against their company, for in their wrath they killed men, and at

their whim they hamstrung oxen. ⁷ Mighty is their anger, for it is fierce, and their company, for it is powerful (Gen 49:5–7 SamP).

It is plain to see that the meaning of the Samaritan version is distinctly opposed to that of the Masoretic text. However, comparison of the two Hebrew texts reveals that the differences between the two versions are minute on the textual surface and they should be viewed as the outcome of a different reading of one and the same consonantal framework:

MT	SamP ¹³
שְׁמַעוֹן וְלוֹי אֲחִים	שְׁמַעוֹן וְלוֹי אֲחִים
כָּלֹו חֲמֵס מִכְּרַתֵּיהֶם :	כָּלֹו חֲמֵס מִכְּרַתֵּיהֶם
בְּסוּדָם אֶל תְּבוּא נַפְשֵׁי	בְּסוּדָם אֶל תְּבוּא נַפְשֵׁי
בְּקִהְלָם אֶל תַּחַד כְּבֹדִי	בְּקִהְלָם אֶל יַחַר כְּבוֹדִי
כִּי בְאַפְסָם הִרְגוּ אִישׁ	כִּי בְאַפְסָם הִרְגוּ אִישׁ
וּבְרִצּוֹנָם עָקְרוּ שׁוֹר :	וּבְרִצּוֹנָם עָקְרוּ שׁוֹר
אָדִיר אַפְסָם כִּי עֵז	אָדִיר אַפְסָם כִּי עֵז
וְעִבְרָתָם כִּי קִשְׁתָּהּ	וְחִבְרָתָם כִּי קִשְׁתָּהּ

The differences between these two versions can be roughly grouped into three categories:¹³

- Interchanges between letters, which in the scripts of the Second Temple period were graphically very similar (*Daleth—Resh*) or even indistinguishable (*Waw—Yod*): כָּלִי “weapon” *versus* כָּלוּ “they terminated;” אָדִיר “cursed” *versus* אָדִיר “mighty.” In the case of תַּחַד *versus* יַחַר an additional interchange of the personal prefix of the imperfect is involved.
- Interchanges between letters, which in the Hebrew dialects of the Second Temple period became phonetically indistinguishable and which

13 The consonantal framework of the Samaritan text follows Ms. Dublin Chester Beatty Library 751, which was copied in 1225 and is one of the best and oldest manuscripts of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The vocalization provided for the Samaritan Hebrew words in question reflects the Samaritan vocalization as preserved in the Samaritan reading tradition, see Ben-Hayyim 1977. In order to make the comparison between the Masoretic and Samaritan vocalization easier, the Samaritan vocalization was rendered in the Masoretic pointing system, compare Schorch 2004, 79–80.

could therefore easily interchange one with the other in the course of the scribal transmission of the text. In the present text, the variants עברתם *versus* חברתם belong to this category, involving the historical laryngals *Ayin* and *Chet* which both weakened into *Aleph* (i.e., *ʿ / *ḥ > ?).

- c. Vocalization: In the case of מכרתיהם, a different meaning is created solely through an alternative vocalization. While the Masoretic text reads מְכַרְתֵּיהֶם, which seems to carry the meaning “their swords,” the Samaritan vocalization is based on the noun **makret* “covenant (making),” which is not extant in Masoretic Hebrew but does exist in Samaritan Hebrew.

Looking at these three categories, and considering the actual differences between the two versions of Gen 49:5–7, it is obvious that a reader from the late Second Temple period could have read the text found in the (proto-) Masoretic text, or the text found in the Samaritan version on the basis of the same consonantal framework. At that time, the two were almost graphically identical. Thus, it was left to the reader to decide whether he read a text praising Simeon and Levi, or rather one which cursed the two brothers. His decision would probably have been led by tradition: Either he knew the vocalization of the consonantal framework by heart, or he could at least paraphrase the story.

As to the similarities between the Samaritan tradition and Jubilees’ account in their respective judgments of Simeon’s and Levi’s deeds, the author of Jubilees and the pre-Samaritans seem to have drawn upon the same source, not only in terms of the consonantal framework, but with regard to the way of reading this consonantal framework as well. On the one hand, the evidence from Jubilees thus helps to demonstrate that the Samaritan way of reading this passage was not exclusively pre-Samaritan but was part of a more widespread tradition of the late Second Temple period. On the other hand, a comparison between the Samaritan and the Masoretic version of Gen 49:5–7 illustrates the high measure of influence the reading had on the emergence of compositions of the Rewritten Bible genre.

I will now discuss further relevant cases from the Book of Jubilees. Admittedly, there are a few cases to discuss, as different ways of reading can only be discerned in such cases where the consonantal framework is ambiguous and can be interpreted in several ways. Nevertheless, these instances should be carefully recorded and analyzed. They will be presented here in three categories, namely:

- 2.1 Instances where Jubilees is based on a vocalization which is different from the Masoretic vocalization but agrees with the Samaritan reading tradition.

- 2.2 Instances where Jubilees is based on a vocalization which agrees with the Masoretic vocalization but disagrees with the Samaritan reading tradition.
- 2.3 Instances where Jubilees is based on a double tradition with regard to vocalization.

It would not be superfluous to note that the Samaritan vocalization, unlike the Masoretic, was never properly codified. Up until the present day, it is transmitted orally within the Samaritan community, and this reading tradition is the only comprehensive source for the Samaritan vocalization. The following quotations from the Samaritan vocalized text are taken from the transcription of this reading published by Zeev Ben-Hayyim.¹⁴

2.1 *Jubilees is based on a vocalization which agrees with the Samaritan reading, and is different from the Masoretic text*

- a) Gen 4:26 (SamP) = Jub 4:12
 In Gen 4:26, the Masoretic text reads:

To Seth also a son was born, and he named him Enosh. At that time people began to invoke the name of the LORD (אָז דּוֹחַל לְקַרְא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה) (Gen 4:26 MT).

In the last sentence, the MT contains an impersonal passive (הִדְחַל). The Samaritan text, however, contains a textual difference exactly with regard to this word. The text reads as follows:

Then he began to invoke the name of the LORD (Gen 4:26b SamP).

The difference is based upon vocalizing the verb not as a passive, but in the perfect i.e. הִדְחַל. The different vocalization causes a different meaning. According to the MT, the invocation of the name of the LORD started during Enosh's lifetime. According to the Samaritan text, however, it was specifically Enosh who started to call upon the name of the LORD. Jubilees shares the view advocated by the Samaritan reading, as can be learned from the following passage:

He was the first one to call on the Lord's name on the earth (Jub 4:12).

14 Ben-Hayyim 1977.

Thus, we may surmise that Jub 4:12 is based on the vocalization contained in the Samaritan reading of the Torah.

b) Gen 15:3 (SamP) = Jub 14:2

According to the Masoretic text in Gen 15:3, Abram says to the Lord:

You have given me no offspring, and so a slave born in my house is my heir (יִרְשׁ אֶתִּי) (Gen 15:3 SamP).

Jubilees seems to contain a different version:

He said: Lord, Lord, what are you going to give me when I go on being childless. The son of Maseq—the son of my maid servant—that is Damascene Eliezer—will be my heir (Jub 14:2).

Contrary to the participle of the Masoretic text (יִרְשׁ), Jubilees would appear to be based on a verbal form in the future. Although this difference may appear negligible, it is most probably significant, given that the Samaritan reading tradition reads this same form as an imperfect i.e. *yīrāš'* (= יִרְשׁ) "he will inherit." Thus Jub 15:3 reads as if it presupposes a vocalization of the verbal form *ירש which is identical with the vocalization in the Samaritan reading.

c) Gen 34:2 (SamP) = Jub 30:2

In Gen 34:2, the story about Shechem and Dinah, we read in the Masoretic text:

When Shechem son of Hamor the Hivite, prince of the region, saw her, he seized her and lay with her by force (Gen 34:2 MT).

The passage in question here is וַיִּשְׁכַּב אֶתֶּהּ וַיַּעֲנֶהָ, where it should be noted that the Masoretic text constructs the verb שכב with the *nota accusativi*, which apparently indicates that the female was just the object of the act, but not a real partner.¹⁵ The Samaritan reading, in contrast, adopted a different vocalization, namely *וַיִּשְׁכַּב אֶתֶּהּ which simply means "and he lay with her." It is this reading which the text of Jubilees seems to be based upon:

He lay with her and defiled her (Jub 30:2).

15 See Schorch 2000, 204.

d) Gen 41:8 (SamP) = Jub 40:1

According to Gen 41:8, Pharaoh had two dreams: One about seven plus another seven cows, and one about seven plus another seven ears of grain. According to the Masoretic text, the next morning

[...] he sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt and all its wise men. Pharaoh told them his dream (Gen 41:8 MT).

Surprisingly, despite the fact that the story had just mentioned two dreams, the last sentence of this passage refers to one dream only, using the singular of חלום “dream:” אֶת חֲלֹמֹוּ ׀. On the other hand, the Samaritan tradition reads a plural (or maybe rather a dual, the two forms are identical), namely *ēlāmo*, i.e. חֲלֹמָיו׀ “his dreams.” Similarly, Jubilees in chapter 40 says that Pharaoh told two dreams to his servants:

He told them his two dreams (Jub 40:1).

Thus, this passage seems to be based on a vocalization parallel to the Samaritan reading.

2.2 *Jubilees is based on a vocalization which agrees with the Masoretic vocalization and is different from the Samaritan reading*

a) Gen 6:4 (MT) = Jub 5:1

In the first verses of Gen 6, the well known, albeit short, story about the relations between the sons of God and the daughters of men is told. At the end, according to the Masoretic version of verse 4, the daughters of men bore children to the sons of God: וַיִּלְדוּ לָהֶם׀ “they bore children to them.”

The Samaritan reading preserves a different interpretation of the consonantal framework of these two words: *wyūldu lemma* (= וַיִּוְלְדוּ לָהֶם׀), which means: “and they beget for themselves.” While in the Masoretic version the subject of the verb is “the daughters of men,” it is “the sons of God” in the Samaritan version.

In this case, Jubilees clearly follows the text recorded in the Masoretic vocalization:

They [i.e. the daughters of men] gave birth to children for them (i.e. the sons of God) (Jub 5:1).

b) Gen 44:12 (MT) = Jub 43:7

Gen 44 tells the story of when Joseph secretly hid his cup in Benjamin's sack before his brothers' departure from Egypt. Afterwards, Joseph's steward follows them and searches their luggage:

He searched, beginning with the eldest and ending with the youngest; and the cup was found in Benjamin's sack (Gen 44:12 MT).

The last sentence of the quoted passage uses the Nif'al, indicating passive voice: וַיִּמְצָא הַגִּבִּיעַ בְּאַמְתַּחַת בְּנִימֵן. The Samaritan text, however, reads this same verb in the active: *wyimsa* (= וַיִּמְצָא), i.e.

And he [i.e. the steward] found the cup in Benjamin's sack (Gen 44:12 SamP).

In this case as with the former, Jubilees follows the Masoretic vocalization and not the Samaritan:

As he was searching among their containers, he began with the oldest and ended with the youngest. It was found in Benjamin's sack (Jub 43:7).

It is quite obvious that Jubilees contains a passive voice and is thus parallel to the Masoretic text.

c) Gen 50:5 (MT) = Jub 45:15

Gen 50:5 refers to the tomb which Jacob prepared for himself in the land of Canaan. According to the Masoretic text, this tomb was created by digging:

In the tomb that I dug for myself in the land of Canaan, there you shall bury me (Gen 50:5 MT).

In the Masoretic text, the making of the tomb is described with the verb כר"ה "to dig:" לִי כָרַיתִי אֶשְׂרָא בְּקִבְרִי. Within the Samaritan tradition however, the form is vocalized in a different way, namely *kāratti* (= כָּרַתִּי) "I hewed out," i.e. it is derived from the root כר"ת "to cut."

Jubilees rewriting of this passage seems to follow the Masoretic vocalization:

He slept with his fathers and was buried near his father Abraham in the double cave in the land of Canaan—in the grave which he had dug for himself in the double cave in the land of Hebron (Jub 45:15).

Admittedly, this is a more complex case, as the two roots כר"ה and כר"ת are semantically very close, and it may therefore have been difficult to make an exact distinction between them.

2.3 *Jubilees is Based on a Double Tradition*

Comparing the evidence presented thus far with regard to passages of the biblical text vocalized in different ways, Jubilees follows the vocalization preserved in the Masoretic text against a different vocalization handed down in the Samaritan reading in three out of seven cases. In four out of seven cases, it expresses the vocalization found in the Samaritan text against a different Masoretic vocalization. So, interestingly enough, the well-known preference in Jubilees for a text close to the so-called pre-Samaritan textual tradition seems to be somehow paralleled by the Jubilees author's slight inclination toward the vocalization which has been preserved in the Samaritan reading; although it must be said that the number of relevant cases is low and therefore insignificant from a statistical point of view.

Nevertheless, the fact that the Jewish author of Jubilees based himself on "proto-Samaritan" vocalization seems to provide further evidence that the vocalization handed down in the Samaritan reading tradition is not "sectarian" in origin, but proceeded from a Hebrew literary culture which was prevalent in both Judah and Samaria, and common to proto-Samaritans and Jews alike during the period of the Second Jerusalem Temple. Thus the Samaritan reading tradition with regard to the vocalization of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch has its roots in traditions which predate the break between Samaritans and Jews at the end of the 2nd century BCE.

There is one further conclusion which may be drawn from the above presented evidence. Namely, that within this common literary culture, the "proto-Samaritan" and "proto-Masoretic" vocalization existed side by side, similarly to the evidence with regard to the consonantal framework gathered from the Hebrew manuscripts found at Qumran.

The simultaneous existence of parallel versions of a text, which emerged from different readings and different vocalization, could well mean that readers or scribes were aware of more than one textual version. We can therefore surmise that a reader/scribe from the time of the Second Jerusalem Temple knew both the "proto-Samaritan" and the "proto-Masoretic" vocalization of a certain text. In one instance, Jubilees seems to contain a "double tradition," pointing to the awareness of more than one vocalization.

Genesis 15 gives an account of God's covenant with Abram and Abram's offering to God. With regard to the latter, we read as follows:

⁹ He said to him, Bring me a heifer three years old, a female goat three years old, a ram three years old, a turtledove, and a young pigeon. ¹⁰ He brought him all these and cut them in two, laying each half over against the other; but he did not cut the birds in two. ¹¹ And when birds of prey came down on the carcasses, Abram shooed them away (Gen 15:9–11 MT).

In the last sentence of this passage, the MT contains a Hif'il of the root **יִשָּׁב** **ב"ב**: **אֵתָם אֶבְרָם: נִשְׁב"ב**. There is a body of evidence that the vocalization of this verbal form was controversial in antiquity. The Septuagint translates it as: *καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς Ἀβραμ*—"and Abram sat together with them."¹⁶ This rendering seems to have proceeded from a vocalization completely different from that of the Masoretic text, namely ***אָתָם יִשָּׁב**. Thus, according to the Septuagint, Abram did not scare the hungry birds away, but had a kind of picnic with them—this textual difference goes back only to a different vocalization.

Apart from the vocalization preserved in the Masoretic text, and the vocalization implied by the Septuagint, a third vocalization is preserved in the Samaritan reading tradition. The Samaritans vocalize the same consonants as **אָתָם יִשָּׁב** "and he drove them back," i.e. they read a Hif'il of the root **שׁו"ב**.

In Jubilees, the story of Abraham and the bird appears in chapter 14:

Birds kept coming down on what was spread out, but Abram kept preventing them and not allowing the birds to touch them (Jub 14:12).

This rendering certainly does not reflect the vocalization of the Greek translator. And although the semantic difference between the Samaritan "drive back" (**שׁו"ב** Hif.) and the Masoretic "shoo away" (**נִשְׁב"ב** Hif.) is not very great, Jubilees still seems to be closer to the vocalization of the Masoretic text.

However, in chapter 11 of Jubilees, which contains the well-known story of Abraham the peasant who endeavors to save his seed on the field from hungry birds, yet another passage seems to draw at the same Biblical source of Gen 15:

As a cloud of ravens came to eat the seed, Abram would run at them before they could settle on the ground. He would shout at them before they could settle on the ground to eat the seed and would say: Do not come down; return to the place from which you came! And they returned. That day he did [this] to the cloud of ravens 70 times. Not a single raven remained in any of the fields where Abram was. All who were with him in

16 The Septuagint is quoted according to the Göttingen edition; the translation is from NETS.

any of the fields would see him shouting: then all of the ravens returned [to their place] (Jub 11:19–21).

It is highly likely this passage was influenced by the offering-story from Gen 15 and, if so, the text is obviously based on the reading “and he drove them back” (וַיִּשְׁבּ אֹתָם), known from the Samaritan vocalization.

Therefore, Jubilees seems to attest both readings of the verb—the Samaritan וַיִּשְׁבּ in Jub 11:19–21, and the Masoretic וַיִּשְׁבּ in Jub 14:12. In other words, Jubilees preserves a double tradition. What is lacking in Jubilees is the vocalization which then became the basis of the Septuagint translation.

Conclusion

One of the points of departure for the idea of Rewritten Bible is the assumption that there was a relatively fixed Biblical text in front of the author of the respective Rewritten Bible composition. The present article, with the help of examples taken from Jubilees, argued that references to the Biblical text should not only consider the consonantal framework, but should also examine the vocalization of this consonantal framework.

On the other hand, and most pertinent to the argument, the different witnesses for the vocalization of Biblical Hebrew texts, especially the Masoretic text and the Samaritan reading tradition, preserve reading traditions which originate in the late Second Temple period or even before. Thus, compositions of the Rewritten Bible genre may help to reconstruct the development of reading Biblical texts in this early period.

Generally, one should realize that vocalization has been a factor of no less importance—as a source, a point of departure, or a matter of dissociation—than the consonantal framework in both the course of textual transmission and the process of re-writing of Biblical compositions.

Bibliography

- Barr, James. 1990. ‘Guessing’ in the Septuagint, Pages 19–34 in *Studien zur Septuaginta: Robert Hanhart zu Ehren; aus Anlaß seines 65. Geburtstages*. Edited by D. Fraenkel and U. Quast. MSU 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Ben-Hayyim, Zeev 1977. עברית וארמית נוסח שומרון, כרך ד': מלי תורה (The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans, vol. IV: The Words of the Pentateuch, Hebr.). Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.

- Ginsburger, Moses, ed. 1903. *Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Uziel zum Pentateuch) nach der Londoner Handschrift (Brit. Mus. add. 27031) hrsg. von M. Ginsburger*. Berlin: Calvary.
- Schorch, Stefan. 2000. *Euphemismen in der Hebräischen Bibel*. OBC 12. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2004. *Die Vokale des Gesetzes: Bücher Mehrteiliges Werk: Die Vokale des Gesetzes: Die samaritanische Lesetradition als Textzeugin der Tora; Band 1: Das Buch Genesis*. BZAW 339. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- . 2006. The Septuagint and the vocalization of the Hebrew text of the Torah. Pages 41–54 in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Edited by M.K.H. Peters. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- . 2009. *Communio lectorum: Die Rolle des Lesens für die Textualisierung der israelitischen Religion*. Pages 167–184 in *Die Textualisierung der Religion*. Edited by J. Schaper. FAT 62. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stähli, Hans-Peter. 1983. „Da schickte sie ihre Magd . . .“ (Ex 2,5): Zur Vokalisation eines hebräischen Wortes—ein Beispiel des Ringens um das richtige Textverständnis. *Wort und Dienst: Jahrbuch der Kichlichen Hochschule Bethel* N.F. 17: 27–54.
- Sperber, Alexander, ed. 1959–1973. *The Bible in Aramaic: based on old manuscripts and printed texts*. Leiden: Brill (4 volumes).
- Tov, Emanuel. 1981. *The text-critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical research*. Jerusalem Biblical Studies; 3. Jerusalem: Simor.
- . 2012³ *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- VanderKam, James C. 1989. *The Book of Jubilees. A Critical Text*. CSCO 510/Scriptores Aethiopicici 88. Louvain: Peeters.

PART 3

Case Studies



Inner Biblical Rewritings

••

Reuse of Prophecy in the Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets

Rewriting and Canonization

István Karasszon

Introduction

In the last two centuries Biblical scholarship has had a twin-sister in Oriental studies. Twins are often similar, and they can easily be mixed up; normally they are on good terms, but we also know exceptions to the rule: they can also hate one another. Traditionally this latter situation is the case when biblical scholars speak of source criticism, and even of redactional criticism, in their explanations of the Bible: Students of the ancient Near East say that they would not believe all this because the texts of their studies never imply that kind of re-working, re-writing which is supposed in biblical texts. They even impute to their colleagues in the field of exegesis that, since the Hebrew Bible is so small a corpus, they tend to make simple things complicated. One may deny this kind of argumentation by saying that the biblical canon is unique in the ancient world. Texts of the ancient Near East had been buried under the earth for centuries, and the great discoveries in the last two centuries had to re-discover them—that is why they have remained unchanged until our time. The biblical canon, on the other hand, has always been something different. People handed the texts down throughout centuries and their formation as text, and later as canon, made changes necessary. In my judgment, this kind of dialogue is, though justified, not fruitful. It necessarily leads to a vicious circle. And am I mistaken if I presume that we now have good opportunities to break through this vicious circle? Students of the texts of the ancient Near East now realize that the formation of literary traditions was quite similar in Mesopotamia and in Israel. The destruction of Babel by Sennacherib and its ideological explanation create a history, according to Stephanie Dalley, and this literary theme was taken up by authors who lived centuries later than the event.¹ Karel van der Toorn describes the social status and the activity of scribes, which were quite similar in Mesopotamia and Israel.² And, when speaking of canon, Albert de

1 See Dalley 2007.

2 See van der Toorn 2007.

Pury and Nina L. Collins showed that the formation of a Hellenistic literary canon was also a model that moulded the composition of the Greek Bible.³

All this, however, does not mean that the canon, as such, was invented by Greeks. On the contrary: the Greek religion never produced a compilation of a religiously binding set of literature. The scholarly activities referred to above speak only of similar activities in producing and preserving literature. Precursors of the Hebrew canon emerged in the history of Israel much earlier than the Hellenistic impact on the country. In the last two decades scholars have repeatedly referred to the formation of the Pentateuch under Persian rule, which might have been the first step on the road to the canon. It is said that the Pentateuch was at first not so much a religious canon, but rather a law book, which inaugurated the province of Yehud amongst the satrapies of the Persian Empire.⁴ As far as I see, it is debated whether Persian authorities required the compilation of this law book in order to judge Israel on the basis of the ancient legal traditions of the country. Though reference is made to the Egyptian law at the same time, and especially to the Letoon trilingual inscription, some scholars do not find these parallels conclusive.⁵ Wide-spread agreement is, however, that the Pentateuch was the result of the legislation in Persian times, and it is also said that the twofold designation of the Pentateuch, the Hebrew *torah* and the Aramaic *dat*,⁶ is a sign of two different understandings of the same book: the binding tradition of Israel on the one side, and the Persian law, which was valid on the soil of the province of Yehud on the other.

In this paper, however, I address the second part of the canon, the Prophets. The interpretation of prophetic literature has always faced a special difficulty, which was formulated for the first time, as far as I know, by the great Jewish

3 De Pury 1999. In the final chapter entitled "Bilan et conclusion" He writes: "Le modèle de ces entreprises doit être cherché dans l'établissement de canons littéraires par les représentants de la culture grecque, notamment à Alexandrie." (p. 109).

Collins 2000, is a profound study of the origins of the translation of the Bible into Greek. The author thinks that the first version of the *Letter of Aristeas* recorded some of the historical facts about the initiative of the Hellenistic king of Egypt, Ptolemy II. Her conclusion is that "There is little doubt that the Aramaic speaking Jews of Hellenistic Egypt in the early third century BCE, did not want or need a translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch into Greek. As Aristeas hints at the beginning of his account, and as he suggests at the end, the translation was made despite Jewish opposition because Ptolemy II wanted to further his reputation by enlarging his library and attracting scholars to his court." (p. 181).

4 See the bold hypothesis of Koch and Frei 1984.

5 It is not the goal of this study to summarize the research. Instead I refer the reader to the Symposium edited by Watts 2001.

6 I think the remarks of Rendtorff (1984) on the choice of words in Ezra are still valid.

scholar of the nineteenth century: L. Zunz, who wrote about the book of Ezekiel that it was possibly not so much the document of the prophecies of a prophet from the sixth century BCE, rather a literary composition from the second century BCE. He might have been right or wrong with this assertion; the exegesis of this book in the twentieth century had to work hard with his legacy.⁷ What is more, the dichotomy, documents of ancient prophecies or literary works, is characteristic of the whole of the prophetic books of the Old Testament. Formerly, scholars endeavoured to separate the original prophetic sayings from the subsequent redactional additions, but now the overall climate has changed. It is now stressed that the original prophetic activity did not include producing books. It was performance and not writing. Consequently, the final form of the prophetic books owes much to the theological work of scribes in the post-exilic age. Indeed, the formation of the prophecies as books is a theological achievement, which should be taken seriously by later interpreters.

Redactions or Rewritings of the Twelve Minor Prophets

All this applies to the book of the Twelve Minor Prophets. The artistic feature of this composition cannot be denied. The book of Jonah is not a prophetic book; the book of Malachi contains no prophetic performance and seems to be a written prophetic tractate; some of the prophets are elusive among the prophets, such as Joel or Habakkuk. Since the first century Jewish scholars mentioned these works as one book, and we are justified in turning toward the similarities that hold these books together, that is, in discovering these books as literary products.

There are many attempts to explain the book of the Twelve Prophets in these terms, both in Europe and in the US. They are quite different and their working methods are also not always the same. European colleagues in general do meticulous works of redactional criticism; they discover a series of similar wordings, similar ideas that then speak in favour of a redactional layer. American colleagues quite often work with compositional arguments and show that, within the book of the Twelve, different compositional entities can be discovered. Both methods are productive, provided that they are done well, but the results differ. Outsiders might be misled by the differences among scholarly achievements and are inclined to think that the results are not assured.

7 Cf. the history of scholarly activities on the book of Ezekiel in Feist 1995.

Let us then begin with the most secure knowledge of the formation of book of the Twelve. In my judgment, Jörg Jeremias's works on the books of Hosea and Amos are quite reliable, and we can say that the first step of producing books on the basis of former prophecies was a kind of harmonization between the role of Hosea and that of Amos.⁸ Amos was, perhaps, a Judean peasant who followed God's call and went to the North to prophecy there. What he might have prophesied cannot be said with certainty. Perhaps he turned against the altar of Bethel; perhaps he prophesied against foreign nations also. It may be that he criticized the social life of Israel. It is not excluded that he transformed the eschatological ideas of contemporary Israelite thought: the day of the Lord is not radiant, rather it implies darkness and judgment. Discerning the original sayings of Amos differs widely in Jeremias's works and in those of his teacher, H.W. Wolff. The historical person of Hosea is much less secure; practically we do not know anything about him. Perhaps he criticized the royal house of Israel. It may be that he referred to the ancient legal traditions of Israel. We cannot rule out that he criticised the chaotic political circumstances in the country and took a position in the context of the Syro-Ephraimite war. It is debated whether he would have used the religious traditions of Jacob and Moses.⁹ But it is virtually certain that he did not use the symbol of adultery and that his sayings were reworked in Southern circles.

What we can be sure is, however, that Hosea was unlikely to have criticized the altar of Bethel. He rather turned himself against the idolatrous cult in the country—against the foreign gods (*b^e'alīm*) and not against cult places. However, we read about the calves of Bethaven in chapter 10! If we are correctly informed, the condemnation of the sanctuary of Bethel was the aim of Amos. A further remark: In Hosea 1, we read about God's ceasing to have mercy upon the house of Israel (*lō 'ōszīf 'ōd*), just like in Am 7:8 and 8:2. But in Hosea this formula is difficult, because it stands at the beginning of the book, even though it presupposes that God had formerly had mercy. Highly remarkable is the idea in both of the books that the prophet would become an enemy of the people: a plumbline (*'anak*) in Am 7:8, and a snare (*pah*) in Hos 9:7. Normally we are used to the harsh words of the prophets, but they mediate the chances of returning and salvation even through judgment. To summarize, it is quite certain that there is a redactional layer in the books of Hosea and Amos,

8 Jörg Jeremias wrote many studies on this subject. However, one best consults his commentaries in the series *Das Alte Testament Deutsch* on both prophetic books Jeremias 1983; 1995. Some of his studies are re-edited in the volume Jeremias 1996. See also his recent attempt to make a difference between the two prophetic figures: Jeremias 2012.

9 See the discussion in de Pury 1992; 1994 and Römer 2007.

and the goal of inserting this layer into the prophecies of both prophets was to harmonize their respective preaching. Though we do not know very much about the historical figures, it is plausible to believe that they were quite different persons. The layer tried to reduce these different persons to a common denominator: they both were messengers of the same God and, consequently, they must have used the same ideas and wordings. With certainty we can say that none of these prophets produced literature. Their work was performance, and harmonizing their preaching made literary activity necessary.

By saying that this result would be the most secure achievement of recent redactional criticism, I have also suggested that the following will be less secure. In my judgment this is because research is being done in two different directions. The first tries to bring more and more books into the composition of Hosea–Amos, and the second endeavours to discern different thematic layers within the already existing prophetic books.

Among those scholars who assume that the formation of the book of the Twelve was a process of expansion by further books, perhaps the most convincing is A. Schart.¹⁰ He thinks that the book of Two was expanded by two further books: that of Micah and Zephaniah. I discuss this idea first, because this expansion is sometimes identified with a redactional layer, that of the Deuteronomistic redaction (also by Schart himself). The most striking feature of this layer is the reformulation of the social criticism of the eighth century prophets.¹¹ The same is true of Micah chapters 3 and 6, but Zeph 2:4–3:8 also show similarities to Amos 1–2. Additionally, it is also interesting that the wording of the criticism of Hosea is rendered valid for Judah in Mic 1:2–7 as well. In the view of Schart (and J. Nogalski),¹² in the process of transmission of prophetic books, not only new books were attached to the former compositions, but the texts were re-worked. Basic ideas of this re-working were the presentation of the will of God and the fall of Israel, as well as the interpretation of the history of Israel, including the role of the prophets in it. Typical of this layer is that the sporadic criticism of former prophets is presented as elementary to the society of Israel (Schart: *systemimmanente Kritik*).

The next step is assumed to be the inclusion of the books of Nahum and Habakkuk into the composition. The identification of the redactional layer is

10 See Schart 1998, especially 156–233.

11 See chapter 5.5.3.7 in Schart 1998, 231.

12 See most recently Nogalski 2012. He reiterates on pp. 258–259: “Yet, Samaria is only mentioned in Mic 1:5–6 where Samaria’s destruction is used as a warning to Jerusalem. These references in 1:5–6 echo the language of Amos and Hosea.”

easy in view of the hymnic parts in both books. It is commonly acknowledged that the acrostic hymn in Nahum 1 functions as an attachment to the end of the book of Micah.¹³ The main theological reason for including these books was that the contents of both were regarded as the fulfilment of the judgment oracles in Hosea and Amos. The former judgment could be responded to with hymns of theophany, but this appearing of God on the scene is also an addition to the former tradition. God is described in these hymns (so in Habakkuk 3 and in the so-called doxologies in Amos) as the ruler of the world, almost in cosmic dimensions.

The re-interpretation of former prophecies seemed to be of vital importance. The comparison between Hag 2:17 and Am 4:9 shows this graphically.¹⁴

הַלִּיתִי אֶתְכֶם בְּשֹׁדָפוֹן וּבִירְקוֹן וּבְבָרָד אֶת כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה יְדֵיכֶם וְאִין־אֶתְכֶם
 אֵלַי נְאֻם־יְהוָה:
 הַלִּיתִי אֶתְכֶם בְּשֹׁדָפוֹן וּבִירְקוֹן... and וְלֹא־שָׁבַתְתֶּם עָדֵי נְאֻם־יְהוָה:

The insertion of the books of Haggai and Zechariah was important inasmuch as they show that the judgment of God was fulfilled with the Babylonian exile. In Zechariah the new visions say that the former punishment of God is closed and a new era of prophecy begins. By doing this, the redactional activity not only introduced the future series of prophetic activity, but it also codified the corpus of pre-exilic prophecy. Thus, its corpus became quasi-canonical with this act. The dichotomy of pre-exilic and post-exilic prophecy emerged; we all remember that this dichotomy still prevailed in the research of the twentieth century.

We may recall our studies at university several decades ago. Our teachers had enormous difficulties in describing the historical figure of Joel, and my professors were also not sure of the time he lived. In the view of recent redactional criticism, almost the whole of the book of Joel is to be attributed to redactional activity. This book can only be read against the background of Hosea, Amos and Zephaniah. Joel 4:1, 3:4 and 2:15 can be understood in line with the book of Amos; Joel 2:23, 1:10–12, 2:26–27 and 4:1 in line with the book of Hosea; Joel 1:15, 2:2, 2:10 and 4:2 in line with the book of Zephaniah. In Nogalski's understanding, the book of Obadiah draws heavily on the book of Amos.¹⁵ The most important contribution of this layer is the reiteration of God's judgment of

13 See Schart 1998, 242ff.

14 See Schart 1998, 255.

15 So Nogalski 1993, 61–68. See also Nogalski 1996. In addition, pp. 104–105 elaborate on Jeremiah 49 also, where he thinks that Amos 9 influenced both the book of Obadiah and that of Jeremiah.

the nations. Ob 1:21 mentions the kingdom of God, but the most important idea is the political role of the eschatological community of the people of God.

The final step is the attachment of two strange writings to the composition. The book of Jonah is not a prophetic book. It is a novel, and its main figure is almost a caricature of a prophet. It is assumed that the aim of this book was to protect Israelites from misunderstanding prophecy. Israel's prophetic heritage can never make members of the people arrogant. As to the form and genre of the book, it is an exception to the rule; as to its theology, we may call its position rather crucial. The book of Malachi is, once again, something unique: quite clearly it is a written prophecy (*Schriftprophezie*), even though prophecy is not writing but performance. As Utzschneider argued, the book draws heavily on Ezekiel,¹⁶ but, of course, there are common points with Haggai and Zechariah also. The book is clearly composed in order to close the prophetic canon.

The question arises almost automatically: what about the attribution of these different layers of redaction to different times? This is extremely important in redaction criticism, but scholars of this recent trend are very cautious: They only state a relative chronology, that is, the succession of the redactions after one another. Perhaps the first step was done before the exile, and the Deuteronomistic redaction of the four prophetic books was produced during the exile, while the last step dates to the third century BCE.

In dating the different layers, are those scholars more courageous who stress the thematic character of the redactions? J. Wöhrle, for example, agrees with the above that the first three steps are identical in his work also, and he dates the insertion of the books of Haggai and Zechariah to the beginnings of the fifth century BCE. Hereafter, however, he differs in his understanding of the layers. He thinks that at the turn of the fifth/fourth century a corpus of oracles against foreign nations was inserted in the transmitted text. The fourth century produced a series of oracles about the Davidic dynasty, which is represented in Amos 9, Micah 4 and 5 and Zechariah 9. The transition to the Hellenistic era was also marked by a new series of oracles against the nations, as expressed in Joel 4, Zechariah 10 and 14, and Malachi 1. But soon after that a correction was made: a redactional layer with the theme of 'salvation for the peoples' (*Heil für die Völker*) was introduced into the context which prophesied the stream of foreign nations to Zion.¹⁷ The last layer was that of grace (*Gnaden-Korpus*) in

16 See Utzschneider 1989. As far as I see, Reventlow (1993) agrees in his commentary.

17 Wöhrle 2008, 335ff. In his wording: "Die der Heil-für-die-Völker-Schicht zugewiesenen Worte zeichnen sich also allesamt dadurch aus, dass hier der gesamten Völkerwelt eine Heilsmöglichkeit verheißen wird und diese an das Kommen der Völker zum Zion und an die dort zu vollziehende Verehrung Jhwhs gebunden ist." (p. 340).

the second half of the third century.¹⁸ Micah 6 and the additions to the acrostic hymn in Nahum 1, as well as redactional parts of the book of Jonah, are involved in the formation of this layer. Wöhrle also agrees that the book of Malachi was thought to be the closure of the prophetic canon.

Conclusion

Any kind of conclusion would be premature. As it has been shown above, parts of these two approaches are overlapping, but the two ways of procedure seem to exclude one another. Nevertheless, this direction of research sheds more light on the literary techniques of ancient authors and redactors and elucidates the first steps that finally led to 'rewriting' the Bible. The redaction of the book of the Twelve Minor Prophets shows us how the spoken words of the prophets became books and were then subject to further interpretations. The late O.H. Steck said it rightly: closing the prophetic books meant also preparing canonization. It is hoped that research on the 'rewritten Bible' would be enriched by results of the recent redactional criticism of the Twelve Minor Prophets.¹⁹

Bibliography

- Collins, Nina L. 2000. *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek*. VTSup 82. Leiden: Brill.
- Dalley, Stephanie. 2007. *Esther's Revenge at Susa. From Sennacherib to Ahasuerus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feist, Udo. 1995. *Ezechiel. Das literarische Problem des Buches forschungsgeschichtlich betrachtet*. BWANT 138. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Jeremias, Jörg. 1983. *Der Prophet Hosea*, ATD. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1995. *Der Prophet Amos*, ATD. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1996. *Hosea und Amos. Studien zu den Anfängen des Dodekapropheten*. FAT 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

18 Wöhrle 2008, 405: "Die der Gnadenschicht zugewiesenen Textbereiche sind also allesamt durch Aufnahmen aus der in Ex 34,6 belegten Gnadenformel bestimmt, was schon deutlich dafür spricht, dass diese Worte kaum unabhängig voneinander entstanden sein dürften. Dafür spricht nun auch, dass die Nachträge der Gnadenschicht noch über die genannten Aufnahmen der Gnadenformel hinaus durch einige markante terminologische Parallelen verbunden sind."

19 The author wishes to thank Revd. J.F. Brouwer for his English corrections.

- . 2012. Die Kritik an Samaria im Amos- und Hoseabuch. Pages 271–286 in *Die Stadt im Zwölfprophetenbuch*. Edited by A. Schart and J. Krispenz. BZAW 428. Berlin / Boston: de Gruyter.
- Koch, Klaus and Frei, Peter. 1984. *Reichsidee und Reichsorganisation im Perserreich*. OBO 55. Göttingen / Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht / Universitätsverlag.
- Nogalski, James D. 1993. *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve*. BZAW 218. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.
- . 1996. Intertextuality and the Twelve. Pages 102–124 in *Forming Prophetic Literature. Essays on Isaiah and the Twelve in Honor of John D.W. Watts*. Edited by J.W. Watts and P.R. House. JSOTS 235. Sheffield: Academic Press.
- . 2012. Jerusalem, Samaria, and Bethel in the Book of the Twelve. Pages 251–269 in *Die Stadt im Zwölfprophetenbuch*. Edited by A. Schart / J. Krispenz. BZAW 428. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter.
- Pury, Albert de. 1994. Hos 12 und die Auseinandersetzung um die Identität Israels und seines Gottes. Pages 413–429 in *Ein Gott allein? JHWH-Verehrung und biblischer Monotheismus im Kontext der israelitischen und altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*. Edited by W. Dietrich and M.A. Klopfenstein. OBO 139. Göttingen / Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht / Universitätsverlag.
- . 1992. Osée 12 et ses implications pour le débat actuel sur le Pentateuque. Pages 175–207 in *Le Pentateuque. Débats et recherches*. Edited by P. Haudebert. LD 151. Paris: Cerf.
- Pury, Albert de. 1999. Qohéleth et le canon des *Ketubim*. Pages 75–110 in *Situer Qohéleth. Regards croisés sur un livre biblique*. Edited by M. Rose. Neuchâtel: Secretariat de l'Université.
- Rendtorff, Rolff. 1984. Esra und das 'Gesetz'. ZAW 96: 165–184.
- Reventlow, H. Graf. 1993. *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi*. ATD 25,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Römer, Thomas. 2007. Les histoires des Patriarches et la légende de Moïse: une double origine? Pages 155–196 in *Comment la Bible saisit-elle l'histoire?* Edited by D. Doré. LD 215. Paris: Cerf.
- Schart, Aaron. 1998. *Die Entstehung des Zwölfprophetenbuchs. Neubearbeitungen von Amos im Rahmen schriftenübergreifender Redaktionsprozesse*. BZAW 260. Berlin / New York: de Gruyter.
- Toorn, Karel. van der. 2007. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, Mass. / London: Harvard University Press.
- Utzschneider, Helmut. 1989. *Künder oder Schreiber? Eine These zum Problem der 'Schriftprophetie' auf Grund von Maleachi 1,6–2,9*. BEATAJ 19. Frankfurt / Bern: Peter Lang.

- Watts, James W. 2001. *Persia and Torah. The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch*. SBLSS 17. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Wöhrlé, Jakob. 2008. *Der Abschluss des Zwölfprophetenbuches. Buchübergreifende Redaktionsprozesse in den späten Sammlungen*. BZAW 389. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.

On the Battlefield and Beyond: The Reinterpretation of the Moabite-Israelite Encounters in 2 Chronicles 20

Előd Hodossy-Takács

What are the Chronicles? Is this book simply a collection of sermons? How can we interpret the statement that the so-called historical books of the Hebrew Bible are theological commentaries on Israelite history? And just to continue: what is history? Is recorded history more than an accurate presentation of a series of events in the proper chronological order with careful conclusions? What is the aim of historical writing: Documentation? Keeping memories? If that's all, why do we have parallel narratives of events? In our 'histories,' we are dealing with events, records and interpretations—assuming that there is indeed a difference between the last two categories. To a certain extent history writing as such is interpretation; in this case of inner-biblical rewriting we find a revision of previous interpretations.

The difference between the accounts of Kings and Chronicles lies in the nature of these sources. If we wish to describe the style of history writing, the former (Kings) is a historian and the second (Chronicles) is a writer. As E. Merrill wrote recently:

The chronicler, like any other researcher, depended on his sources but felt free to use them in a way that reflected his own peculiar circumstances, heritage, experiences, and objectives. Differences between him and his sources are therefore not indicative of sloppiness or revisionism on his part; instead they contribute to the veracity and effectiveness of the account while reflecting the chronicler's own unique personality and situation.¹

The writers of Chronicles adapted the writings of Kings and other well-known texts to suit their ideas. Naturally the scribes behind Kings did not use their sources as modern historians do, but they tried to evaluate the events as they saw them.² The Chronicles were not written to compete with Kings, but it is also misleading to see and use these texts as supplements. Kings and Chronicles are

1 Merrill 2008, 397–412.

2 van der Toorn 2007, 161–162.

testimonies of different views; they must be evaluated and “taken seriously for what they are, theological interpretations of the history and presentations of its meaning for the readers of the time.”³

We can look at these statements in light of a series of documented events; our key text is 2 Chronicles 20. This account deals with conflicts of Moab and Judah, with Jehoshaphat, the 9th century BCE king of Jerusalem acting as the key figure. We know that this was the period before the advent of the Assyrian hegemony over the region. In addition to the prominent kingdoms of Israel (Samaria) and Syria (Damascus), some less important regional powers competed in the region. Judah was sometimes no more than a vassal of Israel; the Transjordanian kingdoms of Ammon, Moab⁴ and Edom reached a higher level of statehood during the period. As a result, they tried to form independent local states (early states⁵), and naturally this attempt led to conflicts with the more developed club. We find some quite extensive texts dealing with the clash of the petty kingdoms, both in the Hebrew Bible and in other writings. I am going to deal with three of these: the Mesha Inscription, 2 Kings 3, and 2 Chronicles 20. For our present purposes the detailed analysis of the selected texts is not important. Instead we will focus on their nature and purpose, and we will try to understand the aims of their authors.

At the beginning of our research it is necessary to ask the simple question: Are we really dealing with a rewritten text here or simply a new composition? Generally speaking, we have to find conscious modifications, additions and/or omissions for making our decision. In the title of the present paper, I use the term “reinterpretation” instead of “rewritten text,” because in our case even the identification of the possible source text is controversial.

The Mesha Inscription—Nature and Goal

According to the first text, the Moabites gained independence from their Israelite overlords after the death of King Ahab of Israel (son of Omri). Naturally in the wording of the Hebrew Bible it is a rebellious act. The text itself is an inscription on basalt (also called: Mesha Stele); at present it contains 34 lines. It was discovered in 1868 and published in 1870—here, in this particular

3 Ackroyd 1970, 297.

4 Younker 1997, 240–245.

5 Cleassen and Skalnik 1978; Spence 2004; Steiner 2001; Smith 2006.

conference we may also mention that the first Hungarian translation became available for the public as early as 1872 (by Mór Ballagi).⁶

Royal ideology pervades the text. The key ideas (like the emphasis laid on the well-known *cherem*), and for those familiar with the Bible, the diction is reminiscent of Deuteronomy. Through the entire record we sense a religious propaganda, an unmistakable sign of ancient Near Eastern victory-texts. It begins with the proud introductory formula: *I am Mesha, son of Kemoshyat, king of Moab*; continued by assurance of his royal descent, *my father ruled over Moab thirty years, and I ruled after my father*. Without this statement the reader may have a strange feeling that he was a simple army commander, talented and cruel enough to rise in power up to the throne. Still from the introduction we learn that our hero was delivered *from all the kings* by the strength of Kemosh, and his god let him *prevail over his enemies*. The main enemy was Omri, the king of Israel, who oppressed Moab *for many days, because Kemosh was angry with his country*. but in the days of Mesha fortune turned and one of the successors of Omri lost the territories North of the biblical Arnon gorge (Wadi Mujib).⁷ The main purpose of this text is to maintain the memory of the glorious freedom fights of the Moabites led by king Mesha against the Israelites.

But it is not just that. We learn that Mesha fought for and took 'Atarot, Nebo, Yahaz, but we hear nothing about the other towns,⁸ although he boasts about *hundreds of cities which I had annexed to the country*. We do not read about the march of the army, nothing about weapons or the incompetence of the enemy. Instead of the details of the war, Mesha writes about his building projects. He made reservoirs, built walls, gates and towers, and dug ditches, *made a highway at the Arnon*; and besides all these, he settled down a large number of people. This has nothing to do with the immediate war victory. At the beginning Mesha explains why he erected this stele: *I made this high place for Kemosh in Qarhoh, because he delivered me . . .*—that is he also built a high place, a sanctuary. The last few lines of the text (31b onward) deal with events in Southern Moab. Here the king receives a new commission: *Chemosh said to me: 'Go down, fight against Hauronen.'* *And I went down [. . .]*. Unfortunately the last part of the text is missing.

6 Hodossy-Takács 2008. In the present paper the translation of Kent P. Jackson is used, in Dearman 1989, 97–98.

7 Ahlström 1993, 579–580.

8 In l. 2 Mesha calls himself *the Dibonite*. Until recently this was understood as the name of his capital, but it is also possible that the term denoted his tribe. Mesha in this sense was a tribal leader, who forged a tribal confederation into a tribal kingdom. The name of his capital would be Qarhoh (l. 3.); Steen and Smelik 2007.

Mesha was no doubt a talented fighter, but his deeds after the war were equally important. Some scholars call this text a building inscription.⁹ But this stele is more than that: it keeps the memory of the great state founder, king of the Moabites with all his deeds. This is a memorial stele.¹⁰ The Mesha Inscription is also a masterpiece of the ideology of war in the Ancient Near East. The king was made competent by his divine counterpart, Chemosh, who tells him where to go and with whom to fight (l. 14: *Now Chemosh said to me: 'Go seize Nebo from Israel'*; l. 32 is the same). The Israelite oppression over Moab was due to the just wrath of Kemosh (l. 5). Following this logic, the idea of *cherem* perfectly fits (l. 17),¹¹ and also the removal of the cultic equipment of YHWH, the foreign deity, from the regained cities (l. 17–18). With all these statements Mesha proved his superiority, not just over his enemies but also over his predecessors. Previously *Gadites had lived in the land of Atarot*, and the king of Israel built some places for himself in Moab's land (l. 10), but with Mesha the new era began. He resettled the cities; he became the founder of the Moabite state.¹² This text is a reminder of this extraordinary person, a piece of ancient royal propaganda.¹³

2 Kings 3—Nature and Goal

2 Kings 3 returns to the opening verse of the book: *after Ahab's death Moab rebelled against Israel* (1:1). This is the biblical account dealing with the events between Moab and Israel (Northern kingdom), naming the same kings as the Mesha Inscription (the Omrides and Mesha). This text fits the theological purposes of 2 Kings. The key elements of the opening verses are the “rebel” of Moab and the forming of a fragile coalition between Joram king of Israel, Jehoshaphat of Judah and the unnamed king of Edom. Since Judah was a vassal of Israel in

9 Smelik 1990, 3.

10 Miller 1974.

11 Monroe finds the context of *cherem* in early state formation; it was based on the people—land—deity tripartite relationship. According to him, the term “was a part of the lexicon and social consciousness of the world to which ancient Israel belonged, long before the literary activity of the Deuteronomistic school” (2007, 321). The evidence is convincing enough to see *cherem* as a well-known topos in the Southern Levant during the Iron Age.

12 On the nature of the Moabite statehood (tribal kingdom) see Routledge 2000, 2004. Bienkowski recently challenged the tribal society model of Routledge (Bienkowski 2009, 10–12).

13 “In fact, the MI (Mesha Inscription) as a whole reads almost like a narrative from the Hebrew Bible.” Dearman and Mattingly 1992, 709.

the middle of the 9th century most likely during the reign of Jehoshaphat, it was an obligation to join this military campaign. The war itself benefited only Israel's interest, and thus even if we talk about the united armed forces of three entities, it is still not a natural coalition against a common enemy. The intruders turned towards the *the way of the wilderness of Edom* (3:8) to attack the Moabites from the South; this would explain the participation of the Edomites, although according to 1 Kgs 22:48 *There was no king in Edom; a deputy was king*. The Edomite presence also explains the seemingly unnecessary wandering of Israel around the Dead Sea. The natural road between the Mishor¹⁴ (Moabite plain North of the Wadi Mujib) and Samaria led through the fords of the river Jordan—no Moabite king expected an Israelite attack from the direction of Edom. The benefit of this route was obviously the chance to arrive unexpectedly. In this region the environment was extremely dry. After seven days of wandering the water shortage almost led to the annihilation of the army.

So the king of Israel, the king of Judah, and the king of Edom set out; and when they had made a roundabout march of seven days, there was no water for the army or for the animals that were with them. Then the king of Israel said, 'Alas! The Lord has summoned us, three kings, only to be handed over to Moab.' (3:9–10)

This was the turning point: the king of Judah came up with the idea of calling a prophet to inquire the Lord (v. 11.). The prophet Elisha first rejected the claim, but later, because of the presence of Jehoshaphat, he declared the will of God, a promise of abundant water resources and the positive outcome of the campaign. On the next day came the fulfillment of his promise. The water flowed from the south, and the Moabites misunderstood the sign. As the sun shone upon the water they thought it must be blood, and they looked at it as a sign of the turning of the coalition's soldiers against each other. As they ran to the camp for the spoil, they met their catastrophic end.

When they rose early in the morning, and the sun shone upon the water, the Moabites saw the water opposite them as red as blood. They said, 'This is blood; the kings must have fought together, and killed one another. Now then, Moab, to the spoil!' But when they came to the camp of Israel, the Israelites rose up and attacked the Moabites, who fled before them; as they entered Moab, they continued the attack. (3:22–24)

14 For the toponyms of Transjordan, see MacDonald 2000.

After this first battle we are told that the coalition seized the Moabite cities one after the other. The closing scene of the story is awesome and awkward: the horrified Moabite king sacrificed his own heir-son on the city wall,¹⁵ and the coalition stopped the campaign and returned home. How can we evaluate this story? Did this campaign led to real victory? They did not occupy the besieged Kir-hareset, but the text simply summarizes: *the cities they overturned* (3:25). It doesn't name any towns the Israelites actually took, and we do not know what the Moabites really lost.

To understand the purpose of this text in its present location we have to focus on the royal figures. We find sharp contrasts, but clearly the most positive figure is the Judean king, who initially is a secondary (supporting) character but evolves throughout the chapter to become the key figure. The Northern king is a fallen, incapable person, who can hardly keep together his own inherited kingdom. The Edomite king probably has no power, he is a puppet; even the recording of his name is unnecessary. The entire army marches through his land, and he is not able to cover their most basic needs. Additionally he is the weakest. At least the Moabites try to break through his military unit (v. 26). We should not even mention the Moabite king, he is the worst in the entire company. In the biblical perspective his irreversible act of offering his son as a burned-offering is more than evil. What kind of a man would be ready to put his own son to death? And there is Jehoshaphat. His only fault was being there, but most probably that was not of his free will. At the time of crisis he was clear-minded; he knew from whom to solicit aid; and the prophet (Elisha) supported him emphatically. From this perspective 2 Kings 3 is not a victory text either, but a prophetic story about a king presented as an example of proper royal behavior.

2 Chronicles 20—Nature and Goal

2 Chronicles 20 is a part of an extensive report on the reign of king Jehoshaphat of Judah (17:1–21:3; 873–849 BCE). These chapters describe him in detail.

- 17:1–19: the character of his reign (v. 4: *he sought the God of his father and walked in his commandments and not according to the ways of Israel*);
- 18:1–19:3: his alliance with king Ahab of Israel (not positive!);

15 The question of human sacrifice would lead us far away from the key theme of this paper so we do not enter into particulars regarding this part of the story. The reader may consult Zevit 2001, 550 n. 129; Tatlock 2009.

- 19:4–11: reforms;
- 20:1–30: war with the Moab-led coalition;
- 20:31–21:3: concluding regnal résumé.

Our text is more than unique among the records regarding the struggles with Moab. Here a coalition of powers of Transjordan began the war against Judah:

After this the Moabites and Ammonites, and with them some of the Meunites, came against Jehoshaphat for battle. Messengers came and told Jehoshaphat, ‘A great multitude is coming against you from Edom, from beyond the sea; already they are at Hazazon-tamar’ (that is, En-gedi).
(20:1–2)

The enemy is a coalition of three parties from East of the Dead Sea: Moabites, Ammonites and the mysterious “meunim,” united against Judah. The third group was most probably people from southern Transjordan. They could be inhabitants of one of the places called Maon in the Bible.¹⁶ The enemy arrived from the South; two textual traditions are preserved: from Aram, from Edom—geographically the second makes sense. They reached En Gedi, so if the Bible’s site identification is correct, the army had to circle around the Dead Sea from the South.

This is terrifying news to King Jehoshaphat. In this time of crisis, instead of war preparations, he began a series of religious acts: *Jehoshaphat was afraid; he set himself to seek the Lord and proclaimed a fast throughout all Judah* (20:3). At the Temple of the Lord he personally led the public prayer (vv. 6–12). The most interesting part of this prayer is 20:10–12, intended to remind the people of the wilderness wanderings. Here the king’s reasoning is about the same as Jephtah’s in Judges 11. As a response a Levite, Jahaziel son of Zechariah, declared the will of God:

He said, ‘Listen, all Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem, and King Jehoshaphat: Thus says the Lord to you: “Do not fear or be dismayed at this great multitude; for the battle is not yours but God’s. Tomorrow go down against them; they will come up by the ascent of Ziz; you will find them at the end of the valley, before the wilderness of Jeruel. This battle is not for you to fight; take your position, stand still, and see the victory of the Lord on your behalf, O Judah and Jerusalem.” Do not fear or be

16 Knauf 1992, 802; or somewhere in the Petra region, SE of Judah (Coggins 1973, 222).

dismayed; tomorrow go out against them, and the Lord will be with you.’
(20:15–17)

Briefly: they must not fear but will have to march against the enemy. The key part of this divine response is the assuring statement that this is God’s battle; the Lord surely will be with the king. In the Temple tradition prayers were regularly answered by prophetic message (cf. Joel 2:18–27). Jahaziel was not an ordinary prophet; he received the gift of the spirit of the Lord in this particular case.¹⁷

The coalition turned towards Tekoa by the Pass of Ziz. The two armies would have met near the otherwise unidentified wilderness of Jeruel. By the time of the arrival of Jehoshaphat’s soldiers (in the description they look like a congregation in procession), there is no one to fight. As the sounds of praise and singing of the army of Judah reached the intruders, they began to kill each other, and *when Judah came to the watch-tower of the wilderness, they looked towards the multitude; they were corpses lying on the ground; no one had escaped* (v. 24). It took three days to gather the booty. After the congregation/army returned joyfully to Jerusalem to the Temple, from where they went out.

This is a fascinating story indeed—victory without fight, with the best possible outcome. *The fear of God came on all the kingdoms of the countries when they heard that the Lord had fought against the enemies of Israel. And the realm of Jehoshaphat was quiet, for his God gave him rest all around* (20:29–30). All through the text we feel as if we are in the midst of Temple service.¹⁸ The warriors of Jehoshaphat passed through the Valley of Blessing (v. 26). We have a prayer, a prophetic declaration summarizing the divine response; we have singing and praise, liturgical shouts like *Give thanks to the Lord, for his steadfast love endures forever* (20:21).¹⁹ But where is the war, if this is a war text? Here the key themes are seeking the Lord and gaining the promise of having a divine counterpart, as it is stated in v. 17: *the Lord be with you*. The text is centered on the main issues of the entire book: (1) the land, as a gift of God (now in danger); and (2) the Temple, the place of divine instruction and the source of blessings.

17 Allen 1999, 561.

18 The victory is thus a lot more than military success. “The victory was intended as an anticipatory pledge of an eschatological kingdom” Allen 1999, 561; “The whole account is both liturgical and theological” Ackroyd 1973, 151; or: “less a battle than a liturgy” Coggins 1973, 222.

19 According to Ackroyd the entire worship practice of the time of the Chronicler is visible in this text (Ackroyd 1970, 304). In the battlefield the praise replaced the shout in holy war contexts, cf. Judg 7:20 (Allen 1999, 561).

The Temple is the center of the just king's plans and purposes. He departs from and returns to the holy site. In sum, this is not a war text but a declaration of the theological theme of fidelity. Or, as Leslie C. Allen stated: "The present narrative reflects a rewriting in the grand style of holy war."²⁰

Additional Notes on the Texts

In two of the previously evaluated texts we discover quite detailed descriptions of preparation and fight, but not in the third one where only the battlefield is named. There are similarities between the texts: notably the prophetic voice and the divine intervention. In the Mesha Inscription the God, Kemosh, orders the king in all the details of the fight. In 2 Kings 3 God rescues (through his prophet) the army from the disastrous consequences of thirst. In the case of 2 Chronicles 20 everything is under divine guidance. What about the outcomes? The result of Mesha's fight is freedom for Moab according to his inscription, 2 Kings 3 is rather unclear in this sense, and the message of 2 Chronicles 20 is the reinforced freedom of Jerusalem.

Looking at the environmental issue, to travel South around the Dead Sea from the direction of Moab was probably rare but not impossible. 2 Chronicles 20 does not say directly that the army encircled the Dead Sea from the South, but otherwise it would be impossible to arrive at Engedi unexpectedly. The army did not continue northwards after Engedi towards Jericho but turned to the wilderness, to the west, and tried to reach Jerusalem from the south. Due to the lack of water, a raid from this direction was unexpected (as it is stated in 2 Kgs 3:9), but the route was not unknown.

Before drawing conclusions regarding inner-scriptural rewriting, we have to think about the relationship of the three texts and the order of events recorded in them. It is debated whether the account of Chronicles has any historical value or not. According to most commentators, it is either a legendary account or has nothing to do with the 9th century but is probably informative regarding the 4th–3rd centuries BCE. Whatever the case may be, we cannot omit this text simply because we do not have enough information on Iron Age Israelite-Moabite conflicts. If we are dealing with a rewritten account, the primary issue would be finding the first (source-) text. We did not mention it yet, but we have one more text, a brief verse dealing with Moabite intruders:

²⁰ Allen 1999, 559.

So Elisha died, and they buried him. Now bands of Moabites used to invade the land in the spring of the year. (2 Kgs 13:20).

On the basis of this piece of information we can state that even if we do not believe that 2 Chronicles 20 is historically accurate, we can suppose that there were Moabite attacks not just against Israel, but against Judah as well. Unfortunately, it seems to be impossible to find the proper order of these events.

1. We know that under Omri and Ahab the authority of the kingdom of Israel over her neighbors was not questioned in Palestine. During the second half of the 9th century this hegemony quickly disappeared. It is possible to see the Mesha Inscription as a more detailed description of 2 Kgs 1:1; and to read 2 Kings 3 as a reaction to Mesha's steps. In this case the Moabites enjoyed their newly gained independence and in their pride led raids against Israel and Judah in the succeeding years. That would be the most natural explanation of the texts as a series of events (Mesha Inscription-2 Kings 3-2 Chronicles 20).²¹
2. It would not be impossible for the Moabite raids to happen earlier, when they tested their weakening neighbors. If this is the case, the local raids go first, the punishing expedition of Israel-Judah-Edom second, and the final fights of Mesha are the last (2 Chronicles 20-2 Kings 3-Mesha Inscription).
3. We can put the Mesha Inscription in the middle as well and keep 2 Kings 3 either first or last. In this case, Mesha's battles explain the regaining of some territories in Northern Moab after local raids (2 Chronicles 20-MI-2 Kings 3);
4. Or, the Moabites simply stopped paying the tribute, got freedom and led attacks (2 Kings 3-MI-2 Chronicles 20).

We can arrange the events recorded in the three texts in four possible orders, and we still did not evaluate the value of the data. Probably these texts contain more legends than facts, and they surely exaggerate. It is not my intention in this paper to solve the question of accuracy. We are dealing with the texts as witnesses and not as sources.²² But still, we are unable to set the supposed events behind them. Inclusively we could say that these are memories from

21 Naturally we are talking about the events recorded in the texts, not about the possible dates of producing these testimonies.

22 On the historical question, see Emerton 2002.

decades of changing attitudes of the small Palestinian states, and the texts are simply variations on a theme. The starting point and the final stage are clear: Moab was Israel's vassal, but the small Transjordanian entity became free. The Mesha Inscription describes in detail the campaign for regaining the territories north of the Arnon, and briefly at the end (although we do not know for sure the extent of the original stele) it mentions the southern campaign against Hawronen, too. If Kir Hareset of 2 Kings 3 is really Kerak²³ we can state the following: the Mesha Inscription and 2 Kings 3 are more or less parallel texts, Mesha led campaigns in the north and south as well. The northern campaign is recorded in Mesha Inscription 5–31a, parallel 2 Kgs 1:1 and 3:5. The battles in the south: Mesha Inscription 31b–33 and 2 Kgs 3:21–27. Our last question after all these is how to explain and where to place 2 Chronicles 20 in this reconstruction. My proposal is that this text reflects on 2 Kgs 13:20—but with a strange usage of 2 Kings 3. I would say it turns everything upside down. The small raiding troop of 2 Kgs 13:20 becomes a full army of a Transjordanian coalition, but the author keeps the route. They march on the same route (south of the Dead Sea) as the Israel-led coalition of 2 Kings 3. Only the direction of the assault is changed to the opposite, this time Moab attacks. The army arrives surprisingly from the south. The battlefield is on the west of the Dead Sea, and instead of a siege against a city we find the armies out in the wilderness. The main event is practically identical: suicide-like killing of each other within the same military unit. In 2 Kings 3 the Moabites thought that had happened (*the kings must have fought together, and killed one another* 3:23), and in the presentation of 2 Chronicles 20 actually that was the case.

This way we can explain the relationship of the texts, but in the case of 2 Chronicles 20 we still have a question to answer. The reign of Jehoshaphat is quite lengthy in this book. Yet the authors still felt the recording of a clash with the neighboring Moabites is important, and they composed this colorful literary unit. Why was it so important for the authors? According to 2 Chron 17:10: *The fear of the Lord fell on all the kingdoms of the lands around Judah, and they did not make war against Jehoshaphat*. Later during his reign, according to chapter 18 (see also 1 Kings 22), he was involved in the Aramean conflicts on the side of Ahab, the 'bad king' of Israel. That event was disastrous, and the covenant with the evil kings of Israel (Northern kingdom) was considered theologically sinful. 2 Chronicles 20 is an important addition to the picture of our king; this is his sole military success.

23 It is debated by Jones 1991 and Smelik 1992, 87–90, contra Mattingly 1992, 84. Kir is north of the Arnon according to Miller 1992, 85. About Kir as capital see Baly 1974, 231, contra MacDonald 2000, 180.

In summary, from the methodological point of view we may state that the phenomenon described above is a strange example of inner biblical rewriting. The authors of the Mesha Inscription and 2 Kings 3 were one-sided but quite well informed regarding the series of battles between the kingdoms of the region and knew their coalitions and petty debates as well. This constant struggle was a central political issue in the Southern Levant. The Second Temple author of 2 Chronicles 20 most probably took the brief note of 2 Kgs 13:20 about the intruding Moabite bands and presented his story in a highly exaggerated and reshaped fashion, with observances of some of the details from 2 Kings 3. From the original sentence the writer-theologian created a lengthy account. The result is a clear theological demonstration of a God-given success to the Temple-centered community. Obviously this is not a typical example to demonstrate the idea of Rewritten Bible, but within the canonical Hebrew Bible it is hard to find texts that represent the central issue better than this one. In the composition of 2 Chronicles 20 a new theological topic gained preference over previous ones, and over historical realities as well.

Bibliography

- Ackroyd, Peter R. 1973. *I. and II. Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM Press.
- . 1970. *Israel under Babylon and Persia*. New Clarendon Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ahlström, Gösta W. 1993. *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest*. Edited by D.V. Edelman. JSOTSup 146. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Allen, Leslie C. 1999. *The First and Second Books of Chronicles. Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. Pages 299–659 in vol. 3 of *The New Interpreters Bible*. Abingdon Press.
- Baly, Denis. 1974. *The Geography of the Bible*. Harper & Row.
- Bienkowski, Piotr. 2009. 'Tribalism' and 'Segmentary Society' in Iron Age Transjordan. Pages in *Studies on Iron Age Moab and Neighbouring Areas in Honour of Michèle Daviau*. Edited by P. Bienkowski. ANESSup 29. Leuven: Peeters.
- Cleassen, Henry J.M. and Skalnič, Peter. eds. 1978. *The Early State*. The Hague: Mouton Publishers.
- Coggins, Richard J. 1976. *The First and Second Books of Chronicles*. The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dearman, J. Andrew. 1989. *Studies in the Mesha Inscription and Moab*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

- Emerton, John A. 2002. The Value of the Moabite Stone as an Historical Source. *VT* 52: 483–92.
- Hodossy-Takács, Előd. 2008. *Móáb—Egy vaskori nép Izráel szomszédjában*. Kréné 9. Budapest: Új Mandátum Könyvkiadó. (Hungarian)
- Jones, Brian C. 1991. In Search of Kir-Hareseth: A Case Study in Site Identification. *JSOT* 52:3–24.
- Knauf, Ernst A. 1992. Meunim. Pages 801–2 in vol. 4 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday.
- MacDonald, Burton. 2000. *East of the Jordan. Territories and Sites of the Hebrew Scriptures*. ASOR Books 6. Boston, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Mattingly, Gerald L. 1992. Kir-Hareseth. Pages 84 in vol. 4 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. New York: Doubleday.
- Merrill, Eugene H. 2008. The Chronicler: What kind of Historian was he anyway? *Bibliotheca Sacra* 165:397–412.
- Miller, J. Maxwell. 1974. The Moabite stone as a Memorial Stele. *PEQ* 106:9–18.
- . 1992. Early Monarchy in Moab? Pages 77–92 in *Early Edom and Moab: the beginning of the Iron age in Southern Jordan*. Edited by P. Bienkowski. SAM 7. Sheffield: J. R. Collins Publications.
- Monroe, Lauren A.S. 2007. Israelite, Moabite and Sabaean War-*hērem* Traditions and the Forging of National Identity: Reconsidering the Sabaean Text RES 3945 in Light of Biblical and Moabite Evidence. *VT* 57:318–41.
- Routledge, Bruce E. 2000. The Politics of Mesha: Segmented Identities and State Formation in Iron Age Moab. *JESHO* 43:221–256.
- . 2004. *Moab in the Iron Age. Hegemony, Polity, Archaeology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Smelik, Klaas A.D. 1990. The Literary Structure of King Mesha's Inscription. *JSOT* 46:21–30.
- . 1992. *Converting the Past. Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography*. OtSt 28. Leiden: Brill.
- Smith, Michael E. 2006. How do Archaeologists Compare Early States? *Reviews in Anthropology* 35:5–35.
- Spence, Kate E. 2004. Review of *Early State and Civilization*. by Bruce G. Trigger. *Antiquity* 78:939–43.
- Steen, Eveline J. van der and Smelik, Klaas A.D. 2007. King Mesha and the Tribe of Dibon. *JSOT* 32:139–162.
- Steiner, Margreet L. 2001. *I am Mesha, king of Moab, or: Economic Organization of the Iron Age II*. SHAJ 7. Amman: Department of Antiquities.
- Stern, Philip D. 1993. Of Kings and Moabites: History and Theology in 2 Kings 3 and the Mesha Inscription. *HUCA* 64:1–14.

- Tatlock, Jason R. 2009. Sacrifice, Human. Pages 18–20 in vol. 5 of *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by K.D. Sakenfeld. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Toorn, Karel van der. 2007. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA / London: Harvard University Press.
- Westbrook, Raymond. 2005. Elisha's True Prophecy in 2 Kings 3. *JBL* 124:530–32.
- Yunker, Randall. 1997. Moabite Social Structure. *BA* 60:237–248.
- Zevit, Ziony. 2001. *The Religions of Ancient Israel. A Synthesis of Parallaxic Approaches*. London: Continuum.

Early Jewish Rewritings

••

Textual Criticism of Hebrew Scripture and Scripture-Like Texts

Emanuel Tov

When utilizing ancient sources in the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture, we use different types of materials, not only those that pertain directly to Hebrew Scripture, but also those that are included in Scripture-like compositions. The latter group, consisting of a few subgroups, contains compositions that have the appearance of Scripture, but were not meant to be such. In this definition, Scripture refers to a collection of authoritative scrolls that one could study, from which one could quote and read in religious gatherings, and that formed the basis for religious practice.

The procedure of textual criticism involves the collecting of differences between the textual sources, named variant readings or variants.¹ In our system, as in that of most scholars, all details in manuscripts are considered readings, while readings differing from MT are named variants. These variants are found in many types of sources, and the present study focuses on variants found in Scripture-like compositions and commentaries.

The analysis starts with compositions that can easily be confused with Scripture, that is: (I) liturgical texts, and (II) rewritten Scripture compositions. A third group is usually not confused with Scripture, viz., commentaries (III), although in fact fragments of such commentaries have sometimes been confused with Scripture.

Liturgical texts (I) have the appearance of Scripture texts, and they even carry names of biblical books, such as 11QPs^a, 4QPs^a, etc. In my view, these names are misleading, but others think they are appropriate (see below).

Rewritten Scripture compositions (II) are a little further removed from Scripture, but in the publication history of these texts, the two categories were sometimes confused. For example, some fragments of the Temple Scroll were initially identified as biblical texts: 11QT^b XI 21–24 was first described as 11QDeut (Deut 13:7–11) by van der Ploeg,² but later identified as part of 11QT^b

1 Some scholars use the term “variants” in the same neutral way that we use the term “readings.” For example, see Westcott and Hort 1896, II.3.

2 Van der Ploeg 1985–1987, 9–10.

by van der Woude³ and García Martínez.⁴ The most characteristic example of a confusion of the two categories is that of the five manuscripts of 4QRP that were published as rewritten Scripture, but are now taken by many as Scripture itself.⁵

A lack of clarity also remains concerning the relation between some Scripture and *peshet* fragments (III).⁶

Equally problematic, though in a different way, is the description of the SP and pre-Samaritan texts. Usually they are portrayed as Scripture, but sometimes as rewritten Scripture. The latter would be wrong, since SP is firmly based as the Scripture of the Samaritan community. Its text indeed uses practices that are also used in the rewritten Scripture compositions, but this fact does not affect its status as Scripture.

The focus of this study is the contribution of the Scripture-like compositions and commentaries to textual criticism. Scripture-like scrolls are problematic in the text-critical procedure, as they reflect both variants similar to those included in ancient Scripture texts, and variations on a large scale, for example, the different sequence of the Psalms in the liturgical Qumran Psalters. Our working hypothesis is that major deviations from MT in these Scripture-like texts are irrelevant to textual criticism, since they are found in compositions that are not classified as authoritative Scripture. However, the analysis is complicated by the fact that scholars disagree regarding the nature of all the texts discussed below. Texts that we consider Scripture-like are considered Scripture by others.

Liturgical Works

Liturgical works are texts used in the religious service by a community or individuals. They can be read aloud or silently, as in the case of Psalms, or they are used in religious practice as in the case of the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*.

3 Van der Woude 1988.

4 García Martínez 1992.

5 See Tov 2010a.

6 The text that has been published as 4QpapIsa^p (4Q69) contains only a few words, and therefore could have represented a *peshet* like 4Qpap pIsa^c. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that papyrus texts of biblical books are extremely rare among the Qumran texts. 4Q168 is presented in all lists as 4QpMic?, but it could be presented equally well as 4QMic?

1. *Ketef Hinnom amulets*. Scholars agree regarding the liturgical nature of the two minute silver rolls, dating to the 7th or 6th century BCE found at Ketef Hinnom in Jerusalem. These rolls, containing the priestly blessing (Num 6:24–26), are generally taken as liturgical texts of some sort. Therefore, their differences from MT may not be relevant to the text-critical analysis of the biblical text: Roll II lacks the words ויחנך, “He will deal graciously with you” (v 25) and ישא יהוה אליך פניו, “The LORD will bestow his favor upon you” (v 26), thus presenting what looks like an abbreviated form of vv 25–26. However, it is unclear whether Roll II indeed presents an abbreviated version since the last word of v 26 (שלום) is followed by other, undecipherable words. It is not impossible that the missing words from vv 25–26 were included there. The indication of these minuses in a textual apparatus of Numbers would be misleading since these silver rolls probably contained a free version of the priestly blessing for personal use.
2. *Pap. Nash*, dating to the 1st or 2nd century BCE, and discovered in Egypt in 1902, contains the Decalogue (Exod 20:2–17 = Deut 5:6–21) followed by the introductory formula Deut 4:45 and the *shema*’ pericope (Deut 6:4–5 are preserved). The Scripture verses of Deuteronomy are thus presented in a different order, while the Decalogue itself contains a mixed text of Deuteronomy 5 and Exodus 20. In the composite text of P. Nash, the argument for the Sabbath commandment reflects the text of Exod 20:11 rather than Deut 5:14–15⁷ (likewise, 4QDeutⁿ adds Exod 20:11 to Deut 5:15).⁸ The Nash Deuteronomy papyrus sheds some light on several small details in the textual transmission of that book, but large differences reflect free rewriting.
3. *Liturgical texts from Qumran*. “Prayer played a major role in the life of the Qumran community. In the wake of the sect’s succession from the Jerusalem Temple, prayer served as a substitute for sacrifice. It was considered the preferred means of worship and instrument for atonement as long as the Temple service was conducted in impurity.”⁹ Many liturgical

7 Small details in the text of that commandment are close to Deuteronomy texts such as 4QDeutⁿ, 4QMez A, 4QPhyl G, and 8QPhyl, in all of which the Exodus pericope replaces that of Deuteronomy or is added to it. See Eshel 1991. The orthography of the Nash papyrus is fuller than that of MT.

8 Likewise, Exod 20:11 was added in codex B* of LXX-Deuteronomy in v 14, but in the wrong position, earlier in the verse. See Tigay 1985, 55–7.

9 Chazon 2000, 712.

works were authored for this purpose¹⁰ as: (1) collections of daily prayers (e.g. 4QDibre Hame'orot); (2) collections concerned with various festivals (e.g. 4QprFêtes); (3) collections concerned with the Sabbath sacrifice (*Shirot Olat Hashabbat*); (4) collections and texts concerned with covenantal ceremonies (e.g. 4QBerakhot; and (5) rituals of purification (e.g. 4QPurification Liturgy).¹¹ All these texts make abundant use of biblical language, while the terminology of the later Jewish liturgy is also recognizable in them.

In addition, segments of the Torah and Psalms have been combined into collections, altered somewhat to suit their use in liturgy.¹² For the liturgy, these changes, such as the juxtaposition of Psalms that are not adjacent in the MT-Psalter and the addition of new ones, are not unusual. However, if these features were taken as representing authoritative Scripture collections, they would be dramatically significant.

It is not impossible that the rather obvious names assigned to these Torah and Psalms fragments may have been considered provisional when first given, but over time they have become definitive, engendering the view held by some scholars that these are Scripture scrolls.¹³

In the next paragraphs, we will explore the implications of these liturgical texts for textual criticism.

- a. *Liturgical Torah Scrolls (or Personal Copies)*. Several Torah scrolls are described as liturgical. The best examples of the liturgical use of Scripture sections are the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*.¹⁴ In addition, a number of "Scripture" texts from the Judean Desert contain only segments of chapters that are included in the *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, as well as

10 This summary reflects the presentation in Parry and Tov 2005.

11 Most of these texts were published in *DJD* VII and XI.

12 Since the argument of liturgical scrolls is not without doubts, it is also possible that these scrolls were prepared for personal use.

13 For the "official" names, see: Tov 2002 and 2010b.

14 The Scripture chapters from which excerpts are included in the Qumran copies of these *tefillin* and *mezuzot* are: Exodus 12, 13 and Deuteronomy 5, 6, 10, 11, 32. See Tov 2008, 30–32. The *tefillin* and *mezuzot* are not regular biblical texts despite consisting of Torah passages separated by a *vacat* in the middle of the line or a blank line. The range of textual variation in these texts reflects the known variants between biblical manuscripts, and is not specific to these excerpted texts. At the same time, the juxtaposition of these texts is not used in text-critical analyses, and is not noted in textual apparatuses.

Deuteronomy 8,¹⁵ and are therefore often described as liturgical.¹⁶ The argument for their liturgical use is supported by the small size of several scrolls,¹⁷ precluding the possibility that they contained the complete biblical books. In the Torah, we can easily posit an opposition between liturgical and other scrolls, while in the Qumran Psalms there is no visible opposition between the presumed liturgical scrolls and an MT Psalter. Presumably the Qumran community accepted such a Psalter, identical or similar to MT, as authoritative.¹⁸ The liturgical use of these scrolls would have included devotional reading from these chapters, as included in the following scrolls:

4QDeut^j, containing sections from Deuteronomy 5, 8, 10, 11, 32 and Exodus 12, 13;

4QDeut^{k1}, containing sections from Deuteronomy 5, 11, 32;

4QDeutⁿ, covering Deuteronomy 8, 5 (in that sequence);

4QDeut^q, probably covering only Deuteronomy 32.¹⁹

4QGen^d, probably a personal copy, with 11 lines of text, did not contain the whole book of Genesis.

- b. *Liturgical Psalm Scrolls (or Personal Copies)*. Among the liturgical Psalms scrolls, three texts contain only the long acrostic Psalm 119: 4QPs^g, 4QPs^h, 5QPs. It can be no coincidence that this Psalm, which has played an important role in Jewish liturgy and that of the Orthodox Church to this day, was transmitted in separate scrolls already in Qumran times, probably for liturgical purposes.

15 The assumption of liturgical use is based on an argument of silence, as other fragments of these scrolls may have been lost, an assumption that is rather unlikely for all these scrolls. Furthermore, in no case has a join between chapters been preserved in the scrolls mentioned below.

16 For references to the liturgical use of some texts, see Duncan 1995, 79 and Weinfeld 1992.

17 4QDeut^j: 14 lines; 4QDeutⁿ: 12–14 lines; 4QDeut^q: 11 lines; 4QPs^g: 8 lines.

18 The authors of the *pesharim* considered the biblical scrolls of the Prophets and the Psalms authoritative (see below, p. 198.). Further, the Psalms are quoted in various sectarian writings (see a list in Flint 1997, 220), introduced by the formula **אשר אמר דויד** in 4QCatena A (4Q177) 12–13 I 2.

19 For the textual critic, this scroll contains very important readings, because it was copied from a very good copy of that book. See Tov 2012, 249.

A relatively large group of additional psalm scrolls from Qumran, including both canonical and “apocryphal” psalms, may be considered liturgical. At least five groups of scrolls and individual scrolls²⁰ differ from the MT and LXX Psalters in both the addition of non-canonical psalms and the omission and altered sequence of the canonical Psalms²¹ (for details on all these, see Flint and Lange).²² Several scholars present these Psalms scrolls as biblical texts,²³ and in their opinion they present a very different picture of the biblical Psalter,²⁴ especially Flint in an extensive study.²⁵ However, the view held by other scholars that these scrolls are liturgical, and therefore irrelevant to the analysis of authoritative Scripture scrolls, is preferable.²⁶ The arguments used in favor of

-
- 20 Due to their fragmentary condition, not all the 36 Qumran scrolls can be ascribed to the five groups.
- 21 These deviations occur especially in the last two books of the Psalter (Psalms 90–150): (1) 11QPs^a, also reflected in the more fragmentary 4QPs^e and 11QPs^b; (2) 4QPs^a and 4QPs^g; (3) 4QPs^b; (4) 4QPs^d; (5) 4QPs^f. For example, both 4QPs^a and 4QPs^g omit Psalm 32, and the former reflects the following sequence: 38, 71; 4QPs^d has the following sequence: 147, 104, while 4QPs^e has the sequence 118, 104 and 105, 146. See Lange 2009, 583.
- 22 Flint 1997; Lange 2009, 415–50.
- 23 The position of J.A. Sanders was formulated with regard to 11QPs^a, which he published in *DJD* IV (1965), but he also referred to the cave 4 Psalms scrolls in Sanders 1974, 98. Wilson 1983; id. 1985 and Flint 1997 dealt extensively with the Psalms scrolls from all the caves. See further Ulrich 2010. It is unclear whether any of the Qumran Psalms scrolls unequivocally supports the sequence of the MT-Psalter against these Qumran collections (see Flint 1997, 158).
- 24 Like Sanders and Wilson at an earlier stage of scholarship, Flint 1997 suggested that books 1–3 (Psalms 1–89) of the collection of Psalms were finalized before books 4–5 (Psalms 90–150) and that the major differences among the various Qumran Psalm collections reflect different crystallizations of the Psalter. According to Sanders and Wilson, a comparison of MT and 11QPs^a shows that alternative collections of Psalms circulated before the 1st century CE.
- 25 This view is reflected not only in Flint 1997, but also in the publications by P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and P.W. Flint of the cave 4 texts as biblical Psalms in Ulrich et al. 2000 and in Ulrich 2010 with a detailed notation of the deviations of the Psalms scrolls from MT. This view is also reflected in Ulrich 1999, 115–20. As for Skehan, I wonder whether this scholar, whose contribution to *DJD* together with Ulrich and Flint was published posthumously, would have agreed to the emphasis on the scriptural character of the cave 4 scrolls. In his own research, Skehan stressed that the scrolls from cave 4, like those from cave 11, do not provide information on the growth of the biblical book of Psalms: Skehan 1978, 164, critically reviewed by Flint 1997, 17.
- 26 Talmon 1966; Goshen-Gottstein 1966; Skehan 1973; Haran 1993; Nitzan 1994, 16–17; Fabry 1998, 153–61; Chazon 2000, 712; Falk 2010, 632. Similar views held by other scholars are mentioned in Lange 2009, 427–30.

that position pertain especially to the longest scroll, 11QPs^a.²⁷ The inclusion in col. XXVII of “David’s Last Words” (2 Sam 23:[1–]7) and of the sectarian prose composition listing David’s compositions precludes the characterization of that scroll as a scriptural Psalms scroll. Other scholars, especially Wacholder and Dahmen, likewise deny the scriptural character of 11QPs^a by emphasizing its eschatological and Davidic character.²⁸

Textual Implications. Liturgical scrolls were used for devotional reading in religious service. Although they contained Scripture texts, the Qumran covenanters would not have considered them adequate for their Bible study or as a source for scriptural quotations. The free approach towards the content of these scrolls comes to light in the addition of the prose composition in 11QPs^a XXVII and of many non-canonical psalms. These scrolls should not be used in canonical and literary criticism of Hebrew Scripture,²⁹ while their small deviations from MT are constantly used in text-critical analysis. These scrolls thus provide no reliable information about the growth of the biblical book of Psalms, just as the liturgical Torah scrolls are irrelevant for the literary analysis of the Torah.

In our view, the large deviations from MT in these liturgical scrolls should not be applied to biblical criticism, textual or literary, since they were written for different purposes. If they were to be used for those purposes, the implications for biblical criticism would be far-reaching:

1. Several non-canonical Psalms would have to be considered scriptural, such as the so-called *Apostrophe to Zion*.³⁰

27 (1) The added antiphonal refrains to Psalm 145 in col. XVI; (2) more in general, cols. XV–XVII represent a separate liturgical collection; (3) col. II 1–5 probably represents a hymn based on Psalm 146:9–10 and other Psalms; (4) the addition of the extra-canonical hymns “Plea for Deliverance” (col. XIX), “Apostrophe to Zion” (col. XXII), and the “Hymn to the Creator” (col. XXVI); (5) the inclusion of the complete text of Psalm 119 points to the scroll’s liturgical character because of the prominent place of that Psalm in the liturgy (see above).

28 Wacholder 1988; Dahmen 2003, 313–18 (Dahmen considers this scroll a manual, based on MT, containing psalms to be used by the future Davidic Messiah); Kleer 1996; Wilson 1997; Lange 2009, 443.

29 Thus also Dahmen 2003, 314, referring to 11QPs^a. If the large deviations from MT in the Qumran Psalms scrolls are taken as authoritative Scripture, they would have to be recorded in the critical apparatuses of Scripture editions, as was indeed done by Ulrich 2010, see below.

30 Indeed, as a logical consequence of his views, Ulrich 2010 at the end of the first section of Psalms (all the Psalms scrolls except for 11QPs^a), records the *Apostrophe to Judah*,

2. The prose composition in 11QPs^a XXVII (“David’s Compositions”) would have to be included in a “variant edition” of the scriptural book of Psalms.³¹
3. The unusual sequences and the omission of Psalms (e.g. Psalm 32 in 4QPs^a and 4QPs^q) should be indicated in a critical apparatus of the Scripture text,³² although they may have appeared elsewhere in the Qumran Psalter.

Rewritten Scripture Compositions

A typical group of Scripture-like compositions are the so-called rewritten Scripture texts. Authoritative status is not a sufficiently good criterion for the distinction between Scripture-like compositions and Scripture texts, since some rewritten Scripture texts themselves obtained authoritative status.

While many exegetical elements were inserted in authoritative Scripture copies in the course of their rewriting and transmission, a group of closely related rewritten Scripture texts, *non-biblical* texts,³³ were likewise changed away from the earlier text.³⁴ The two groups differ in their authoritative status, while both inserted changes in their underlying texts. Editors—scribes of biblical manuscripts such as the SP-group, the *Vorlage* of the LXX in 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel and MT-Jeremiah inserted major and minor changes in the text, all of which were included in the authoritative Scripture texts that were circulated in ancient Israel.³⁵ Similar changes, often far more encompassing, were embedded in rewritten Scripture texts. As we shall see below, the large changes of this type are not relevant for the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture since

Apostrophe to Zion, Eschatological Hymn, Plea of Deliverance, in alphabetical sequence (pp. 691–3). Likewise, somewhat inconsistently, among the Psalms of 11QPs^a, and not as an appendix, this volume includes the Apostrophe of Zion, the Plea for Deliverance, the so-called Syriac Psalms, and even the prose composition in col. XXVII named “David’s Compositions” (pp. 694–726).

31 This was indeed done by Ulrich 2010, 725.

32 This was indeed done by Ulrich 2010, 636 in the heading of the Psalms, e.g. 31:23–25 → 33:1–12 in 4QPs^a; likewise, 31:24–25 → 33:1–18 in 4QPs^q; 38:16–23 → 71:1–14 in 4QPs^a, etc.

33 4–11QTemple, Jubilees, Enoch, as well as smaller compositions: Apocryphon of Moses, Apocryphon of Joshua, 4QVisSam (4Q160), 4QpsEzek^{a–e} (4Q385, 386, 385b, 388, 391), 4QPrayer of Enosh (4Q369 [4QPrayer Concerning God] and Israel?), included in the *DSSR*, vol. 3A (Rewritten Bible).

34 See White Crawford 2008; Brooke 2000; Segal 2005; Falk 2007; Zahn 2010, 326–9.

35 See Tov 2008, 283–305.

these works represent new compositions and not Scripture texts. Moreover, they did not serve as authoritative Scripture texts in later periods, with the exception of Jubilees and Enoch, considered authoritative in the Ethiopian Church. At the same time, these texts reflect several ancient variants in small details that are taken into consideration in textual analysis.

The boundary between the two types of texts is not easy to determine, as is shown vividly by 4QRP, published in *DJD* XIII as a rewritten Scripture text, and now considered by some a greatly deviating Bible text.³⁶

In my view, text-critical editions should not record the large deviations in these rewritten Scripture texts nor many of the small differences. However, this issue is complicated because many small details may be connected to a larger rewriting pattern. We focus on two central texts.

4-11QTemple. An analysis of the reworking of 11QT^a, probably considered authoritative at Qumran, is meant to illustrate the complexity of the text-critical use of that composition.³⁷

From col. LI 11 onwards, 11QT^a adduces large sections of Deut 16:18ff., together with other laws from the Torah, arranged mainly according to the chapter sequence in Deuteronomy, but also organized topically within that arrangement. This arrangement involves several digressions, such as the inclusion of Deuteronomy 12, against the sequence of the chapters, in col. LIII 1 ff. In the course of this rearrangement, we notice the following major “changes” in the biblical text.

- a. 11QT^a systematically changed the third person references to God to the first person, although a few instances were forgotten (e.g. LXI 3 = Deut 18:21 [2x]), and in other cases he omitted the divine name altogether (e.g. LIII 11 = Deut 23:22).
- b. 11QT^a often changed *weqatal* forms to *waiqtol* (e.g. XVI 3 = Exod 29:21; XVI 16 = Exod 29:12).
- c. 11QT^a changed *ky* at the beginning of laws to *im* (8x) (e.g. LII 9; LIII 12).
- d. 11QT^a combined Scripture passages (e.g. LII 1–3; Deut 16:21–22 + Lev 26:1; LII 3–4; Deut 17:1 + 15:21).

Special attention should be paid to harmonizing additions in 11QT^a. For example, Deut 13:1 (LIV 5–6) was harmonized to Deut 12:28; Deut 13:15 (LV 6) was harmonized to Deut 17:4; Deut 17:4 (LV 19) was harmonized to Deut 13:15.

36 See Tov 2010a.

37 11QT^a considered itself authoritative; see L 7, 17; LIV 5–7; LVI 20–21. See Collins 2011, 39. Note also the *deluxe* format of this scroll, on which see Tov 2004, 125–9.

These changes can be illustrated best in running texts. Thus, the regulation of the centralization of the cult is adduced twice in chapter 12 (12:15–19; 12:20–28), but only once in 11QT^a LIII 2–8, rephrasing the second formulation (Deut 12:20–28).³⁸ That segment incorporates a phrase from the first formulation of the centralization regulation לכה אתן אשר (LIII 3–4), parallel to Deut 12:21 לך יהוה אשר נתן יהוה לך, but derived from the first introduction in Deut 12:15. In the following presentation, the differences between MT and 11QT^a are underlined, while quantitative differences are stressed by the arrangement in two columns.

11QTemple ^a LIII 2–8	MT Deut 12:20–28	
כי א[ותה נפשכה לאכול ב]שר	כי תאווה נפשך לאכל בשר	20
בכול אות נפשכה] תואכל בשר]	בכל אות נפשך תאכל בשר	
	כי ירחק ממך המקום אשר יבחר	21
	יהוה אלהיך לשום שמו שם	
וז[בח]ת]ה מצואנכה ומבקריכה	וזבחת מבקרד ומצאנד	
בברכתי אשר אתן לכה	אשר נתן יהוה לך	
	כאשר צויתך	
ואכלתה בשעריכה	ואכלת בשעריך	
	בכל אות נפשך	
	אך כאשר יאכל את הצבי ואת האיל	22
	כן תאכלנו	
והטהור והטמא בכה יחדיו כצבי וכאיל	הטמא והטהור יחדו יאכלנו	
רק חזק לבלתי אכול הדם	רק חזק לבלתי אכל הדם	23
כי הדם הוא הנפש	כי הדם הוא הנפש	
ולוא תואכל את הנפש עם הבשר	ולא תאכל הנפש עם הבשר	
	לא תאכלנו	24
על הארץ תשופכנו כמים וכסיתו בעפר (Lev 17:13)	על הארץ תשפכנו כמים	
	לא תאכלנו	25
למען ייטב לכה ולבניכה אחריכה עד עולם	למען ייטב לך ולבניך אחריך	
ועשיתה הישר והטוב לפני	כי תעשה הישר בעיני יהוה	
אני יהוה אלוהיכה		

11QT^a succeeded very well in condensing and omitting many of the repetitions in the biblical text:

38 See Tov 2008, 17–20.

- i. The law in Deut 12:20–28 is prefaced by two introductions: (20) כִּי יִרְחִיב את גְּבוּלְכָה כֹּאֲשֶׁר דִּבְרַתְךָ לַיהוָה and (21) כִּי יִרְחַק מִמְּךָ הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יִבְחַר יְהוָה לְשׁוֹם שְׁמוֹ שָׁם This section in 11QT^a was probably introduced by one prefatory phrase only:
 [כִּי אֶרְחִיב אֶת גְּבוּלְכָה כֹּאֲשֶׁר דִּבְרַתְי לָכֶה וְאִמְרַת אֹכֵלָה בְּשָׂר כִּי אֶ]וֹתָהּ.³⁹
- ii. Several phrases were omitted in 11QT^a because they repeat phrases in the immediate context:
 (21) כִּי אֶ]וֹתָהּ נִפְשָׁכָה 2 LIII (covered by 11QT^a LIII 2)
 (22) אֶךְ כֹּאֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל אֶת־הַצִּבִּי וְאֶת־הָאֵיל (abbreviated in 11QT^a LIII 4–5 to כִּצְבִי וְכֵאֵיל)
 (22) לֹא תֵאָכְלֵנוּ (25), לֹא תֵאָכְלֵנוּ (24), כֵּן תֵאָכְלֵנוּ (22) (“redundant” repetitions).

This contrastive analysis of Deuteronomy 12 and 11QT^a LIII 2–8 brings to the fore the differences in their approach. 11QT^a presents a more practical approach to the formulation of the biblical law than Deuteronomy 12. A similar difference is visible in a contrastive analysis of Lev 23:27–29 and 11QT^a XXV 10–12.

This analysis shows how the small changes, created through the rewriting technique, relate to the text of MT. They are easily taken as variant readings to be recorded in a critical apparatus, but in my view cases like these need not be recorded. Therefore, due to the uncertainty relating to the textual background of 11QT^a, I suggest to take into consideration only deviations from MT in 11QT^a that are supported by *external evidence*. If this suggestion is followed, no detail of 11QT^a should be recorded in an edition like *BHQ* when not supported by external evidence.⁴⁰ Obviously, in this way all the unique variants of the scroll will be disregarded as suspected exponents of rewriting.

In an earlier study, I summarized the textual relations between the sources as follows:⁴¹

39 The immediate joining of two introductory phrases as suggested by Yadin (כִּי אֶרְחִיב אֶת (גְּבוּלְכָה... וְכִי יִרְחַק מִמְּכָה) is inconsistent with the avoidance of repetition in 11QT^a.

40 Indeed, all references in *BHQ* to variants in 11QT^a are supported by other witnesses, for example: Deut 12:25 and 13:19 = 11QT^a LIII 7, LV 14 (cf. 12:28); 12:26 = 11QT^a LIII 9–10; 16:19 = 11QT^a LI 12 (= LXX); 16:20 = 11QT^a LIII 7 (= LXX S); 17:16 = 11QT^a LVI 16; 21:6 = 11QT^a LXIII 5 (the lack of 11QT^a column notations in *BHQ* decreases the value of the notation). Not all the relevant differences between MT and 11QT^a are recorded in *BHQ* (see 12:22 בְּךָ; 18:5 (וְהִגְרִשִׁי 20:17; לִפְנֵי); 21:23 11QT^a is quoted without support from the versions).

41 Tov 1982, 109–10.

11QT^a = LXX and SP ≠ MT : 22 (many cases of common harmonizations)⁴²

11QT^a = LXX ≠ MT ≠ SP : 26

11QT^a = SP ≠ LXX : 2

11QT^a = SP MT 6 (not reflected in translation)

While 11QT^a is thus closer to the LXX and SP than to MT, there are also extensive differences among these sources:

11QT^a ≠ SP and LXX : 33x, usually when LXX = SP

11QT^a ≠ LXX : 6

11QT^a ≠ SP : 11.

The combined evidence indicates that 11QT^a is not exclusively close to any of the three sources. Accordingly, the source of 11QT^a should be characterized as non-aligned. That biblical manuscript certainly included more variants than included in our analysis, since we chose not to include readings of 11QT^a that are unsupported by other sources.

For our investigation of the text-critical background of the Torah it is very significant that seven of the readings that 11QT^a has in common with the LXX and SP and six additional ones are in the nature of harmonizations.⁴³ Other harmonizing pluses can no longer be identified. This situation reflects our earlier observation that the most popular Torah text in Palestine was often of a less precise nature,⁴⁴ such as visible in harmonizations. The secondary readings that SP and LXX have in common, among them many harmonizations, are now also shared with 11QT^a and several other sources.

The analysis of the biblical quotations in Jubilees points in the same direction.

Jubilees. As in the case of 11QT^a, the large deviations in Jubilees from MT are disregarded for the textual–literary analysis. Among the smaller variants, we again focus on the variants that are supported by either MT, SP, LXX, or one of the Qumran scrolls,⁴⁵ disregarding the unique readings of Jubilees since they

42 In a study devoted precisely to this issue, Schiffman stresses the common basis of some of the readings of 11QT^a and the LXX, stressing their common origin, pointing in these cases to common halakhic exegesis. For example, the addition of בוכה in LIII 4 (= Deut 12:22, agreeing also with SP) and in LII 4 (= Deut 15:22) is meant to stress that the “pure” and “impure” refer to the worshippers, not to animals. See Schiffman 1992.

43 See Tov 1982, 104–7 for the evidence.

44 See Tov 2012, 184.

45 The textual analysis of Jubilees is based on the Ethiopic and Latin texts, as the few Hebrew Qumran fragments provide too little material. In places in which the text can be examined we easily identify elements that are identical to the text common to MT LXX

cannot be disentangled from Jubilees' exponents of rewriting. In our analysis, we are led by two seminal studies of VanderKam, 1977 and 1988.⁴⁶

According to VanderKam,⁴⁷ based on a count of agreements, Jubilees is especially close to the LXX and SP, texts that were "at home in Palestine."⁴⁸ However, when disagreements are also taken into consideration, VanderKam⁴⁹ realized that "Jub's biblical citations were drawn from a text that was rather more independent of the Palestinian family of which Sam and the LXX are, at different stages supposed to be witnesses." Nevertheless, Jubilees is closer to SP and LXX than to the other texts.⁵⁰

Like VanderKam, Hendel, basing himself on "indicative errors" in Genesis 1–11, considers the connection between LXX and SP to be stronger than between the other members of the triad SP LXX MT.⁵¹ His stemma depicts two hyparchetypes for Genesis 1–11, the proto-M and old Palestinian hyparchetype.⁵²

I do accept the idea of an old Palestinian text best represented by LXX SP, and also quoted by 11QT^a, Jubilees, and Pseudo-Philo's LAB.⁵³

SP as well as brief changes in the formulation. 4Q223–224 Unit 2, col. V (Jub 39:9–40:7) = Gen 39:12–41:43 with many words and verses skipped. 4Q225 2 i 4–14 runs parallel to Gen 15:3–6, 22:2 and col. ii to Gen 22:7–11. One also notices an occasional exclusive reading that could have been based on a variant, such as col. V 3 (Jub 39:10) אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה]תָּה (thus also the Ethiopic translation) for MT LXX SP אֲשֶׁר חָבָאתָ (Gen 39:17). The fidelity of the Ethiopic translation to its Greek original, and the latter's fidelity to the Hebrew can be established by an analysis of the cave 4 fragments. See VanderKam, *DJD XIII* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994) 4, 56. VanderKam 1973, 18–95 had reached the same conclusion on the basis of the cave 11 fragments of Jubilees.

46 VanderKam 1977; id. 1988. The data were provided by VanderKam in 1973, but his summarizing statements in 1988 were clearer.

47 VanderKam 1977, 137.

48 This conclusion was repeated in VanderKam 1988, 73.

49 VanderKam 1988, 83.

50 "... if there was a Palestinian family of texts of which the LXX and Sam are two representatives and Jubilees a third, then it must have been a very loose conglomeration of divergent texts" (*ibid.*, 84).

51 Hendel 1998, 100.

52 Hendel also mentions horizontal influence between the hyparchetypes. However, that part of the discussion is unnecessarily detailed, because it is based on the assumption that MT SP LXX are directly related to each other without other texts intervening. However, we should not forget that these three texts are only three out of a much larger number of texts.

53 The text quoted by LAB is often close to the *Vorlage* of the LXX, named Palestinian in Harrington 1971. Harrington provides examples of the proximity of LAB to the *Vorlage* of the LXX (not to the LXX itself) in the Torah, sometimes shared with SP, and in the other

Bible Commentaries and Pesharim

Of the three groups of Scripture-like texts, the Bible commentaries and *pesharim* are usually not confused with Scripture texts. They are discussed here because the problems of extracting variants from them resemble the recognition of variants in Scripture-like texts. Bible commentaries do not reflect large differences from MT+, but only differences in small details, which are sometimes difficult to identify.

Pesharim. It is easy to differentiate between the Bible text and the exposition in the *pesharim*. The Bible texts contain many variants vis-à-vis MT in small details, while some variants are found in the exposition.

Different views have been voiced regarding the text-critical value of the biblical text quoted by the *pesharim*. A positive evaluation is reflected in the textual editions that incorporate readings from these *pesharim*: BHS and BHQ for 1QpHab, HUB for the *pesharim* on Isaiah, and the *Biblia Qumranica* for the Minor Prophets. The editors of these texts considered the evidence convincing enough to be recorded in an apparatus. For example, in Habakkuk 1–2, BHQ records many variants, e.g. 1:8 וקול for MT וקלו and 1:12 להוביח for MT למוביו. At the same time, other scholars cautioned that many so-called deviations from MT in the *pesharim* and commentaries were due to contextual exegesis.⁵⁴ Brooke focused on exclusive readings in the *pesharim* not supported by MT, ancient Hebrew manuscripts, or the ancient versions. He demonstrated that the biblical text quoted in the *pesharim* introduced some changes in syntactical and grammatical details, e.g. in person, as well as in the omission of parts of verses, and in one case of ten verses, viz., in 4QpIsa^b 2 lacking 5:14–24.⁵⁵ These changes are used by Brooke as an argument against the text-critical use of the *pesharim*.

In textual analyses, a maximalistic approach underlies the lists of presumed variant readings for 1QpHab by Brownlee and for all the *pesharim* by Lim.⁵⁶ Thus, according to Lim,⁵⁷ 17 percent of all the words of the MT of Nahum differ

books often with the LXX and the Lucianic tradition. However, this study does not mention full statistics, and it lacks reverse examples of disagreements between these sources and LAB.

54 E.g., Molin 1952; Brooke 1987 with references to earlier studies.

55 Brooke also includes among the changed readings cases of metathesis and other playful changes of letters, such as for Nah 3:6 כראי in 4QpNah באורה (4Q169 3 iii 2).

56 Brownlee 1959; Lim 1997, 69–109; Lim 2002.

57 Lim 1997, 91.

from the corresponding segments of 4QpNah and 12 percent of all the words of 1QpHab. However, from these numbers one has to deduct morphological variations, some orthographical variants and a large number of contextual changes, all of which could have been inserted by the author of the *peshet*. This evidence leads to the possibility, but no more than a possibility, that the underlying biblical text of the *pesharim* did not differ much from MT. On the other hand, if it could be proven that the biblical text in a *peshet* once circulated separately as a biblical manuscript, it would resemble the popular, basically vulgar text of 1QIsa^a and many other texts. Believing this to be the case, several scholars⁵⁸ characterized the underlying texts of the *pesharim* as “vulgar.”⁵⁹

Commentaries. No specific biblical text or text group is reflected in the non-biblical Qumran compositions,⁶⁰ both sectarian and non-sectarian.⁶¹ Only 4Q252 provides enough material for an extensive analysis.⁶²

In the rewritten text of 4Q252, the close relation to Scripture is clearly visible in long stretches of text, but at the same time 4Q252 removes what it considers superfluous elements from the context without harming its meaning.⁶³ In view of the frequent stylistic abbreviations in 4Q252, its shorter text cannot be taken as support for an assumed short *Vorlage*. This applies also to some assumed stylistic changes.

Indeed, 4Q252 represents a small number of variants supported by the other witnesses. These deviations have been reviewed in detail by Brooke,⁶⁴ who tried to fit them into the framework of earlier-expressed textual theories.

58 Van der Ploeg 1951, 2–11, esp. 4; Elliger 1953, 48; P. Kahle in a review of Elliger in Kahle 1954, 479; Segert 1955, 608.

59 At the same time, the text of these *pesharim* should not be characterized as a separate “recension,” as suggested, for example, by Collin 1971 on the basis of an analysis of 1QpMic, which was characterized by him as reflecting a third recension of the biblical book, alongside the MT and LXX. This characterization was rejected by Sinclair 1983.

60 4QCommGen A (4Q252), 4QCommGen B (4Q253), 4QCommGen C (4Q254), 4QCommGen D (4Q254a), 4QTanh (4Q176), 4QCommMal (4Q253a).

61 Lange 2002; id., 2009, 158–68.

62 4Q252, an unusual text from the point of view of its structure, is closest in its adherence to the Scripture text after the *pesharim*. See Bernstein 1994; id., 1994–1995; Lim 1993. In the first columns, 4Q252 presents a rewritten text very closely adhering to the biblical text with a fuller orthography, without altering it, but adding exegetical remarks, mainly relating to chronology. Then it moves slowly away from that pattern to a more free relation to the Scripture text, and at that point it also uses the term *peshet*.

63 For example, האדמה פני מעל המים; I וישלח את היונה] MT 8:8 מאתו היונה את וישלח, הקלו MT 8:8] I 14. This procedure is followed even in the removal of one of two synonymous words in a poetical passage. ורישית אוני] MT 49:3 כחי וראשית אוני.

64 Brooke 1998.

Brooke sees a degree of closeness between 4Q252 and the LXX. We accept that view, but expand this vision to the SP, which has been left out of the analysis by Brooke. Although the data are not completely clear, it seems that the allegiance of 4Q252 lies more with the LXX and SP than MT.⁶⁵

Conclusion

Summarizing, in the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture, we use different types of materials, not only those that pertain directly to Hebrew Scripture, but also those that are included in Scripture-like compositions. The latter group, consisting of a few subgroups, contains compositions that have the appearance of Scripture, but were not meant as such. Liturgical texts have the appearance of Scripture texts, and they even carry names of biblical books of the Torah and Psalms, such as 11QPs^a, 4QPs^a. However, in our view, the large deviations from MT in these scrolls should not be applied to biblical criticism, textual or literary, since they were written for different purposes. If they were used within textual and literary criticism, the implications for biblical criticism would be far-reaching. Likewise, in my view, text-critical editions should not record the large deviations in rewritten Scripture texts, or many of the small differences. The recording of variants should be limited to those readings that are supported by other sources. The same procedure should be followed in the study of Bible commentaries, while *pesharim* provide more relevant data.

Bibliography

- Bernstein, Moshe. 1994. 4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary. *JJS* 45: 1–27.
- . 1994–1995. 4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources. *JQR* 85: 61–79.
- Brooke, George J. 1987. The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants? Pages 85–100 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by C.A. Evans and W.F. Stinespring. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

65 According to this description, 4Q252 is very problematic for discovering its underlying biblical text. In principle, any of the small deviations from MT could present an ancient variant, but when seen in the framework of the large changes that possibility seems very slim. This free approach makes it possible that what looks like a stylistic or linguistic change is not an ancient variant, but it is unlikely.

- . 1998. Some Remarks on 4Q252 and the Text of Genesis. *Textus* 19: 1–25.
- . 2000. Rewritten Bible. Pages 777–81 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2. Vol. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brownlee, William J. 1959. *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*. JBL Monograph Series XI; Philadelphia: SBL.
- Chazon, Esther G. 2000. Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers. Pages 710–15 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2. Vol. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Collin, Matthieu. 1971. Recherches sur l'histoire textuelle du prophète Michée. *VT* 21: 281–97.
- Collins, John J. 2011. Changing Scripture. Pages 23–45 in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Edited by H. von Weissenberg et al. BZAW 419. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Dahmen, Ulrich. 2003. *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPSa aus Qumran*. STDJ 49. Leiden: Brill.
- Duncan, Julie. 1995. 37. 4QDeutⁱ. *DJD* XIV. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Elliger, Karl. 1953. *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. BHT 15. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Eshel, Esther. 1991. 4QDeutⁿ: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing. *HUCA* 62: 117–54.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. 1998. Der Psalter in Qumran. Pages 137–63 in *Der Psalter im Judentum und Christentum*. Edited by E. Zenger. HBS 18. Freiburg: Herder.
- Falk, Daniel K., 2007. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. CQS 8. London and New York: T&T Clark.
- . The Contribution of the Qumran Scrolls to the Study of Ancient Jewish Liturgy. Pages 617–51 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Flint, Peter W. 1997. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. STDJ 17. Leiden: Brill.
- García Martínez, Florentino. 1992. 11QTemple^b: A Preliminary Publication. Pages 363–91 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11. Leiden/Madrid: Brill.
- Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. 1966. The Psalms Scroll (11QPS^a): A Problem of Canon and Text. *Textus* 5: 22–33.
- Haran, Menahem. 1993. 11QPSa and the Canonical Book of Psalms. Pages 193–201 in *Minhah le-Nahum—Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in*

- Honour of His 70th Birthday*. Edited by M. Brettler and M. Fishbane. JSOTSup154. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Harrington, Daniel. 1971. The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. CBQ 33: 1–17.
- Hendel, Ronald S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kahle, Paul. 1954. Review of Elliger 1953. TLZ 79: 478–9.
- Kleer, Martin. 1996. "Der liebliche Sanger der Psalmen Israels." Untersuchungen zu David als Dichter und Beter der Psalmen. BBB 108. Bodenheim: Philo.
- Lange, Armin. 2002. The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process. Pages 21–30 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities.
- . 2009. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer, I: Die Handschriften biblischer Bucher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lim, Timothy H. 1993. Notes on 4Q252 fr. 1, cols. i–ii. JJS 44: 121–6.
- . 1997. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2002. Biblical Quotations in the Pesharim and the Text of the Bible: Methodological Considerations. Pages 71–89 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities.
- Molin, Georg. 1952. Der Habakkukkomentar von 'En Fesħa in der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft. TZ 8: 340–57.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. 1994. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, trans. Jonathan Chipman. STDJ 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Parry, Donald W. and Emanuel Tov. 2005. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, vol. 5, Poetic and Liturgical Texts*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Ploeg, Johannes P.M. van der. 1951. Le rouleau d'Habacuc de la grotte de 'Ain Fesħa. BO 8: 2–11.
- . 1985–1987. Les manuscrits de la grotte XI de Qumran. RevQ 12: 3–15.
- Sanders, James A. 1974. The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPsa) Reviewed. Pages 79–99 in *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honor of Eugene A. Nida*. Edited by M. Black and W.A. Smalley. The Hague: Mouton.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1992. The Septuagint and the Temple Scroll: Shared 'Halakhic' Variants. Pages 277–97 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* (Manchester, 1990). Edited by G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars. SBLSCS 33. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Segal, Michael. 2005. Between Bible and Rewritten Bible. Pages 10–29 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze, SDRSL. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Segert, Stanislav. 1955. Zur Habakuk-Rolle aus dem Funde vom Toten Meer VI. *ArOr* 23: 575–619.
- Sinclair, Lawrence A. 1983. Hebrew Text [sic] of the Qumran Micah Peshet and Textual Traditions of the Minor Prophets. *RevQ* 11: 253–63.
- Skehan, Patrick W. 1973. A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a. *CBQ* 35: 195–205.
- . 1978. Qumran and Old Testament Criticism. Pages 163–82 in *Qumrân, Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*. Edited by M. Delcor. BETL 46. Paris-Gembloux/Leuven: Duculot/University Press.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. 1966. Pisqah Be'emša' Pasuq and 11QPs^a. *Textus* 5: 11–21.
- Tigay, Jeffrey H. 1985. Conflation as a Redactional Technique. Pages 53–96 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited J.H. Tigay. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1982. The Temple Scroll and Old Testament Textual Criticism. *ErIsr* 16: 100–11.
- . 2002. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2004. *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*. STDJ 54. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- . 2008. *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010a. From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?) Pages 73–91 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by M. Popovic. JSJSup 141. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- . 2010b. *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Ulrich, Eugene. 1999. Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text. Pages 99–120 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Edited by E. Ulrich. Grand Rapids, MI/Leiden: Eerdmans/Brill.
- . 2010. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*. VTSup 134. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Ulrich, Eugene et al. 2000. *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles*. DJD XVI. Oxford: Clarendon.
- VanderKam, James C. 1977. *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.
- . 1988. Jubilees and Hebrew Texts of Genesis–Exodus. *Textus* 14: 71–85.

- Wacholder, Ben Zion. 1988. David's Eschatological Psalter 11Q Psalms^a. *HUCA* 59: 23–72.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. 1992. Grace after Meals. *JBL* 111: 427–40.
- Westcott, Brooke F. and Fenton J.A. Hort. 1896. *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, vols. I–II. 2nd ed. London/New York: Macmillan.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Wilson, Gerald H. 1983. The Qumran Psalms Manuscripts and the Consecutive Arrangement of Psalms in the Hebrew Psalter. *CBQ* 45: 377–88.
- . 1985. *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter*. SBLDS 76. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- . 1997. The Qumran *Psalms Scroll* (11QPsa) and the Canonical Psalter. *CBQ* 59: 448–64.
- Woude, Adam S. van der. 1988. Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle. *RevQ* 13: 89–92.
- Zahn, Molly M. 2010. Rewritten Scripture. Pages 323–36 in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Apocryphon of Jeremiah C from Qumran: Rewritten Prophetic Text or Something Else?¹

Balázs Tamási

Introduction

Since 1961, when the term “Rewritten Bible” was introduced by Professor Geza Vermes into the academic discourse,² numerous previously unknown Qumran texts of variable genres have been published in the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (III–XL)³ series. Moreover, our picture of the formation of the text and corpus of the later scriptural canons has dramatically changed, owing to the Dead Sea discoveries and their text editions in the past 50 years. Nevertheless, both the idea of “Rewritten Bible” and its content are continuously reconsidered or criticized by scholars,⁴ though, borrowing from Sidnie White Crawford, “Vermes’s definition remains the main starting point for any discussion of this phenomenon”.⁵ This phenomenon, the term and its definition is somehow tied to the so-called Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, the text I am going to focus on in this paper. First I assume that the “Rewritten Bible” in a reconsidered form may play a (direct or indirect) role in finding the definition of the genres of this previously unknown text of the Second Temple period. Second I hold that the compositional structure of the so-called Apocryphon of Jeremiah C may make the text appropriate for a study of genre, which follows here. It has recently been debated whether its genre should be reckoned as “Rewritten Bible,” and to view it as “Rewritten prophet,” as suggested by George Brooke.⁶ Is it more appropriate to apply the term ‘parabiblical’ for the Apocryphon? How useful is this term, applied to many Qumran texts in the DJD series (IX, XIII, XIX, XXII

1 It is my privilege to celebrate the Jubilee of the “Rewritten Bible” by contributing my study. I am especially grateful to Prof. Geza Vermes who has taught all of us through his works and to Prof. József Zsengellér who both imagined and carried out the International Conference on the phenomenon of “Rewritten Bible” (Budapest, 10–13. July 2011).

2 Vermes 1961, 95.

3 Until 1961 only the scrolls of the First Cave had been published (1QIs^a, 1QapGen, 1QPHab, 1QS, 1QM, 1QH), in the two first volumes of the DJD.

4 E.g. Bernstein 2005; Campbell 2005; Petersen 2007 etc.

5 Crawford 2008, 3.

6 Brooke 1998, 271 and 278–288; Brooke 2000a, 2.696; Brooke 2000b, 2.779; also see Wacholder 2000, 443 and Henze 2009, 25–26.

and XXX), if we try to understand the relation of the scriptural prophecies and their reworked forms?

Devorah Dimant, the official editor of the Apocryphon, has recently drawn scholarly attention stating that “neither the distinct manner in which the Apocryphon reworks passages from the Hebrew Bible nor the literary spheres of the composition have been properly dealt with by subsequent research.”⁷ Nevertheless, I am not the first to focus on the reworking method of and finding an appropriate genre classification for the Apocryphon. In monographic studies and in a few articles scholars pay some attention to the question.⁸ On the other hand, in agreement with Dimant I believe that it is adequate to pose the question how the ApocJer C reworks the scriptural passages, and also that the genre of this fragmentary text should be defined. Nonetheless we should be aware of the fact that there was not only one Hebrew Bible at the time, and the text of the scriptural books had not been crystallized in the same sense as the later biblical canons. My aim is to understand what was rewritten in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, as well as how and why. I shall also point out that other exegetical techniques may be detected in the text. To know what is rewritten, we should briefly present the compositional structure of the fragments.

The Compositional Structure of ApocJer C

The 225 Hebrew fragments of 4Q385–390, coming from Qumran Cave Four, were officially published by Devorah Dimant in 2001 when she finally sorted them out as the parts of two distinct previously unknown ‘pseudo-prophetic’ texts, namely Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C (hereafter ApocJer C).⁹ In a very recent study she persisted in this division of the fragments¹⁰ and her reconstruction is indeed an important starting point for the scholarly discourse. The alternative approach has been initiated by Monica Brady who criticizes the methodology of Dimant, mainly for the use of “for-

7 Dimant 2011, 37.

8 The most profound study is Monica Brady’s article (Brady 2005) which deals with the reworked verses and parts of the scriptural material. The extensive lists and classification of the scriptural parts and verses can be found in Dimant 2001, especially see pp. 100–104. Also see Brooke 1998, 278–285; Jassen 2007, 225–231; Henze 2009, 33–37.

9 Dimant 2001.

10 Dimant 2011, 17–39, especially see 18–19.

mal and literary elements . . . as the criteria for sorting fragments”¹¹ and considers the fragments (4Q385–390) as the parts of one bigger group, the so-called “Pseudo-Ezekiel” fragments (4Q383–391). On the one hand, Brady and Wright¹² point to the possible uncertainties of Dimant’s sorting of the fragments; on the other hand Dimant in her response to Brady properly opposes that “She does not explain how one and the same composition would contain a reworking of Ezekiel’s Vision of the Dry Bones (Ezekiel 37) next to a narrative description of Jeremiah accompanying the Judeans as they go into the Babylonian exile (elaborating 2 Kings 25 and Jeremiah 52). Such a combination is unknown in any of the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic compositions, for these writings always deal with a single figure at a time.”¹³ To summarize, Dimant provided a valuable reconstruction of the fragments as parts of two separate writings. She is right in separating the two groups of rewritten prophecies of Ezekiel (cf. Ezek 1 and 37:1–17) and Jeremiah (cf. Jeremiah 40–44, 52), however, at some points it remains indeed uncertain to which group (Pseudo-Ezekiel or ApocJer C) the fragments containing anonymous *ex eventu* prophecies on Israel’s past and future should be classified. To take a few examples, 4Q386-1-iii, which follows Jer 51:7, is classified by Dimant as part of Pseudo-Ezekiel¹⁴ and 4Q387 4 i, which borrows phrases from Ezek 38:22, is determined as the fragment of ApocJer C.¹⁵ Turning to the reconstruction of ApocJer C, we are convinced that due to the overlapping copies (4Q385a-4, 4Q388a-7 ii, 4Q389-8-ii) the largest surviving fragment (4Q387 2 i–ii) allows the longest connected reconstruction of the text with 18 lines.¹⁶ This contains anonymous prophecies on the events

11 Especially see Brady 2005, 90 where she adds that “In many ways this approach lends itself to the separation of fragments into isolated pieces—this one mentions Jeremiah, this other Ezekiel, still another the Law; or this passage is poetry, another historical narrative, another dialogue between a prophet and the Lord.” See more in Brady 2005, 90–94.

12 E.g., Wright (2002, 250) and Brady (2005, 93) criticize that Dimant’s first observance—namely that “The fragments display very similar scribal hands, and more or less the same material.” (Dimant 1992, 407–408)—contradicts her divisionary approach in sorting the fragments. Recently Dimant confirmed her view that had already been articulated in the official edition of the fragments (Dimant 2001, 130), stating that “The same scribe could have copied different works on the same scroll” (Dimant 2011, 20).

13 Dimant 2011, 21.

14 Dimant 2001, 66–67.

15 Dimant 2001, 195–196. This latter appears in Wright’s critique of dissecting the fragments where he states that several fragments attributed to ApocJer C rework verses from Ezekiel (Wright 2002, 250–251, cf. Dimant 2011, 23).

16 Dimant 2001, 189–190.

of the Second Temple period.¹⁷ But how does this lengthy part relate to the fragments that contain the name of Jeremiah?¹⁸

From this point of view the Achilles heel of the reconstruction is that no overlaps can be found between the fragments containing the name Jeremiah and the lengthy anonymous prophecies on Israel's past and future.

Seeing the examples of other historical apocalypses, Dimant concludes that the fragments succeed one another in such a manner that they broadly follow the events of Israel's history until eschatological times.¹⁹ If we accept this order of the fragments, one of the most fragmentary parts contains the Exodus from Egypt (4Q388a-1, 4Q389-2), other fragments present the age of entering Canaan (4Q389-4) and the early monarchy with positive overtones (4Q385a-1), and in other damaged copies the apostasy going back to the First (4Q385a-3), 4Q388a-3, 4Q389-6-7) and Second Temple times is retold (4Q387 frg. 1-4 cf. 385a-3, 4Q390). This historical survey eventuates in the section which seems to contain eschatological expectations (4Q385a 16-17). Following this chronological sequence, and on the basis of five fragments, the text is assumed by Dimant to be a reconstructed lengthy part of a Jeremiah prophecy (4Q385a, 4Q387, 4Q388a, 4Q389, 4Q390). As a part of this lengthy *vaticinia ex eventu*, a rewritten portrayal of the scriptural Jeremiah has survived in the certain fragments of the text (4Q383-i, 4Q385a-18-i-ii and 4Q389-1). These parts of the ApocJer C, which may preserve the peculiarities of the rewritten scriptural texts, are to be examined regarding how the scriptural version of Jeremiah was reworked in them. But first of all we must survey the designations of the composition which have been proposed in the last decades by the editors and researchers of these fragments.

The Denomination of the Composition

Two compositions received their present names in the complete edition of the fragments when they were published together in 2001. However, their names in the DJD 30, Pseudo-Ezekiel and Apochryphon of Jeremiah C, were not completely new. In 1956, at the beginning of the research, John Strugnell determined the fragments as parts of '*un écrit pseudo-jérémien*'.²⁰ According to Milik who received the transcriptions of the fragments from Strugnell in the 1970s,

17 Dimant 2001, 173.

18 See 4Q383 (1,2; 2,2); 4Q385a-18 (i 2, 6, 8; ii 3, 4, 6); 4Q389-1,5.

19 Dimant 2001, 100.

20 Strugnell 1956, 65.

the seven copies of the work were called 'Pseudo-Ezekiel'.²¹ A few fragments which contain the Merkavah vision were published in 1988, and were named Second Ezekiel by Strugnell and Devorah Dimant.²² From then on, Strugnell handed over the full responsibility of the edition to Dimant. In the course of her further research she identified the three groups of the fragments one of which was published in 1992 as a Pseudo-Moses writing²³ and the second as the Apocryphon of Jeremiah in 1994.²⁴ In the final stage of editing, when she was preparing the last fragment for publication, she recognized that contrary to her previous suppositions, 4Q390 includes the divine discourse tied to the Moses-like Jeremiah. In the recent edition of the fragments in the DJD 30, however, Dimant isolates only two coherent writings, Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C as it has already been mentioned above. Reflecting on the phenomenon that the author(s) communicates as an Ezekiel and a Jeremiah at some points of the texts, the scholars and the publishers of fragments determined the name and the identity of the text in comparison with the canonical books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Just to mention a few examples: the collective name of Deutero-Ezekiel and Jeremiah given by Wacholder, the collective name of Pseudo-Ezekiel for the whole composition by Brady, and Pseudo-Jeremiah and Ezekiel for the whole text by García Martínez.²⁵

The Possible Genres of the Composition

The names of the composition, as I mentioned above, show us that the scholars approached the fragments from the angle of the scriptural prophetic books. Thus they attributed them to pseudonym or 'false' authors of the late Second Temple literature. The difficulties of the anachronistic classification of these kind of texts arise together with these inappropriate designations (pseudo-, pseudegraphic or apocryphal). I agree with Hindy Najman, who said that "Like the classification of texts as pseudepigraphic, the characterization of Second Temple texts as 'Rewritten Bible' is problematic. When scholars who employ such a concept encounter biblical and extra-biblical texts that recount biblical narratives variations or insertions, they may be tempted to infer that these texts aspire to replace an older authentic biblical tradition with a new version.

21 E.g. in Milik 1976, 254–255.

22 Strugnell-Dimant 1988, 45–56.

23 See Dimant 1992, 2. 413–447.

24 Dimant 1994, 11–31.

25 Wacholder 2000, 445–461; Brady 2000 and 2005, 88–109; García Martínez 1996, 285.

Instead, we should ask whether these writers shared our contemporary conception of the text?"²⁶ It is also intriguing that the earliest copies of prophetic books have different variants in Qumran. Thus we can assume the same or similar authority of the different scriptural versions in this period.

Non-scriptural authoritative texts have also been discovered in the Qumran corpus, e.g. the Book of Enoch or the Book of Jubilees, which transferred important messages to the Jewish groups of the Second Temple period. Finally, it is important to point out the problem that in certain cases it is difficult to decide whether some texts are scriptural or not. Between 1947 and 1956, approximately fifteen Jubilees scrolls were found in five caves at Qumran, all written in Hebrew. The large quantity of manuscripts (more than for any biblical books except for Psalms, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Exodus, and Genesis, in descending order) indicates that Jubilees was widely used at Qumran. According to Devorah Dimant, Jubilees and Apocryphon of Jeremiah C drew on the same tradition or biblicizing composition.²⁷ Todd Hanneken, another scholar, has recently concluded in his article that 4Q390, one possible part of the Apocryphon, interprets Jubilees as Scripture, relying upon the chapters 1 and 23.²⁸ In this context, it is interesting to refer to Patrick Davis' thesis regarding 4Q390 that it preserved a fragment from the later copy of the Apocryphon which rewrites the older version of the text (cf. 4Q387, 2) where the iniquities of the Second Temple period are depicted differently by the author in the form of an *ex eventu* prophecy.²⁹ Nevertheless, ApocJer C has a complex relation to the scriptural and other authoritative sources. The oldest manuscripts of the so-called Apocryphon are nearly contemporaneous with the earliest extant manuscripts of Jeremiah from Qumran. Taking into consideration this textual pluriformity of the scriptural Jeremiah, the question may arise regarding the ApocJer C: What was rewritten in the text? Should we differentiate between the scriptural base-text and its rewritings? Can we find such a complex definition/term which would embody all literary genres and techniques that are included in the Apocryphon? I would assert here that the scholarly discourse regarding these writings of multiple genres as the ApocJer C, employs the literary terms only in a wider sense (e.g. "parabiblical") or broadens the scope of a flexible term (e.g. "Rewritten Bible"). The earlier strategy was followed in finding an overarching designation for the classification of the very different Qumran texts (e.g. the so-called pseudo-prophetic texts) in the DJD text edi-

26 Najman 2003, 7.

27 Dimant 1992, 437–439; Dimant 2001, 102–103, 238–243, 246–249.

28 Hanneken 2011, 407–428, especially see 407 and 428.

29 See Davis 2011, 267–295.

tion, while the latter term is applied for the reworking of the scriptural parts of Ezekiel and Jeremiah, that is, for prophetic texts to which there are no *peshers* in Qumran.

Accordingly, its concept, namely the “Rewritten Prophets,” involves both the narrative and the visionary parts of these rewritings, as it is suggested by Brooke.³⁰ While Brooke³¹ and Henze³² find it useful to consider both Pseudo-Ezekiel and ApocJer C as parts of the “Rewritten Bible,” Bernstein rejects their inclusion because their “goal is not to explicate prophetic material but to supplement it in some other fashion.”³³ If we turn back to the somewhat anachronistic term “parabiblical” which is generally considered as a broader category, we can probably point to other genre-related aspects of the Apocryphon. Originally this term was introduced by Ginsberg, for the case when texts “paraphrase and/or supplement the canonical Scripture as an alternative”, and they are not quoting and interpreting the Scripture.³⁴

Several years later the so-called “parabiblical” term was revived in a form which may mean a literary genre and/or a wide category of texts with very different genres. A huge number of different writings are categorized as “parabiblical” in four volumes of the DJD³⁵ to which the so-called Pseudo-Ezekiel and Apocryphon of Jeremiah belong as well. The classification of a group of texts from Qumran as “parabiblical” was an earlier decision of the editors. In the index volume of the DJD which was published by Emanuel Tov in 2002, Lange and Mittmann-Richert attempt to define the genres of the compositions found in Qumran. They write about the term parabiblical as used in the DJD that “On the basis of biblical texts or themes, the authors of parabiblical texts employ exegetical techniques to provide answers to questions of their own time, phrased as answers by God through Moses or the prophets. The result of their exegetical effort is communicated in the form of a new book. Therefore, parabiblical literature should not be understood as a pseudepigraphic phenomenon. . . .”³⁶ It is intriguing that Lange³⁷ and Tov (in association with Parry)³⁸ have not recently included ApocJer C in the category of parabiblical

30 Brooke 2000a, 2. 696.

31 Brooke 2000b, 2. 779.

32 Henze 2009, 25–26.

33 Bernstein 2005.

34 See Ginsberg 1967, 574.

35 See Attridge 1994; Broshi 1995; Brooke 1996; and Dimant 2001.

36 Lange and Mittmann-Richert 2002, 117–118.

37 Lange 2003, 305–321.

38 Tov and Parry 2006, xxiv, also see Henze 2009, 25, n. 1.

texts. Daniel Falk reflects in his monograph that the so-called parabiblical texts are “lying between ‘biblical’ text and exegesis, but in certain cases it is hard to identify that what a ‘biblical’ text is.”³⁹ However, he does not deal with the ApocJr C at all. Addressing the basis of this problem, Brooke has recently proposed reconsideration of the literary corpus under discussion, the authoritative traditions, and the hierarchy and evolution of genres as well.⁴⁰

If we look for a special genre-related feature of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, we should first of all define what kind of revelatory technique was adopted by the author. The focal point of this work, which is designated as the base-text by Matthias Henze,⁴¹ is the *ex eventu* prophecy which includes a review of history dictated or retold by a prominent prophet, namely Jeremiah. The grammatical tense in which this review is expressed is bound to the historical period in which the prophet lived. Thus all pre-exilic events are narrated in past tense, while Second-temple and eschatological history is told in future tense.⁴²

Another important question is how the prophet’s knowledge of history was revealed, because there is no reference to a vision or an interpretative angel in the text. The fragment (4Q389–I) identified by Dimant as the beginning of the work may allude to a letter sent by Jeremiah to the Judean exiles, read to them at their gathering in Babylon. Dimant goes further behind this narrative and suggests that history was directly revealed to Jeremiah in the letter, without any mediator. The problem is that there is no extant allusion to this kind of revelation in the text.

In contrast, we can recognize that the extant text of the Apocryphon regularly draws upon scriptural traditions both from the Book of Jeremiah and other scriptural passages (Brady). Alex Jassen assumes that the author conceptualized Jeremiah as someone who experienced divine revelation through the process of reading and re-contextualizing earlier scriptural collections.⁴³ García Martínez, with Jassen, calls this technique or genre “revelatory exegesis.”⁴⁴

To summarize, the author employs three strategies in his “revelatory exegesis.” First, the three different fragments testify that the author rewrites the exile narratives on the basis of the last chapters of the scriptural Jeremiah. Second, the author re-contextualizes the prophecies of the later prophets (e.g. Nahum,

39 Falk 2007, 1.

40 Brooke 2010, 361–386.

41 Henze 2009, 34.

42 Dimant 2001, 100.

43 Jassen 2007, 227.

44 Jassen 2007, 215–240, especially see 225–231 and 237; also see García Martínez 2010.

Amos) and adapts several instructions and condemnations from the Torah (e.g. Deuteronomy, Leviticus). In addition, he also updates Daniel (9:24) in the form of the 490-year prophecy (4Q387-2-ii-4, 4Q390), based on Jeremiah's famous 70-year prophecy (Jer 25:11–12; 29:10).⁴⁵ Nevertheless, Daniel was considered a prophet at Qumran⁴⁶ and later by Josephus⁴⁷ and was grouped among the prophets in the Septuagint. Thus, Both the scriptural prophets and the Torah portions were reinterpreted by the author of the ApocJer C in the light of the historical events of late Second Temple period and its eschatological expectations.⁴⁸

Finally, I would quote Lim's vivid description of the compositional "makeup": "What can be observed from the vestiges of this original composition is its dependence upon biblical sources, especially the prophecy of Jeremiah and the book of Deuteronomy. However, it did not simply adopt the biblical narrative wholesale but wove a new compositional garment from the diverse strands of scriptural sources."⁴⁹

What Scripture Was Rewritten in the Jeremiah Portrayal?

First of all I have to note that it is more difficult to recognize the underlying text (hypo-text)⁵⁰ and the overlying interpretation (hyper-text) in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C than to find them in the so-called Pseudo-Ezekiel text. Brooke has recently asserted that the "scriptural texts should not be automatically distinguished from those compositions that interpret them, either implicitly or explicitly."⁵¹ Pseudo-Ezekiel clearly rewrites at least three sections of the biblical Ezekiel, namely 'the Merkavah Vision,' 'The Vision of the Dry Bones,' and 'Ezekiel's Prophecies against the Foreign Nations.'

In contrast, in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C we can find the sporadic re-contextualization of the scriptural verses,⁵² while there are also rewritten chapters from Jeremiah. Just to mention one important example of the

45 See Dimant 1992; Werman 2006; Eshel 2006; Tamási 2009; Reynolds 2011; Davis 2011.

46 See 4Q174 1–3 ii 3 (cf. 11Q13 2:18).

47 To Daniel see *Ant.* 10.267–269, 10.245–246, 249.

48 Henze 2009, 37.

49 Lim 2004, 154.

50 For the use of these terms in similar context, see Brooke 2010, 367.

51 Brooke 2010, 370.

52 For the detailed list of the scriptural and non-scriptural verses which are rewritten in the text see, Brady 2005, 95–108.

re-contextualization of a prophetic passage, in the fragment 4Q385-17, second column, the author rewrites the original oracle of Nahum (3:8–10) against Niniveh. The speaker in the name of Jeremiah adopts the prophetic voice of Nahum and addresses Egypt directly: “Where is your portion, O Amon, which dwells by the Niles?” In Nahum’s original speech Egypt is never the direct addressee, because the eventual destruction of ‘No-Amon’ is introduced as an analogy to the experience of Niniveh.⁵³ What is the meaning of this un-cited but rewritten or reworked scriptural prophecy? Dimant suggests that the focus on Egypt in this fragment refers to the contemporary polemics of the author against Ptolemaic Egypt.⁵⁴ I would like to add to her suggestion that, originally, in the Book of Jeremiah, there is a harsh criticism of Egypt (43 and 46).

In the narrative parts of the historical survey we can find those events from the time of Moses which were mediated by Jeremiah to the later group in exile. This fragment (4Q389 2) reworks or more precisely excerpts the chapters 13–14 of Numbers and chapters 1–2 of Deuteronomy (e.g. Kadesh Barnea is mentioned, a divine oath, God walks with the people in the desert, and the 40 years long wandering in the wilderness appears).

The other section I would like to focus on is the rewritten portrayal of the scriptural Jeremiah, which has survived in three sections of the Apocryphon (4Q383-i, 4Q385a-18-i-ii and 4Q389-1). Here I am convinced that these passages represent a ‘rewritten scriptural’ text, thus showing that the composition includes short rewritings of the scriptural Jeremiah. I would like to draw attention also to the phenomenon that this fragmentary apocryphon embodies a composite literary genre which shows affinities both to special exegetical and to special rewriting techniques.

One of the above-mentioned fragments, namely the 4Q385a-18-i-ii, reworks a larger part of the scriptural material less strictly and focuses on events surrounding the deportation. This is the largest fragment that is unquestionably concerned with the prophet Jeremiah. The two columns of about ten lines each contain accounts of two separate events involving Jeremiah, based on both scriptural and non-scriptural sources. We should ask the question here which Book of Jeremiah was available in Qumran? Six manuscripts of the Book of Jeremiah were discovered in the Second and the Fourth Caves. However, the complete text of the biblical Jeremiah has not survived in Qumran, yet Tov had pointed out earlier (*through the analysis of the fragments—with special regard to the fragment “b” of the Fourth Cave*) that the earliest scriptural version of Jeremiah (4QJer b, 4QJer d) reflects the similar structure and length

53 Jassen 2007, 228–229.

54 Dimant 2001, 158–159.

of the preserved Jeremiah text of the Septuagint.⁵⁵ At the same time this non-crystallized, developing stage of the Book of Jeremiah may help the modern interpreter understand the status and function of this so-called pseudepigraphic or apocryphal text. So this composition rewrote and transmitted the scriptural and non-scriptural tradition of Jeremiah, and its author updated it as well. Let me give some examples of this kind of Jeremiah portrayal.

In the first column of the 4Q385a-18 we can recognize both the rewriting and the summary of the two scriptural chapters, namely Jeremiah 40 and 52 (cf. 2 Kings 25).⁵⁶ The third-person narrative recounts briefly, in eleven lines, the events of the second deportation to Babylon. At first glance it seems to contain a similar description of the scriptural story but in a shorter form: Jeremiah went forth before the Lord and he escorted the captives to Riblah, when Nebuzaradan took the vessels of the Sanctuary, the priests and the nobles and the sons of Israel as well and brought them to Babylon.

In the next five lines of the fragment there is new information on the role of the prophet. Firstly, he followed them until they reached a river, the name of which is missing. Furthermore Jeremiah commanded them what they should do in the land of captivity, namely to keep the covenant and not to defile the name of God as Israel, as their kings and their priests used to do. What is interesting here? Firstly, in the scriptural story of Jeremiah there is no allusion to this journey of the prophet. Unfortunately the name of the river is invisible on the damaged fragment. We can find a similar idea in the later rabbinic text of *Pesiqta Rabbati* 26, namely that Jeremiah followed them to the river Euphrates.⁵⁷ In 2 Baruch (10:1–5), the later apocalypse, we read that Jeremiah was sent by Baruch to Babylon to encourage the captives. The *Paralipomena Jeremiou* or 4 Baruch similarly depicts Jeremiah who spent some time in Babylon (3, 4, 5, 7).

The special thing in this motif is that the character of Jeremiah is reshaped, becoming more active as a prophet and a teacher. This is supported by the subsequent lines of the fragment in which Jeremiah teaches the people to keep the commandments and warns against idolatry as well. Here it is worth mentioning also that Jeremiah appears with Mosaic features in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C.⁵⁸

The Septuagint contains a very similar and short narrative related to the portrayal of Jeremiah. 2 Maccabees (2:1–12) rewrites and further develops

55 See Tov 1999, 364.

56 For the Hebrew text and its English translation, with notes and commentary, see Dimant 2001, 159–163.

57 Dimant 2001, 166.

58 Dimant 2001, 105.

this tradition in which Jeremiah handed over the Torah to the deportees, and exhorted them to keep it. At the same time he hid the vessels of the Sanctuary in a cave of Mount Nebo. Thus he is portrayed as a second Moses who looks down from the top of Nebo to the Promised Land. Besides 2 Maccabees, also the Epistle of Jeremiah contains the encouragement of the deportees.

Going back to the same fragment of the Apocryphon (4Q385a-18), in its second column⁵⁹ first-person speeches appear both by the Lord and the people, which are set within a framework of a third-person narrative. The narrative probably reworks the events which occurred in Tahpanes according to Jeremiah 43:8–44:30. The scriptural narrative was summarized in only ten lines. It says that the people ask Jeremiah to pray for them before God. Because of the fragmentation of the text we have insufficient information on whether Jeremiah prayed on their behalf or not. According to Dimant's reconstruction, Jeremiah rejects to pray for the refugees in Egypt.⁶⁰ In the following lines we can find that Jeremiah laments over Jerusalem.

In the last lines Tahpanes in Egypt recurs, perhaps in the context of introducing another word of the Lord which was mediated by Jeremiah to the sons of Israel and the sons of Judah, and Benjamin. If we compare the scriptural scene in Tahpanes to its version in the Apocryphon, we can easily recognize that there is just one coinciding motif in them, namely the place of the activity. In the Book of Jeremiah (ch. 42), the people's appeal to Jeremiah to pray for them is placed in Judea before they fled to Tahpanes in Egypt, taking Jeremiah and Baruch with them. The tradition that concerns Jeremiah's lament over the destruction of Jerusalem is also absent from the Book of Jeremiah. On the other hand this attribution of lamentation to Jeremiah appears in the first verse of the Lamentations in the Septuagint. This tradition is echoed in the so-called apocryphal works of 2 Baruch and the Paralipomena Jeremiou, and it has been preserved in the rabbinic tradition as well (Lamentations Rabbah [introd.], bMoed Qatan 26a, bBBat. 15a).⁶¹

There is a second, tiny fragment of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C which implies that the prophet was crying over the destruction of Jerusalem (4Q383-1:1).

Finally, the *third fragment*, namely the 4Q389-1, which also touches upon the portrayal of Jeremiah, is located by Dimant at the beginning of the

59 Dimant 2001, 163–164.

60 C.J. Patrick Davis assumes that this deed of Jeremiah “may have been prompted by particularly strong feeling toward the Hellenized Alexandrian Jewish Community” (Davis 2011, 476.).

61 Dimant 2001, 105.

Apocryphon. It briefly accounts a public reading of a document which was sent by Jeremiah from Egypt to the exiles near the river Sour in Babylon. According to Dimant's assumption it should be understood as an introductory event of the divine review of history which was revealed to the prophet. She identifies this unnamed document as a letter sent by the prophet. Here I would like to remark that the theme of the writing, sending or reading of a letter can be found at the end of several writings of the late Second Temple Jewish literature, for example in 1 Enoch, the Book of Jeremiah, the Book of Baruch, and in 2 Baruch. We also know that this fragment has striking resemblances to the first verses of the Book of Baruch, from verse 1:1 to 1:8. Accordingly, here Baruch reads out his book before the people near the river Soud. Thus I would assert that the Apocryphon seems to be the rewriting, adaptation and summary of the last chapters of the Book of Jeremiah, and the first lines of the later Book of Baruch, which presumably belonged to the Hebrew Vorlage of the OG of Jeremiah.⁶²

Concluding Remarks

In the course of my analysis I have pointed out the problem of the genre classification of the whole composition. This problem is connected with the naming of the writing and it is derived from the complexity of the composition's genre as well. On the one hand, all of the terms, "pseudepygraphic," "apocryphal," "Rewritten Bible," "parabiblical," seem to be more or less problematic. On the other hand, I consider these terms relevant to understanding the multigeneric ApocJer C. Other designations (e.g. "revelatory exegesis," "historical apocalypse") reflect different main aspects of the genre and structure of the ApocJer C. The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C does not interpret the extant prophetic Book of Jeremiah, while it includes the re-contextualization of different prophetic and of other scriptural passages (e.g., from Nahum, Deuteronomy and Numbers). We can also find both rewritten and epitomized chapters and passages from the Book of Jeremiah. It is important to observe that there are no *pescharim* on Jeremiah or Ezekiel in Qumran. The author does not cite from Scripture directly but re-contextualizes and reinterprets its verses in the narrative sections of the Apocryphon, which concern the post-exilic events of Israel's past. The three fragments which contain the portrayal of Jeremiah represent the rewritings of chapters 40–44, and 52 from Jeremiah. The question arises here if these epitomized Jeremiah narratives in the Apocryphon can be

62 See Tov (1975), and in detail see Tov's other study (1976).

understood as rewritten prophetic texts or not. My answer to this question would be that as the rewriting of a text does not necessarily mean its extension, the reworked and shortened portrayal of Jeremiah may represent rewritings of scriptural narratives in the composition.

I have also pointed out in my paper the new narrative elements of these rewritings. Many of them can be found in the later Septuagint (Bar 1:1–4, Lam 1:1; 2 Macc 2:1–12; Epistle of Jeremiah 4), while others were transmitted through later non-scriptural texts (2 Baruch, Paralipomena Jermiou, Pesikta Rabbati 26). So I suppose that these rewritings of the portrayal of Jeremiah might have drawn mainly from the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint. The re-contextualization and rewritings of the scriptural passages were techniques for both the transmission and the updating of the developing Jeremiah-tradition. However, these techniques might have been important also for the self-authorization of the text, and we may regard them as parts of an authority-conferring strategy, too, yet we should not think that the author intended to replace an older authentic scriptural text.

Bibliography

- Attridge, Harold et al. eds. 1994. *Parabiblical Texts, Part 1.: Qumran Cave 4. VIII.* DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 2005. 'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category which has Outlived its Usefulness? *Textus* 22: 169–196.
- Brady, Monica. 2005. Biblical Interpretation in the 'Pseudo-Ezekiel' Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four. Pages 88–109 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Brooke, George J. 1998. Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives. Pages 271–301 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam. 1. vol. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2000a. Prophecy. Pages 694–700 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2. vol. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2000b. Rewritten Bible. Pages 777–781 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2. vol. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2010. Genre, Theory, Rewritten Bible and Peshet. *DSD* 17: 361–386.
- Brooke, George J. et al. eds. 1996. *Parabiblical Texts, Part 3. Qumran Cave 4. XVII.* DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Broshi, Magen et al. eds. 1995. *Parabiblical Texts, Part 2. Qumran Cave 4. XIV.* DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Campbell, Jonathan G. 2005. 'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique. Pages 43–68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003*, Edited by J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons, and L.K. Pietersen. LSTS 52. London: T&T Clark.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SDSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Davis, C. J. Patrick. 2011. Torah-Performance and History in the Golah: Rewritten Bible of "Re-presentational" Authority in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C. Pages 467–495 in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection*. Edited by P.W. Flint, J.D. Baek and S. Kyung. SBLEJL 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Dimant, Devorah. 1992. New Light from Qumran on the Jewish Pseudepigrapha—4Q390. Pages 405–447 in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid, 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1994. An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385B = 4Q385 16). Pages 11–31 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by G.J. Brooke and F. García Martínez. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2001. *Qumran Cave 4. XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD XXX. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2011. Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C in Perspective. *RevQ* 25: 17–39.
- Eshel, Hanan. 2006. 4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period. Pages 102–110 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Falk, Daniel K. 2007. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls*. CQS 8./LSTS 63. New York: T&T Clark.
- García Martínez, Florentino. ed. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*. 2 ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Ginsberg, H. Louis. 1967. Review of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary*. *TS* 28: 574.
- Hanneken, Todd R. 2011. Status and Interpretation of Jubilees in 4Q390. Pages 407–428 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam*. Edited by E.F. Mason. JSJSup 153. Leiden: Brill.
- Henze, Matthias. 2009. 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C and 4QPseudo-Ezekiel: Two 'Historical' Apocalypses. Pages 25–41 in *Prophecy after the Prophets? The Contribution of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Understanding of Biblical and Extra-Biblical Prophecy*. Edited by K. De Troyer, A. Lange, L.L. Schulte. CBET 52. Leuven: Peeters.
- Jassen, Alex P. 2007. *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*. STDJ 68. Leiden: Brill.

- Lange, Armin. 2003. The Parabiblical Literature of the Qumran Library and the Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible. Pages 305–321 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by M.P. Shalom, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields. vTSup 94. Leiden: Brill.
- Lange, Armin and Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike. 2002. Annotated List of the Texts from the Judean Desert Classified by Content and Genre. Pages 115–164 in *The Text from the Judean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judean Desert Series*. Edited by E. Tov. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lim, Timothy H. 2004. Review: Devorah Dimant, ed., *Qumran Cave 4.XXI. Parabiblical Texts; Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, DJD XXX, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001. *JBL* 123: 153–155.
- Milik, Jozef T. 1976. *The Books of Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Najman, Hindy. 2003. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill.
- Parry, Donald W. and Tov, Emanuel eds. 2005. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader Part 6: Additional Genres and Unclassified Texts*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2007. Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon: Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism? Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, E.J.C. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill.
- Reynolds, Bennie H. III. 2011. Adjusting the Apocalypse: How the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C Updates the Book of Daniel. Pages 279–294 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls In Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. Vol. 1. Eited by A. Lange, E. Tov, M. Weigold and B.H. Reynolds III. vTSup 140. Leiden: Brill.
- Strugnell, John. 1956 Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân: Communication de J. Strugnell. *RB* 63: 49–67.
- Strugnell, John, Dimant, Devorah. 1988. 4QSecond Ezekiel. *RevQ* 13: 45–56.
- Tamási, Balázs. 2009. Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics Against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship Behind the Fragments. Pages 310–328 in *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*. Edited by K.D. Dobos, M. Köszeghy. HBM 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1975. *The Book of Baruch Also Called I Baruch (Greek and Hebrew): Texts and Translations*. PS 6. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- . 1976. *The Septuagint translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8*. HSM 8. Missoula, Scholars Press.
- . 1999. The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of its Textual History. Pages 363–384 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited by J.H. Tigay.

- Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. (reprinted, with small changes in Tov, Emmanuel 1999. *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays in the Septuagint*. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill).
- Vermes, Geza. 1961. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. SPB 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. 2000. Deutero Ezekiel and Jeremiah (4Q384–4Q391): Identifying the Dry Bones of Ezekiel 37 as the Essenes. Pages 445–461 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum.
- Werman, Cana. 2006. Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature. *DSD* 13: 229–255.
- Wright, Benjamin G. III. 2002. Review: Devorah Dimant, ed., *Qumran Cave 4.XXI. Parabiblical Texts; Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*, DJD xxx, Oxford: Clarendon, 2001. *DSD* 9: 249–253.

Between Rewritten Bible and Allegorical Commentary: Philo's Interpretation of the Burning Bush

Steven D. Fraade

Introduction

Categories are useful for sorting diverse materials, but they reach the limits of their usefulness when they become rigid, which is to say when their boundaries become impermeable, when they do not allow for straddlers (which interest me the most). In the case of the literary category (I resist speaking in terms of “genre”) “rewritten Bible,” it provides a heuristically convenient umbrella under which to include a wide assortment of ancient Jewish writings that make little or no distinction between the scriptural text being “rewritten” and its paraphrastic expansion, reduction, or alteration. However, what gets left out from under the umbrella should not be put “out of sight, out of mind” with respect to what is included under it. In particular, I have in mind the form of scriptural commentary, which I (and others) have often sought to sharply, perhaps too sharply, demarcate from “rewritten Bible” as being fundamentally different with respect to its *explicit* interpretive stance vis-à-vis the scriptural text, and the implicit authority claims thereby made for both the commented-upon text and the text of commentary, as for those of the commentator(s) and the interpretive community.¹ In other words, the value of this distinction, even as it needs to be qualified, is in the performative function of the commentary in relation to its underlying hermeneutical/theological presumptions.

In a previous study of rabbinic midrash as commentary, I sought to deconstruct this demarcation by arguing that even rabbinic scriptural commentary, notwithstanding its atomistic differentiation of scriptural lemma and midrashic comment, implicitly constructs (or may rest upon and hence masks) a continuous rewritten scriptural narrative.² In the present context I wish to look at another transgressive example, this time drawn from the writings of Philo of Alexandria, in which the forms of “rewritten Bible” and “commentary,” in this case allegorical, are combined in interesting ways. Philo is not usually

¹ See, in this regard, Alexander (1988), who argues that “rewritten Bible” differs from “commentary” in the former’s “dissolving” of explicit exegesis.

² Fraade 2006.

included among the exemplars of “rewritten Bible,” in large part because he is thought of more as a “commentator.”³ I hope to show, through one example, that in Philo’s case, this delineation is too sharply drawn. In his introduction to his *Life of Moses* (1.4), Philo is tellingly explicit in saying that his account will be most accurate due to his combining of what he has read (Scripture) with what he has heard (tradition), perhaps an apt characterization of “rewritten Bible” in general:

§4 ἀλλ’ ἔγωγε τὴν τούτων βασκανίαν ὑπερβάς τὰ περι τὸν ἄνδρα μὴνύσω μαθὼν αὐτὰ καὶ βίβλων τῶν ἱερῶν, ὅς θαυμάσια μνημεῖα τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας ἀπολέλοιπε, καὶ παρά τινων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους πρεσβυτέρων· τὰ γὰρ λεγόμενα τοῖς ἀναγινωσκόμενοις αἰεὶ συνύφαινον καὶ διὰ τοῦτ’ ἔδοξα μάλλον ἐτέρων τὰ περι τὸν βίον ἀκριβῶσαι

But I will . . . tell the story of Moses as I have learned it, both from the sacred books, the wonderful monuments of his wisdom which he has left behind him, and from some of the elders of the nation; for I always interwove what I was told with what I read, and thus believed myself to have a closer knowledge than others of his life history.⁴

The scriptural base (uncited by Philo) of the example we shall consider is the story of the “burning bush” in Exod 3:1–6, the first four verses of which will first occupy our attention. Before turning to Philo’s interpretation of the passage in his *Life of Moses*, we might look at the scriptural text itself, in Hebrew, English, and Greek, to ask what therein might call out for interpretive attention:

Exodus 3:1–6 (MT)

1 וּמֹשֶׁה הָיָה רֹעֵה רֹעֵה אֶת־צֹאן יִתְרוֹ חֹתָנוּ בְּהֵן מִדְיָן וַיִּנְהַג אֶת־הַצֹּאן אַחֲרֵי הַמִּדְבָּר
וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הַר הָאֱלֹהִים חֲרָבָה:
2 וַיֵּרָא מִלְּאֵךְ יְהוָה אֵלָיו כְּלִבְתַּאֲשׁ מִתּוֹךְ הַסֵּנֶה וַיֵּרָא וַהֲנֵה הַסֵּנֶה בַּעַר בְּאֵשׁ
וְהַסֵּנֶה אֵינְנוֹ אֶכָּל:
3 וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֶסְרֶה־נָּא וְאֶרְאֶה אֶת־הַמַּרְאֶה הַגָּדֹל הַזֶּה מִדּוּעַ לֹא־יָבֵעַר הַסֵּנֶה:
4 וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה בִּי סֵר לְרֵאוֹת וַיִּקְרָא אֵלָיו אֱלֹהִים מִתּוֹךְ הַסֵּנֶה וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה מֹשֶׁה
וַיֹּאמֶר הִנְנִי:
5 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־תִּקְרַב הֵלֶם שְׁלִנְעֻלֶיךָ מֵעַל רַגְלֶיךָ כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹמֵד
עָלָיו אֲדַמְתִּי־קֹדֶשׁ הוּא:

3 On the positive, but qualified, relation of Philo’s Exposition of the Law, which includes his *Life of Moses*, to “rewritten Bible,” see most recently, Sterling 2012, 423–24, cited below at n. 15.

4 Here and in what follows, Greek texts and English translations of Philo are from the Loeb Classical Library edition.

6 וַיֹּאמֶר אֲנֹכִי אֱלֹהֵי אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהֵי יִצְחָק וְאֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב וַיִּסְתַּר מִשָּׁה
פָּנָיו כִּי יָרָא מִהַבֵּית אֱלֹהֵי אֱלֹהִים:

Exodus 3:1–6 (NJPS)

1 Now Moses, tending the flock of his father-in-law Jethro, the priest of Midian, drove the flock into the wilderness, and came to Horeb, the mountain of God.

2 An angel of the Lord appeared to him in a blazing fire out of a bush. He gazed, and there was a bush all aflame, yet the bush was not consumed.

3 Moses said, “I must turn aside to look at this marvelous sight; why doesn’t the bush burn up?”

4 When the Lord saw that he had turned aside to look, God called to him out of the bush: “Moses! Moses!” He answered, “Here I am.”

5 And He said, “Do not come closer. Remove your sandals from your feet, for the place on which you stand is holy ground.

6 I am,” He said, “the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.” And Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God.

Exodus 3:1–6 (LXX)

1 Καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἦν ποιμαίνων τὰ πρόβατα Ἰσθὸρ τοῦ γαμβροῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱερέως Μαδίαμ καὶ ἤγαγεν τὰ πρόβατα ὑπὸ τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος Χωρηβ.

2 ὥφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς ἐκ τοῦ βάλτου, καὶ ὄρα ὅτι ὁ βάλτος καίεται πυρὶ, ὁ δὲ βάλτος οὐ κατακαίεται.

3 εἶπεν δὲ Μωϋσῆς Παρελθὼν ὄψομαι τὸ ὄραμα τὸ μέγα τοῦτο, τί ὅτι οὐ κατακαίεται ὁ βάλτος.

4 ὡς δὲ εἶδεν κύριος ὅτι προσάγει ἰδεῖν, ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν κύριος ἐκ τοῦ βάλτου λέγων Μωϋσῆ, Μωϋσῆ. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Τί ἐστίν;

5 καὶ εἶπεν Μὴ ἐγγίσῃς ὠδεῦσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου· ὁ γὰρ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ σὺ ἕστηκας, γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν.

6 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, θεὸς Ἀβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαακ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακωβ. ἀπέστρεψεν δὲ Μωϋσῆς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ εὐλαβεῖτο γὰρ κατεμβλέψαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

For our purposes, the differences between the MT and LXX are minor (we have one Qumran Hebrew fragment; the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the targumim are unremarkable). Several details (among many) strike me as being of particular interpretive significance:

1. What is the function of the “angel of the Lord” (הַיְהוָה אֲנֹכִי; ἄγγελος κυρίου) that appears to Moses in v. 2, but plays no further explicit role in the continuing narrative, which speaks instead of the Lord/God. Are these the same?
2. What is the relation between the visual experience of Moses, emphasized by the repeated use of verbs for seeing (six times in vv. 2–4, 6, but more pronounced in the MT than in the LXX), but not described, to the explicit revelatory aural content of vv. 4–6 and following?
3. What is the nature of this “bush” (a happax legomenon in both Hebrew and Greek: הַיַּבֵּשׁ; ὁ βᾶτος), appearing only here and in Deut 33:16, in reference to the same narrative?
4. Does the appearance of the burning bush serve any function other than to attract Moses’s attention so as to initiate the dialogue between God and Moses that follows, in which Moses receives his commission, which is all that can be inferred directly from the scriptural account?

However, notwithstanding these calls for interpretation, the scriptural narrative of the burning bush receives surprisingly little attention in Jewish writings prior to or contemporaneous with Philo. There is nothing to speak of inner-scripturally (except for Deut 33:16, already mentioned), nor in the Dead Sea Scrolls, nor in the writings collected by James Charlesworth in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*,⁵ nor in the fragments of Hellenistic Jewish writers.⁶ The narrative retellings of both the book of *Jubilees* and Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* skip over the incident entirely, where we would expect to find it.⁷ Only Josephus includes a relatively unremarkable paraphrase, to which we will return shortly.

Philo’s Rewriting of Exodus 3:1–2

In *Life of Moses* 1.65–66, in the context of recounting Moses’s sojourn in Midian, Philo paraphrases Exod 3:1–2, by at first simply filling in some details in the scriptural narrative:

§65 ἄγων δὲ τὴν ποιμνὴν εἰς τόπον εὐδρόν τε καὶ εὐχορτον, ἔνθα συνέβαινε καὶ πολλὴν πόαν προβατεύσιμον ἀναδίδοσθαι, γενόμενος πρὸς τινὶ νάπει θεάμα

5 Charlesworth 1983–1985; Delamarter 2002.

6 See Niehoff 2011a, 20 n.8 (Ezekiel the Tragedian), 63–64 (Aristobulus), 145.

7 See *Jub.* 48:1–2; *LAB* 10:1.

ἐκπληκτικώτατον ὄρα. βάτος ἦν, ἀκανθώδές τι φυτὸν καὶ ἀσθενέστατον· οὗτος, οὐδενὸς πῦρ προσενεγκόντος ἐξαίφνης ἀνακαίεται καὶ περισχεθεὶς ὄλος ἐκ ῥίζης εἰς ἀκρέμονα πολλῆ φλογὶ καθάπερ ἀπὸ τινος πηγῆς ἀνομβρούσης διέμενε σῶος, οὐ κατακαϊόμενος, οἷα τις ἀπαθῆς οὐσία καὶ οὐχ ὕλη πυρὸς αὐτὸς ὢν, ἀλλὰ τροφῆ χρώμενος τῷ πυρί.

§66 κατὰ δὲ μέσσην τὴν φλόγα μορφή τις ἦν περικαλλεστάτη, τῶν ὁρατῶν ἐμπερῆς οὐδενί, θεοειδέστατον ἄγαλμα, φῶς ἀυγοειδέστερον τοῦ πυρὸς ἀπαστρέπτουσα, ἦν ἂν τις ὑπετόπησεν εἰκόνα τοῦ ὄντος εἶναι· καλεῖσθω δὲ ἄγγελος, ὅτι σχεδὸν τὰ μέλλοντα γενήσεσθαι διήγγελλε τρανοτέρᾳ φωνῆς ἡσυχία διὰ τῆς μεγαλουργηθείσης ὄψεως.

65 Now, as he was leading the flock to a place where the water and the grass were abundant, and where there happened to be plentiful growth of herbage for the sheep, he found himself at a glen where he saw a most astonishing sight. There was a bramble-bush, a thorny sort of plant, and of the most weakly kind, which, without anyone's setting it alight, suddenly took fire; and, though enveloped from root to twigs in a mass of fire, which looked as though it were spouted up from a fountain, yet remained whole, and, instead of being consumed, seemed to be a substance impervious to attack, and, instead of serving as fuel to the fire, actually fed on it.

66 In the midst of the flame was a form of the fairest beauty, unlike any visible object, an image supremely divine in appearance, refulgent with a light brighter than the light of fire. It might be supposed that this was the image of Him that is; but let us rather call it an angel or herald, since, with a silence that spoke more clearly than speech, it employed as it were the miracle of sight to herald future events.

Moses went where he did in search of good pasturing for his sheep. The bush was a *thorny* and *weakly* kind, perhaps implicit in βάτος, but here made explicit.⁸ To accentuate the miraculous nature of the sight, Philo adds that Moses saw the bush suddenly alight without anyone igniting it, and that the fire appeared as a fountain. Notably, but undramatically, not only was the bush not damaged by the fire, but the bush fed on the fire.

However, Philo's most important contribution here (beginning with §66) is to focus on the nature of the angel within the flames, in part because of the ambiguity of the scriptural narrative as to the angel's function, in part due to

8 See BDB 702; LSJ 311.

Philo's Platonic discomfort with God's appearing to Moses in a visible form. Here he begins his transition from retelling the story to interpreting it. Philo wishes to stress that the divine image in the midst of the bush was *not* a visible object in the normal (physical) sort of visibility, notwithstanding the scriptural verse's repeated emphasis on seeing, nor was this a fire in the usual sense, but rather a refulgent light brighter than normal fire. While one might think, says Philo, of the angelic appearance as constituting an image or visual representation of God, prior to his communication with Moses, ἄγγελος should be understood in its base meaning as messenger or herald.⁹ Since a normal messenger communicates his message through speech rather than through vision, this provides Philo with an opportunity to expand upon the miraculous nature of this event: a *silent* speech that communicates through supernatural *sight*.

This emphasis on the miraculous interchangeability of the senses of seeing and hearing (seeing what would be normally heard) is familiar from Philo's several interpretations of the theophany at Mt. Sinai, to which, in a sense, the burning bush incident is a prelude. In particular, note his interpretations of Exod 20:15 (18) ("All the people saw the voice") and Exod 20:19 (22) ("You have seen that I have spoken to you out of heaven"), which I have treated at length elsewhere in print.¹⁰ Thus, the function of the burning bush is not simply to get Moses's attention for the communication with God that follows, which would seem to be the plain meaning of the scriptural text, but which leaves the specific function of the angel/messenger unclear. Rather, by Philo's retelling of the story, the "miracle of sight" is employed to "herald" through an articulate silence "future events." In a sense, then, what Moses (and Philo's "readers") "sees" is the *future*. The specifics of this vision as message, that is, the nature and meaning of the future events being foretold, remain to be unpacked in Philo's more explicit allegorical commentary to follow.

The First Level of Symbolic Commentary

Although, as I have suggested, Philo has already (in §66) begun to shift from retelling to explaining, it is in the next paragraph (§67) that he begins his meta-

9 LSJ 7. Cf. BDB 521.

10 See *On the Decalogue* 32–49; *On the Migration of Abraham* 47–49 (including an interesting interpretation of Deut 4:12); *The Life of Moses* 2.213; Fraade, 2008. Compare also Philo's *Questions and Answers on Exodus* 2:47 (to Exod 24:17), wherein Philo similarly discounts fire as a physical representation of God.

phoric unpacking or decoding of the three main characters of the rewritten narrative: the bush, the fire, and the angel:

§67 σύμβολον γὰρ ὁ μὲν καιόμενος βᾶτος τῶν ἀδικουμένων, τὸ δὲ φλέγον πῦρ τῶν ἀδικούντων, τὸ δὲ μὴ κατακαίεσθαι τὸ καιόμενον τοῦ μὴ πρὸς τῶν ἐπιτιθεμένων φθαρῆσεσθαι τοὺς ἀδικουμένους, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἄπρακτον καὶ ἀνωφελῆ γενέσθαι τὴν ἐπίθεσιν, τοῖς δὲ τὴν ἐπιβουλὴν ἀζήμιον, ὁ δὲ ἄγγελος προνοίας τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ τὰ λῖαν φοβερὰ παρὰ τὰς ἀπάντων ἐλπίδας κατὰ πολλὴν ἡσυχίαν ἐξευμαρίζοντος.

67 For the burning bramble was a symbol of those who suffered wrong, as the flaming fire of those who did it. Yet that which burned was not burnt up, and this was a sign that the sufferers would not be destroyed by their aggressors, who would find that the aggression was vain and profitless while the victims of malice escaped unharmed. The angel was a symbol of God's providence, which all silently brings relief to the greatest dangers, exceeding every hope.

Whereas several early rabbinic midrashim interpret the lowly, thorny bush as symbolizing Israel in its suffering,¹¹ Philo's unpacking is at first more universal: the bush represents sufferers, while the fire symbolizes their oppressors. Just as the fire fails to consume the bush, the aggressions of the oppressors fail to harm their victims, who "escape unharmed." This reversal of seeming fortunes is ensured by the divine providence, represented in the narrative by the angel/herald, which *silently* fulfils, even exceeds, the hopes of the oppressed for relief. While this symbolic unpacking could have been performed on the scriptural text itself, certain aspects depend on Philo's prior retelling of the narrative, especially the emphasis on the *silence* of the angel. However, the angel as divine providence, perhaps previously implied, is here made explicit. This sets the stage for what appears to be a second, deeper level of allegorical commentary, which is dependent upon both the rewritten narrative (§§65–66) and the first level of symbolic decoding (§67).

11 See in particular *Mekhilta of R. Shim'on bar Yoh. ai* 3:8. (ed. Epstein-Melammed, 1–2). Cf. *Exod. Rab.* 2:1. For ancient interpretations of the burning bush more broadly, see Ginzberg, 1968, 415–416 n. 115.

The Second Level of Allegorical Commentary §§68–70

Next, Philo is explicit that his decoding thus far has only reached the first level, to which there is more to be mined below:

§68 τὴν δὲ εἰκασίαν ἀκριβῶς ἐπισκεπτέον. ὁ βράτος, ὡς ἐλέχθη, φυτὸν ἀσθενέστατον ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἄκεντρον, ὡς εἰ καὶ μόνον ἐπιψαύσειέ τις τιτρώσκειν, οὐτ' ἐξαναλώθη τῷ φύσει δαπανηρῶ πυρί, τοῦναντίον δὲ ἐφυλάχθη πρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ διαμένων ὅποιος ἦν πρὶν ἀνακαίεσθαι μηδὲν ἀποβαλὼν τὸ παράπαν αὐγὴν προσέλαβε

68 But the details of the comparison must be considered. The bramble, as I have said, is a very weakly plant, yet it is prickly and will wound if one do but touch it. Again, though fire is naturally destructive, the bramble was not devoured thereby, but on the contrary was guarded by it, and remained just as it was before it took fire, lost nothing at all but gained an additional brightness.

First, the thorny bush is not just lowly, as appropriate to its representing those who suffer, but can inflict through its thorns harm to those who touch (that is, seek to harm) it. Here Philo picks up on a something previously said, almost in passing, at the end of §65, that the bush was not only unharmed by the fire (which is all that the scriptural text says), but was protected by it, fed on it, even gaining in brightness.

In the next section (§69), Philo makes his one historical allusion:

§69 τοῦθ' ἅπαν ὑπογραφή τις ἐστὶ τῆς ἐθνικῆς ὑποθέσεως, ἢ κατ' ἐκείνον τὸν χρόνον ἐπεῖχε, μόνον οὐ βοῶσα τοῖς ἐν συμφοραῖς. “μὴ ἀναπίπτετε, τὸ ἀσθενὲς ὑμῶν δύναμις ἐστίν, ἢ καὶ κεντεῖ καὶ κατατρώσει μυρίους. ὑπὸ τῶν ἐξαναλώσαι γλιχομένων τὸ γένος ἀκόντων διασωθήσεσθε μᾶλλον ἢ ἀπολείσθε, τοῖς κακοῖς οὐ κακωθήσεσθε, ἀλλ' ὅταν μάλιστα πορθεῖν νομίση τις ὑμᾶς, τότε μάλιστα πρὸς εὐκλειαν ἐκλάμψετε”

69 All this is a description of the nation's condition as it then stood, and we may think of it as a voice to the sufferers: “Do not lose heart; your weakness is your strength, which can prick, and thousands will suffer from its wounds. Those who desire to consume you will be your unwilling saviours instead of your destroyers. Your ills will work you no ill. Nay, just when the enemy is surest of ravaging you, your fame will shine forth most gloriously.”

In saying, “All this is a description of the nation’s condition as it then stood,” Philo presumably refers to the condition of Israel in Egypt at Moses’s time, before returning, it would seem, to a more universal message. In other words, the future events that are heralded by the burning bush are those awaiting Moses upon his return to Egypt. Why this brief, seemingly unnecessary, nod to history? Is Philo thinking that there are those who would apply his allegorical interpretation to the condition of the Jewish community of Egypt (Alexandria) of his own time (early first century CE)? If so, does he seek to discourage such a reading, or indirectly to allow for it (doth he protest too much)? Depending on when we date Philo’s *Life of Moses* in relation to the uprising against the Jews of Alexandria under Flaccus, one could imagine Philo’s allegorical interpretation to speak directly to “the nation’s condition as it then stood” in his *own* time as well.¹²

Interestingly, it is precisely after this historical and national nod, that Philo intensifies his diction by switching to the second-person address, as if the herald of the burning bush is now directly speaking to Philo’s “readers” as sufferers, intensifying even further the message of turned tables first planted inconspicuously at the end of §65: *Your* seeming weakness is *your* strength. Those (*your* tormentors) who seek to destroy *you*, will be *your* unwitting saviours. Just when *your* condition seems as bad as it can get, *you* will shine forth like the fire. What a reversal of roles!

Finally, the fire (which previously symbolized the oppressors) now addresses directly the oppressors, as if speaking for God:

§70 πάλιν τὸ πῦρ φθοροποιὸς οὐσία διελέγχουσα τοὺς ὠμοθύμους· “μὴ ταῖς ἰδίαις ἀλκαῖς ἐπαίρεσθε, τὰς ἀμάχους ῥώμας ἰδόντες καθαιρουμένας σωφρονίσθητε· ἡ μὲν καυστικὴ δύναμις τῆς φλογὸς ὡς ξύλον καίεται, τὸ δὲ φύσει καυστὸν ξύλον οἶα πῦρ ἐμφανῶς καίει.”

70 Again fire, the element which works destruction, convicts the cruel-hearted. “Exult not in your own strength” it says. “Behold your invincible might brought low, and learn wisdom. The property of flame is to

12 See Niehoff (201b, 11–16) who argues for Philo’s having written the Exposition of the Law toward the end of his life while in Rome, in which political and intellectual context the Exposition, especially the *Life of Moses*, needs to be understood. For a similar argument, see most recently Bloch (2012, 71–77). Note in particular (76): “Philo’s allegorical reading of the burning bush episode—the burning bush is a ‘symbol of those who suffered wrong’—may not only refer to the biblical suffering of the Israelites in Egypt, but also to the suppression in Philo’s Alexandria.”

consume, yet it is consumed, like wood. The nature of wood is to be consumed yet it is manifested as the consumer, as though it were the fire.”

Just as the sufferers were told by a voice (of the herald?) not to despair in their seeming weakness (§69), the oppressors are now directly admonished not to exalt in their seeming (physical) strength, but to learn wisdom.¹³ Returning to the scriptural terms of the message, the flame and bush (wood) have exchanged roles as consumer and consumed. Once again, not only is the bush (whether Israel or sufferers more universally) not consumed (as per the plain scriptural sense), but it will vanquish its oppressors.

From “Rewritten Bible” to Allegorical Commentary

Thus far, I have sought to demonstrate that Philo’s allegorical interpretation of the scriptural narrative of the burning bush is based not on the scriptural text itself, but on its initial retelling (§65 and the beginning of §66). Philo’s explicit commentary begins with his comment that “It might be supposed that this was the image of Him that is; but let us rather call it an angel or herald . . .” From there on, Philo’s allegorical understanding of bush and fire as signifying sufferers and their oppressors grows steadily more explicit and pronounced, with some surprising twists (the fire changes from the oppressors to the voice that condemns the oppressor and back again). However, notwithstanding this apparent division of labour, it would be difficult to draw a sharp line of demarcation between “rewritten Bible” and “commentary” here.

Can we presume that the initial rewritten scripture (§§65–66) upon which Philo comments was one that he himself created (perhaps for the very purposes of providing a base for his commentary), rather than a version of the scriptural narrative that he inherited from his predecessors or that circulated in his time among Alexandrian Jews? We may ask more broadly, can we presume that extant texts of rewritten scripture are the exegetical products of their authors alone in direct response to Scripture alone (*sola scriptura*, as it were), and not the creative incorporation of Scripture and tradition (as Philo himself avers¹⁴)? In this case we are at a disadvantage since we have, as previously noted, so little evidence of interpretations of the burning bush either prior to or contemporaneous with Philo.

13 I would move the closing quotes to the end of the previous sentence ending with “learn wisdom.”

14 See above at n. 4.

Our only other example of a rewritten version of the story from around Philo's time is that found in Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 2.264–268, which I shall not cite here. In that passage we find several elements of Josephus's retelling that are common to Philo's: 1. Moses chooses to pasture his father-in-law's sheep by Mt. H. oreb because of the abundant herbage there (§§264–65). Josephus also notes that the “fire found a tongue” (§267), but without going on at length, as does Philo, about the “miracle of sight.” Most significant perhaps is Josephus's portrayal of the voice from the fire as predicting (heralding) the future (§268). However, for Josephus that future is the “glory and honour that [Moses] would win from men under God's auspices.” Thus, while the two retellings share several important elements, they are of a rather mundane sort. Josephus's retelling, while lengthier than Philo's does not provide the basis for a similarly soaring commentary. Nevertheless, the comparison enables us to see how particularly “Philonic” is Philo's retelling of the burning bush narrative, being not the end of his process of interpretation, but only the first step of several, in a sense the staging area for his allegorical commentary.

From this (admittedly brief) example, of which there are others, especially in Philo's *Life of Moses*, we might ask whether “rewritten Bible,” in its other shapes and contexts is the end of an exegetical process, its beginning, or something in between. As Gregory Sterling says of Philo's Exposition of the Law, of which the passage that we examined may be considered an acute example, “His standard handling of the text is to summarize the account and to comment on his summary . . . Philo appropriated the tradition of rewriting the text in the Exposition but used it as a technique within the commentary tradition.”¹⁵ Thus, as important and useful as the distinction between “rewritten Bible” and “(allegorical) commentary” is, we should not allow that distinction to conceal the ways in which they are intersecting partners in the multifaceted dynamics of ancient scriptural interpretation.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip S. 1988. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bloch, Renée. 2012. Alexandria in Pharaonic Egypt: Projections in *De Vita Mosis*. *SPhilo* 24: 69–84

15 See above, n. 3.

- Charlesworth, James H. ed. 1983–1985. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.
- Delamarter, Steve. 2002. *A Scripture Index to Charlesworth's the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Fraade, Steven D. 2006. Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash As Commentary. Pages 59–78 in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*. Edited by C. Bakhos. JSJSup 106. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008. Hearing and Seeing at Sinai: Interpretive Trajectories. Pages 247–68 in *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by G.J. Brooke, H. Najman and L.T. Stuckenbruck. Leiden: Brill.
- Ginzberg, Louis. 1968. *Legends of the Jews*. vol. 5. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- Niehoff, Maren R. 2011a. *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2011b. Philo's *Exposition* in a Roman Context. *SPhilo* 23: 1–21.
- Sterling, Gregory E. 2012. The Interpreter of Moses: Philo of Alexandria and the Biblical Text. Pages 423–24 in *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.

Philo's Life of Moses as "Rewritten Bible"

Finn Damgaard

Normally, Philo's writings are not included in the discussion of the phenomenon of "Rewritten Bible" because of their literary form of exposition and Philo's allegorical method. I shall argue, however, that Philo's *Life of Moses*, can be seen as an example of this phenomenon. Or at least, as we shall see, the first book of the *Life of Moses*.¹

In the first part of the article I shall discuss the genre of the *Life of Moses* and offer an explanation for why the work seldom appears on lists of rewritten Biblical works.² In the second and final part, I shall present a reading of the *Life of Moses* that is based on an understanding of the work as an example of the "Rewritten Bible" phenomenon. In so doing, I shall demonstrate how Philo makes use of implicit rather than explicit exegesis as his main interpretative strategy in the first book of the *Life of Moses*.

As is well known, the *Life of Moses* consists of two books. Whereas the first book is concerned with Moses as a king, the second deals with Moses' legislative, priestly and prophetic functions. While the first book is arranged

1 The present article reproduces parts of a chapter in my forthcoming book, *Recasting Moses: The Memory of Moses in Biographical and Autobiographical Narratives in Ancient Judaism and 4th-Century Christianity* (Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang 2013).

2 Peder Borgen has argued that the whole *Exposition*, including the *Life of Moses*, should be classified as Rewritten Bible. According to Borgen, Philo's *Exposition* in general meets Philip Alexander's criterion for Rewritten Bible (Alexander 1988, 116–118). The *Exposition* does, however, also comprise surveys of laws as well as explicit theological aims, which Alexander excluded from his definition. Borgen accordingly argued that Alexander's definition should be broadened so that it also comprises surveys of laws and explicit theological aims (Borgen 1997, 78). Borgen's classification of Philo's *Exposition* seems, however, not to have influenced scholarship on Rewritten Bible. To my knowledge, only Daniel J. Harrington thinks that some of Philo's writings could be included as Rewritten Bible texts, but unfortunately he does not specify which of them (Harrington 1986, 239). As to specific works of Philo, only the *Life of Moses* appears on a list of Rewritten Bible texts, namely on Bruce N. Fisk's list of "related compositions" to Rewritten Bible texts (Fisk 2000, 951). In his interesting article on Philo's various compositional techniques in the *Life of Moses*, Brian McGing also claims that the work is "a re-writing, a re-composition of the Bible narrative" though without relating the composition to other Biblical Rewritings (McGing 2006, 123). In the present article, I shall restrict myself to examine the *Life of Moses* only, since Philo makes more use of implicit exegesis in the first part of this work than in any other writings of the *Exposition*.

chronologically and deals with Moses' life from his birth (Exodus 2) to the near end of Numbers with the apportionment of land to Reubenites and Gadites (Numbers 32), the structure of the second book is topological. In the first part of the second book (2.8–65), Philo is occupied with the laws of Moses, their excellence, origin, division and the punishments and rewards. In addition, Philo also devotes considerable space to retelling the story, which is otherwise known from the *Letter of Aristeas* concerning the origin of the Greek Pentateuch. In the second part (2.66–186), Philo proceeds by giving an account of pentateuchal issues related to the high priest: the tabernacle, the vestments of the high priest and Moses' instructions of Aaron and Aaron's blooming staff. Finally, in the last and final part (2.187–291), Philo records different oracles delivered through Moses in the Pentateuch. The content in the second book is not arranged chronologically, and material from the Pentateuch is even repeated now and then in the different parts of the second book. In addition, whereas symbolic or allegorical exegesis is only used occasionally in the first book,³ Philo makes use of more complicated allegorical exegesis in the second book.⁴

Because of the complex composition of the work, there is no scholarly agreement as to whether the *Life of Moses* ought to be understood as a genuine biography or as a commentary on the biblical account. Mark Edwards, for instance, has claimed that Philo's *Life of Moses* "does not purport to be a life of Moses, but a commentary on the Biblical account,"⁵ and there is no single mention of Philo in classical scholarship on ancient biography.⁶ Biblical scholars such as Richard Burridge and Dirk Frickensmith, however, have taken the

3 In the first book, there are allegorical interpretations of the burning bush (1.67), the springs and trees at Elim (1.189) and Moses' hands at the victory over Amalek (1.217).

4 In the second book, there are allegorical interpretations of the Cherubim as God's two powers (2.96), the mercy seat of the Ark as God's gracious power (2.99), the tabernacle, its furnishings and of the vestments of the high priest (2.109–140) and the nut of Aaron's staff (2.180–183).

5 Edwards 1997, 229. Later in his article, Edwards mistakenly places Philo's *Life of Moses* on his list of works that are biographies (Edwards 1997, 230). However, since he places Philo's *Life of Moses* on the list between the works of Eunapius and Mark the Deacon, he probably means the *Life of Moses* by Gregory of Nyssa.

6 Cf. Leo 1901, Stuart 1928, Dihle 1956, Momigliano 1971, Swain 1997, 22–23, Sonnabend 2002. In addition, Philo is not mentioned in any of the contributions to the anthology of Erler & Schorn 2007. Recently, Philo's *Life of Moses* has been considered a biography in McGing 2006, 117–121, who also points out that classical scholarship on biography does not mention Philo's *Life of Moses*, whereas biblical scholars engaged in the debate on the genre of the Gospels include the work in the tradition of Graeco-Roman biography.

Life of Moses as a genuine Greek biography.⁷ In an important article from 1929, Anton Prießnig also identified the literary form of the *Life of Moses* as a Greek biography.⁸ According to Prießnig, the structure of the *Life of Moses* resembles that of Suetonius' biographies by giving a chronological account of Moses as king in the first book and a topological treatment of him as lawgiver, high priest and prophet in the second book, which is then followed by the death narrative at the end of the second book. The fact that Philo himself uses the word βίος at the beginning as well as in the conclusion of the *Life of Moses* (1.1; 2.292) shows, I think, in contrast to Edwards, that the work *itself* really claims to be a life of Moses. But how should we then understand the content of the second book?

In her book *Biography in Late Antiquity*, Patricia Cox Miller notices "the amount of space given over to discussions of disciples, teaching methods, and *publications* in biographies like Eusebius' of Origen and Porphyry's of Plotinus."⁹ This, I would add, holds true already of Philo's *Life of Moses*, and I suggest that Philo's combination of a biography of Moses with a presentation of Moses' publications may have been the principle that has defined his division of the narrative into two books. Thus the second book is primarily occupied with the Pentateuch as the writing of Moses (his laws, prophecies and account of priestly issues),¹⁰ whereas the first book uses the Pentateuch as a source for the life of Moses (cf. 1.4). In a nutshell the different approaches adopted in the first and second book reflect the difference between picturing Moses as *life*, i.e., the protagonist of the Pentateuch, and Moses as *writing*, i.e., as the author of the Pentateuch. While the first book is primarily occupied with who Moses was, the second book is concerned with affirming the Mosaic authority of the Pentateuch and providing an interpretative key to Moses' corpus and recalling the way the corpus was written and translated. Biographical interest was often generated especially in relation to ancient teachers such as Socrates, Jesus and Pythagoras, whose doctrines they themselves did not commit to writing.¹¹ However, a minority of ancient biographies also focused on men of letters such as the ones Miller referred to, namely Eusebius' biography of

7 Burrige 2004, 124–149, and Frickensmith 1997, 176–177.

8 Prießnig 1929, 143–155.

9 Cox Miller 1983, xv. (my emphasis).

10 Brian Britt has explored the ambivalence of Moses as a speaking character in a story written by himself. According to Britt, Moses is, in the words of Jacques Derrida, a "writing being" and a "being written." Though Britt points out that the ambivalence is often expressed by the splitting or doubling of Moses in film and fiction, he does not find the ambivalence in Philo's *Life of Moses*. On the contrary, he argues that Philo explores Moses only as a "being written" (Britt 2004).

11 Cf. Hägg 1991, 87.

Origen and Porphyry's of Plotinus, and the structure of the *Life of Moses* should be compared to these ancient biographies. Philo's *Life of Moses* thus functions as an introduction to the 'philosopher's writings.'¹² It is interesting that there is some indication that Philo's city, Alexandria, was the origin of the development that partly led to the genre of the introductory βίος: it was at the Library of Alexandria that the famous Hellenistic poet Callimachus (305–240 BC) composed his catalogue of the holdings of the library (the so-called *Pinakes*) in which he combined bibliography with biographical information. According to Arnaldo Momigliano, the Callimachaen *Pinakes* were an important step in the development of Hellenistic biography.¹³ Callimachus' approach was later adopted by Thrasylus, who also came from Alexandria and who died during Philo's lifetime, in 36 CE.¹⁴

The division of the two books may also explain why allegorical exegesis gradually increases in the second book. Philo seems to have postponed the allegorical interpretations until the second book since it is within this volume that he explicitly interprets Moses as a textual figure.¹⁵

The second book of the *Life of Moses* is, I think, the main reason why the work is seldom included in the discussion of the phenomenon of 'Rewritten Bible.' But if we examine the first book of the *Life of Moses* in isolation, we will find that the book conforms to the features that are normally identified as typical for this phenomenon, whether we accept the principal characteristics of

12 As was also suggested by Geljon 2002, 37–46. Geljon enumerates eleven features that characterize the introductory, philosophical βίος: 1) the βίοι show variety in their titles; 2) the βίος of a philosopher has an introductory character; 3) the introductory character entails that a general readership is assumed; 4) the aim of a βίος may provide some introductory remarks about the philosopher's thought and it may also have an apologetic purpose; 5) standard topics that are discussed are the subject's ancestry, family, birth, death and funeral; 6) the education of a philosopher occupies a prominent place in the description of his life; 7) the events are narrated in a chronological sequence, but the sequence can be interrupted by topical material; 8) the βίος is an encomium on the protagonist; 9) a βίος shows what kind of person the protagonist was and that his deeds were in harmony with his words; 10) the description of the life has a paradigmatic function: his virtue has to be imitated; and 11) an annotated bibliography is given, combined with a discussion of the order and chronology of the writings. Their authenticity may also be discussed, cf. Geljon 2002, 35–36. Geljon bases his list on the studies by Burridge's *What are the Gospels?* Concerning the genre of an introductory, philosophical βίος, see Mansfeld 1994.

13 Momigliano 1971, 13.

14 Cf. Geljon 2002, 34.

15 Against Geljon, who claims that the allegorical interpretations in the second book of the *Life of Moses* do not fit so well into an introductory life (Geljon 2002, 44).

Philip Alexander,¹⁶ Bruce Fisk,¹⁷ George Brooke¹⁸ or another scholar. The first book of the *Life of Moses* offers a coherent rewriting of a substantial portion of the Bible, namely from Exodus 2 to Numbers 32. It also follows the content as well as the order of the Pentateuch relatively closely, while at the same time being highly selective in what it represents: motives such as the "theology of the land" and the Biblical paradigm of exile and return are omitted. The work also clearly displays an editorial intention, to which I shall return below. It mainly contains implicit rather than explicit exegesis, although it does contain some explicit comments. It also makes use of non-biblical oral tradition, as Philo himself claims in his introductory remarks. According to Philo, he has learned the story of Moses, "both from the sacred books, the wonderful monuments of his wisdom which he has left behind him, and from some of the elders of the

-
- 16 Alexander defines the category Rewritten Bible as a distinct literary genre. According to Alexander, Rewritten Bible texts: 1) "are narratives, which follows a sequential, chronological order"; 2) they are "free-standing compositions which replicate the form of the biblical books, on which they are based"; 3) they are "not intended to replace, or to supersede the Bible"; 4) they "cover a substantial portion of the Bible" and are "centripetal," reintegrating legends into biblical history; 5) they "follow the Bible serially, in proper order, but they are highly selective in what they represent"; 6) "[t]he intention of the texts is to produce an interpretative reading of Scripture"; 7) "they can impose only a single interpretation on the original"; 8) "[t]he limitations of the narrative form also preclude making clear the exegetical reasoning"; and 9) they "make use of non-biblical tradition and draw on non-biblical sources, whether oral or written" (Alexander 1988, 116–118).
- 17 According to Fisk, the term Rewritten Bible describes a narrowly circumscribed group of texts which are, however, too diverse to constitute a literary genre. The group of texts have the following characteristics: 1) they "offer a coherent and sustained retelling of substantial portions of OT narrative, generally in chronological sequence and in accord with the narrative framework of Scripture itself"; 2) they integrate extrabiblical traditions into the biblical storyline; 3) they contain implicit rather than explicit exegesis, "by filling gaps, solving problems and explaining connections in the biblical text"; and 4) they serve as "companion to, rather than replacement of, Scripture" (Fisk 2000, 947–948).
- 18 According to Brooke, Rewritten Bible is not a literary genre itself but an activity found in many different genres. According to Brooke, the following features are typical for the activity: 1) "the source is thoroughly embedded in its rewritten form not as explicit citation but as a running text"; 2) "the order of the source is followed extensively"; 3) "the content of the source is followed relatively closely"; and 4) "the original genre or genres stays much the same"; "the source provides the generic model (Brooke 2002, 32–33). In another article Brooke also emphasizes that Rewritten Bible texts "clearly display an editorial intention that is other than or supplementary to that of the text being altered" (Brooke 2000, 778). It is Daniel K. Falk who has combined Brooke's two articles in order to identify all the features that Brooke has found in relation to the concept of rewritten Bible (Falk 2007, 12).

nation,”¹⁹ and he argues moreover that he believes himself “to have a closer knowledge than others of his life’s story” (1.4). Since the work is composed in Philo’s *own* name—in contrast to the many other Jewish Biblical Rewritings that are primarily composed anonymously or pseudepigraphically—Philo probably felt compelled explicitly to defend and legitimize his rewriting (such as Josephus also does in his introduction to the *Jewish Antiquities* and the author of Luke-Acts in his introduction to the gospel). And since Philo writes in his own name, he also now and then speaks in first person with expressions as “in my opinion” and “we are told that.”

The origin of the genre actually also stays much the same. The books of Exodus and Numbers are, of course, not a biography proper, but Philo is actually not the only one who has seen the biographical potential in these books. Thus, for instance, a modern scholar such as Rolf P. Knierim has argued that the books should be read as a biography of Moses.²⁰ Finally, Philo’s work is not intended to replace or supersede the Pentateuch; on the contrary, an important aim of the work is to function as an introduction to the Pentateuch.

The Editorial Intention of the Life of Moses

This brings me to my second part in which I shall discuss the editorial intention of the *Life of Moses*. It is, of course, just as difficult to reconstruct authorial intent in the *Life of Moses* as in any other literary work. Philo does, however, give us a hint in the beginning of the work. Here he claims that an essential motive for writing is that “Greek men of letters have refused to treat him [Moses] as worthy of memory (μνήμη)” (1.2). The biography of Moses was thus probably motivated by the interaction of the Jewish Diaspora community with its non-Jewish surroundings in Alexandria. It does not follow, as some would have it, that Philo only wrote his biography of Moses for a Greek readership.²¹ In the work, Philo rather addresses the discrepancy and dissonance between his own view of Moses as “the most perfect of men” and the ignorance or even mendacity (cf. 1.3) of those well-educated Greek people whom Philo and his Jewish intellectual circles otherwise took as their peers. With the *Life of Moses*

19 Translation of Philo’s *Life of Moses* is from the Loeb edition (Colson 2002). The Greek texts of Philo’s works are from Cohn, Wendland, Reiter & Leisegang 1962.

20 Knierim understands the book of Genesis as a kind of introduction to the biography of Moses in Exodus–Deuteronomy (Knierim 1985, 409–415). See also Blenkinsopp 1992, 52, and Whybray 1995, 2, 8.

21 Such as, for instance, Goodenough 1933, 109–125.

Philo presents a picture of Moses that was meant to demonstrate to both Jewish and Greek readers that Moses actually embodied all the virtues that both the Greek and Jewish intelligentsia praised so much.

As has been stressed by Koen Goudriaan, Maren Niehoff and others, Philo constructs Moses' identity in the *Life of Moses* by dissociating him from Pharaoh and the Egyptians.²² By stressing the cultural inferiority of the Egyptians, Philo probably sought to participate in the hegemonic discourse of Roman Egypt with its stereotyped portrait of the Egyptians. To be a native Egyptian was the third estate in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, those who were charged with the annual poll-tax, the so-called *laographia*²³ (literally 'the registration of the *laos*'). It seems to have been widespread at the time of Philo to associate Egyptian origin with cultural inferiority. One of Philo's contemporaries, the Alexandrian grammarian Apion, thus expressed his contempt for the Jews by depicting their ancestors as Egyptians by race (CA 2.10–11). According to Josephus, Apion himself tried to conceal his own Egyptian descent and to pass for a genuine Alexandrian (CA 2.29). Josephus might be right, since it would be understandable if both Alexandrian Egyptians and Alexandrian Jews took recourse to the strategy of pointing out the otherness of the other part in order to stress their own adherence to an Alexandrian and Hellenistic identity.²⁴ Thus in his rewriting of Exod^{LXX} 2:19, Philo seems deliberately to have omitted that the daughters of Jethro identified Moses as an Egyptian. Though they did so by mistake, Philo seemingly did not want to apply such a degrading title to Moses.²⁵ In his emphasis on the cultural inferiority of the Egyptians, Philo carries on the Pentateuch tradition with its dominant evaluation of Egyptian values as being bad and dangerous. However, while the Pentateuch not only opposes Egyptian *values*, but even also *Egypt* as a place of residence, Philo's negative picture focuses solely on the Egyptians and the Egyptian way of life. If the Pentateuch's opposition to Egypt signifies a strong disapproval of any Egyptian Diaspora community, indicating that Israel cannot truly serve God in

22 Goudriaan 1992, 74–99, Pearce 1998, 79–105, and Niehoff 2001, 45–74.

23 The poll-tax was also commonly called the *Aigyptioi*, that is 'the Egyptians,' in literary and official documentary texts, a term which acquired connotations of administrative, fiscal and cultural inferiority (Bowman & Rathbone 1992, 114).

24 Cf. Goudriaan 1992, 74–99.

25 In *Mut.* 117–120 Philo explains the "erroneous" title by claiming that the daughters could not rise above the world of senses (with the exception of Zipporah, who is said to have been a θεοφόρητος and a προφητικός). In the *Life of Moses*, however, Philo does not touch on the capacities of the daughters but simply omits their identification of Moses as an Egyptian. Rather than being described as a προφητικός in *Life of Moses*, Zipporah is claimed to be the most beautiful of the daughters (1.58–59).

Egypt, such as F.V. Greifenhagen has recently suggested,²⁶ Philo's rewriting of the Exodus narrative actually rehabilitates Egypt as a place of residence. Philo's imagined Jewish Diaspora community is not defined by its country of residence but by its spiritual progress towards virtue and the knowledge of God.

Thus, whereas the God of the Septuagint speaks of delivering the Israelites from Egypt by giving them a good and spacious land flowing with milk and honey, (Exod^{LXX} 3:8), Philo's God, by contrast, speaks in generalized terms of delivering the nation "from this place to another home (ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἐνθένδε ἀποικίας)" (1.71, my translation). This is consistent with Philo's overall description of the journey through the wilderness, not as a journey to the Promised Land but as a colonial expedition (ἀποικία) (1.163, 170, 195, 255) to a "land in which the nation proposed to settle" (1.220). Thus, the Hebrews are not on their way home (οἰκία) but on their way to found a colony (ἀποικία). Philo's choice of words here is rather surprising, as if at the time of Moses the Hebrews had a μητρόπολις in Egypt that produced ἀποικίαι.²⁷ Perhaps, however, his use of the term ἀποικία in the *Life of Moses* reflects Philo's and his Jewish contemporaries' own strong attachment to Alexandria?

At the very end of the *Life of Moses*, Philo even redefines the meaning of ἀποικία as a migration from earth to heaven. Just as in Deuteronomy, Moses does not enter the land of Canaan in the *Life of Moses*. But whereas this was meant as a punishment of the biblical Moses, Philo deliberately manipulates this view.²⁸ According to Philo, Moses actually fulfilled the goal of ἀποικία, i.e., to migrate from earth to heaven,

Afterwards the time came when he [Moses] had to make his migration from this place to heaven (ἡ ἐνθένδε ἀποικία εἰς οὐρανὸν), and leave this mortal life for immortality, summoned thither by the Father who

²⁶ Greifenhagen 2002, 260–261.

²⁷ In *In Flaccum* 48 and *De Legatione ad Gaium* 281–282, Philo uses the characteristic vocabulary of Greek colonization by referring to Jerusalem as a μητρόπολις that has produced a large number of colonies (ἀποικίαι). As Sarah Pearce has recently argued, Philo's reference to Jerusalem as a μητρόπολις in these works does not reveal a tension between his attachment to Alexandria, on the one hand, and his allegiance to Jerusalem, on the other, as many have claimed. Pearce argues that Philo rather refers to Jerusalem as a μητρόπολις in order to introduce the colonies on which Philo focuses his attention. In Pearce's words, "The emphasis is on the widespread phenomenon of Jews who feel rooted in other lands where, as in Alexandria, they are prepared to defend their institutions to the point of death" (Pearce 2004, 32).

²⁸ In his rewriting of Num 20:1–13, Philo says thus nothing about God's anger at Moses and Aaron and the punishment that he promised to inflict upon them (1.210–213).

resolved his twofold nature of soul and body into a single unity, transforming his whole being into mind, pure as the sunlight (2.288, Loeb with minor alterations)

Thus, the word ἀποικία appears at crucial points throughout the *Life of Moses*; we meet it for the first time at the burning bush, where God urges Moses to be a leader of the nation “who would shortly take them from this place to another home (ἡγεμόνα τῆς ἐνθένδε ἀποικίας)” (1.71, Loeb with minor alterations), and we meet it again in 1.163, immediately after the digression in 1.148–162 that depicts Moses as a philosopher-king and cosmopolitan. At this place the word is for the first time used to define the goal of the journey as a settlement in the land of Canaan—a meaning the word preserves until the very end of the *Life of Moses*. Here, however, the meaning is turned upside down. The ἀποικία of Moses was not to be “the land of the Canaanites” (1.163) but a spiritual migration ἐνθένδε εἰς οὐρανὸν (2.288). By the end of the work it becomes clear that the very first occurrence of ἀποικία together with the last occurrence in the *Life of Moses* form the interpretative key for understanding the real meaning of the colonial journey. To imitate Moses and his movement ἐνθένδε εἰς ἀποικίαν in 1.71 is thus at the very end shown to be a spiritual migration of the soul from the body. By turning the meaning of the missing entry upside down, the story of Exodus actually turns out to be an allegory of the migration of the soul towards virtue and the knowledge of God. This interpretation of the Exodus movement is, however, never claimed explicitly in the *Life of Moses*, it is only implied in the way Philo rewrites the biblical narratives.

By interpreting the Exodus narrative as a spiritual migration, Philo also adapts to his Diaspora setting the narrative that could otherwise be seen as highlighting the Jews' flight from Egypt. Although the members of Philo's imagined Jewish community are meant to become cosmopolitans as Moses had been before them and are defined by the absence of a “dwelling-place set apart,”²⁹ Philo does not lose sight of the social and political issues of his own day. His agenda in the *Life of Moses* is not merely to assure his intellectual Jewish readership that Moses was the most perfect of all great Hellenistic men

29 Thus the words of the fortune-teller Balaam: “But I shall not be able to harm the people, which shall dwell alone, not reckoned among other nations; and that, *not because their dwelling-place is set apart and their land severed from other*, but because in virtue of the distinction of their peculiar customs they do not mix with others to depart from the ways of their fathers” (1.278, emphasis added). Symptomatic when approaching the land of Canaan, Moses finds the Hebrew population that had remained in the land to have abandoned all their ancestral customs and sense of belonging (1.239–242).

but also to advocate a turn in the political attitude to the Jews whose status had probably deteriorated as a result of Roman rule.³⁰

Thus, rather than depicting the Exodus as a return to a God-given country,³¹ Philo claims that the Exodus was a Jewish act of self-defence because of the tyranny of the king (1.9) and his negligence of the civil rights of the Jews (1.35–37). In this way Philo adapts the narrative to his Alexandria Diaspora setting by giving the narrative an immediate and contemporary relevance in his emphasis on those parts of the narrative that dealt with ancient oppression in Egypt and the deliverance by Moses.³² Philo thus turns his rewriting into a central political document of his own day dealing with the problem of how to treat Jews living in the Diaspora, and in Alexandria in particular.

In light of the work's political concern, one might consider the possibility that Philo may also have had a Roman readership in mind when he wrote the *Life of Moses*. Perhaps the work should even be seen as a companion piece to the *In Flaccum* and the *De Legatione ad Gaium* that may also have had an intended dual readership (Jewish and Roman).³³ There is, in fact, a striking, and to my knowledge hitherto unseen, parallel between the *Life of Moses* and the *In Flaccum*.

According to Philo, the Greeks were bursting with envy when the Jewish king Agrippa arrived in Alexandria, because “they were vexed by the idea that a Jew had become king (βασιλεύς), which was to them as if each of them had

30 According to Victor Tcherikover, the status of the Jews dramatically deteriorated as a result of Roman rule. Instead of being considered part of the large class of Greeks, the Jews were counted together with the Egyptians and charged the *laographia* (Tcherikover 1963, 1–32). This interpretation has been challenged by Kasher 1985, 233–309 and Gruen 2002, 54–83. According to Gruen, the Jews were not directly implied in the *laographia* and succeeded in maintaining an independent status. However, even if the Jews were not directly implied in the *laographia*, as Gruen asserts, they were nevertheless influenced by the increasing social tension under Roman rule. See also Niehoff 1992, 22. See *Spec.* 3.159–162 for Philo's vivid and indignant account of a tax-collector's razzia (the passage, however, does not make it clear if the Jews had to pay the *laographia*).

31 The nearest Philo comes to speaking of the land as God-given in the *Life of Moses* is at 1.255. In this passage on Num^{LXX} 21:16–18 the text speaks of how the Hebrews sang songs to God, “who gave them the land as their portion (κληροσύχος) and had, in truth, led them in their migration (ἀποικία).” Notice, however, that Philo still speaks of ἀποικία and that the words are not spoken by God, but only express the people's feelings.

32 Cf. Dawson 1992, 116.

33 Cf. Birnbaum 1996, 21 and van der Horst 2003, 15–16.

been deprived of an ancestral kingdom (βασιλεία) (*Flacc.* 29, my emphasis).³⁴ The reason why the people resented Agrippa's appointment is rather strange, namely the apparently harmless circumstance that a Jew had become king. In light of this, the *Life of Moses*—which is the only writing in which Philo calls Moses a βασιλεύς³⁵—acquires a completely new relevance if the work is taken as a sort of companion piece to the *In Flaccum*, since Philo devotes the whole of the first book of the *Life of Moses* to presenting Moses as the just king par excellence.³⁶ The Septuagint does not refer to Moses as a βασιλεύς.³⁷ Philo,

34 The English translation of *In Flaccum* is from van der Horst 2003.

35 Moses' kingship is also implied in *De Praemiis et Poenis* 52–56 and *De Virtutibus* 53. However, both passages precisely refer to the account given in the *Life of Moses*.

36 Further research has to be undertaken in order to clarify the precise relationship between the *Life of Moses* and *In Flaccum*. Here I will only propose some parallels for further study. Although envy (φθόνος) was a conventional motif noted and refused in encomiastic literature (cf. Stuart 1928, 55–56, 92–93), we should not fail to notice that just as envy was the driving force behind the riots that broke out in 38 (*Flacc.* 29–30, see also the famous passage in *De Specialibus Legibus* 3.1–6 where Philo claims that envy [φθόνος] was the main cause of the riots, to which he had, willy-nilly, to expose himself, and *De Legatione ad Gaium* 48, where the motif of envy also recurs), so the motif of envy also plays a crucial role in the introduction to the *Life of Moses*. Here Philo claims that Greek men of letters have refused to treat Moses as being worthy of memory “through envy (φθόνος)” (1.2, my emphasis). In addition, according to *In Flaccum* 45, “There is not one country that can contain all the Jews, so numerous are they.” Interestingly, the same piece of information is used in the *Life of Moses* to argue that the Jews should not be deprived of their equal privileges: “For settlers abroad and inhabitants of other regions are not wrongdoers who deserve to be deprived of equal privileges, particularly if the nation has grown so populous that a single country cannot contain it and has sent out colonies in all directions” (2.232, my emphasis). According to Philo's account in the *In Flaccum*, however, this is exactly what Flaccus did: “For only a couple of days later he [Flaccus] issued a decree in which he stigmatized us as foreigners (ξένος) and aliens (ἔπηλυς) and gave us no right to plead our cause but condemned us without trial” (*Flacc.* 54). In light of this information, Philo's argument in *Life of Moses* 1.35 seems aimed at exactly the situation that followed in the wake of Flaccus' decree. See also the parallels between the *Life of Moses* and the *In Flaccum* mentioned by Meeks 1976, 49–54 and the parallels between the *Life of Moses* and the *De Legatione ad Gaium* noted by Borgen 1996, 149–153. Meeks and Borgen do not, however, claim that the *Life of Moses* should be seen as a companion piece to *In Flaccum* or *De Legatione ad Gaium*.

37 The most relevant Biblical text to Mosaic kingship is, as often noted, Deut^{MT} 33:4–5: “Moses charged us with the law, as a possession for the assembly of Jacob. There arose (ויהי) a king (מלך) in Jeshurun, when the leaders of the people assembled—the united tribes of Israel.” If, however, ויהי is pointed *waw*-consecutive, as the Masoretes thought,

however, already drew the readers' attention to this possibility at the beginning of the work, since Moses is here described as "the young king (ὁ νέος βασιλεύς)" (1.32).³⁸ And later in the work, Philo claims that Moses was made ruler (ἡγεμῶν) over a nation more populous and greater than any others (1.148) because of his virtue and his rejection of the governance of Egypt (1.149). By portraying Moses as a king, Philo may have wanted to demonstrate the importance of the Jews and their tradition that originated from a true philosopher-king, perhaps in polemical contrast to the degeneracy of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Philo's portrait of Moses as a king might be seen as reproducing and imitating a Roman aristocratic and senatorial opposition to dynasties. Thus whereas Moses did not seek his own self-aggrandizement as a king, for instance the appointment and promotion of his own sons to positions of importance (1.150), the Roman emperor was claiming his position on inheritance. In contrast to the degeneracy of dynasties such as the Julio-Claudian, the good king Moses had only one aim, namely to benefit his subjects (1.151).

the Hebrew text may refer to Moses as a king. In the Septuagint מֶלֶךְ is translated with the future tense (ἔσται), which makes the passage read like a messianic prophecy. If Wevers is right in suggesting that the translators thereby seem to have an earthly ruler in mind and that they may have thought of a kind of *Moses redivivus* because of the context of Deut 33:5, one could argue that the Septuagint implicitly refers to Moses as ἄρχων, which is how the Septuagint translates מֶלֶךְ; cf. Wevers 1995, 541. Moses is also called ἄρχων in the mocking question in Exod^{LXX} 2:14. Gregory of Nazianzus, for instance, even refers to Moses as ἄρχων ἀρχόντων (*Orat.* 11.2). ἄρχων is, however, a relatively mild word compared to βασιλεύς, and Philo never refers explicitly to Deut^{LXX} 33:5. However, as William Horbury has argued, the commission to rule may also have been unfolded in other pentateuchal narratives in verses on the rod or sceptre of Moses (Exod 4:20), on Moses' and Aaron's reverent reception by the elders and the people (Exod 4:27–31), on the title "lord" given him by Aaron, Joshua and others (Exod 32:22; Num 11:28; 12:11; 32:25–27) and on the covenant made not simply with Israel but with Moses and with Israel (Exod 34:27). It is, however, more questionable if the Septuagint also enhanced this tendency such as Horbury claims (Horbury 2006, 115–117).

- 38 In one scene of Ezekiel's *Exagoge* (fragments 6 and 7), Moses is also portrayed as a future king. In the scene, Moses dreams of a great throne on the peak of Mount Sinai, and he sees a man with a crown and sceptre. On Moses' approach, the man hands over to Moses the crown, sceptre and throne and then withdraws. Moses beholds then the entire world, and a host of stars does obeisance to him. Afterwards the dream is interpreted by Moses' father-in-law, Raguel, who claims that Moses will live to see the dream fulfilled. For a discussion of this scene in relation to Moses' kingship, see Lierman 2004, 90–102.

Conclusion

Philo's picture of Moses may be seen as a political response to the situation of the Alexandrian Diaspora Jews. By presenting Jewish culture as equal to Greek culture, Philo may indirectly have advocated that the Jews should be placed on an equal footing with Alexandria's Greek citizens. It may seem paradoxical that Philo should have used a narrative that highlighted the Jews' flight from Egypt to establish the credentials of the Jewish community as valid residents.³⁹ Philo, however, rewrote the flight in such a way that it substantiated the Jewish claim for citizenship. Philo removes the 'theology of the land' and the Biblical paradigm of exile and return from his version of the Exodus narrative and claims that the migration did not have as its goal the land of Canaan. In so doing, Philo's rewriting actually rehabilitates Egypt as a place of residence. According to Philo's rewriting of the Pentateuch, Moses' Jewish Diaspora community as well as the community of Philo's own day should, however, not define itself by its country of residence but by its spiritual progress towards virtue and the knowledge of God. By recasting the Pentateuch narratives as a biography of Moses, Philo sought to create a mimetic relationship between the figure of Moses and his own Diaspora community. Philo's picture of the life of Moses was at one and the same time a defence of the Jews' strong attachment to Alexandria and of their legitimate fight for civil rights—and also a symbol for the typical Diaspora sense of belonging elsewhere, not in a specific land, but, as cosmopolitans, with virtue and the knowledge of God.

Though Philo's works are normally associated with allegorical interpretations, my reading of the *Life of Moses* demonstrates that Philo could also make use of implicit rather than explicit exegesis as his main interpretative strategy. Others of his works, however, indicate that it did not have to be an either/or, since he actually combines the two strategies in several of his other works, such as, for instance, the *Life of Abraham* and the *Life of Joseph*. Philo's works are thus highly interesting for our understanding of the phenomenon of "Rewritten Bible" and how this phenomenon was related to other interpretative strategies that were used in Antiquity.

39 Erich S. Gruen has dealt with this issue though not in relation to Philo. He claims that Jews would not have propagated a narrative that highlighted their flight from Egypt at a time when they sought to establish their credentials as residents and argues accordingly that several of the well-known gentile rewritings of the Exodus account should not be taken as gentile attempts to manipulate the account for polemical purposes, but as the Jews' own reshaping and misshaping of the Exodus narrative as a literary creation of self-defence (Gruen 1998, 41–72).

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip S. 1988. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Birnbaum, Ellen. 1996. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's thought. Israel, Jews, and Proselytes*. BJS 290 = Studia Philonica Monographs 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. 1992. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*. New York: Doubleday.
- Borgen, Peder. 1996. Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor: Observations in Philo's Writings and the Revelation of John. *NovT* 38: 145–159.
- . 1997. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete For His Time*. NovTSup 86. Leiden, New York/Köln: Brill.
- Bowman, Alan. K. and Rathbone, Dominic. 1992. Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 82: 107–127.
- Britt, Brian. 2004. *Rewriting Moses. The Narrative Eclipse of the Text*. JSOTSup 402. London/New York: T&T Clark.
- Brooke, George J. 2000. Rewritten Bible. Pages 777–781 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2. Vol. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2002. The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible. Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London: British Library.
- Burridge, Richard A. 2004. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd edition. Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Cohn, Leopold, Paul Wendland, Sigfried Reiter and Hans Leisegang. 1962. *Philonis Alexandrini: Opera Quae Supersunt*. vol. 1–6. Berlin: Reimer.
- Colson, Francis Henry. 2002. *Philo*. vol. 6. Loeb. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cox Miller, Patricia. 1983. *Biography in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, LA: University of California Press.
- Damgaard, Finn. 2013. *Recasting Moses: The Memory of Moses in Biographical and Autobiographical Narratives in Ancient Judaism and 4th-Century Christianity*. Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (forthcoming).
- Dawson, David. 1992. *Allegorical readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley, LA/New York: University of California Press.
- Dihle, Albrecht. 1956. *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- Edwards, Mark J. 1997. Epilogue, Biography and Biographic. Pages 227–234 in *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Edited by M.J. Edwards and S. Swain. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Erler, Michael and Schorn, Stefan. 2007. *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit. Akten des internationalen Kongresses vom 26.–29. Juli 2006 in Würzburg*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 245. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Falk, Daniel K. 2007. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. LSTS 63/CQS 8. London: T & T Clark.
- Fisk, Bruce N. 2000. Rewritten Bible in Pseudepigrapha and Qumran. Pages 947–953 in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*. Edited by C.A. Evans and S.E. Porter. Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press.
- Frickensmith, Dirk. 1997. *Evangelium als Biographie. Die vier Evangelien im Rahmen antiker Erzählkunst*, TANZ 22. Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Geljon, Albert C. 2002. *Philonic Exegesis in Gregory of Nyssa's De Vita Mosis*. BJS 333 = Studia Philonica Monographs 5. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. 1933. Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis. *HTR* 26: 109–125.
- Goudriaan, Koen. 1992. Ethnical Strategies in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Pages 74–99 in *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*. Edited by P. Bilde et al. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press
- Greifenhagen, Franz V. 2002. *Egypt on the Pentateuch's Ideological Map: Constructing Biblical Israel's Identity*. JSOTSup 361. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Gruen, Erich S. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism. The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley, LA/London: University of California Press.
- . 2002. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hägg, Tomas. 1991. Socrates and St. Antony. A Short Cut through Ancient Biography. Pages 81–87 in *Understanding and History in Arts and Sciences*. Edited by R. Skarsten, E.J. Kleppe and R.B. Finnestad. Acta Humaniora Universitatis Bergensis 1. Oslo: Solum Forlag A/S.
- Harrington, Daniel J. 1986. Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies. Pages 239–258 in *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Horbury, W. 2006. Monarchy and Messianism in the Greek Pentateuch. Pages 79–128 in *The Septuagint and Messianism*. Edited by M.A. Knibb. BETL 195. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Kasher, Aryeh. 1985. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt. The Struggle for Equal Rights*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Knierim, Rolf P. 1985. The Composition of the Pentateuch. *SBLSP* 24: 395–415.
- Leo, Friedrich. 1901. *Die griechisch-römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lierman, John. 2004. *The New Testament Moses*. WUNT II. 173. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Mansfeld, Jaap. 1994. *Prolegomena. Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author or a Text*. Philosophia Antiqua 61. Leiden: Brill.

- McGing, Brian. 2006. Philo's adaptation of the Bible in his *Life of Moses*. Pages 117–140 in *The Limits of Ancient Biography*. Edited by B. McGing and J. Mossman. Llandysul: The Classical Press of Wales.
- Meeks, Wayne A. 1976. The Divine Agent and His Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel. Pages 43–67 in *Aspect of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by E.S. Fiorenza. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1971. *The Development of Greek Biography*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Niehoff, Maren. 2001. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Pearce, Sarah. 1998. Belonging and not Belonging: Local Perspectives in Philo of Alexandria. Pages 79–105 in *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by S. Jones and S. Pearce. JSPSup 31. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2004. Jerusalem as 'Mother-City' in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria. Pages 19–36 in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. Edited by J.M.G. Barclay. LSTS 45. London/New York: T&T Clark.
- Prießnig, Anaton. 1929. Die literarische Form der Patriarchenbiographien des Philon von Alexandrien. *MGWJ* 73: 143–155.
- Sonnabend, Holger. 2002. *Geschichte der antiken Biographie. Von Isokrates bis zur Historia Augusta*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Stuart, Duane Reed. 1928. *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*. Berkeley LA: University of California Press.
- Swain, Simon. 1997. Biography and Biographic in the Literature of the Roman Empire. Pages 1–37 in *Portraits. Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Edited by M. J. Edwards and S. Swain. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tcherikover, Victor. 1963. The Decline of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt in the Roman Period. *JJS* 14: 1–32.
- van der Horst, Pieter W. 2003. Introduction. Pages 1–53 in P.W. van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus: the first pogrom: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 2. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Wevers, John William. 1995. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Whybray, Roger Norman. 1995. *Introduction to the Pentateuch*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Josephus' "Rewritten Bible" as a Non-Apologetic Work

Marton Ribary

The apologetic character of Books 1–11 of the *Jewish Antiquities*, a recapitulation of the biblical narrative, has long been overemphasized in the Josephus scholarship. According to the standard view, Josephus sets the criteria of critical historiography aside in this work and follows a twofold apologetic agenda: on the one hand, he addresses a pagan readership in defence of the Jewish people, and on the other hand, he addresses a Jewish readership to make amends for the *Jewish War* which is usually considered to be a testimony to his betrayal. This view is based on two assumptions: first that the *Antiquities* is a badly written piece of history; and second that Josephus no longer receives financial support from the Roman authorities during its composition. This article argues that these assumptions are unfounded: far from being a defensive work, the *Antiquities* is a good piece of history, the *Sitz im Leben* of which is only slightly different from that of the *War*. The article first summarises the arguments against the apologetic character of Books 1–11 of the *Antiquities*, then the arguments for their historical character. The third and last section attempts to redefine the aim of Josephus' "Rewritten Bible" as an endeavour to make the Jewish political constitution and the corresponding philosophy comprehensible to a favourable non-Jewish audience, possibly an opposition elite with aristocratic values in the city of Rome.

Henry St. John Thackeray, the early 20th century translator of Josephus for the Loeb edition, describes "the man and his work" with the following words: "as a writer he lacks some of the essential qualifications of the great historian. Egoist, self-interested, time-server and flatterer of his Roman patrons, he may be justly called: such defects are obvious."¹ Thackeray takes the same position as his contemporary German Richard Laqueur who also paints an unfavourable picture of Josephus' personality and writing skills.² Laqueur and Thackeray propose the theory that whereas the *Jewish War* is a propagandistic work condemning popular rebellions against the mighty Romans which has been financed by the Roman government (and especially by Vespasian and Titus), the *Jewish Antiquities* is a reconsideration of Jewish history and

1 Thackeray 1929, 19.

2 Laqueur 1920, 96–128.

an apology written during the reign of the “anti-intellectual” Domitian who stopped financing Josephus’ work.³

In this regard, Josephus must be called a pathetically failed author. On the one hand, as a supposed propagandist of the Flavian court in his *War*,⁴ he fails to provide a focused glorious account for the rise of Vespasian and Titus. Their ultimate rise to imperial power rather proves the point made in the opening words of the work which calls “the war of the Jews against the Romans . . . the greatest not only of the wars of our own time, but . . . well-nigh of all that ever broke out between cities or nations.”⁵ (*BJ* 1.1) Josephus tells in his autobiography that he eventually presented his histories to the emperor Titus who was so impressed that “he affixed his own signature to them and gave orders for their publication.” (*Vita* 363) It should be emphasised, however, that the *War* had not been dedicated to the emperor, unlike the *Natural History* of the contemporary Pliny the Elder who goes to great lengths to praise the emperor in the preface of a work which is unlikely to serve propagandistic goals.⁶

If Josephus had written the *Antiquities* for the Romans as an apology for the Jewish people, then he also failed to reach his target audience. The introduction of his subsequent apologetic treatise *Against Apion* (1.1–3) makes it clear that the *Antiquities* was not read and defamatory stories about the Jewish people continued to circulate. For this reason, Josephus considered it necessary to address such accusations and write a methodological appendix to his *magnum opus* in a “concise way” (συντόμως—*CA* 1.3).

Indeed, it is very hard to imagine that someone unfavourable to or simply uninterested in the Jews takes the trouble to wade through twenty lengthy volumes to see the arguments of a Jewish writer in defence of his own people.

3 In the words of Thackeray: “If, in his *Jewish War*, the author had offended Jewish susceptibilities by recommending submission to the conqueror, he would now make amends by showing that his race had a history comparable, nay in antiquity far superior, to that of the proud Roman.” In Thackeray 1929, 56. Cf. also Mason 2000, xiv–xv.

4 Following the traditional view, Shaye Cohen labels him a “Roman apologist and propagandist, a career on which he had embarked while still in Palestine.” Cohen 1979, 234.

5 The works of Josephus are quoted according to the translation of The Loeb Classical Library. (Thackeray et al. 1926–1965).

6 Pliny starts the *Natural History* with a long encomium of the emperor Vespasian eventually dedicating his work to him in Praef. 6: “But who could judge the value of these compositions with confidence when about to submit to the verdict of your talent, especially when the verdict has been invited? for formal dedication of the work to you puts one in a different position from mere publication.” Translation is according to Rackham et al. 1938–1962, 1:5–7. For a comparison of Josephus and Pliny see Rajak 1983, 198–201.

The *Antiquities* is simply too demanding to serve apologetic purposes⁷ and the supposed apology is too implicit to be effective.⁸

Whether "apology" should be regarded as a genre, a mode of writing or thinking, whether a work's "apologetic" character should be decided according to the author's intention (emic perspective) or according to the work's reception (etic perspective), such questions are discussed extensively in scholarly literature.⁹ This paper employs a simple understanding of the term which regards ἀπολογία to be an antonym of κατηγορία, i.e. an accusation. In this regard, the paper follows Mark Edwards and his co-editors who write in the introduction of *Apologetics in the Roman World* that "apologetic is . . . the defence of a cause or party supposed to be of paramount importance to the speaker. It . . . is distinguished from polemic (which need not assume any previous attack by the opponent) and from merely epideictic or occasional orations."¹⁰ According to this understanding, apology is a discourse genre/mode in the sense of address and reply where the attacking address (κατηγορία) does not need to be recapitulated explicitly, and similarly, the defensive reply (ἀπολογία) may be likewise implicit, but the reader should be able to reconstruct both.

In this sense, the later minor works of Josephus can be justifiably called apologetic. The *Life* is a personal apology answering accusations levelled against Josephus' character and his role in the Jewish war, whereas the *Against Apion* is a public apology replying to general anti-Semitic accusations. In order to keep the historical character of the *Life* which Josephus presents as an appendix to the *Antiquities* (*Vita* 430), he waits until the last paragraphs before he makes the κατηγορία explicit.¹¹ Employing another, explicitly apologetic genre,

7 Cf. Mason 2000, xiii–xiv.

8 Gregory Sterling attempted to resolve the question whether the *Antiquities* is primarily an apology or a piece of history by proposing to unite the two in what he calls "apologetic historiography." He defined the term as a "story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose written by a member of the group who follows the group's own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish this identity of the group within the setting of the larger world." (Sterling 1991, 17.) It seems to me that this definition is too broad and suspiciously constructed with a specific set of literature (including the *Antiquities*) in mind. Instead of addressing the question, it simply eliminates it.

9 A clear overview of the extensive debate as well as a "typology of apologetics" from genre to mode to a way of thinking is provided by Petersen 2009. I wish to thank Professor Petersen for his valuable critiques and comments that helped me clarify my understanding of the term "apology," and for sending me an offprint of his article.

10 Edwards et al. 1999, 1.

11 "Subsequently, numerous accusations against me were fabricated by persons who envied me my good fortune; but, by the providence of God, I came safe through all. . . . Such are

Josephus opens the *Against Apion* with the slanders which he wishes to refute in two books.¹²

In comparison to these works, the *Antiquities* as a grand apology is a misconception. It is simply due to the subject matter and the nature of the available sources that Josephus is bound to employ a different historical method than the one used in the *War*. To the hoary past about which Thucydides, Plato, Varro and Strabo can talk only in myths,¹³ Josephus claims to give a coherent and trustworthy historical narrative by rewriting the biblical account and thereby, in the words of Steve Mason, he also promises to provide “a handbook of Judean law, history and culture for a Gentile audience in Rome.”¹⁴

Why is the *Jewish Antiquities* Not Apologetic?

During the composition of the *Jewish War* the enterprise of writing the ancient history of the Jews seemed unnecessary to Josephus.¹⁵ He writes there (*BJ* 1.17) that

to narrate the ancient history of the Jews . . . would, I considered, be not only here out of place, but superfluous; seeing that many Jews before me have accurately recorded the history of our ancestors, and that these records have been translated by certain Greeks into their native tongue without serious error.

The passage refers to the Septuagint that Josephus sees as a model for his own “translation” in the introduction of the *Jewish Antiquities* (1.10–11). He reiterates the legendary account of *The Letter of Aristeas* inasmuch as he mentions the initiative of “the second of the Ptolemies” and the approval of the High Priest Eleazar, but contrary to the *Aristeas* version in which Jews are sent forth to Alexandria to carry out the translation project, Josephus attributes the

the events of my whole life; from them let others judge as they will of my character.” (*Vita* 425, 430).

12 “I observe that a considerable number of persons, influenced by the malicious calumnies of certain individuals, discredit the statements in my history concerning our antiquity . . . The authors of scurrilous and mendacious statements about us will be shown to be confuted by themselves.” (*CA* 1.2, 1.4).

13 Cf. Rajak 1982.

14 Mason 1998, 101.

15 Cf. Spilsbury 1998, 14–15. and Sterling 1991, 242.

achievement to Greek scholars. Apparently, Josephus does not consider Jewish scholars superior to their fellow Greeks. When he speaks about earlier Jewish historians in a passage of the *Against Apion* (1.218), he gently criticises them for their lack of perfect understanding of the Hebrew records, apparently due to a language barrier. He writes that

Demetrius Phalereus, the elder Philo, and Eupolemus are exceptional in their approximation to the truth, and [their errors] may be excused on the ground of their inability to follow quite accurately the meaning of our records.

Contrary to what he said in the *War*, Josephus presents the enterprise of the *Antiquities* as if it has been always on his agenda (*Ant.* 1.7–9), and confesses that it is only because of the size of the task and his former lack of proficiency in Greek that he decided some twenty years ago to write the history of the Jewish war in a separate work which he then considered to be more urgent. Imperfect as recent Jewish historical pieces may be, Josephus still feels that the historical recapitulation of the biblical narrative is not a pressing need. He says that it is only due to the persuasions of certain curious people and above all that of Epaphroditus that he has finally decided to start the enormous enterprise.¹⁶ He further adds (*Ant.* 1.9) that he has also considered whether the Jewish ancestors “were willing to communicate” the ancient history of the Jews to the Greeks.

The *Antiquities* addresses a primarily non-Jewish Greek-speaking audience. Josephus undertakes the work “in the belief that the whole Greek-speaking world will find it worthy of attention” (*Ant.* 1.5),¹⁷ but as he points out, he has also considered whether “any of the Greeks [have been] curious to learn” about it (*Ant.* 1.9). Josephus explains Jewish customs and laws for his interested readers throughout the work,¹⁸ but he promises in the last sentence of

16 “However, there were certain persons curious about the history who urged me to pursue it, and above all Epaphroditus . . . Yielding, then, to the persuasions of one who is ever an enthusiastic supporter of persons with ability to produce some useful or beautiful work, and ashamed of myself that I should be thought to prefer sloth to the effort of this noblest of enterprises, I was encouraged to greater ardour.” (*Ant.* 1.8–9)

17 Louis Feldman (Thackeray et al. 1926–1965, 9:527.) draws attention to the affirmation of this claim in the epilogue of the *Antiquities* in 20.263: “And now I take heart from the consummation of my proposed work to assert that no one else, either Jew or gentile, would have been equal to the task, however willing to undertake it, of issuing so accurate a treatise as this for the Greek world.”

18 Mason 1998, 68.

the *Antiquities* that he will describe them fully with their corresponding philosophical foundations in a work what he tentatively entitles “an account about customs and their explanations.”¹⁹

Josephus reports in *Against Apion* that he presented the *War* first to Vespasian and Titus (CA 1.51) to whom he refers as “Emperors” (αὐτοκράτορες) in his *Life* (*Vita* 361). He adds that he then gave copies to “many Romans who had taken part in the campaign” (CA 1.51) without specifying whom he means.²⁰ Josephus would have let his readers know, if he had distributed his *Antiquities* among Roman officials in a similar way, but he never makes such a statement. For this reason, it is highly unlikely that Josephus incorporated Roman decrees guaranteeing the civic rights of the Jews in the *Antiquities* with a persuasive and defensive aim addressing the Roman government.²¹ If we also take into account that Justin Martyr’s (mid-2nd century CE) petition which he addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, clear and straightforward in its aim (to acquit “Christians” wrongly persecuted for their name only), achieved nothing whatsoever,²² it is difficult to imagine that Josephus really thought that such implicit hints in an enormous historical work would serve such purposes.

Josephus also tells us that he presented the *War* to “King Agrippa and certain of his relatives” (*Vita* 362) whom he specifies as King Agrippa II, his brother-in-law Julius Archelaus and a certain Herod in *Against Apion*, and he claims that he had actually “sold” (ἐπίπρασκον) copies to “a large number of [his] compatriots, persons well versed in Greek learning.” (CA 1.51) Such statements are not made about the *Antiquities*, and therefore it seems to me similarly unconvincing to suppose a Jewish audience which is not addressed in the introduction. The *locus classicus* for such opinion is *Ant.* 4.197 where Josephus excuses

19 Josephus uses the phrase τὴν περὶ ἔθῶν καὶ αἰτιῶν ἀπόδοσιν to refer to this project when he talks about the custom of circumcision (*Ant.* 1.198). The never-finished project is mentioned also in *Ant.* 1.25, and promised to follow the publication of the *Antiquities* in *Ant.* 20.268. Cf. the articles of Vermes (1982) and Tomson (2002) who discuss this project in the light of Josephus’ expositions of the Mosaic legal system in *Ant.* 3.224–286, *Ant.* 4.199–301 and CA 2.190–217.

20 Hannah M. Cotton and Werner Eck try to identify these people whom Josephus introduces as military commanders in his war narrative (Tiberius Iulius Alexander, Sextus Vettulenus Cerialis, Larcus Lepidus, Marcus Titius Frugi and Aeternius Fronto), but reach a very sceptic conclusion whether they have actually received a copy of the *War* from Josephus. Cf. Cotton and Eck 2005, 41–44.

21 A Roman governmental audience is supposed on the basis of this argument by Spilsbury 1998, 20.

22 Cf. the introduction of Minns and Parvis 2009.

his innovative rearrangement of the Mosaic constitution.²³ The introductory paragraph to Josephus' summary of the Mosaic legal system reveals that he has a primarily non-Jewish Greek readership in mind. The argument for rearrangement in the introduction to the Mosaic constitution (*Ant.* 4.196) refers back to the general introduction of the work (*Ant.* 1.17) and restates Josephus' historical methodology of incorporating legal information in the course of the historical narrative on the one hand, and not adding to, nor leaving anything out of it on the other.

The precise details of our Scripture records will, then, be set forth, each in its place, as my narrative proceeds, that being the procedure that I have promised to follow throughout this work, neither adding nor omitting anything. (*Ant.* 1.17)

But here I am fain first to describe this constitution, consonant as it was with the reputation of the virtue of Moses, and withal to enable my readers thereby to learn what was the nature of our laws from the first, and then to revert to the rest of the narrative. All is here written as he left it: nothing have we added for the sake of embellishment, nothing which has not been bequeathed by Moses. (*Ant.* 4.196)

Many scholars have pointed out that despite his promise in the general introduction Josephus has indeed added to the biblical narrative and also omitted some information. Incriminating episodes (the golden calf, the gift received by Abraham from Pharaoh for Sarah) and themes which might embarrass an enlightened Greek readership (miracles just as Elijah's translation to heaven, messianic themes, the name "Mount Moriah" which sounds like *μωρία* meaning 'folly') have been silenced. However, the practice was apparently not limited to the Greek audience, but was also common in the synagogue. The last two mishnayoth of mMegillah (4:9–10) and the corresponding tMegillah 3:31–41 list problematic biblical passages (mostly about the licentious behaviour of the forefathers) which should not be translated to Aramaic.

Omissions as well as elaborated favourable descriptions of biblical characters²⁴ are natural in the genre of "Rewritten Bible," and do not necessarily serve apologetic purposes. Favourable rewriting of the biblical narrative

23 On the basis of this passage, a Jewish readership is supposed by Spilsbury 1998, 29. and Feldman 1998b, 543–544.

24 A short list of such omissions and additions is provided by Cohen 1979, 37–38., a more detailed one by Sterling 1991, 291–295., and one with a concentration on the Genesis

was a well-established tradition in Jewish circles. The *Antiquities* is little different in this manner from such works as the *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon* or the later Targumim which could be hardly called apologetic. When Josephus promises to omit and add nothing, he does not mean the very *words* of the biblical account, but the *facts* which are documented there.²⁵ In agreement with later rabbinic practices, he only applies such strictness to the legal material and feels free to elaborate the narrative parts aggadically.²⁶ Modifications of the *Antiquities* can be interpreted within the genre of “Rewritten Bible” without attributing a general apologetic character to the entire work.

Why is the *Jewish Antiquities* Historical?

The short historiographical note at the very beginning of the *Antiquities* sketches the basic motifs for undertaking a historical work: winning fame for the historian; praising a historical figure; being constrained by events in which the historian himself has been involved; and informing about important affairs of general utility (*Ant.* 1.1–3). Josephus attributes the third and fourth to himself while writing the *War* (*Ant.* 1.4), and the last one as the basic motif for writing the *Antiquities* (*Ant.* 1.5–6). He promises (*Ant.* 1.5) to provide an account of ancient Jewish history and political constitution (ἀρχαιολογία καὶ διάταξις τοῦ πολιτεύματος) “translated from the Hebrew records” (ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθηρμηνευμένη γραμμάτων).

The word “translation” or “paraphrase”²⁷ and correspondingly the model of the Septuagint project that Josephus claims to follow (*Ant.* 1.10–12) indicate that Josephus is aware that he is bound to use a historical methodology significantly different from the one applied in the *War*.²⁸ The most important difference is that for large parts of the ancient history of the Jews there is nothing with which the biblical narrative can be contrasted. The *Against Apion* discusses this problem and argues that in contrast to Greek historical works

narrative by Franxman 1979, 25, and 285–287. A topical arrangement of omissions and additions is provided by Feldman 1998b, 546–570.

25 This crucial difference has been pointed out by Rajak 1982, 472.

26 In the wording of Louis Feldman, “the prohibition of change may apply only to the actual commandments in the Law rather than to the narrative portion.” Feldman 1998b, 542.

27 Etienne Nodet concludes that Josephus did not use a Greek version of the Bible for the *Antiquities*, but “paraphrased a much altered Hebrew source including marginal glosses and variant readings.” Nodet 2007, 111. For a detailed study of Josephus’ biblical source material with a reconstructed *stemma* see the introduction of the same author in Nodet 1996, 5–33.

28 Cf. the preface of the *Jewish War* (*BJ* 1.1–3).

that are written from the personal perspective of the author, the Bible as the single and monumental historical work of the Jews is an unbiased and publicly authorised version of the history of the Jewish people, and for this reason, one may use the biblical narrative without the critical caveats inevitable in the case of Greek historical sources.

Thus, there are two different modes of writing history:²⁹ the *War* is an example of one based on sources that the author acquires from first-hand knowledge, whereas the *Antiquities* is an example of a mode based on facts that the author has received in a reliable and authorised transmission. While addressing criticism levelled against his reliability, Josephus explains the difference between these modes in the *Against Apion* (1.53–55):

Nevertheless, certain despicable persons have essayed to malign my history, taking it for a prize composition such as is set to boys at school. What an extraordinary accusation and calumny! Surely they ought to recognize that it is the duty of one who promises to present his readers with actual facts first to obtain an exact knowledge of them himself, either through having been in close touch with the events, or by inquiry from those who knew them. That duty I consider myself to have amply fulfilled in both my works. In my *Antiquities*, as I said, I have given a translation of our sacred books; being a priest and of priestly ancestry, I am well versed in the philosophy of those writings. My qualification as historian of the war was that I had been an actor in many, and an eyewitness of most, of the events; in short, nothing whatever was said or done of which I was ignorant.

Despite having stated the superior reliability of the "Hebrew records," Josephus applies the critical tools common in Greek historiography wherever possible. He quotes extra-biblical sources³⁰ in the retelling of the Genesis story corresponding to the Great Flood,³¹ the extreme age of the ancestors,³² the Tower

29 Sterling points to these two modes of history-writing without elaborating on them. Sterling 1991, 240–241.

30 Passages where Josephus uses such sources can be collected from the lists of Franxman 1979, 22–23, Feldman 1998a, 133, and Feldman 1998b, 560.

31 Josephus quotes the works of Berosus the Chaldean and Nicolas of Damascus, and also mentions Hieronymus the Egyptian in *Ant.* 1.93–95.

32 In *Ant.* 1.107–108, Josephus lists a great number of Greek and pagan historians (e.g. Manetho, Berosus, Mochus, and Hestiaeus) who attest that in early days, humans lived a very long life.

of Babel,³³ the character of Abraham³⁴ and his children.³⁵ In order to bring his account closer to the requirements of critical historiography, Josephus significantly downplays the role of the supernatural by de-emphasising divine intervention into history and downgrading miracles.³⁶

From the many possible modes of rewriting the biblical narrative, Josephus has chosen the historical mode, but unlike the “Rewritten Bible” of the Chronicles and, to some extent, that of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch,³⁷ he consciously applied rhetorical³⁸ as well as critical methods. According to Feldman, in doing so, Josephus is equally indebted to the rhetorically oriented Isocratean tradition and the critical-analytical Aristotelian school of historiography.³⁹ In an Isocratean vein, he incorporates fictitious speeches and dialogues,⁴⁰ forms moral judgement on the historical actors⁴¹ and looks for psychological motives of their actions.⁴² In an Aristotelian vein, he analyses the details given in the biblical narrative and tries to solve internal contradictions,⁴³ creates a single, unified narrative based from the scattered information in the biblical books⁴⁴ and applies typology.

33 Josephus quotes the Sybilline Oracles and Hestiaeus in the introduction to his account in *Ant.* 1.118–119.

34 In *Ant.* 1.158–160, Josephus quotes Berosus and Nicolas, and reports that Hecataeus wrote a complete book about Abraham.

35 Josephus includes a long quotation from Alexander Polyhistor to conclude his account about the descendants of Abraham in *Ant.* 1.239–241.

36 Cf. Josephus’ retelling of the crossing of the Red Sea (*Ant.* 2.348), Elijah’s translation to heaven (*Ant.* 9.28) and the omission of Balaam’s speaking ass (*Ant.* 4.109). These are the examples given by Feldman 1998b, 568–569.

37 The comparison is made by Feldman 1998b, 541.

38 Maren Niehoff labels Josephus’ method in the *Antiquities* as “rhetorical historiography” and considers its rhetorical character vis-à-vis the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Niehoff 1996, 31–34.

39 Feldman 1998a, 12.

40 E.g. Abraham’s speech and Isaac’s reported response in Josephus’ retelling of the binding of Isaac (*Ant.* 1.228–231). Cf. Feldman 1985, 226.

41 Josephus says in the introduction (*Ant.* 1.14–17) that this is one of the key features of his work, and he also incorporates wise sayings to point out the moral lesson of a particular event to his readers (cf. Feldman 1998b, 565–566).

42 E.g. Abraham’s preparation for the slaughter of his son, Isaac, and his corresponding speech (*Ant.* 1.225 and 1.228–231). Cf. Feldman 1985, 242.

43 For Josephus’ removing difficulties and resolving contradictions see Feldman 1998b, 560–562., for adding military details see Feldman 1998b, 567., for localising details and clarifying family relations see Franxman 1979, 13–17.

44 Franxman 1979, 14–16.

Josephus follows the models of Hellenistic historians to communicate the biblical narrative effectively to a pagan audience.⁴⁵ For example, describing Abraham as a scientist who decides to embrace monotheism (his *μετάνοια*) because of rational contemplation of the celestial order makes the biblical revelation comprehensible to the Greek mind.⁴⁶ Similarly, the allusions to Euripides' *Iphigenia in Aulis* render the story of the binding of Isaac in its Josephus version intelligible by highlighting the major differences between the sacrifice of Abraham and Isaac on the one hand and that of Agamemnon and Iphigenia on the other.⁴⁷ Hellenising phenomena attributed to Josephus' "Rewritten Bible" are due to the historical mode of rewriting he has chosen to employ in the *Antiquities*.

Redefining the Aim of the *Jewish Antiquities*

According to his autobiography, Josephus received great benefits during the reign of Vespasian which he claims to "remain unaltered" under his descendants Titus and Domitian (*Vita* 428). Vespasian granted Josephus lodging in his previous residence in the city of Rome, a parcel outside Jerusalem untroubled by the Roman garrison and therefore more profitable than his previous one, Roman citizenship and a pension (*Vita* 422–423). As Josephus claims, Domitian added to this list of benefits a tax exemption for his land property (*Vita* 429). The list is impressive, but does not exceed the benefits that the emerging Flavian emperors bestowed on a great number of other people in the course of building a new *Klientensystem*.⁴⁸

Such benefits must have guaranteed Josephus a decent living, but large scale circulation of his works would have required more resources. When Josephus says that he "presented" (*ἔπέδωκα*—*Vita* 361, 362) or "gave" (*ἔδωκα*—*CA* 1.51) copies of the *War* to the emperors and some who took part in the military affairs, he probably means that these copies had been made at his own expense. To his compatriots, including King Agrippa II himself, Josephus claims to have "sold" (*ἔπρασσον*—*CA* 1.51) his work as he might have been unable to finance

45 Sterling 1991, 284.

46 Such description, by the way, is not foreign to Jewish tradition. Annette Yoshiko Reed directs to the parallels in *Jubilees* 12:16–18, Philo's *De Abrahamo* 69–71 and *Questiones ad Genesim* 3.1. Yoshiko Reed 2004, 128.

47 Cf. Feldman 1985.

48 Cf. Cotton and Eck 2005, 39–40 and the references they mention there.

further copies for an audience already interested in Jewish matters and ready to pay for a historical account.

Josephus also reports that Titus was so satisfied with the account that he “gave orders for their publication” (δημοσιῶσαι προσέταξεν—*Vita* 363). The Church historian Eusebius (263–339 CE) writes that Josephus “was honoured by . . . the inclusion of the works composed by him in [Rome’s public] library” (*HE* 3.9.2),⁴⁹ but Jerome (347–420 CE), whose account on Josephus seems to depend on Eusebius in many respects, suggests that the honour applied to the *War* only.⁵⁰ Read in this context, “orders for publication” probably meant the acquisition of a single copy of the *War* and its deposition in a public library. For this reason, it is not surprising that Josephus emphasised Agrippa’s “sixty-two letters testifying to the truth of the record” (*Vita* 364) over the honour given to him by Titus.

The costs of ancient book production were so high that copies were made exclusively on demand.⁵¹ Publication and dissemination of a literary work depended on the author’s social network⁵² which, in the case of Josephus, did not mean the highest, imperial circles. Hannah M. Cotton and Werner Eck conclude their rich and insightful article about Josephus’ social status in the city of Rome with the statement that “it seems certain that he held no prominent position in the social life of Flavian Rome.”⁵³ From the time of the composition of the *War* until the *Antiquities*, his social network expanded beyond his compatriots to include Greek-speaking Roman intellectuals around Epaphroditus to whom he dedicated all his later works.

Josephus addresses the *Antiquities* to “the whole Greek-speaking world” (ἅπανσα Ἑλλην) (*Ant.* 1.5) and dedicates it to his generous patron Epaphroditus, most probably a literate freedman who worked as a grammaticus, i.e. a secondary-level private teacher, in the city of Rome and owned a massive

49 Greek text and English translation according to Lake and Oulton 1926–1932.

50 *De viris illustribus* 13: “Coming to Rome he presented to the emperors, father and son, seven books *On the captivity of the Jews* (septem libros Judaicae captivitatis), which were deposited in the public library (qui et bibliothecae publicae traditi sunt).” Latin text is according to Migne’s *Patrologia*, translation is made by Ernest Cushing Richardson and appeared in Schaff and Wace 1988.

51 On the cost of book production in the early imperial period, see Harris 1989, 193–196.

52 A clear summary about the conditions of publication and dissemination of the written word in the ancient world is given by Tcherikover 1956, 171–173. A more detailed account can be read in Harris 1989, 222–229.

53 Cotton and Eck 2005, 52.

library of 30,000 scrolls.⁵⁴ He seems not to have been the only one in the city interested in the history and philosophy of the Jews as Josephus seems right "to assume that there are still today many lovers of learning like the king [Ptolemy II Philadelphus]" (*Ant.* 1.12).⁵⁵

Cassius Dio reports in his *Roman Histories* (67.14) that in 95 CE, Titus Flavius Clemens, the emperor Domitian's cousin, and his wife were charged with ἀθεότης. Dio clarifies the phrase as "a charge on which many others who drifted into Jewish ways were condemned."⁵⁶ Another indication of a significant group of Romans with Jewish predilections is the emperor Nerva's issuing of coins next year which advertised the abolition of the calumny of the *fiscus Iudaicus* (*fisci Iudaici calumnia sublata*). From this time on, the Jewish tax was imposed on subjects with Jewish practices regardless of their ethnic background suggesting that, on the one hand, some Jews had decided to abandon their ancestral tradition, and on the other hand, some pagans had decided to take upon the "Jewish ways" like the aforementioned Clemens.⁵⁷

The knowledge of the *War* is presupposed throughout the *Antiquities* suggesting a circle of Roman intelligentsia "deeply interested in Judean culture"⁵⁸ which Josephus established during his stay in the city of Rome. Religious motivation for such interest was probably overshadowed by the alternative, aristocratic political constitution Josephus advocates in his works. Steve Mason points out that the monarchical aspirations of Herod and his heirs, as well as of earlier Roman *principes* and pretenders, are gently criticised in the *War*, though Josephus applies "safe criticism" and never targets "the current regime, but other figures with conspicuously similar traits."⁵⁹ In the *Against Apion*,

54 According to the alternative identification, Josephus' patron was a prominent freedman and secretary of Nero who assisted the emperor in suppressing the Pisonian conspiracy in 64 CE and also in taking his own life, and was eventually executed by Domitian. Sources are collected by Schürer et al. 1970–1987, 1:48. n. 9. This is, however, rejected on chronological grounds (Epaphroditus must have survived Domitian), and the identification depending on the Byzantine *Suda* lexicon is now generally accepted. Cf. Thackeray's introduction in Thackeray et al. 1926–1965, 4:x–xi. and Cotton and Eck 2005, 50–51.

55 Cf. Mason 1998, 77–79.

56 Text and translation is according to Cary and Foster 1914–1927. Cf. also Cotton and Eck 2005, 44.

57 For a sound theory about the reasons of issuing the *fiscus Iudaicus* coins see Goodman 1989. On its relationship to Josephus' possible Roman audience, cf. Cotton and Eck 2005, 45–46.

58 Mason 2000, xix.

59 Mason 2009, 347. and see 330–343. for Mason's analysis of Josephus' critique on monarchical aspiration in the *War*.

Josephus contrasts the ideal Jewish polity, which he calls “theocracy,” with monarchy, oligarchy and democracy, and a couple of paragraphs later he makes clear that under “theocracy” he actually understands a meritocratic rule of the priestly class:

To give but a summary enumeration: some peoples have entrusted the supreme political power to monarchies, others to oligarchies, yet others to the masses. Our lawgiver, however, was attracted by none of these forms of polity, but gave to his constitution the form of what—if a forced expression be permitted—may be termed a “theocracy”. (CA 2.164–165)

Could there be a finer or more equitable polity than one which sets God at the head of the universe, which assigns the administration of its highest affairs to the whole body of priests, and entrusts the supreme high-priest the direction of the other priests? These men, however, owed their original promotion by the legislator to the high office, not to any superiority in wealth or other accidental advantages. No; of all his companions, the men to whom he entrusted the ordering of divine worship as their first charge were those who were pre-eminently gifted with persuasive eloquence and discretion. (CA 2.185–186)

For his Greek-speaking Roman readers, Josephus promises that the *Antiquities* “will embrace our entire ancient history and political constitution” (*Ant.* 1.5). The third subsection of the introduction⁶⁰ describes the constitution of Moses as superior to others for its utmost rationality and congruity guaranteed by a solid philosophical ground starting with the description of the construction of the world (1.18–25). Harold Attridge points out that Josephus uses the language of natural theology to make the Jewish constitution and philosophy comprehensible to the Graeco-Roman world.⁶¹ Inasmuch as they ascribe a significant function to “natural theology as the basis of social order” and a prominent role

60 This 26-paragraph long introductory section of the *Antiquities* can be divided into three subsections, the first including notes on historiography (1.1–9), the second defining the purpose of the work similar to that of the Septuagint (1.10–17), and the third summarising the character of the lawgiver Moses and his constitution (1.18–26). The division is according to Attridge 1976, 41–42.

61 Attridge 1976, 65–66.

to piety in their codes, Josephus' description of Moses⁶² comes close to those of the mythical lawgivers Zaleucus of Epizephyrian Locris in the Greek historian Diodorus Siculus (1st century BCE), Romulus of Rome in Diodorus' contemporary Dionysius of Halicarnassus,⁶³ and Lycurgus of Sparta in Josephus' contemporary Plutarch.⁶⁴

According to Josephus, historical parts of the Bible are inherent elements of the Jewish legal system; central legal and philosophical ideas are expressed or illustrated by the biblical narrative. The rewriting of the *Antiquities* not only provides its favourable non-Jewish readership with a smooth single narrative of the manifold biblical accounts, but also with an alternative political constitution (priestly meritocracy) and a corresponding alternative philosophy.⁶⁵ The motto of this enterprise might be the words of Moses addressing the Jewish people upon his descent from Mount Sinai (*Ant.* 3.84) that describe the Torah in which "a blissful life" and "an ordered government," i.e. the utmost goal of philosophy and of political constitution, is united:

Hebrews, said he, God, as of yore, has received me graciously and having dictated for you rules for a blissful life (βίος εὐδαίμων) and ordered government (πολιτεία κόσμον ὑπαγορεύσα), is coming Himself into the camp.

To conclude, according to a contextual and comparative reading of Josephus' oeuvre the rewritten biblical narrative of the *Antiquities* is not apologetic, but fundamentally historical with a special agenda of advocating an alternative political constitution to Greek-speaking "lovers of learning." Apologetic elements can be interpreted within the genre of "rewritten Bible," whereas Hellenising tendencies are either due to the historical mode of rewriting or to Josephus' primary aim to make the Jewish ideal polity and the corresponding philosophy comprehensible to a favourable non-Jewish audience. Within Roman conditions, an aristocratic constitution would be the closest to Josephus' priestly meritocracy, appealing to an opposition elite whose history

62 *Ant.* 1.18: "But, since well-nigh everything herein related is dependent on the wisdom of our lawgiver Moses, I must first speak briefly of him, lest any of my readers should ask how it is that so much of my work, which professes to treat of laws and historical facts, is devoted to natural philosophy (ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον φυσιολογίας κεκοινώνηκεν)."

63 Attridge 1976, 62–66.

64 Cf. Feldman 2005, 222–231.

65 Mason 1998, 80–85, and Mason 2000, xiv–xvii.

the winners and advocates of the imperial rule understandably preferred to hide away.

Bibliography

- Attridge, Harold W. 1976. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for Harvard Theological Review.
- Cary, Earnest and Herbert B. Foster eds. 1914–1927. *Cassius Dio's Roman History*. 9 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. 1979. *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. BRS 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Cotton, Hannah M. and Werner Eck. 2005. Josephus' Roman Audience: Josephus and the Roman Elites. Pages 37–52 in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by J.C. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J.B. Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, Mark J., Martin Goodman, Simon R.F. Price, and Christopher Rowland. 1999. Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman Empire. Pages 1–13 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by M.J. Edwards, M. Goodman, S.R.F. Price, and Ch. Rowland. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Feldman, Louis H. 1985. Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter. *JQR* 75: 212–252.
- . 1998a. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 1998b. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2005. Parallel Lives of Two Lawgivers: Josephus' Moses and Plutarch's Lycurgus. Pages 209–242 in *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Edited by J.C. Edmondson, S. Mason, and J.B. Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Franxman, Thomas W. 1979. *Genesis and the Jewish Antiquities of Flavius Josephus*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Goodman, Martin. 1989. Nerva, the Fiscus-Judaicus and Jewish Identity. *Journal of Roman Studies* 79: 40–44.
- Harris, William V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lake, Kirsopp and Oulton, John Ernest Leonard eds. 1926–1932. *Eusebius of Caesarea's Ecclesiastical History*. 2 Vols., The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laqueur, Richard. 1920. *Der Jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: Ein Biographischer Versuch Auf Neuer Quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen: Münchow'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Mason, Steve. 1998. "Should Any Wish to Enquire Further" (Ant. 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus's Judaeae Antiquities/Life. Pages 64–103 in *Understanding*

- Josephus: Seven Perspectives*. Edited by S. Mason. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2000. Introduction to the Judaeen Antiquities. Pages xiii–xxxvi in *Flavius Josephus. Translation and Commentary. Judaeen Antiquities 1–4*. Edited by S. Mason. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2009. Of Despots, Diadems and Diadochoi: Josephus and Flavian Politics. Pages 323–349 in *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*. Edited by W.J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite, and P.A. Roche. Leiden: Brill.
- Minns, Denis and Parvis, Paul M. eds. 2009. *Justin Martyr's Apologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Niehoff, Maren. 1996. Two Examples of Josephus' Narrative Technique in His "Rewritten Bible". *JSJ* 27: 31–45.
- Nodet, Etienne. 1996. *La Bible De Josèphe I—Pentateuque*. Paris: Cerf.
- . 2007. Josephus' Attempt to Reorganise Judaism from Rome. Pages 103–122 in *Making History: Josephus and Historical Method*. Edited by Z. Rodgers. Leiden: Brill.
- Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. 2009. The Diversity of Apologetics: From Genre to a Mode of Thinking. Pages 15–41 in *Critique and Apologetics: Jews, Christians and Pagans in Antiquity*. Edited by A.-Ch. Jacobsen, J. Ulrich, and D. Brakke. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Rackham, H., Jones, William Henry Samuel and Eichholz, David Edward eds. 1938–1962. *Pliny's Natural History*. 10 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Rajak, Tessa. 1982. Josephus and The "Archaeology" Of the Jews. *JJS* 33: 465–477.
- . 1983. *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. London: Duckworth.
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. 2004. Abraham as Chaldean Scientist and Father of the Jews: Josephus, Ant. 1.154–168, and the Greco-Roman Discourse About Astronomy/Astrology. *JSJ* 35: 119–158.
- Schaff, Philip and Henry Wace eds. 1988. *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series*. 14 Vols. Edinburgh/ Grand Rapids, Mich.: T&T Clark/Eerdmans.
- Schürer, Emil, Fergus Millar, Geza Vermes, and Martin Goodman. 1970–1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Spilsbury, Paul. 1998. *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Sterling, Gregory E. 1991. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tcherikover, Victor. 1956. Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered. *Eos* 48: 169–193.

- Thackeray, H. St. John. 1929. *Josephus: The Man and the Historian*. New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press.
- Thackeray, H. St. John, Ralph Marcus, Wikgren, Allen Paul and Feldman, Louis H. eds. 1926–1965. *Josephus*. 9 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tomson, Peter. 2002. Les systèmes de Halakhah du Contre Apion et des Antiquités. Pages 189–220 in *Internationales Josephus-Kolloquium Paris 2001: Studies on the Antiquities of Josephus / Études sur les Antiquités de Josèphe*. Edited by F. Siegert and J.U. Kalms. Münster: Lit.
- Vermes, Geza. 1982. A Summary of the Law by Josephus Flavius. *NovT* 24: 289–303.

Josephus' Rewriting of Genesis 24 in *Ant.* 1.242–255

Christopher T. Begg

Introduction

Scholars have long noted the distinctiveness of the account of the marriage of Isaac in Genesis 24 vis-à-vis the other narratives of Genesis. As is regularly pointed out, the chapter is the longest in the book, and tells its story with a degree of circumstantiality that is atypical for Hebrew narrative style, with, e.g., Abraham's servant recapitulating, at great length, his whole previous experience in his report to Rebekah's family in vv. 34–49.¹ In this presentation I wish to examine how, why, and with what effect an ancient rewriter of the Bible, i.e. Josephus in *Ant.* 1.242–255 dealt with the Genesis 24 story and its peculiarities.²

Before we turn, however, to the actual comparison between Genesis 24 and Josephus' rewriting, a word is in order concerning the respective, somewhat differing contexts of the two versions. In both, the story of Isaac's marriage stands within a textual complex dealing with the final events of Abraham's life and the transition to the following generations of his line. In Genesis, the complex in question extends from Genesis 22 through 25 and encompasses the following six segments: (1) the near sacrifice of Isaac (22:1–19); (2) the parenthetical genealogical notices for Abraham's brother Nahor (22:20–24); (3) the death and burial of Sarah (23:1–20); (4) the marriage of Isaac (24:1–67); (5) Abraham's marriage to Keturah, his children by her, and his dispatch of these to the east (25:1–6); and (6) the patriarch's death and burial (25:7–11). Josephus, in *Antiquities* 1, has a content parallel to each of these six units. At the same time, however, he also notably rearranges their sequence within his own presentation. In particular, he anticipates the notices on Nahor's descendants of Gen 22:20–24—that in Genesis are attached to the *Aqedah* story of 22:1–19—to a much earlier point, appending these in 1.153 to his parallel (1.151–152) to the information concerning the family of Terah found in Gen 11:26–31. Having done this, he subsequently relates the stories of Gen 22:1–19 and 23:1–20

-
- 1 See the remark of Sternberg (1985, 143) regarding the segment Gen 24:28–33: "... the episode certainly looks overtreated, unrolling at a leisurely pace and with circumstantial detail associated with Homeric rather than with the biblical style."
 - 2 For the text and translation of *Ant.* 1. 242–255, I use H. St. John Thackeray 1991, 118–127. For previous, summary treatments of the passage, see Franxman 1978, 164–168; Nodet 1990, 54–56; Feldman 2000, 97–99.

back-to-back in 1.222–236 and 1.237, respectively, likewise reducing the Bible's lengthy account of Sarah's death and burial in the latter passage to a summary paragraph. Thereafter, again departing from the biblical order, he gives his version of Gen 25:1–6 in 1.238–241. To this, in turn, he attaches his equivalents first of Genesis 24 (1.242–255) and then of 25:7–11 (1.256). Already the historian's handling of the context of Genesis 24 is indicative then of his readiness to take rather considerable liberties with the order and content of his biblical source.

To facilitate my comparison between them to which I now turn, I divide up the material of Gen 24:1–67 and *Ant.* 1.242–255 into four longer units of parallel content as follows: (1) Gen 24:1–14// *Ant.* 1.242–245 (exposition: the servant's commissioning, journey, and prayer); (2) 24:15–33// 1.246–252a (the servant's "progress" from the well to Rebekah's house); (3) 24:34–49// 1.252b–255a (the servant's discourse to Rebekah's family); and (4) 24:50–67 and 1.255b (the marriage process completed). Let us now look at each of these four segments in succession.

Gen 24:1–14 & *Ant.* 1.242–245

The servant's commissioning by Abraham (and the entire subsequent happening) is dated in Gen 24:1 by reference to the advanced age (and blessed state) of the patriarch. Josephus, at the start of 1.242, substitutes an alternative dating indication, itself anticipated by him from Gen 25:30, i.e. the fact of Isaac's being "about forty years old"—an age when it would be "high time" for his father to get his adult son married—as he will proceed to do in what follows.

The commissioning scene in Gen 24:2–9 unfolds in three stages. In a first stage (vv. 2–4), Abraham directs his senior, nameless servant to place his hand under his thigh in view of Abraham's intention of adjuring him to secure a wife for his son, not from the Canaanites, but rather from his own kindred in the patriarch's native country. These opening words of Abraham, in turn, give rise to an exchange between the servant and his master (vv. 5–8) that constitutes the second stage of the commissioning process. This exchange opens with the servant (v. 5) asking whether, if the woman found by him in Abraham's native land refuses to accompany him, he should bring Isaac himself back there. To this query, Abraham replies at length in vv. 6–8, prohibiting the move suggested by the servant (v. 6), affirming his confidence that God, through his "angel," will enable the servant to find the appropriate woman (v. 7), and finally concluding that while the woman's refusal would dispense the servant from his oath, he, on no condition, is to take Isaac back to Abraham's country of

origin (v. 8). Finally, the scene concludes in v. 9 with the servant doing what Abraham enjoined him in vv. 2–4, i.e. placing his hand under the patriarch's thigh and swearing to do what he has been directed.

How does Josephus deal with this lengthy biblical sequence in 1.242b–243? First of all, he—in contrast, to Jewish tradition elsewhere (see, e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 59.11; *PRE* 16.3)—follows Gen 24:2 in leaving the servant nameless. As for the exchange between him and Abraham, the historian leaves aside their entire “follow-up” conversation in 24:5–8. In so doing, Josephus eliminates any speaking role for the servant, just as he passes over in silence the “negative eventualities” (the woman's refusal, Isaac's “transfer”) around which the two men's discussion revolves in the above passage, as well as the invocation of God and his “angel” found in Abraham's words of 24:7. The effect of these omissions is to heighten the stature of Abraham as the sole speaker in the Josephan commissioning scene. Josephus also, however, modifies the presentation of that portion of Gen 24:2–9 he does utilize, i.e. its vv. 2–4 and 9. In particular, he turns the patriarch's direct address words to the servant in vv. 3–4 about what he is asking of him into a series of editorial statements about Abraham's initiatives at this juncture, i.e. in light of his “decision” to procure a wife for Isaac, he dispatches the servant on his mission, doing so “after binding him by solemn pledges.” Thereafter, the prohibition of the servant's taking a wife for Isaac from among the Canaanites voiced by Abraham in v. 3b is left aside. Abraham's vague allusion to the identity of the woman envisaged by him in v. 4 (“... go to my country and to my kindred and get a wife for my son Isaac”) for its part, is rendered much more precise by Josephus in 1.242b, where, in accordance with Abraham's decision (1.242a), the servant is sent to arrange for Isaac's marriage with a definite, named woman, i.e. Rebekah, granddaughter of his brother Nahor. This modification, which draws on the genealogical notices of Gen 22:20–24 (in which Rebekah appears by name) that have been anticipated by Josephus in 1.153 (see above), disposes of the question of why Abraham leaves things as indeterminate as he does regarding the woman intended by him in his biblical instructions to the servant. Likewise the oath-taking gesture enjoined by Abraham on the servant in 24:2 and performed by him in 24:9 undergoes modification by Josephus, being turned by him into an explanatory appendix (1.243) concerning the nature and purpose of the “solemn pledges” he has taken from the servant: “These pledges are given on this wise; each party places his hand under the other's thigh, and they then invoke God as witness of their future actions.” This explanation, intended to clarify the biblical practice for a Gentile audience that would have been unfamiliar with it, makes the gesture in question a mutual one: both parties place their hands under

each other's thighs, rather than the servant alone doing this as recounted in Gen 24:2,9.³

Following the lengthy commissioning scene of Gen 24:1–9, the biblical account becomes much terser in its narration (24:10–11) of the servant's journey to and arrival at the "city" where its subsequent events will unfold. By contrast, Josephus' version takes a more expansive turn at this juncture. Thus, while Gen 24:10a refers simply to "all kinds of choice gifts from his master" the servant "takes" in setting out along with ten camels, the historian's rendition in 1.244a accentuates Abraham's continued initiative and purposefulness ("he sends to his friends over there presents"), as also his munificence (the gifts sent by him "by reason of their rarity or their being wholly unobtainable in those parts, were inestimable"). Again, Gen 24:10b suggests that the servant's journey was both uneventful and brief: having arisen, he simply goes "to Mesopotamia to the city of Nahor."⁴ Josephus, via his interjected notice in 1.244b invests the servant's journey, related so jejunely in the Bible itself, with a heightened interest and suspense:

*The servant's journey was prolonged, because travel is rendered difficult in Mesopotamia, in winter by the depth of mud, and in summer through the drought; moreover the country is infested by bands of brigands whom travellers could not escape without taking necessary precautions.*⁵

-
- 3 Philo (*Questions and Answers on Genesis*, 4.86. *Philo Supplement I*. Marcus 1953, 364–365) raises a question not posed by either the Bible or Josephus, i.e. why is it specifically under Abraham's "thigh" that the servant is to place his hand. In his response, the Alexandrian distinguishes between a literal and an allegorical sense to the gesture: literally, the servant is to place his hand in proximity to Abraham's generative organ given the marriage and eventual procreation the patriarch has in view, while allegorically he is to come in contact thereby with that part of his master's soul that "does not flow but is firm in solidity and strength."
 - 4 Elsewhere, Jewish tradition (e.g., *Gen. Rab.* 59.11; *b. Sanh.* 95a; *PRE* 16.3), taking its cue from the above biblical formulation, makes the servant's journey a miraculous happening in which he reaches his destination on the same day as he set out (within three hours according to R. Akiba as cited in the second of these sources).
 - 5 Here and subsequently, I italicize those elements of Josephus' presentation that lack a direct counterpart in the Bible itself. Josephus' indication about the length of the journey, of course, corresponds more closely to the ancient geographical realities than does what is suggested by the Bible and made explicit in later Jewish tradition concerning the duration of the servant's trip (see n. 4). According to Speiser (1964, 183), that journey, beginning likely at Hebron and with Haran at its goal would have "taken at least a month."

As for the end point of that journey, he (1.244c) gives a proper name (“Charran”)⁶ to the “city of Nahor” where the servant arrives according to Gen 24:10b, drawing the name from the mention of this site in Gen 11:31 (// *Ant.* 1.152) as the place where Terah’s family—including his son Nahor—comes to a halt on their journey from “Ur of the Chaldees,” and further specifying “the suburbs” of the city as the servant’s stopping point. According to Gen 24:11, the servant’s arrival at the well occurs at the usual time for the city’s womenfolk to come to draw water. Josephus (1.244 *in fine*) has him actually “fall in with” a group of maidens who have come for that purpose. This difference, as we shall see, leads to others in Josephus’ subsequent handling of the biblical account.

Once he has stationed himself at the well, the biblical servant offers a rather extended prayer (Gen 24:12–14) in which he asks God to bring success to his mission and favour to Abraham (v. 12) and alludes to his current situation at the well, with the women approaching (v. 13; see v. 11). Thereafter, he proposes a two-part “test” by means of which he will be enabled to identify the “right” woman, i.e. she is the one who, upon his request for water, will offer this to him and then volunteer to water his camels as well (v. 14a). Finally, the prayer concludes with the servant affirming that if things go as proposed by him, he will know that God has indeed “shown steadfast love” to his master (v. 14b).⁷ Josephus’ version of the prayer (1.245), once again, converts biblical direct into indirect address and has the servant address himself to “God” rather than the “Lord” (LXX *κύριος*) as in Gen 24:12.⁸ More notably, it gives a new content to the “test” proposed by the servant in Genesis. In Josephus’ rendering, the servant will be enabled to identify “Rebekah,” whose name—in contrast to his biblical counterpart—he already knows from Abraham’s instructions to him (see 1.242), by her responding affirmatively to his request for a drink, when the other women (with whom the servant has already “fallen in” according

6 Likewise *PRE* 16.3 specifies “Haran” as the place where the servant arrives.

7 In *Gen. Rab.* 60.3, the servant’s prayer is declared to be one of a number of “improper” biblical prayers that God nonetheless answered in a fitting manner. Specifically, the midrash avers that the servant in formulating his request in Gen 24:14 leaves open the possibility that the maiden who does as he asks could be a slave girl—an inappropriate wife for Isaac. Nonetheless, God saw to it that the woman who meets the servant’s tests was none other than Rebekah.

8 Both these modifications are in accordance with Josephus’ frequent practice in his rewriting of the Bible. On the historian’s penchant for substituting indirect for biblical direct address, see Begg 1993, 12–13, n. 38 and the literature cited there. On his virtually total avoidance of the biblical term “Lord” as a designation for the Deity (this likely prompted by the non-currency of an “absolute” use of term [ἴ] *κύριος* for god(s) in secular Greek), see *ibid.*, 45, n. 218 and the literature cited there.

to 1.244c) rebuff him. In thus modifying the initial test proposed by the servant in Gen 24:14, while leaving aside the further test adduced by him there (the voluntary offer of water for the camels),⁹ and by assigning the other women an active—if negative—role in the proceedings, Josephus continues to go his own way vis-à-vis the biblical presentation of the scene at the well.

Gen 24:15–33 & Ant. 1.246–252a

With Gen 24:15 a new character, Rebekah, here named for the first time in the biblical chapter, comes on the scene; in the passage extending through v. 33 she plays the leading role in securing entrance to the home of Abraham's kin for the servant. This extended biblical segment has its Josephan parallel in 1.246–252a.

Within Gen 24:15–33 itself, a first sub-section may be distinguished in vv. 15–21, where Rebekah, following the narrator's elaborate presentation of her person and activities at the well in vv. 15–16, successfully meets both parts of the test proposed by the servant in his prayer (see v. 14a), first giving him the drink he asks for (vv. 17–18) and then volunteering to water his camels (vv. 19–20), as the servant looks on in silent wonderment, “seeking to learn whether the Lord had prospered his journey or not” (v. 21). In line with his previous reformulation of the servant's proposed “test,” Josephus reworks the scene as recounted in 24:15–21 as well. Passing over the preliminary indications of 24:15–16 concerning Rebekah (her parentage, beauty, virginity and water-drawing),¹⁰ he has the servant address himself, not specifically to her, but to the assembled maidens with his request for water. In response, the group as a whole refuses

9 The servant's camels are cited three times in the course of Gen 24:10–14. Josephus' version passes over all these references, likely viewing them as a dispensable element of a biblical narration he found overlong. Subsequently, however, he will make allusion to the beasts' presence in his parallel to Gen 24:32 in 1.252a; see n. 34.

10 Josephus' omission of the *personalia* that Gen 24:15–16 supplies concerning Rebekah is noteworthy in that in other contexts—both in his rewriting of the Bible and in non-biblical portions of his corpus—he accords recurrent attention to the beauty and virginity of women figures. Here, the omission may be due both to the historian's desire to bring the servant's test and its realization into closer connection with each other—a connection that the interlude devoted to the details concerning Rebekah in 24:15–16 obscures—as well as a shift of focus in his presentation overall from Rebekah's physical attributes to her interior qualities (and their expression in word and deed). See, however, 1.248 and n. 17. On the historian's (ambivalent) treatment of the Bible's women figures overall, see Feldman 1998, 188–192.

the request, alleging the difficulty of obtaining water and their own need for this. One of them, however, takes the opposite tack, reproaching the other women for their lack of hospitality to the stranger,¹¹ while she herself “*graciously* (φιλοφρόνως)¹² offers” water to him. In this response of hers, the woman differentiates herself from the others, exactly as envisaged by the Josephan servant in formulating his test, and thereby prompts “high hopes of attaining his main object” on the part of the servant (so the opening words of 1.247; compare the vaguer formulation of 24:21, according to which “the servant gazed on her in silence to learn whether or not the Lord had prospered his journey”).

Gen 24:22–25 features a series of further exchanges between the servant and the woman who has just “passed” his double test, which themselves lead into an additional prayer by the servant (vv. 26–27; cf. 24:12–14). Josephus’ parallel to this segment in 1.247–251 is characterized both by its rearrangements of the biblical sequence and its amplifications of this, amplifications that serve above all to highlight the extraordinary qualities of Rebekah. Both these aspects of Josephus’ rewriting are evident in his handling of the opening portion of Gen 24:22ff., i.e. vv. 22–23a, where the servant first bestows several pieces of jewellery upon the woman and only then inquires about her family. Taking care to represent the servant as first ascertaining the woman’s identity before presuming to award her his gifts, Josephus (1.247) has him begin by posing the question about the woman’s family, at the same time elaborating upon this with words of fulsome praise for her:

... [he] commended her for her nobility and goodness of heart [εὐγενείας καὶ ... χρηστότητος]¹³ in not hesitating to minister to another’s need at the cost of her own toil and inquired who were her parents, wishing them joy of

11 In reporting here an initial word by Rebekah unparalleled in the Bible itself, i.e. “*What will you [the other women] ever share with anyone, who refuse even a drop of water?*”), Josephus, rather exceptionally, makes use of direct address, thereby accentuating the status of the speaker.

12 With this (inserted) adverb characterizing the manner in which Rebekah dispenses the water, Josephus highlights her magnanimity. Josephus will use terminology of the same *Wortfeld* in reference to Rebekah and her family twice in what follows; see 1.250,251, and cf. nn. 23,28.

13 This collocation occurs only here in Josephus’ corpus. The praise that the Josephan servant here accords Rebekah has a counterpart in the lengthy commendation Philo bestows upon her as the servant’s spiritual teacher in his allegorization of the scene at the well as found in *Post.* 39–45, 132–153. On the second of the above terms and its cognates in Greek literature generally, see: Stachowiak 1957; Spicq 1978, 971–976.

such a child, and saying “May they marry thee¹⁴ to their hearts’ content into the house of a good man to bear him children in wedlock.”

Having thus anticipated and elaborated upon the servant’s initial question to Rebekah of Gen 24:23a, Josephus also expatiates on the summary answer attributed to the latter in Gen 24:24 (“I am the daughter of Bethuel the son of Milcah, whom she bore to Nahor”). Preserving the Bible’s direct address form of Rebekah’s answer, the historian’s version has her cite her own name, clarify the current situation of her father Bethuel, and make anticipatory mention of the figure of her brother Laban who will figure prominently in what follows. His rendering of the woman’s answer in 1.248 thus reads:

... I am called Rebecca,¹⁵ and my father was Bathuel, but he is now dead,¹⁶ and our brother Laban directs the whole household, with my mother, and is guardian of my maidenhood (παρθενία¹⁷).¹⁸

-
- 14 Here exceptionally, Josephus utilizes direct address, thereby focusing attention on the man’s words (and the stature of Rebekah to whom he addresses them). Such shifts from (prevailing) indirect to direct address in the discourses Josephus attributes to characters is a not infrequent feature of his biblical rewriting; see Begg 1993, 123–124, n. 772.
- 15 In the Bible’s presentation, the servant is nowhere directly informed of the name of the woman with whom he is dealing. In filling the lacuna here, Josephus has the servant now learn that the woman who has met his test is the one whom Abraham had named (1.242) as she whom he is to procure for his son, this confirming that the woman with whom he is currently speaking is indeed the one intended.
- 16 This interjected indication concerning Bethuel’s previous demise serves to dispose of a difficulty posed by the biblical account overall: how is that, whereas Bethuel is Rebekah’s father and as such the head of her family, in Gen 24:28 she is said to run to her *mother’s* household, and thereafter it is Laban—not Bethuel—who takes matters in hand in vv. 29–33? Why too is Bethuel mentioned only once in the continuation of the chapter, i.e. in v. 50, and there in second place after his son Laban? On the issue, see the commentaries. Elsewhere in Jewish tradition, the problem gives rise to an alternative “solution” to the one introduced by Josephus above, i.e. although still alive at the moment of the servant’s arrival, Bethuel died during the course of the ensuing negotiations, thus leaving Laban to conclude the process. See *Gen. Rab.* 60.12; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 24:33,55 (here it is further alleged that Bethuel having set poisoned food before the servant, ended up eating that food himself and so died).
- 17 With this reference to Rebekah’s “virginity”, placed by him on her own lips, Josephus makes delayed use of the editorial notice of Gen 24:16 previously passed over by him (see n. 10): “a virgin (LXX παρθένος), whom no man had known.”
- 18 By introducing mention—anticipated by him from the continuation of the biblical account—of her brother and mother (and their joint role as rulers of the household) into

Josephus' rearrangement of the sequence of Gen 24:22–27 continues in 1.249a, where he gives an “anticipated” version of the servant's prayer of vv. 26–27 that in the Bible serves to round off the preceding interaction between him and Rebekah in vv. 22–25. In thus repositioning the servant's (second) prayer, Josephus likewise compresses its biblical model, passing over the references to the man's bowing his head and worshiping of v. 26 as well as the elaborate doxology of 24:27a in order to focus on his acknowledgement of divine support in 24:27b (“As for me, the Lord has led me on the way to the house of my master's kin”). His generalized rendition of this final component of the servant's biblical prayer in 1.249a accordingly reads: “On hearing this [i.e. Rebekah's answer of 1.248] the servant rejoiced alike at the deeds done and the words spoken, seeing that God was so manifestly furthering his mission.”

Having now disposed of the content of Gen 24:23aα and 26–27 (in which Rebekah's identity is confirmed for the servant), Josephus next (1.249b) gives his delayed rendering of 24:22 (the servant's gifts to Rebekah). Here again, he expatiates on the Bible's presentation of the matter, underscoring both the appropriateness of the gifts and the servant's motivation in giving these, a motivation which, in turn, furthers the historian's magnification of Rebekah's qualities:

... and producing a necklace and some ornaments¹⁹ *becoming for maidens* (παρθένους; cf. Rebekah's reference to her “maidenhood” [παρθενίας] in 1.248) *to wear*, he offered them to the damsel²⁰ *as a recompense and*

his version of Rebekah's reply, Josephus sets up the role both will have in the negotiations that follow.

- 19 Gen 24:22 is more detailed concerning the gifts and their value: “a gold nose-ring weighing a half shekel and two bracelets for her arms weighing ten gold shekels.” In Josephus, the focus shifts from the monetary value of the gifts to their suitability for a woman of Rebekah's current status and, above all, to the gifts' function as simple tokens with which the servant recognizes Rebekah's meritorious conduct. See the comment of Feldman 2000, 98, n. 764: “Josephus . . . reduced these [the Bible's] very precious gifts to a necklace and some ornaments, presumably to avoid the suggestion that Eliezer was, in effect, trying to bribe her.”
- 20 With this formulation, Josephus—perhaps under the influence of the servant's subsequent report about his initiative (“. . . I put the ring on her nose, and the bracelets on her arms”) in Gen 24:47b—clarifies the language of Gen 24:22, where the servant is said simply “to take” the ornaments, with no explicit indication of what he did with them after doing so. (In having the servant only bestow his gifts after ascertaining Rebekah's identity, contrary to the sequence of Gen 24:22–23, Josephus likewise may have been influenced by the reversal of this sequence one finds in the servant's report concerning it in 24:47.)

*a reward for her courtesy (χάριτος) in giving him drink, saying that it was right that she should receive such things, having outstripped so many maidens in charity (ἀγαθήν).*²¹

At this juncture (1.250), Josephus makes (displaced) utilization of yet another component of the sequence Gen 24:22–27, i.e. the servant's second question to Rebekah in v. 23b (which in the biblical context is immediately appended to his query about her parentage in v. 23a) concerning accommodation possibilities at her house. In having the servant pose his second question separately from his first, he also greatly expands on its biblical formulation ("Is there room in your father's house for us to lodge in?"), thereby making the request considerably more circumstantial and deferential than it is in the Bible itself:

He also besought that he might lodge with them, *night prohibiting him from journeying farther, and being the bearer of women's apparel of great price,*²² *he said that he could not entrust himself to safer hosts such as he had found her to be. He could guess from her own virtues (ἀρετῆς) the kindness (φιλανθρωπίαν)*²³ *of her mother and brother, and that they would not take his request amiss;*²⁴ *nor would he be burdensome to them, but would*

-
- 21 The above conclusion of the declaration with which the Josephan servant accompanies his bestowal of the gifts clearly has in view Josephus' distinctive version of the servant's "test" that involves, not just Rebekah herself, but also the other women at the well. His words here likewise echo those he speaks to her in 1.247 ("he commended her for her nobility and goodness of heart in not hesitating to minister to another's need at the cost of her own toil").
- 22 The above motivations Josephus supplies for the servant's request for accommodations hark back to previous elements of his account, i.e. the "inestimable value" of the presents with which Abraham sends him off and the danger of "brigands" facing him on his journey (see 1.244). In their combination, these factors make the servant's request appear an eminently reasonable one. The latter motivation likewise intimates the prospect of advantage for Rebekah and her family in accepting the servant's request—a point that will be accentuated in the continuation of his words; see above and cf. n. 26.
- 23 This noun form pertains to the *Wortfeld* of the adverb φιλοφρόνως used by Josephus in describing Rebekah's "graciously" dispensing water to the servant in 1.246; see n. 12. In their combination, the two cognate terms highlight Rebekah's "philanthropic" spirit in a way that goes beyond the Bible's more "objective" presentation of her words and actions. On the above noun, see Spicq 1958, 161–191; *idem* 1978, II, 922–927.
- 24 With this further expansion of the biblical servant's request, Josephus has him turn to a *captatio benevolentiae* of his (potential) hosts, whose own virtues he extols simply on the basis of his experience of the hospitality of their daughter and sister.

pay a price for their gracious hospitality (φιλοξενίας)²⁵ and live at his own expense.²⁶

In Gen 24:25, Rebekah replies to the servant's brief query about accommodations (24:23b) with an equally summary statement: "we have plenty of straw and fodder and a place to spend the night." Josephus, who has just elaborated at length on the servant's request, does the same with the response he attributes to Rebekah in 1.251, where she first addresses his remarks about her relatives and then indicates that the matter must be referred to Laban as the head of the household (which status she already attributed to him in her words of 1.248):

"To this she replied that with regard to her parents' humanity (φιλανθρωπίας; cf. φιλαφρόνως [1.246], φιλανθρωπίαν [1.250]) he judged aright, but she upbraided (ἐπεμέμφετο) him for suspecting them of meanness (μικρολόγους)²⁷ for he would have everything free of cost (ἀμισθί²⁸);²⁹ however, she would first speak to her brother Laban and with his consent would bring him in.³⁰

-
- 25 This compound form as read by Marcus, Niese and Naber occurs only here in Josephus. The codices MSPL have the simple form ξενίας (which Nodet adopts). On the compound (and its adjectival cognate) in secular and NT Greek, see Spicq 1978, II, 932–935.
- 26 With this final component of the servant's speech, Josephus has him adduce an additional consideration, already adumbrated by him in his previous words (see n. 22), in favour of his appeal: after extolling the family's hospitality, he now plays "the self-interest card": they will lose nothing, but rather gain financially themselves by taking him in.
- 27 Josephus' one remaining use of this adjective is in BJ 1.274. The word might be viewed as the opposite of the "philanthropy" which is the key attribute of Rebekah and her family in Josephus' presentation, where "philanthropic" terminology is applied to them three times; see 1.246, 250.251.
- 28 Josephus' one remaining use of this word is in Ant. 16.291.
- 29 This portion of Rebekah's answer has no counterpart in that ascribed to her biblical counterpart in Gen 24:25. On the other hand, it does pick up on the servant's own flattering words concerning her family as cited in 1.250, even as it "corrects" his surmises concerning them by making clear that, in fact, they are even more hospitable than he has supposed, such that there is no need to the servant to be concerned about being "burdensome" to them or "paying his own way" at their house.
- 30 This concluding portion of Rebekah's response according to Josephus takes the place of her statement about her family's ("we") having everything necessary for the servant's reception in Gen 24:25. In answering as she does here, Rebekah evidences due deference to the one whom she had earlier characterized as he "who directs the whole household" (see 1.248)—given that status of his, he alone can make the decision about taking the servant in. In formulating Rebekah's response in this way, Josephus has in view the continuation of the biblical account in 24:28–33, where Laban is shown welcoming the servant into the family's house, once Rebekah has reported matters to the family (see v. 28).

The segment that began in Gen 24:15 with the servant's initiative at the well finds an initial resolution in 24:28–33, as he gains admittance to the house of the woman with whom he has spoken there. Whereas in his treatment of the preceding material of Gen 24:15–27, Josephus repeatedly amplifies the biblical account, he limits his equivalent to the circumstantial “entry account” of 24:28–33 to a single, highly compressed half-paragraph (1.252a) that reads:

So, this being done,³¹ she introduced the stranger (ζένον³²),³³ his camels³⁴ were received by Laban's servants,³⁵ and he himself was brought in to sup with the master.³⁶

-
- 31 This transitional phrase refers back to Rebekah's preceding words in 1.251b, where she announces her intention of informing Laban and gaining his agreement before bringing the servant into their home, indicating that she did indeed act on that intention. Compare Gen 24:28–29, where Rebekah hastens to report her experiences at the well to her “mother's household” (cf. Josephus' anticipated reapplication of this source element in the mention of her mother as co-director of the household in 1.248) and, in response, Laban himself runs to the well.
- 32 This term echoes the word φιλοξενίας used by the servant in making his request for accommodations in 1.250; due to Rebekah's initiative, he now attains what he requested.
- 33 In making Rebekah the subject of this action, Josephus diverges from the account in Gen 24:31, where it is Laban who welcomes the servant into his house, doing so after hearing Rebekah's report, and himself going out to the spring to meet him (see vv. 28–30). The effect is to shift attention away from Laban—the ostensible head of the household—to Rebekah herself who “introduces” the servant into the house—albeit with Laban's (presumed) permission in accordance with her statement to the servant in 1.251 about her requesting that permission.
- 34 In Josephus' version, this is the first mention of the servant's accompanying camels; by contrast, the biblical account has already made repeated reference to them throughout Gen 24:1off., likewise citing them in the biblical account of the servant's entry *chez* Laban in 24:30,31,32. See n. 9.
- 35 With his characteristic concern for hierarchical propriety (see Rebekah's previous deferring to Laban as the head of her household on the question of the servant's accommodations in 1.251), Josephus leaves the camels to be dealt with by the household servants; compare Gen 24:32, where Laban in person “ungirds the camels” and provides his guest with straw and provender for them. Once again, the figure of Laban and his initiatives recedes in Josephus' version (see previous note), those initiatives being attributed by him to other characters (Rebekah, the household servants). In the same line, Josephus leaves aside Gen 24:32's reference to Laban's providing the servant with water for washing his feet and those of his retinue (a group whose presence along with the servant is nowhere referred to by Josephus; compare the servant's question “is there room in your father's house *for us* to spend the night?” in 24:23b; see n. 56).
- 36 Compare Gen 24:33aα: “Then food was set before him...”; Josephus' formulation accentuates the hospitality accorded the servant who is not merely given food but is made

Gen 24:34–49 & Ant. 1.252b–255a

The third main component within Genesis 24 consists of a lengthy, uninterrupted discourse by the servant (vv. 34–49) addressed to Rebekah's kin. Here, the servant first fills his hosts in on his own identity and that of his master (vv. 34–36), then recapitulates *in extenso*, but with also with recurrent variations, the whole preceding series of events (vv. 37–48),³⁷ and finally concludes with a curiously allusive appeal that his hearers tell him whether or not they intend to “deal loyally and truly” with his master, so that, in the latter case, he [the servant] might “turn either to the right hand or to the left” (v. 49). Josephus evidently found this element of the biblical account with its wide-going repetition of but also discrepancies with what precedes and its seemingly anti-climatic conclusion in need of major reworking. Accordingly, in his version of Gen 24:33–49 in 1.252b–255a he ascribes to the servant a speech—addressed not only to Laban (as would appear to be the case in Gen 24:33ff.)—but also to Rebekah's mother—that replaces these problematic features of the *Vorlage* with a much briefer, but also more purposely organized argument for their assenting to the proposed marriage between Rebekah and Isaac. In presenting his case (which he does only after acted the part of a good guest by supping with Laban; see n. 36), the Josephan servant (1.252), dispensing with the self-presentation of Gen 24:34 (“I am Abraham's servant”)³⁸ and the biographical particulars concerning his master in 24:35–36 (which he will, however, allude

to dine with Laban, the household's head (as is presupposed by the subsequent biblical account). From the continuation of 24:33, Josephus omits the servant's declaration in v. 33aβ (“I will not eat until I have told my errand”), to which Laban then responds (v. 33b) by telling him to proceed. The biblical servant's insistence on speaking before he has partaken of the food that has been provided him might appear rude on the part of a guest in another's person's home, and so Josephus modifies the biblical account of the matter, having the servant first eat and only then venture to address his hosts; see 1.252b, which opens with the transitional formula “supper ended,” this picking up on the immediately preceding reference in 1.252a to the servant's “being brought in to sup with the master.” See also the remark of Feldman 2000, 99, n. 768: “... the good guest must eat first, as we see, for example, when Telemachus visits Nestor (*Od.* 3.67–68); and so Josephus... reverses the biblical order [within 24:33].”

- 37 One such variation concerns the servant's report of his interactions with Rebekah. Here, his words in v. 47 reverse the sequence of his initiatives as cited in 24:22–23a: he now represents himself as having first asked Rebekah about her identity and only then bestowing his gifts upon her (as Josephus describes him as doing in 1.247–249). For a detailed analysis of the variations between the events told in Gen 24:1–27 and the servant's report of these in Gen 24:33–49 and the significance of these variations see Sternberg 1985, 145–152.
- 38 Jewish tradition (see, e.g., *b. B. Qam.* 92b) highlights the servant's modesty in acknowledging from the start, as he does in Gen 24:34—that he is (nothing but) the servant of Abraham.

to subsequently; see below), begins immediately by highlighting the close kinship existing between Abraham and the family of his hosts:

*Abraham is the son of Therrus and a kinsmen of yours; for Nahor, the grandfather of these children, dear lady, was Abraham's brother; they had the same father and the same mother.*³⁹

Having commenced in this way, the servant in 1.253a proceeds to explain the reason for Abraham's "sending" (πέμπει⁴⁰)⁴¹ him to his current hearers: he did so in order to arrange for marriage between his "lawful son" and "sole heir"—both highly desirable attributes for a perspective spouse⁴²—and "this

In Josephus' version of his words, the servant appears still more self-effacing, beginning his discourse with mention, not of himself, but of his master Abraham.

- 39 In the above opening of the servant's words, note that he addresses himself explicitly only to Rebekah's mother, rather than (also) to Laban, even though earlier in 1.252a it is with him that the servant is "brought in to sup." In Gen 24:34–49, the addressees of the servant's words are nowhere explicitly identified, while in v. 50 it is Laban and Bethuel (on the problem of his functioning as a respondent to the servant, see n. 16) who respond to him. Thus, vis-à-vis the Bible, Josephus accords the mother a heightened importance in the negotiations concerning Rebekah, doing so in accordance with the latter's declaration in 1.248 that her mother, is "co-director" of the household along with Laban.
- 40 Note this historic present form, a form which Josephus, in line with the Atticizing tendencies of his biblical rewriting, often introduces in place of the past forms of the LXX (and MT). On the phenomenon, see Begg 1993, 10–11, n. 32 and the literature cited there. See also nn. 55, 57.
- 41 In limiting himself to the bare fact of Abraham's having "sent" him, the servant passes over the detailed, largely verbatim recapitulation of this happening that his biblical counterpart presents in Gen 24:37–41 (compare 24:2–9), with its reminiscence, e.g., of the oath-taking procedure and the discussion between the two men about what will happen should the designated woman be unwilling to return with the servant. Josephus' formulation likewise—in accordance with his account of the matter in 1.242—represents the servant as having been sent specifically to Rebekah's family, whereas in Gen 24:1–9, as we have seen, the patriarch is vaguer about to whom it is he is sending the servant. See n. 43.
- 42 The servant's allusion to Isaac (who, as in Gen 24:33–49, remains unnamed) here in his twofold capacity as Abraham's "lawful son" and "sole heir" have a certain counterpart in the servant's declaration of Gen 24:36: "And Sarah my master's wife bore a son to my master when she was old and he has given him all that he has." (The latter portion of the servant's biblical statement in 24:36 in fact "anticipates" something which only occurs at a subsequent point in the biblical account; see Gen 25:5, where Abraham "gives all he has" to Isaac). The function of the references to Isaac's current status within the Josephan servant's discourse is to put the hearers in a favorable frame of mind for accepting the

damsel.”⁴³ To this statement, in turn, the Josephan servant attaches a remark (1.253b) that returns to the topic of kinship, representing this as Abraham’s all-dominate concern in his choice of a wife for his son:

Aye, though he might have taken for him the wealthiest (εὐδαιμονεστᾶτην)⁴⁴ of the women yonder he scorned such a match, and in honour of his own kin he now plans this marriage.⁴⁵

At the opening of 1.254, the servant already comes, on the basis of all that he has previously said about Abraham’s proposition and the motivation behind this—to an initial appeal to his hearers, this in contrast to the biblical speaker, who only formulates such an appeal at the very end of his discourse in 24:49: “Flout not his [Abraham’s] ardour (σπουδῆν) and his proposal.”⁴⁶ To that

proposition he is about to make, given the desirable attributes of the one on whose behalf he will make the proposition.

- 43 In having the servant specify “this damsel,” i.e. Rebekah as the one whom Abraham had sent him to obtain as a wife for Isaac here, Josephus continues to align his version of the servant’s discourse to Rebekah’s family with his previous account of the instructions given the servant by Abraham, instructions which are more specific concerning the wife he has in mind for Isaac than are those given by the patriarch in Gen 24:2–9; see n. 41.
- 44 Words of the εὐδαιμον- stem are prevalent in Josephus’ corpus. His use of the terminology reflects the importance of the word εὐδαιμονία (absent from the LXX) in Greek ethical discourse. On the terminology in Josephus, see Weiss 1979, 427–428; Mason 1991, 185.
- 45 This portion of the servant’s speech alludes to—even while eliminating its “ethnic edge,” an element of the biblical story not previously utilized in Josephus’ version, i.e. Abraham’s prohibition of the servant’s taking a wife for Isaac “from the daughters of the Canaanites” that the patriarch enunciates in Gen 24:3 and which the servant himself recalls in his discourse in 24:37. In adapting this source item, Josephus intimates a motivation—lacking in the Bible itself—for that prohibition, i.e. Abraham’s insistence that his son’s future wife be drawn from his own kin. Given the importance of this requirement for him, Abraham, the servant declares, has willingly foregone the advantages that marriage outside his kinship circle would bring. His doing that, in turn, should make Rebekah and her family all the more appreciative of and ready to accept the overture that he is making to them, seeing that this is not prompted by any “mercenary” motive on the patriarch’s part. On the problem posed for Josephus by the practice of intermarriage, given on the one hand that he does not wish to promote loss of identity and assimilation among his own people, while on the other he is concerned not to offend Gentile readers by adopting too hard a line on the matter, see Feldman 1998, 135–139.
- 46 The servant’s call here for the family to accept the proposition Abraham is making them with such eagerness through his words stands in contrast to the biblical speaker’s above-mentioned, surprisingly indefinite conclusion to his discourse in Gen 24:49 that seems to leave the hearers with two alternatives, equally possible ways of dealing with Abraham

appeal in turn, the servant, in the continuation of 1.254, appends a “theological motivation,” itself corresponding to the servant’s evocation, in Gen 24:48, of “the God of my master Abraham who has led me by the right way to take the daughter of my master’s kinsman for his son”, i.e. “*for* it was through God’s will (κατὰ . . . θεοῦ βούλησιν) that all else befell me on my journey and that I found this child and your house.”⁴⁷ That motivation is itself given a motivation of its own at the end of 1.254, where the servant, summing up (and adapting) his biblical counterpart’s lengthy recalling of his experiences at the well in Gen 24:42–47, affirms:

...*for* when I drew nigh to the city I saw many maidens coming to the well,⁴⁸ and I prayed that I might light upon this one,⁴⁹ as indeed has come to pass.⁵⁰

Following—and drawing the implications from—the above double, juxtaposed motivation, the servant concludes his discourse in 1.255a with a renewed appeal to his hearers that picks up and elaborates upon his initial, brief request of them in 1.254a (see above):

and where it is the negative possibility (i.e. their not acting “loyally and truly” towards him) that, in fact, gets the greater attention.

- 47 In Gen 24:48 itself—which serves as a lead-in to the summons the servant issues his hearers in 24:49 (a sequence reversed in Josephus’ rendering) the reference to God’s role in what happens is part of a reminiscence by him of his prayer of Gen 24:26–27 (cf. *Ant.* 1.249), a reminiscence that is not reproduced in Josephus’ version of the servant’s discourse. On Josephus’ recurrent use of terms of the βουλ-stem in reference to the “will of God,” see Attridge 1976, 75–76; Jonquière 2007, 115–117.
- 48 With this formulation, the Josephan servant harks back to the mention, at the end of 1.244, of his “falling in with a number of maidens going to fetch water.” Compare Gen 24:13, where, within the context of his prayer (24:12–14) the servant mentions the coming of “the daughters of the townspeople” to the well.
- 49 This component of the servant’s recapitulation of his experiences at the well corresponds to the notice of 1.244a about his praying to God that Rebekah “. . . might be found among these maidens.” Whereas the servant in Gen 24:42–44 cites the content of his prayer of 24:12–14 at length, the Josephan servant does so much more summarily, passing over, e.g., the “test” proposed by him in his prayer as reported in 1.245b.
- 50 With this formulation, the servant makes summary reference to the fulfilment of his prayer at the well as recounted 1.246–253a. The biblical servant recapitulates the fulfilment process at much greater length in Gen 24:45–47 when recalling the events of Gen 24:15–33.

Nuptials thus manifestly blessed of heaven (ὑπὸ θείας)⁵¹ do you then ratify, and show honour to Abraham, who with such zeal (σπουδῆς)⁵² has sent me hither, by consenting to give the damsel away.⁵³

Gen 24:50–67 & Ant. 1.255b

The biblical account in Genesis 24 tells of the denouement of the story in much circumstantial detail in its vv. 50–67. In this segment, the family's consent is related in vv. 50–51, but Rebekah's actual departure occurs only in v. 61, following a series of intervening events (the servant's prostration before God [v. 52] a distribution of gifts by him [v. 53], a shared nocturnal meal [v. 54a], an attempt by the family to delay Rebekah's leave-taking [vv. 54b–55], the servant's insistence on setting out immediately [v. 56], a consultation of Rebekah who evidences her readiness to depart with him [v. 57], and the family's dismissal and blessing of Rebekah [vv. 58–60]). Thereafter, one finds a lengthy description of Rebekah's approach to the waiting Isaac (vv. 62–65), a report by the servant to Isaac (v. 66), who then takes Rebekah, marries her, and in his love for her is "comforted after his mother's death" (vv. 67). Josephus (1.255b) reduces this whole lengthy sequence to half a paragraph, limiting himself to two key points concerning the story's resolution, i.e. the family's consent and Isaac's marrying of Rebekah, while leaving aside all the intervening biblical developments. In relating the family's assent on the basis of Gen 24:50–51, Josephus eliminates v. 50's mention of Bethuel (whom Rebekah has reported to be already dead in 1.248), thus making her mother, along with Laban—the

51 This reference to the heavenly inspiration for the proposed marriage—which itself serves as a theological reason for why Abraham's proposal should be accepted—lacks an explicit counterpart in the servant's discourse in Gen 24:33–49 (although see the response [24:50] to his discourse by Bethuel and Laban who aver "this thing is from the Lord"). The reference does, however, have a counterpart elsewhere in Jewish tradition; see, e.g., *b. Mo'ed Qat.*18b, where the men's words in Gen 24:50 are cited as scriptural proof for the proposition "a woman is [destined to] a man by God."

52 This term echoes the same word used in 1.254a, where the servant asks his hearers not to "flout" Abraham's "ardour" (σπουδῆν). The repetition of the term highlights—in a way designed to flatter those hearers—just how eager Abraham is for inter-marriage with them, this notwithstanding the other advantageous prospects he has available to him (see 1.253b).

53 This formulation, like—and even more so than—the servant's initial appeal in 1.253a (see n. 47) serves to give a clearer point to the biblical servant's concluding words of Gen 24:49. In particular, it underscores, one last time, just how desirous Abraham is for the proposed marriage between Rebekah and his son.

addressees of the servant's words according to 1.252b—those who give the consent. He likewise transposes into a reference to the pair's inner reaction to the servant's discourse the initial words pronounced by them in 24:50b, i.e. "The thing comes from the Lord." Given these modifications of the biblical presentation, his formulation concerning the family's consent runs:

And they, *since the suit was to their liking*, understood God's will (γνώμην τοῦ θεοῦ)⁵⁴ and sent (πέμπουσιν)⁵⁵ their daughter in accordance with the servant's request.⁵⁶

As for the sequence Gen 24:62–67, Josephus extracts a single element from this as well, i.e. Isaac's "marrying" (γαμεῖ)⁵⁷ of Rebekah (v. 67αγ), leaving aside the whole preceding account (vv. 62–66) of the movements of the couple that precede their coming together. In so doing, he likewise replaces the remaining indications within v. 67 itself (Isaac's bringing Rebekah into his tent, his love for her, his being "comforted" for his mother's death) with two indications of his own, i.e. the fact of Isaac's being now "*the master of his father's estate*" (a point adumbrated by the servant in his address to the family in 1.253a; see above and cf. n. 42), now that Abraham's sons by Keturah have "*departed to found their colonies*."⁵⁸ Thus, while in both Genesis 24 and Josephus' version,

54 Josephus' rendering of the family's response passes over the continuation of their words in Gen 24:50b, i.e. "we cannot speak to you anything bad or good" which reads somewhat oddly, given that they are in fact, speaking to the servant here (and will have more to say to him subsequently).

55 This historic present form echoes the same form used by the servant in 1.253, where he speaks of Abraham's "sending" (πέμπει) him to Rebekah's kin. See nn. 40,57.

56 In Gen 24:51, the family declare: "Look, Rebekah is before you, take her and go, and let her be the wife of your master's son, as the Lord has spoken." Subsequently, however, it is only in 24:59 that they actually release Rebekah to him, after which the party sets out in v. 61, following the family's blessings on Rebekah in v. 60, with a whole series of events intervening between these developments (see above). Josephus conflates the family's declaration consigning Rebekah to the servant (v. 51), their dismissal of her (v. 59) and the group's departure (v. 61) into a single narrative moment, thus passing over all that comes between. He likewise leaves aside the biblical references to the "nurse" (v. 59) and "maids" (v. 61) who accompany her, keeping all attention on Rebekah herself (his non-mention of these minor figures parallels his omission of Gen 24:32's [see also 24:54] reference to the men accompanying the servant; see n. 35).

57 Compare the past construction ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ γυνή used in LXX Gen 24:67. See nn. 40,55.

58 Josephus has already reported this development, in an anticipation of Gen 25:6, in *Ant.* 1.239; see above. Also elsewhere, Josephus associates the movements of early generations of humanity with the ancient Greek city states' practice of dispatching their surplus

the story ends—as it begins in the historian's rendering (see 1.244)—with a focus on the figure of Isaac, in the latter it is his socio-economic status, not his emotions as in the former, that are the center of attention.⁵⁹

Conclusion

As emerges from the amount of space (i.e. 14 paragraphs in B. Niese's division of the text) as well as the considerable effort expended by him in his rewriting of the passage, Josephus clearly found the story of Genesis 24 of interest and significance for his purposes in the writing the *Antiquities*.⁶⁰ At the same time, the latter feature suggests that the historian did not find the chapter satisfactory simply as he found it and so undertook to give it a thorough-going reworking that extends to its wording, style, content, and sequence. To that end, Josephus applied to the source text a whole series of interconnected rewriting techniques that are employed by him throughout the Bible-based portion of the *Antiquities* (i.e. *Ant.* 1.1–11.296). Of these techniques, the most conspicuous in the case under consideration here is clearly his omission and abbreviation

populations to establish colonies. On this Hellenizing feature of Josephus' rewriting of the Bible, see Feldman 2000, 39–40, nn. 281–82.

59 Given the psychologizing that is a hallmark of Josephus' rewriting of the Bible, his non-utilization of the references to Isaac's "love" for Rebekah and his being "consoled" by her for his mother's death of Gen 24:67 is noteworthy. In his presentation, then, even more so than in the Bible, Isaac remains a passive, emotionless figure for whose economic and marital benefit others take the initiative. On the historian's treatment of Isaac overall, see Feldman 1998, 290–303.

60 Josephus' interest in the biblical chapter becomes all the more apparent when his handling of it is compared with the minimalistic use made of it in the biblical rewritings of *Jubilees* and Pseudo-Philo; see *Jub.* 19:10 (Abraham takes a wife for Isaac "in the fourth year of the first week of the 42nd jubilee") and *LAB* 8.4 ("Now Isaac took for himself a wife from Mesopotamia, the daughter of Bethuel..."). (In the latter reference, note the initiative attributed to Isaac in arranging his own marriage in contrast to his passivity in this regard in the presentations of Genesis, Josephus, and *Jubilees*.)

An additional background issue for the above discussion concerns the text-form of Genesis 24 used by Josephus: did he work with the biblical chapter in a MT-like version and / or its LXX rendering? In fact, however, given the wide-going agreement between MT and LXX in this instance as well as Josephus' own paraphrasing approach to his biblical source material, the question is both largely unanswerable and marginally relevant for our purposes: all that needs to / can be said is that Josephus knew a version of Genesis 24 similar to that jointly attested by MT and LXX Genesis 24 and proceeded to thoroughly rework this in accordance with his various concerns and tendencies.

of source data. In fact, three of the four parallel segments I have distinguished within Genesis 24 and *Ant.* 1.242–255 (the exposition, the servant’s address to Rebekah’s family, and the denouement of the story) exhibit such compression on his part, with only the section devoted to the interactions between the servant and Rebekah (*Ant.* 1.246–252a) being comparable in length to its biblical prototype (Gen 24:15–33).⁶¹ Conversely, the technique of addition to/elaboration of the Bible’s account is much less in evidence in Josephus’ rendering, the only notable instance being his amplification of the words exchanged between the servant and Rebekah in the just-mentioned segment 1.246–252a. That segment is notable for its utilization of yet another of Josephus’ standard rewriting techniques, i.e. rearrangement of the biblical sequence, something we saw happening especially in his version of Gen 24:22–27 in 1.247b–251. (Recall too that Josephus’ opening allusion to Isaac’s age in 1.242a is anticipated by him from a later point in the biblical narration, i.e. Gen 25:19, just as the reference to the sending away of Abraham’s sons by Keturah at the end of 1.255 is inspired by the subsequent mention of this happening in Gen 25:6). Beyond the above three rewriting techniques, Josephus reworks the data of Genesis 24 in still other ways. On the terminological / stylistic level, he, e.g., replaces the Bible’s characteristic parataxis with hypotaxis, substitutes—though not invariably—indirect for source direct address (see n. 8), favors the historic present where (LXX) Genesis 24 consistently employs past forms (see nn. 40,55,57), and avoids the use of “Lord” as a divine title (see n. 8). Also on the content level, however, Josephus takes notable liberties with Genesis’ account. Abraham sends the servant to procure Rebekah in particular as a wife for Isaac rather than simply someone from among his kindred. Contrary to the suggestion of Gen 24:10a, the servant’s journey is both lengthy and dangerous (see 1.244a). The place to which he comes is called “Charran” (1.244a), in contrast to the “city of Nahor” cited in Gen 24:10b. The “test” devised and put into effect by the servant is different in the biblical and Josephan presentations: in Genesis this—in its formulation, execution, and recapitulation—concerns Rebekah alone and her interactions with the servant, while in Josephus the test involves other women as well. Whereas in Gen 24:24 Rebekah does not give the servant her actual name, she does so in 1.248. The woman’s father has a active—albeit minimal—role in Genesis (see 24:50, where he, along with Laban, replies to the servant’s discourse) and her mother none; in 1.248, by contrast, Rebekah informs the servant that her father is already dead, and so subsequently it is her mother who functions both as an addressee of and respondent to the servant’s

61 Even here, however, Josephus significantly reduces the sequence Gen 24:28–33 telling of the servant’s introduction into Rebekah’s home in his version of this happening in 1.252a.

words (see 1.252b, 255b). As for Laban, Josephus somewhat diminishes the role attributed to him in the Bible with, e.g., the scene at the well featuring his initial encounter with the servant (Gen 24:29–31) disappearing in Josephus' version, as do also the series of hospitable initiatives attributed to him in 24:32, these being either ascribed to Laban's servants or passed over entirely in 1.252a. According to 24:33 the servant refuses to eat until he has announced his mission; in 1.252b he delivers his discourse once he has finished supper. In reporting that discourse itself, Josephus (1.252b–255a), gives it a content that notably differs from what one reads in Gen 24:34–49. Thus, e.g., Josephus' servant is much more clear and direct in what he asks of his hosts in 1.254a, 255a than is his biblical counterpart in Gen 24:49. Such differences of content persist to the very end of the two accounts: the indications, e.g., concerning Isaac's emotional state in 24:67 yield to notices on the newly-wed's socio-economic status, vis-à-vis that of his half-brothers in 1.255a.

What now is distinctive about Josephus' version vis-à-vis the story told in Genesis 24 as a result of his application of the above rewriting techniques to the chapter's data? Most obviously his rendering represents a streamlining of the source story's leisurely, circumstantial narration in which the servant's discourse (Gen 24:34–49) recapitulates largely verbatim what has been related in 24:1–27 and the denouement of the affair is a highly protracted one. As a result both of his omissions / abbreviations and his substitute content for the servant's discourse, Josephus avoids Genesis' verbal repetitions, dispenses with such various minor, "functionless" characters as the attendants of both the servant and Rebekah (see nn. 35, 56), and brings matters to a more expeditious resolution once the climactic moment of the family's giving its assent has been reached. In addition, the historian's rewriting (implicitly) addresses (and disposes of) questions / problems suggested by the Genesis account: Why is the biblical Abraham as vague as he is regarding the woman whom he has in mind for Isaac? How is it that Rebekah does not mention Laban in her reply to the servant Gen 24:24, given the leading role he will assume in what follows? Why too is Bethuel the *pater familiae* cited only in second place after his son Laban in Gen 24:50? Why as well are there discrepancies between the servant's experiences as related by the narrator and the former's own report of these to the family in 24:34–48? What moreover is the servant, in fact, asking of Rebekah's family at the conclusion of his discourse to them (see Gen 24:49)? How furthermore is one to make sense of the seeming discrepancy between the family's ready, unconditional consignment of Rebekah to the servant in 24:50–51 and their subsequent attempts to detain her that involves *inter alia* a consultation with the woman herself in 24:58 that would seem better in place when the decision about her future is first being made by them? In Josephus'

rendering, all these questions with which the biblical account leaves its readers are—now in one way, now in another—disposed of, the result being a version of the episode that is both more compact and more internally consistent than is the Bible's own story.

Josephus' rewriting likewise has shown itself to be informed by various other concerns that distinguish it from its biblical prototype. For one thing, his version effectively eliminates the Genesis story's recurrent allusions to the possibility that the marriage envisaged by Abraham will not come about due to the non-cooperation of his Mesopotamian kindred. References to that possibility in the discussion between Abraham and the servant (see Gen 24:5–9) are passed over by him, as is the extended account of the family's attempt to retain Rebekah in 24:54–60. Throughout his version then, the dealings between the two related lines are depicted by Josephus as a model for the kind of intra-Jewish harmony and sense of kinship that the historian repeatedly highlights both positively (by presenting instances of such harmony in action) and negatively (by his emphatic condemnation of intra-Jewish violence and civil strife).⁶² The Josephan version likewise evidences a concern to accentuate the episode's conformity to norms of politeness, propriety, proper protocol and societal hierarchy.⁶³ Thus, the servant only bestows his gifts on the woman once he has ascertained her identity as the God-designated future wife of his master's son (1.249b) rather than prior to his doing this (compare 24:22–24), and the appropriateness of those gifts to Rebekah's current status is highlighted. In requesting hospitality from Rebekah the servant assures her that he can and will recompense the family for any expenses occurred (compare Gen 24:23 and 1.250b) so that no financial burden will accrue to them from his stay *chez eux*. In her reply, Rebekah makes clear that only Laban (earlier characterized by her as the one “who directs the whole household,” 1.248) can make the decision concerning the accommodations requested (compare 24:25 and 1.251b), while Laban himself leaves the work of providing for the servant's camels to his own servants (compare 24:32 and 1.252a). As a good, polite guest, the Josephan servant, moreover, first participates in the meal that has been set

62 On this feature of Josephus' writings, see Feldman 1998, 140–143. The feature appears to have in view the situation of *Antiquities*' “secondary audience,” i.e. his own coreligionists, whereas other aspects of his version (e.g., the stylistic modifications / improvements, avoidance of the *κύριος* title, introduction of “philanthropy” and *eudaimonia* terminology, etc.) are intended to make his work appealing for its primary (projected) readership, i.e. cultivated Gentiles. On *Antiquities*' double audience, see *ibid.*, 46–56.

63 On this feature of Josephus' rewriting, Franxman 1978, 167.

before him and his hosts rather than insisting that they listen to his story prior to eating (compare Gen 24:33,54 and 1.252b). Yet another noteworthy feature of Josephus' rewriting is his heightening of the story's dramatic element.⁶⁴ Under this head, I recall that the historian replaces the non-descript travel notice of Gen 24:10 with references to the length, difficulties and dangers involved in the servant's journey in 1.244. Likewise the drama surrounding events at the well is increased via Josephus' introduction of a third, speaking party in addition to the servant and Rebekah, i.e. the other women whose negative response to the servant's request throws Rebekah's own positive reaction to him into relief. This last remark serves to recall a further distinctive feature of Josephus' version of the Genesis story, i.e. the enhanced role assumed by women in the story's unfolding. The other women who, as just pointed out, function as a negative foil to Rebekah at the well are given an active role by Josephus in the proceedings there, whereas Gen 24:11–12 simply mentions the fact of their presence. Subsequently, it is to Rebekah's mother that the servant addresses himself in 1.252b with the words, unparalleled in Gen 24:34–49, "dear lady," and it is she, rather than Bethuel, who, together with Laban, approves the servant's proposal and consigns Rebekah to him (compare 1.255b and 24:50–51). It is, above all, however, the figure of Rebekah who assumes a "higher profile" in Josephus' account. In his version, the name "Rebekah" surfaces from the start (see 1.242), whereas in Genesis 24 it does so only in v. 15. In the "well scene," her speaking role is enhanced. She pronounces her own name (1.248; contrast Gen 24:24), and shows no hesitancy in remonstrating both with the other women (see 1.246b) and the servant himself (1.251) for their wrongful behaviours or suppositions. It is she, not Laban (so Gen 24:31), who eventually conveys the servant into the family home (1.252a). Repeatedly, the servant voices words of praise for her character and actions that lack an explicit biblical counterpart: he commends her for her "nobility and goodness of heart," speaks of her as a source of "joy" for her parents (1.247b), confers the ornaments upon her "as a recompense for her courtesy," and as her due "for having outstripped so many maidens in charity" (1.249b), just as he "guesses from her own virtues the kindness of her parents" (1.250a).⁶⁵ This accentuation by

64 On "dramatization" as a hallmark of the Josephan rewriting of the Bible, see Feldman 1998, 179–185.

65 Having accentuated the person and qualities of Rebekah throughout his version of the well scene, Josephus does, admittedly, diminish her biblical role in what follows: the servant does not mention her by name or recapitulate her initiatives in his discourse to the family (compare Gen 24:45–47); she is not asked whether she is willing to accompany

Josephus of the “feminine presence” in the story is all the more noteworthy given that elsewhere the historian often downplays the persons and initiatives of biblical women figures.⁶⁶ In other respects as well, Josephus’ rendering of Genesis 24 appears to depart from *Tendenzen* that elsewhere characterize his approach to the biblical material; his version is not, e.g., conspicuously less theological—in the sense of making explicit mentions of God and his role in the proceedings—than is its source,⁶⁷ and, contrary to his practice regarding other biblical women, it diminishes rather than plays up Gen 24:16’s mention of Rebekah’s beauty and virginal status, shifting the focus rather to her interior qualities (see n. 10).⁶⁸ Thus it might be said that Josephus’ version of Genesis 24 in *Ant.* 1.242–255a stands in contrast, not only to its biblical source (and to Jewish tradition elsewhere),⁶⁹ but also, in certain respects, to his own typical procedures in his rewriting of the Bible.

Brief as it is in relation to the twenty books of *Antiquities*, the fourteen paragraphs of Josephus’ version of Genesis 24 have yielded evidence of his varied techniques as a rewriter of the Bible, as well as the purposes behind and

him (compare 24:57); and her words and actions upon sighting Isaac are left aside (compare 24:64–65), just as is the notice on Isaac’s “loving” her of 24:67. With regard to this “bifurcation” in Josephus’ treatment of Rebekah, several comments might be made. First, in the earlier part of his presentation, he develops a highly positive portrayal of Rebekah that remains with the reader throughout the remainder of his version. Second, the above “omissions” are themselves part of Josephus’ overall effort to streamline the biblical account that sets in with Gen 24:34 and extends to the other characters cited there (the servant, the family, and Isaac) as well.

66 E.g., he gives only a highly abridged version of the Genesis 23 story about Abraham’s devotion to the remains of his dead wife in 1.237, just as he passes over the “songs” the Bible attributes to Miriam (Exod 15:20–21), Deborah (Judges 5), and Hannah (1 Sam 2:1–10). For more on the topic, see Feldman 1998, 188–92. Josephus’ (exceptional) enhancement of the figure of Rebekah, it might be noted, has a counterpart in *Jubilees*’ account which goes beyond the Bible in attributing a number of prayers and discourses to her; see Endres (1987, 217) who remarks concerning Rebekah’s treatment in *Jubilees*: “The matriarch’s fortunes rose more than those of any other character whom this author portrayed.”

67 On “detheologizing” as a recurrent feature of the historian’s biblical rewriting overall, see Feldman 1998, 205–14.

68 See also Josephus’ non-utilization, as pointed out in n. 60, of the indications concerning Isaac’s emotions at the moment of his marriage to Rebekah as cited in Gen 24:67, this notwithstanding his general tendency to enhance the Bible’s limited attention to characters’ psychological states (on which, see Feldman 1998, 197–204).

69 Such differences between Josephus’ version and the wider Jewish tradition concerning Genesis 24 surface in connection, e.g., with the length of the servant’s journey (see n. 4) and the role and death of Bethuel (see n. 16).

the distinctiveness of his presentation that results from their application. Of course, however, my findings regarding this single passage can only be properly assessed when comparisons like the one attempted here are extended to other, longer segments of the *Antiquities*.

Bibliography

- Attridge, Harold W. 1976. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 7. Missoula, MT: Scholars.
- Begg, Christopher T. 1993. *Josephus' Account of the Early Divided Monarchy* (AJ 8,212–420): *Rewriting the Bible*: BETL 108. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
- Colson, Francis H. and George H. Whitaker. trs. 1929–1963. *Philo*. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Endres, John C. 1987. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQMS 18. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association.
- Epstein, Isidore, ed. 1935–1952. *The Babylonian Talmud*. London: The Soncino Press.
- Feldman, Louis H. 1998. *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible*. HCS 27. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . tr. 2000. Translation and Commentary (III). *Flavius Josephus—Judean Antiquities I–IV*, Leiden: Brill.
- Franxman, Thomas W. 1978. *Genesis and the "Jewish Antiquities" of Flavius Josephus*. BO 35. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Freedman, Harry, tr. 1983. *Midrash Genesis Rabbah* (2 vols.). London/New York: The Soncino Press.
- Jonquière, Tessel M. 2007. *Prayer in Josephus*. AJEC 70. Leiden: Brill.
- Maher, Michael, tr. 1992. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible 1B. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.
- Marcus, Ralph, tr. 1953. *Philo Supplement I*. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mason, Steve. 1991. *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study*. SPB 39. Leiden: Brill.
- Naber, Samuel A., ed. 1888. *Flavii Iosephi Opera Omnia I*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Niese, Benedictus, ed. 1954. *Flavii Iosephi Opera I*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Nodet, Étienne, tr. 1990. *Flavius Josephus Les Antiquités Juives*, 1B Livres I à III traduction et notes. Paris: Cerf.
- Pérez, Miguel Fernández, tr. 1984. *Los capítulos de Rabí Eliezer*. Biblioteca Midrásica 1. Valencia: Institución S. Jerónimo para la Investigación Bíblica.
- Rengstorf, Karl Heinrich, ed. 2002. *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

- Speiser, Ephraim A. 1964. *Genesis*. AB 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc.
- Spicq, Ceslas. 1958. Philanthropie hellénistique, vertu divine et royale. *Studia theologica* 12: 161–191.
- . 1978. *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire*. 2 vols. OBO 22:1–2. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Stachowiak, Lech R. 1957. *Chrestotes. Ihre biblisch-theologische Entwicklung und Eigenart*. *Studia Freiburgensia (New Series)* 17. Freiburg: Herder.
- Sternberg, Meir. 1987. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. *Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Thackeray, H. St. John, tr. 1991. *Josephus Jewish Antiquities Books I–IV*. Cambridge, MA/London: Harvard University Press.
- Weiss, Hans-Friedrich. 1979. Pharisäismus und Hellenismus. Zur Darstellung des Judentums im Geschichtswerk des jüdischen Historikers Flavius Josephus. *Orientalische Literaturzeitung* 74: 421–431.

Later Rewritings

••

Can We Apply the Term “Rewritten Bible” to Midrash? The Case of *Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer*

Rachel Adelman

A Question of Genre

The author of *Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer* (from here on PRE) artfully retells biblical history, from the creation story in Genesis to the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert.¹ According to Joseph Heinemann² and Geza Vermes,³ the midrash models itself after the genre of earlier compositions in the Second Temple Period, classified as the “Rewritten Bible” [המקרא המשוכתב], including *Jubilees*, Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, the *Genesis Apocryphon* (from Dead Sea Scrolls), and *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo (*Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, from here on LAB). According to Vermes, the “Rewritten Bible” constitutes “a narrative that follows Scripture but includes a substantial amount of supplements and interpretative developments.”⁴ Recent studies present a critique of the category from the standpoint of Qumran research, suggesting that the use of the term ‘Bible’ is anachronistic given no consensus existed on the canonized ‘sacred text’ in the late Second Temple period. Brooke therefore amends the genre characteristic of this literary corpus as “rewritten scriptural texts.”⁵

-
- 1 Most modern scholars concur that PRE was probably composed by one author. In terms of the composition and compilation of midrash, this constitutes a radical shift from midrashic compositions of the classical rabbinic period (2nd–5th c. CE). On the question of the authorship and coherence of PRE, see the discussion in Stein 2004, 1–2 and Elbaum 1992, 99–126.
 - 2 Heinemann 1974, 181. Joseph Dan also makes this general observation about rabbinic literature of the medieval period (Dan 1974, 133–144).
 - 3 Vermes 1973, 67–126 and 228–229.
 - 4 Vermes, Millar and Goodman 1986, 326. This definition may apply to many narrative expansions on the Bible in midrashic composition of the classic period, but in PRE the emphasis is on *one* continuous story line, as I show later.
 - 5 See Brooke 2002, 31–41 and 2000 2, 777–781; and Najman’s critique of the term in Najman 2003, 7–8 (especially n. 14). Both Moshe Bernstein and Michael Segal defend the term as useful but emphasize its narrowness, where the distinction rewritten biblical compositions and biblical manuscripts themselves must be presumed: it excludes texts that are meant to be “biblical” or “biblical translations,” such as the Samaritan Bible or Palestinian Targums; it must show a great deal of dependency on scriptural texts, which excludes the fantastical *1 Enoch* and *The Books of Adam and Eve* (*Vita* and *ApMos*); and that it should embrace legal

For the author of PRE, however, the Masoretic Text (MT) was a given; this midrash does not presume to be a “revelatory replacement or successor.”⁶ A second problem arises with regard to the category “Rewritten Bible” as descriptive of a genre common to all these compositions, rather than an interpretive method or process. This discussion is taken up by . . . in this volume of essays [reference]. As a heuristic, I have adopted the concept of “Rewritten Bible” as genre, following the nine criteria established by Phillip Alexander.⁷ In this paper, I question whether PRE, a relatively late midrash dating to the mid-8th century, really adheres to these criteria. What do we gain, moreover, by the comparison between PRE and this literature of the Second Temple period?

The following are Alexander’s criteria, succinctly presented by Sidnie White Crawford:

- 1) Rewritten Bible texts are narratives, which follow a sequential chronological order.
- 2) They are . . . free-standing compositions, which replicate the form of the biblical books on which they are based.
- 3) These texts are not intended to replace, or to supersede the Bible.
- 4) Rewritten Bible texts cover a substantial portion of the Bible.
- 5) Rewritten Bible texts follow the Bible serially, in proper order, but they are highly selective in what they represent.
- 6) The intention of the texts is to produce an interpretative reading of Scripture.
- 7) The narrative form of the texts means . . . that they can impose only a single interpretation on the original.
- 8) The limitations of the narrative form also preclude making clear the exegetical reasoning.
- 9) Rewritten Bible texts make use of non-biblical tradition and draw on non-biblical sources.⁸

In my book, *The Return of the The Repressed: Pirqa de-Rabbi Eliezer and the Pseudepigrapha*, I engage in a detailed analysis of how PRE differs from the earlier “rewritten scriptural texts.”⁹ I will summarize, *very briefly*, the points

texts as well. See Bernstein 2005, 169–196 and Segal 2005, 10–28. Most recently, see the discussion in Fraade 2006, 59–78 and a review of the controversy in Crawford 2008, 8–14.

6 Fraade’s wording (2006, 61).

7 Alexander 1988, 99–121.

8 Alexander 1988, 116–118, White Crawford 2008, 10.

9 Adelman 2009, 5–14.

of difference. Alexander’s first criterion entails conformity to sequential, chronological order, but, in this regard, *PRE* proves to be a non-conformist. Overall, the composition moves from the story of Creation (*PRE* 3–9) to the Exodus and the Israelites’ sojourn in the desert (*PRE* 54 of the printed edition). However there are many flights of fancy diverging from the time-line, that revolve around a theme (Repentance, Charity, the Covenant of Circumcision and so forth), perhaps influenced or indicative of homiletical form. Furthermore, the selective inclusion and exclusion of biblical material in *PRE* does not demonstrate a balance between the literal and non-literal material, as Alexander describes in his fourth criterion. Rather, there is considerable blurring between the literal and non-literal, between the realistic and the fantastic, raising the question as to whether the distinction is significant to the composition at all. Most importantly, in terms of my analysis in this paper, *PRE* fails to meet Alexander’s claim that the exegetical reasoning behind the rewrite is always hidden. Often the author of *PRE* highlights verses from the Bible as proof texts. Sometimes exegetical questions are even posed directly.

In my book, I argue that dependence on earlier interpretive rabbinic traditions and the explicit use of biblical quotations compels us to adopt a new term for this genre: Narrative Midrash.¹⁰ *PRE* combines both the classical models of homily and exegesis, in a kind of ‘transition genre’ from verse-by-verse commentary to one continuous story.¹¹ The narrative expansions on the Bible in *PRE* are more often built around a theme, and only loosely follow the biblical narrative.¹² The biblical story is re-told with quotes from the original text interwoven into a new narrative rendition. Rather than a composite of various rabbinic interpretations, as in the classic exegetical midrash, *Genesis Rabbah*, the author creates an integrated narrative, blurring the boundary between interpretation and primary source, as in the so-called “Rewritten Bible.” Furthermore, form follows function both in the Second Temple compositions and *PRE*, in that the biblical narrative is reworked in terms of a messianic vision of the End of Days. Like other eschatological works beginning to surface in Jewish circles in the 8th century in Palestine, the author of *PRE* reconfigures the biblical stories with a “a sense of an ending” (Frank Kermode’s term), living in an epoch, on the verge of the messianic era, when “the foundations of life quake beneath our feet.”¹³ This is created through the recycling of

10 This term is my own, a modification of Herman Strack’s “narrative haggadah” (Strack and Stemberger 1991, 354–356).

11 Heinemann 1974, 181.

12 Elbaum 1992, 103.

13 Kermode 1996, 47.

characters, sacred sites, and miraculous objects throughout the composition, connecting the End of Time either to Creation or to the foundational events in Israelite history. In so doing, the author establishes a concord between origins and the eschaton. The audacity to rewrite the biblical narrative is driven by a messianic re-visioning of history.

In this paper, I explore the recycling of one particular personality—Elijah *redivivus* who is identified with Phinehas, the zealous High Priest of the desert sojourn. The composition, *Biblical Antiquities* (*LAB*) also implicitly identifies Phinehas with Elijah. By comparing the compositions, I hope to make two points: 1) *PRE* demonstrates a dependence on aggadic traditions or exegetical motifs that can be traced back to sources in the Second Temple period, which may have deliberately been *repressed* by the rabbinic establishment; and 2) that a close reading of *PRE*, as an exegetical work, can inform our reading of the earlier apocryphal sources that it may draw from, where the interpretive reasoning in those sources is obscure.

Elijah *Redivivus* as a Liminal Figure

According to Harold Fisch, Elijah embodies the “wanderer archetype . . . who does marvellous deeds, to annul evil decrees, to save individuals in distress, to heal the sick, succour the poor, and in general perform useful social services.”¹⁴ A liminal figure, betwixt and between, he is found at the crossroads of time in the liturgy and rituals of the Jewish people.¹⁵ As the harbinger of the messianic era, he is invoked in the blessings following the Haftarah reading and grace after meals, his name is singled out among the prophets with the wish that “he come soon” or “bring us good tidings.”¹⁶ At the Passover Seder, the fifth glass of wine is designated for Elijah to signify his task as the prophet of redemption, and he visits every circumcision as the “guardian of the covenant

14 Fisch 1980, 125.

15 Stein 2004, 145. Dina Stein examines Elijah's role in the introductory chapter to *PRE* (Stein 2004, 150–151). In addition to his role in the biography of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus (*PRE* 1, not in the parallel account in *ARNb* 13), Elijah also plays a pivotal role in R. Akivah's transformation (*b. Nedarim* 50a). See Margoulies 1960, 79–100 on examples of Elijah's appearance in the genre “tales of the sages.”

16 See Wiener 1978, 132–133, and Faierstein 1981, 85. The scholarly consensus is that the blessings on the Haftarah indicating Elijah's role as forerunner of the Messiah were already recited in the Second Temple period. See also J. Heinemann 1966, 143–144.

(*malakh ha-brit*),” with a special seat assigned to him.¹⁷ He is also invoked at the Havdalah ritual, with a closing ditty on the coming of Elijah,¹⁸ expressive of his role in ushering in the final redemption.¹⁹ These rituals in time are markers of transition—imbedded in the narrative of the Jewish people’s movement from slavery to freedom, the initiation of the infant into the covenant, or, in the case of *Havdalah*, in the ceremony distinguishing the Sabbath from the mundane days of the week. Yet this characteristic of Elijah *redivivus* as a liminal figure, a wise, old pariah wandering in exile, offering the promise of redemption, is a far cry from the biblical image of the zealous prophet who, during the reign of Ahab, declared a devastating drought upon the land (1 Kgs 17:1) and single-handedly slaughtered 450 prophets of Baal at Wadi Kishon (1 Kgs 18:19, 40). Following the incident of the murder of Navoth for the sake of his vineyard, the prophet pronounces a gruesome doom toll against the House of Ahab (1 Kgs 21:21–22). During the reign of Ahaziah, he calls for fire to descend from Heaven to incinerate two captains of fifty and their men alive (2 Kgs 1:10–12). How did this fanatic for monotheism metamorphose into the kindly, old man of aggadic lore?

Two biblical passages attest to the source of his eternal life: 1) the ascension to Heaven in a fiery chariot in the presence of Elisha, his disciple (2 Kgs 2:11–12), and 2) his identification with the “messenger/guardian of the covenant” (*malakh ha-brit*), who will bring about reconciliation between parents and children before “the coming of the awesome, fearful day of the Lord” (Mal 3:1, 23–24). That is, Elijah returns to Earth as forerunner of the eschaton because he never really died according to the biblical account. However, the narrative expansions in PRE (chapters 29, 43 and 47), by linking him with the zealot Phinehas, conjectures an alternative reason for the prophet’s immortality and his transformation from zealot to herald of the End of Days.

17 This tradition is based on the assumption that Elijah will not come on the Sabbath or Holy Days themselves (*b. Eruvin* 43b, and *b. Pesahim* 13a). See Wiener 1978, 64 and 133–134.

18 See also Noy 1960, 110–117 and the discussion to follow.

19 The earliest source for Elijah *redivivus* is found in Malachi (Mal 3:24–25; LXX 4:5–6), circa 500 BCE, which describes Elijah’s role as herald of God’s fury and the inauguration of the messianic age. Ben Sirach follows this tradition (Sir 48:10). The Christian tradition identifies Elijah as a prefiguration of John the Baptist (Matt 11:7–15), the messianic kingdom of Heaven heralded by Jesus of Nazareth (Mk 1:2–8, Lk 1:16–17; Matt 11:1–6), cf. Hill 1998, 50. I will discuss these sources at length over the course of this chapter.

From Zealot to Guardian of the Covenant, PRE 29

The author of PRE introduces the story of Elijah's role as guardian of the covenant (*malakh ha-brit*) in the context of Abraham's eighth trial—the patriarch's circumcision at the ripe old age of ninety nine (Gen 17:1), which becomes the springboard for several homiletical passages on the significance of circumcision in PRE 29. Given the context, we are primed for a very concrete understanding of Elijah's role as “guardian of the covenant (*malakh ha-brit*),” the covenant here understood to be a reference to *brit milah*. The prophet is introduced in a paraphrase of the theophany at Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19), following a discussion of the collective initiation ceremony in Joshua (5:2–3) and the practice of covering the foreskin and blood with the dust of the Earth.²⁰ The midrash claims that circumcision was observed in this way until the division of the United Kingdom, under the reign of Jeroboam (of the tribe of Ephraim). While the Bible deems idolatry to have been the primary sin of the Northern Kingdom, according to PRE 29, it was a policy to prevent circumcision.²¹ Because of this, Elijah imposes a drought on the land, and, upon hearing that Jezebel wants to kill him, flees for his life:

*Pirqe de-Rabbi Eliezer, Chapter 29*²²

4. Elijah arose and fled from the land of Israel and escaped, as it says, “He arose and ate and drank; (and with the strength from that meal he walked forty days and forty nights as far as the mountain of God at Horeb)” (1 Kgs 19:8).

5a. The Holy One, blessed be He, appeared to him and said, “Why are you here, Elijah?” (1 Kgs 19:9). He answered Him, “I have been exceedingly

20 On this custom, Friedlander remarks: “The Babylonian Jews appear to have used water to cover the blood at the circumcision, whereas the Palestinian Jews used earth to cover the blood and the foreskin after the circumcision.” See *Sha'arei Zedek* V. 10; Tur, *Yoreh De'ah*, 265; Zohar, Gen 95a.; *Menorath ha-Maor* 80 (sources cited in Friedlander 1981, 212, n. 3).

21 The author seems to be projecting back onto the biblical context a practice which was prevalent during times of oppression under foreign rule, as in the persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes IV from 168–164 BCE (see 1 Macc 1:48), and under the Roman ruler, Hadrian (c. 96 CE), see Herr 1972, 98, n. 51. The author, himself, probably did not live in a time when circumcision was forbidden since the Muslims themselves practiced it.

22 This translation is based on the 1st ed., checked against Börner-Klein 2004, 331–335, supplemented with reference to alternative manuscripts; parallel sources include: *Tanhuma Ki Tissa* 19, and Zohar, Exod 192a. For a semi-critical edition of the Hebrew text see Appendix G of Adelman 2009, 293–294.

zealous [*qan'o qin'eti*] (for the Lord, the God of Hosts, for the Israelites have forsaken Your covenant, torn down Your altars, and put Your prophets to the sword. I alone am left, and they are out to take my life)” (1 Kgs 19:10).

5b. The Holy One, blessed be He, said to him, “You are always zealous. You were zealous in Shittim over sexual immorality, as it says, “Phinehas, son of Eleazar (son of Aaron the priest, has turned back My wrath from the Israelites by displaying among them his zealotry for Me [*be-qan'o et qin'ati*], so that I did not wipe out the Israelite people in my jealousy [*be-qin'ati*]”)” (Num 25:11). And here you are zealous. By your life [*hayekha*], Israel will not make the covenant of circumcision until you see it with your very own eyes.

6. Here the sages instituted (the custom) that there would be a seat of honor for the messenger of the covenant, {for Elijah is called “the messenger of the covenant”},²³ as it says, “. . . As for the messenger of the covenant that you desire, he is already coming” (Mal 3:1).

7. [May the God of Israel hurry and bring in our lifetime the Messiah to comfort us and renew our hearts, as it says “He shall return the hearts of the fathers to their sons . . .” (Mal 3:24)].²⁴

This passage is constructed as an etiological narrative, accounting for why Elijah is invited as a witness to every circumcision ceremony, and constitutes the earliest evidence and aggadic support for the tradition of Elijah's chair.²⁵ God is ostensibly saying: “During the reign of Ahab, the Israelites did not circumcise their sons, but ‘by your life’ (*hayekha*), Elijah, they do now! And you are invited to see it with your very own eyes.” The oath serves to *ameliorate* Elijah's critique of the people, both as a promise of their transformation and a condemnation of the prophet. God then causes him to wander forever, bearing witness to Israel's fidelity to the covenant. The critical stance with regard to Elijah's zealotry is a tradition that dates back to Tannaitic literature. In the *Mekhilta*, he is categorized as “claimant on behalf of the father's honour [*tove'a kavod ha'av*] and not the son's”, and this type of prophet is impossible [*sh-i*

23 This phrase appears in En866 and Higger's edition.

24 This paragraph only appears in the printed editions, not in any of the manuscripts, and is probably an addition of a later scribal hand.

25 The tradition is first recorded in PRE 29. See Wiener 1978, 58–59. Rubín claims that this is the earliest source on the tradition of Elijah's chair. The commentary of the Biur ha-Gra, on the *Shulhan Arukh* (*Yoreh De'ah* 265:11), cites PRE as the source (Rubín 1995, 95–96).

ifshi be-nevu'atekha"].²⁶ That is, Elijah, in his defence of God, does not play the role of intercessor in pleading for mercy on behalf of his people²⁷ as Moses did after the Sin of the Golden Calf. Instead the prophet re-asserts his role as zealot (“jealous for God”), and because he refuses to shift his ground from harsh zealot to advocate of mercy, he is ostensibly fired.

The author of PRE seems to have absorbed this exegetical tradition yet, in linking Elijah with Phinehas, equivocates over the nature of the prophet’s zealotry. The midrash draws on two sources for why the prophet, as a zealot, must return to Earth (as Elijah *redivivus*). He is projected forward, identified with “the guardian of the covenant” [*malakh ha-brit*] in Malachi, where Elijah is, quite literally, designated as the *guardian of brit milah*. He is also projected back to Phinehas, high priest and grandson to Aaron, who lived through the Israelite sojourn in the desert and into the period of Judges (cf. Judg 20:28). The connection is based on a verbal echo between Elijah’s claim that he had been “exceedingly zealous (*qan’o qin’eti*) for the Lord, God of hosts” (1 Kgs 19:10, 14), and the divine praise of the prophet’s predecessor: “he was jealous with my jealousy [*be-qan’o et qin’ati*] among them, so that I did not consume the people of Israel in my jealousy [*be-qin’ati*” (Num 25:11). These are the only two figures in the Hebrew Bible explicitly identified with zealotry for God. The Hebrew root, *q.n.* [קנא] means “to be jealous”²⁸ or “zealous” (that is jealous on behalf of another).²⁹ God, Himself, is described as a “jealous God [אל קנא]”³⁰ in demanding the fidelity of the Israelites to the exclusion of all other gods. Both Phinehas and Elijah act out God’s jealousy (or zealotry for God) against the errant Israelites engaged in idolatry. The midrash then, following the principle of “the conservation of biblical personalities,” identifies them as one and the same. With the exception (perhaps) of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, whose

26 *Mekhilta Bo* 1 (ed. Horovitz 1931, 4).

27 These midrashim are consistent with the general rabbinic consensus critical of Elijah’s zealotry (cf. *SEZ* 8, *Cant. Rab.* 1:29, *PRK* 17:1, *Mek Bo* 1 (ed. Horovitz 1931, 4), cf. ARNb 47 (ed. Schechter 1887, 85). For an analysis of the rabbinic attitude to Elijah’s zealotry see Yisraeli 2003, 103–124, and for a comparison between Philo, Josephus and *LAB*, on the zealotry of Phinehas see Feldman 2002, 315–345. For an analysis of Phinehas’ zealotry, see Collins 2003, 3–21.

28 Cf. Num 5:14, 30, or as a noun, in the latter half of the verse, Num 25:11: בְּנִי אֶת כְּלִי־יָדַי וְאֶת כְּלִי־יָדַי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּקִנְאָתִי”

29 Cf. Num 11:29, Num 25:11, 13, and Zech 1:14, and 1 Kgs 19:10, 14.

30 Cf. Exod 20:5, and 34:14, and Deut 4:24, 5:9.

dating is quite controversial, this is the first rabbinic source to make that identification.³¹

Elijah as Phinehas (PRE 47) and the Parabiblical Sources

Also in chapter 47, Phinehas is identified with Elijah for different yet complementary reasons, the ‘exegetical hook’ being the reward of the “covenant of peace [ברית שלום]” granted to Phinehas and his association with “the guardian of the covenant [מלאך הברית]” (*qua* Elijah) in Malachi. At the scene of Phinehas’ debut in Shittim, the Israelite men and the Moabite women engage in a form of ritual prostitution entailing idolatry, known as Baal-peor (Num 25:1–2).³² A plague breaks out in the camp, and God commands Moses

31 Elijah is identified as Phinehas in *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Exod 4:13, 6:18, 40:10 and Deut 30:4. Elsewhere I have argued for the dependence of *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on *PRE*, contrary to Hayward (Adelman 2009, 6 and 200–202; Hayward 1978, 22–34), and I will briefly allude to that discussion again here. See Ish Shalom’s essay on “The Greatness of Elijah [גדולת אליהו]” which includes an analysis of the prophet’s genealogy in *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* (Ish Shalom 1969, 2–13). The identification of Elijah with Phinehas also appears among the Church Fathers. Origen, at the end of the 2nd c. refers to it as a Jewish tradition: “I know not what is the motive of the Jewish tradition that Phinehas the son of Eleazar, who admittedly lived through the days of many of the Judges, is the same as Elias, and that immortality was promised to him in Numbers (25:12).” (Origen, on John 6:7; Petrus Damascus—in Migne’s edition CXLV, 382B; cf. Ps-Jerome on 1 Sam 2:27, cited in Ginzberg 1928 6, 316–317, n. 3). The identification is also implied by the choice of Haftarah for Parashat Phinehas (as 2 Kings 19) in the annual Torah reading cycle, but this may already be based on the late midrashic sources. Büchler also points to the association in the Triennial Torah reading cycle between the passage in Numbers and Malachi, where the “covenant of peace [ברית שלום]” granted to Phinehas is associated with the phrase “my covenant of life and well-being [בריתי היתה אתה והשמים]” (Mal 2:5). According to Büchler, “it is the selection of this Haftarah for Num xxv. 10 which gave rise to the Aggada connecting Elijah with Phinehas” (Büchler 1894, 37). But this seems to be putting the cart before the horse; it is the exegetical tradition which most likely informs the liturgical one not vice versa. In addition, based on the Genizah fragments of the 11th or 12th c. found in Fostat, Adler points to the Haftarah of the triennial cycle for Num. 25:1–10, portions from Joel and Amos ending with the phrase: “Phinehas son of Eleazar in the Twelve minor prophets” and the verse from Mal 2:5 (Adler 1896, 527–528). See the discussion on *PRE* 47, later in the body of this essay, as to how this association was established.

32 The terms “harlotry” and “idolatry” are associated with the cult of Baal throughout the Hebrew Bible because of the role of ritual prostitution in Baal worship (cf. Hos 5:3–5, 6:10, 7:4, Jer 2:20, 3:2–4 and 9:1, Ezekiel 16 and 23). However, there is very little evidence external to the Hebrew Bible linking sexual orgiastic behaviour and cult worship (see the

to hang the leaders of the rebellion in order to stave off the wrath of the Lord (v. 4). But when the head of the Simeonite tribe engages in relations with a Midianite princess, they all sit at the entrance of their tents and weep (v. 6). Phinehas, vigilante-like, seizes a lance, enters the tent, and spears the couple in the act of coitus, thereby halting the plague. God then rewards him with “the covenant of peace” (Num 25:12–13). PRE renames “Phinehas” “Elijah,” not because of the resonance between the term “jealous” or “zealous” [קנא] (as in PRE 29), but because both Phinehas and Elijah enact atonement on behalf of the nation.

*Pirqa de-Rabbi Eliezer, Chapter 47*³³

4c. And the Holy One, blessed be He, saw what Phinehas had done and that he had stopped the plague upon Israel, as it says, “and the plague ceased” (Num 25:8 and Ps 106:30).

5a. The Holy One, blessed be He, considered the name of Phinehas (the same) as the name of Elijah,³⁴ may he be remembered for good, of the residents of Gilead who caused Israel to repent in the land of Gilead, as it says, “I had with him a covenant of life and well-being, (which I gave to him, and of reverence, which he showed Me. For he stood in awe of My name)” (Mal 2:5).

5b. And He gave him eternal life in this world and in the world to come.

5c. And he gave him and his sons a good reward among the righteous for the sake of the eternal priesthood, as it says “It shall be for him and his descendants after him a pact of priesthood for all time” (Num 25:13).

discussion in Frymer-Kensky 1992, 199–202). In PRE 47 (printed eds.) the transgression at Baal-peor is compared to the idolatry of the Golden Calf, and the women’s seductive behaviour is described in very similar terms to the seduction of the Fallen Angels in PRE 22. Radal also notes the parallel in his comment on PRE 47, n. 18, and PRE 22, n. 19, quoting from Hos 4:12: “My people inquire of a thing of wood, and their staff gives them oracles. For a spirit of harlotry has led them astray, and they have left their God to play the harlot.” Harlotry is often invoked as a metaphor for idolatry in Hosea, Ezekiel, and Jeremiah; in the biblical passage concerned with Baal-peor, in Numbers, the two transgressions merge.

33 This translation is based on the 1st ed., checked against Börner-Klein 2004, 641, supplemented with reference to alternative manuscripts; for a semi-critical edition of the Hebrew text see Adelman 2009, 295–298 (Appendix H).

34 Friedlander suggests (based on the Epstein manuscript): “He called the name of Phinehas by the name of Elijah”. This is similar to Higger’s version (Ca2858): קרא שמו של פנחס בשמו אליה.

The identification between the two zealots here hinges on the assumption that the gift of the “covenant of peace [ברית שלום]” (Num 25:12–13) is one and the same as the “covenant of life and well-being [בריתי היתה אתו החיים והשלום]” in Malachi (2:5).³⁵ Through associative logic, a link is made between Elijah as “the guardian of the covenant [מלאך הברית]” (Mal 3:1) and the “angel of the Lord of hosts [מלאך ה' צבאות]” (Mal 2:7), identifying the prophet as the unequivocal recipient of this covenant.³⁶ The covenant of peace offered to Phinehas [ברית שלום] is then understood to mean eternal life.³⁷ This same tradition is conveyed by *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Num 25:12, without naming Elijah explicitly:

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Num 25:12

With an oath, say to him from My Name: Behold I decree for him My covenant of peace. And I will make him the messenger of the covenant, and he shall live forever to proclaim the news of redemption at the end of days. . . . (Hayward’s translation, 1978: 23)³⁸

While the link between Phinehas and Elijah, as recipient of “the covenant of peace” in the incident of Baal-peor (Num 25:12) and “the guardian/messenger of the covenant” (Mal 3:1) is only covert, here, with regard personage, the author of PRE makes that identification explicit.

The image of Elijah as the one who averts God’s wrath as “guardian” of the people appears in the post-biblical sources as early as Ben Sirach (2nd c. BCE),

-
- 35 Rashi and Radak assume that this verse is an allusion to Phinehas, but not Elijah.
- 36 According to rabbinic sources, the “angel of God [מלאך ה']” in Judg 2:1 is also identified as Phinehas, establishing yet another link with the passage in Malachi (cf. *Lev. Rab.* 1:1, *Num. Rab.* 16:1, *Tanhuma Shelah* 1, *Midr. Pss.* 103).
- 37 The expression “Phinehas still exists [ועדיין פנחס קיים]”—based on the intertextual link between Num 25:12 and Mal 2:5—also appears in *Sifre* Num 131, *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Num 25:12, *Tanhuma Pinhas* 1 and *Num. Rab.* 21:3. With respect to Elijah, the expression “עדיין הוא קיים” or “ועדיין קיים” also appears in *s.o.r.* 1b. *b. Bava Batra* 121b, where “seven overlap the entire [history] of the world.” It is worth noting, here, that Amram (Moses’ father) sees Ahiya, but Phinehas *does not* encounter Elijah. Perhaps a conscious oversight is made in these classic rabbinic sources, detaching Phinehas from Elijah. See the discussion to follow in the body of this paper.
- 38 This translation has been checked against Clarke 1984, 192 (based on the British Museum Manuscript Add. 27031).

in the context of the great eulogy on the prophet (ch. 48).³⁹ The verse presents an interesting paraphrase of the passage in Malachi (3:23 MT):

The Wisdom of ben Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) 48:10

You who are ready at the appointed time, it is written, to calm the wrath of God *before* it breaks out in fury, to turn the heart of the father to the son, and *to restore the tribes of Jacob* (RSV trans., italics added to highlight interpolation).⁴⁰

Elijah not only bridges the gap between the generations but brings about the return of the dispersed tribes of Israel, as well, in the End of Days. The author of PRE adopts this image of the prophet as herald of the redemption and agent of reconciliation between father and son, in an attempt to harmonize the three biblical sources (1 Kings 19, Numbers 25 and Malachi 3). Following Rubin's and Wiener's lead, I suggest that "*malakh ha-brit*", in PRE, is understood to be a guardian, the one who guarantees that the covenant is kept, like the angel who traveled in the midst of Israel during their sojourn through the desert (Exod 23:20–23, Judg 2:1–5).⁴¹ Elijah plays this role of "guardian of the covenant" both on the horizontal and vertical axes. On the horizontal (human) plane, he reconciles the children unto their fathers and the fathers unto the children [וְהִשִּׁיב לֵב אָבוֹת עַל בְּנֵים וְלֵב בְּנֵים עַל אָבוֹתָם], before the advent of that "fearful day of the Lord" (Mal 3:23), "so that, when I come, I do not strike the whole land with utter destruction." (v. 24).⁴² On the vertical one (between man and God), Phinehas, "turned back [God's] wrath from the Israelites by being exceedingly zealous for [Him], so that [God] did not wipe out the Israelite people in [His] jealousy" (Num 25:11). And Elijah similarly, according to PRE 29, guarantees the preservation of covenant at every *brit milah*, as the "guardian of the cov-

39 Klausner argues that this is the earliest evidence of the idea of "Elijah as the forerunner of the Messiah" (Klausner 1955, 257), accordingly the prophet/priest will also anoint the Messiah, as he restores "the flask of oil for anointing" (*Mekhilta VaYassa* 6, ed. Friedman 51b, and other sources, Klausner 1955, 455, n. 20). But Faienstein insists that there is no reference to the Messiah, as a personage here in Sirach, rather the allusion is to the messianic era (Faienstein 1981, 78).

40 Cf. also Sir 45:24, 50:24–26. In the Hebrew version, edited by Moshe Segal (1958, 230), the text reads: להשבית אף לפני [י חרוץ] / להשיב לב אבות על בנים להכין ש[בטי ישראל] / אשר ראך ומנת כי א[ה] ה[הוא חיה יחי]ה.

41 Based on the discussion in Rubin 1995, 95–96 and Wiener 1978, 58.

42 Elijah's role in the Messianic era is made explicit in PRE 43 (see the discussion in Adelman 2009, 205–206).

enant [*malakh ha-brit*].” Accordingly, he who functioned as the advocate of the covenant in biblical/historical time, during the reign of Ahab, will also be the agent of reconciliation in the End of Days (according to Malachi), consistent with his role in the present (through ritual), invited as the guest of honor at every circumcision.

The Controversy over Elijah’s Genealogy

The identification of Elijah with Phinehas operates on a deeper level than mere linguistic parallels. According to the Tanhuma, the “covenant of peace” (Num 25:12) entailed not only the gift of the High Priesthood to Phinehas,⁴³ but also eternal life, a claim perhaps based on his longevity in the Hebrew Bible. He served as the High Priest up until the end of the Book of Judges, where he was mediator between God and the Israelites in the context of the civil war against the tribe of Benjamin (Judg 20:28).⁴⁴ As I mentioned earlier, Elijah’s longevity, or rather ‘immortality’, may also be traced to his mysterious ascension to Heaven in a chariot of fire (2 Kgs 2:11).⁴⁵ Phinehas, however, is not identified explicitly with Elijah, the prophet, in rabbinic sources until later,⁴⁶ as recorded

43 Phinehas is granted the high priesthood (*brit kehunat ‘olam*) while Eleazar (his father) is still alive, and presumably when he has other children, so the high priesthood essentially skips a generation (cf. Num 25:13). In the Talmud, there is a tradition that until the incident with Baal-peor he had not yet been made a priest (*b. Zevahim* 101b).

44 This implies that Phinehas had lived for over three hundred years (see Radak on Mal 2:5). Likewise, in the book of Joshua, there is a scene where the two and a half tribes erect an altar on the other side of the Jordan and a civil war almost ensues, until a guarantee is exacted that they will continue to make the trip to serve at the Tabernacle in Shiloh; Phinehas plays a critical role, like the “guardian of the covenant”, in guaranteeing their loyalty (Josh 22:13, 30, 31, 32; also Josh 24:33). In the midrash, he also plays a critical role in the story of Jephthah and his daughter (cf. Judg 11:30–40), where (as high priest) he refuses to annul the fatal vow (*Gen.Rab.* 60:3, *Lev.Rab.* 37:2). For a review of Phinehas’ zealotry in the biblical and post-biblical sources see Mack 1982, 122–129.

45 He is one of the nine people to whom eternal life is granted, cf. *Derekh Eretz* 1:18. See also *b. Bava Batra* 121b., Josephus, *Ant.* 9.29, *b. Mo’ed Qatan* 26a. See also the discussion in Wiener 1978, 50–51.

46 A long legacy of debate surrounds Elijah’s genealogy as recorded in *Gen.Rab.* 71:11 (Albeck and Theodor 1965, 833–834), *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 18 (Ish Shalom 1969, 87) and *Seder Eliyahu Zuta* 15 (Ish Shalom 1969, 199). According to one opinion, he is a descendant of Leah, from the tribe of Gad, “of Tishbe in Gilead” (1 Kgs 17:1) where Gilead is understood as Gad’s territory (Josh 13:25). Leah’s naming of Gad as “What fortune [גַּד גַּב]!” (Gen 30:11), is then an allusion to his messianic role in the End of Days (cf. *Gen. Rab.* 71:9). According to

in PRE (27 and 43) and *Tg. Ps.-Jon.*, though hints of the prophet's identification with the priesthood, without naming Phinehas, are found in the Talmud and later rabbinic sources.⁴⁷ It seems that the tradition surrounding the allusion to Elijah's and/or Phinehas' priestly office and messianic role was quite popular in the Second Temple period, as suggested by sources in the Apocrypha,⁴⁸ the Pseudepigrapha,⁴⁹ and the New Testament (where Elijah is identified with John the Baptist). The question is whether the tradition on the identification of Phinehas with Elijah was conscientiously suppressed by the rabbinic establishment, only to resurface later in PRE.⁵⁰ I will now trace the evolution of Elijah's association with the priesthood, and more specifically with Phinehas, in order to explore when and why this tradition may have gone underground.

According to Aptowitz, the identification of Phinehas with Elijah dates back to a Hasmonean tradition.⁵¹ His evidence is based on the attempt to link

another opinion, he is a descendant of Rachel, from the tribe of Benjamin (cf. 1 Chron 8:27); גלעד = גל עד, is then an allusion to the Chamber of Hewn Stone (לשכת הגזית) in the Temple, which was partially situated in Benjamin's territory (cf., Josh 18:28). See Albeck's notes on *Gen. Rab.* 71:11, Albeck and Theodor 1965, 834, n. 3. For a systematic comparison of all the versions on Elijah's lineage, see Wiener 1978, 44–45, Ish Shalom's introduction to *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 1969, 11–12, Margoulies 1960, 12–19, as well as Ayeli 1994, 43–66 and Yisraeli 2003, 103–124.

47 See *b. Bava Metzia* 114b, *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Exod 6:18 (*et. al.* see above), and *Midr. Prov.* 9:3, *Yalkut* on Proverbs 944 (תתקמד). See also *Pesiqta Rabbati* 4:2, based on Hos 12:14, where the two prophets of the tribe of Levi, Moses, and Elijah, are compared (parallel to PRE 40). There is a hint in *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah* 18 that Elijah was thought to be a priest because he demanded of the widow of Zarephath to break bread first (1 Kgs 17:13) as the priestly “bread offering [*challah*]”, but Elijah himself appears to resolve the dispute among the Rabbis, declaring that he is a descendant of Rachel. See also Ish Shalom's discussion on the relationship between Elijah and “*Meshiah ben Yosef*” in his introduction to *S.E.R.* 1969, 11–12, and the discussion on the messianic role of Jonah in ch. 11, especially footnote 3.

48 See Sir 48:10. In the First Book of Maccabees, Mattathias, in his zealotry, is compared to Phinehas, with a claim of direct descent from him: “Phinehas, our father, never flagged in his zeal, and his was the everlasting priesthood” (2:54, cf. 2:26).

49 See *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, where two messianic figures, one from Levi, a priest, sometimes characterized as a zealot for war, and another from Judah, are mentioned: *T. Levi* 18:1, *T. Reub.* 6:6, *T. Sim.* 7:1–3, *T. Dan* 5:10, and *T. Jos.* 19:11. See the discussion of these sources in Ayeli 1994, 56–57, notes 60–62. See also LAB 48:1 and the discussion to follow in the body of this paper.

50 I am not the first to conjecture that there must have been a rejection or repression of this tradition. See Faierstein 1981, 75–86, Ayeli 1994, 57–58, and Yisraeli 2003, 106–108.

51 See Aptowitz 1927, 95, cited in Hayward 1978, 24. Ginzberg, in his study, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, identifies the “Teacher of Truth” (“מורה צדק”, 1, 5–11, and 6,10) with Elijah. The Talmud adopts a similar phrase: “עד יבוא ויורה צדק”, based on Hos 10:12, as a reference

the descent of Mattathias to Phinehas in the book of Maccabees, as well as allusions to the messianic role of the High Priest in the End of Days in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.⁵² This tradition was suppressed later by the rabbinic establishment in order to dissociate the messianic role of Elijah from the political alliance between the king and the priesthood, with the corruption of the Hasmonean dynasty during the Second Temple Period—as it says, “one does not anoint priests as kings.”⁵³ Yet, as both Ayeli and Yisraeli point out, by the time the rabbinic sages (circa 3rd to 5th c. CE) began attributing Elijah’s genealogy to the tribe of Benjamin or Gad,⁵⁴ as if to divert it away from the priesthood, the anti-Hasmonean agenda was no longer relevant.⁵⁵ Hayward, likewise, argues that the equation of Phinehas with Elijah dates back to the Hasmonean period, among circles favourable to John Hyrcanus (c. 135 BCE). On the basis of *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Deut. 33:11, where Johanan the high priest is mentioned in the light of Elijah’s zealotry against Ahab, Hayward claims that “John Hyrcanus I brings Elijah and Phinehas together.”⁵⁶ However, his evidence for the early date of this identification hinges almost entirely on this example from *Tg. Ps.-Jon.*, which many scholars argue is a much *later* source.⁵⁷ In all the examples where Phinehas is identified with Elijah, it is highly likely that the Targum draws from PRE.⁵⁸

to the prophet’s messianic role as arbiter of all unresolved halakhic disputes in the End of Days (cf. *m. Eduyot* 8:7; for a complete list of sources, see Ginzberg 1976, 212, n. 14). According to Ginzberg, Elijah is linked to the priesthood through Phinehas, but *LAB* is his earliest source for this link, which post-dates *Fragments* (circa 70 CE). Klausner suggests that Elijah will serve as the High Priest who anoints the Messiah, based on the writings of Justin Martyr (“Dialogue with Trypho the Jew”, ch. 8 near the end; ch. 9 beginning). According to Justin (circa 2nd c., CE), Trypho claimed that the anointing of the Messiah by Elijah (Elias) was a well-established tenet in Jewish circles and therefore an argument against the messianic status of Jesus (see Klausner 1955, 456, n. 22). However, this early Christian source already betrays the influence of the Gospels and only reinforces my argument that the rabbinic establishment *did not* make this oral tradition explicit in the aggadic writings, despite its popularity, *because* of the Christian identification of Elijah as John the Baptist.

52 See footnotes 48 and 49.

53 Cf. *y. Horayot* 3, 47:3, *y. Shekalim* 6, 49:4, *y. Sotah* 8, 22:3, in Hebrew: “אין מושחין מלכים כהנים”.

54 See footnote 46.

55 Yisraeli 2003, 108 and Ayeli 1994, 57.

56 Hayward 1978, 31.

57 See Adelman 2009, 6 and 200–202. See Shinan’s critique of Hayward’s analysis here in Shinan 1991, 195, n. 10. See also Syrén 1986, 171–178, esp. n. 367.

58 See footnote 31.

The earliest source for the identification of Phinehas with Elijah is recorded in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*, known by its Latin title as *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*LAB*).⁵⁹ *LAB* belongs to the genre of the "Rewritten Bible"—an imaginative retelling of the Hebrew Bible from Adam to King David.

LAB Chapter 48 "The Ascension of Phinehas"

1. And in that time also Phinehas laid himself down to die, and the Lord said to him: Behold you have passed the 120 years that have been established for every man. And now rise up and go from here and dwell Danaben on the mountain and dwell there many years, and I will command my eagle and he will nourish you there, and you will not come down to mankind until the time arrives and you be tested in that time. And you will shut up the heavens then, and by your mouth it will be opened up. And afterward you will be lifted up into the place where those who were before you were lifted up and you will be there until I remember the world. And then I will make you all come and you will taste what is death." 2. And Phinehas went up and did all that the Lord commanded him. 3. Now in the days when he appointed Eli⁶⁰ as priest, he anointed him in Shiloh (trans. Harrington, in Charlesworth *OTP* 1985:362).

Several elements link this theophany with events in Elijah's life, although the chronological order has been altered radically from the biblical narrative. The command to rise and dwell in the mountains alludes to God's command to Elijah (1 Kgs 19:8); the promise that he would be fed by an eagle anticipates Elijah's story of being fed by ravens, while in hiding from Jezebel (1 Kgs 17:4). Elijah's decree that there shall be no rain or dew except by his word (1 Kgs 17:1) is, here, euphemistically called "shutting up the heavens." And the prophet's ascension in a chariot of fire (2 Kgs 2:11) is described as a lifting "up to the place where those before you were lifted up." The text then introduces

59 *LAB* was probably originally written in Hebrew between the 1st and 2nd c., CE, but the only extant version found was in Latin (translated from the Greek). It is called "Pseudo-Philo" because it consistently appeared alongside the Latin translation of Philo's works, though the philosopher is clearly not the author of the composition. See the discussion in Cohn 1898, 277–332 and James 1971, 29–33.

60 Harrington's note on 48, b: The mss. have "him" (*eum*), but in the light of *LAB* 50:3 and 52:2, Eli seems to be implied (ed. Charlesworth *OTP* 1985, 362). Hayward argues that Phinehas' anointing of Eli, here, is most likely a polemic against the Samaritans, who regarded Eli as the heretic who led Israel away from the true place of the sanctuary, Mount Gerizim, in establishing the Tabernacle in Shiloh (1978, 28, an argument based on Spiro 1953, 103).

the *eschaton* as "when I remember the world," suggesting that only then would he die (perhaps because the resurrection of the dead would then be imminent); yet here it does not specify Phinehas'/Elijah's role in the End of Days. Furthermore, no exegetical impetus for the link between the two zealots is made, in contrast to PRE 29 and 47. Like PRE, Phinehas' zealotry at Baal-peor is described in laudatory terms in LAB, in the context of the condemnation of Micah's idol: "For I remember in my youth when Jambres sinned in the days of Moses your servant, and I went and entered in and was possessed with jealousy in my soul, and I hoisted both of them up on my sword."⁶¹ The Rabbis may very well have been aware of this source, or the oral tradition behind this source, yet conscientiously suppressed the tradition identifying Phinehas with Elijah. While upholding the significance of Elijah's role in the End of Days, they wished to distance the prophet from Phinehas' violent expression of zealotry. In the Talmud, for example, the Rabbis carefully circumscribe Phinehas' vigilante behavior as being divinely sanctioned only because it conformed to a set of very narrow criteria.⁶²

But the most substantial basis for the rabbinic tradition of *dissociating* Elijah's genealogy from the tribe of Levi may be found in the link made between Elijah and John the Baptist in the Gospels.⁶³ In Luke, we are privy to an elaborate annunciation scene of the birth of John the Baptist, son of Zechariah, the priest. In a fascinating paraphrase of the Malachi passage, the angel tells Zechariah that his son, as yet to be conceived, "will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, and he will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, to make ready for the Lord a people prepared" (Luke 1:16–18, RSV trans.).⁶⁴ While in the Gospel of Mark (9:12–13) the identification is only implied, in Matthew it is made explicit:

61 LAB 47:41 (Charlesworth (ed.), *OTP* 1985, 361), cf. 28:2, 4. The Egyptian magicians are not named in Exod 7:11, but are called Jannes and Jambres in the Jewish tradition (*b. Sotah* 11a, *b. Sanhedrin* 106a, *b. Menahot* 95a.), as well as the early Christian tradition (2 Tim 3:8). They are also identified as advisors to Balaam in *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* to Num 22:22, hence their association with Baal-peor here (cf. Num 31:16, where Balaam is the one who advised Balak to defeat the Israelites in this way).

62 *b. Sanhedrin* 44a–b. For an analysis of the rabbinic critique of Phinehas' zealotry, see Mack 1992, 124–127.

63 Ayeli also cursorily makes this suggestion, 1994, 57.

64 It must be noted, however, that here John the Baptist is not identified explicitly as Elijah, but, rather, that he will come "in the spirit and power" of Elijah.

The disciples put a question to him: ‘Why then do our teachers say that Elijah must come first?’ He replied, ‘Yes, Elijah will come and set everything right. But I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they failed to recognize him, and worked their will upon him; and in the same way the Son of Man is to suffer at their hands.’ Then the disciples understood that he meant John the Baptist (Matt 17:10–13, RSV trans.).

In addition, John is described as wearing a hairy mantle and a leather girdle about his waist like Elijah (1 Kgs 1:8, Matt 3:4).⁶⁵ And as Jesus is dying on the cross, the bystanders conjecture that he calls upon Elijah (Matt 27:49, Mk 15:35), because the prophet, according to Malachi, was deemed to be the harbinger of the Messianic era.⁶⁶ In a comprehensive study on this subject, Wink claims that “by making John’s role unmistakably clear, Matthew introduces an element of certainty which admits of no ambiguity: John is the prophesied Elijah. By this means the elevation and assimilation of John does not endanger the unique significance of Jesus for salvation. In addition, other Christological safeguards were added to make clear John-the-Elijah’s subordination to Jesus-the-Messiah.”⁶⁷ The identification hinges on the image of Elijah’s eschatological role, as recorded in Malachi. But, as Faierstein cogently argues, the passage in the Hebrew Bible refers to the messianic era as a time period, “the coming of the great and terrible day” (Mal 3:23), not to the Messiah as a personage.⁶⁸ Following a review of the literature, he concludes that the “Elijah as forerunner of the Messiah” hypothesis was generated in Christian, not Jewish, circles. Furthermore, within rabbinic circles there was a strong impetus to dissociate Elijah from the priesthood, not because of an anti-Hasmonean polemic, but because of John the Baptist’s imputed role, *qua* Elijah, as forerunner of the ‘false’ Messiah.⁶⁹

65 Cf. also Lk 7:24–27.

66 This is probably because the bystanders misinterpret Jesus’ plea on the cross as a call to Elijah: “My God, My God [*Eli, Eli*], why have you forsaken me”, most probably quoting Pss 22:2: “אֵלֵי, אֵלֵי, לִמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי” (cf. Matt 27:46 and Mk 15:33).

67 Wink 1968, 40. There is some conjecture that Jesus himself was Elijah (Luke 9:8 and Matt. 16:14), but in the disciples’ speculations, most often John the Baptist was linked to Elijah. In the Gospel of John, however, he apparently disavowed the role (John 1:21). For a recent analysis of the strong dissociation of John the Baptist from Elijah in the Gospel of John, see Martyn 1976, 181–219.

68 Faierstein 1981, 77.

69 According to Martyn, the view that Elijah was “the forerunner of the Messiah, may be paradoxically indebted somehow to an early Christian syllogism: Jesus is the Messiah; John the Baptist was Elijah; Elijah is therefore the forerunner of the Messiah” (Martyn 1976, 190).

Conclusion: Between Myth and Praxis

In the rabbinic tradition, Elijah is elevated to the level of a ‘Supernatural’ (to borrow Eliade’s term), with his presence in many rituals marking the transitions from the sacred to the profane time or vice versa. Most of the aggadic sources *detach* the image of Elijah *redivivus* from his biblical persona. The narrative expansions in PRE are unique, however, in maintaining continuity between his role in the biblical text as zealot, and his rabbinic role as the beneficent eternal wanderer. This continuity is affirmed in two concrete ways: by the seat of honor held for Elijah at every *brit milah*, where he is to testify to the people’s fidelity to the covenant, and through his role in the End of Days, where he is to facilitate reconciliation between the generations and the ultimate repentance of Israel. In Eliade’s terms, Elijah’s role in ritual “recollects or re-enacts the power of events in primordial time,” events consecrated in the biblical era.⁷⁰ Yet, in the rabbinic mind, these events also become a source of *tiquin*, ‘spiritual reparation’, which facilitate the move to the final messianic era. They are therefore not mere replays, in which mythic time is superimposed upon history to the point of annulling chronology altogether, but rather re-enactments with a redemptive goal that spiral towards the End of Time. In the following chart, I outline the relationship between the different images of Elijah through alternative ‘time zones’—the biblical, the aggadic, and the eschatological—in order to highlight this pattern:

Chart comparing the three time zones of Elijah’s role

Time Zone	Persona	Task or Role	Symbol/Ritual
Biblical Time ‘pre-history’, <i>in illo tempore ab origine</i> (PRE 47 and section from PRE 29)	Elijah qua Phinehas as zealot for God; Elijah as prophetic adversary to Ahab in the northern kingdom	“Claimant on behalf of the father’s honor” against the son ⁷¹	Rewarded with the “covenant of life and well-being (<i>shalom</i>)” the (Num. 25:12, cf. Mal 2:5)

⁷⁰ Eliade 1963, 18–19.

⁷¹ Phrase borrowed from the *Mekhilta Bo* 1 (ed. Horovitz 1931: 4).

Chart comparing the three time zones of Elijah's role (cont.)

Time Zone	Persona	Task or Role	Symbol/Ritual
Transition: <i>en media res</i> (the aggadic image in the end of PRE 29)	Elijah as the "Eternal Wanderer"	"Guardian of the covenant" (Mal 3:1), returns to Earth as 'penance' for his excessive zealotry	Elijah's chair at the brit milah
End of Time (eschatology)	Elijah as harbinger of the messianic era	Brings about reconciliation between the generations and the ultimate <i>Teshuvah</i> before that "fearful day of the Lord" (Mal 3:23–24) תובע כבוד הבן	Rituals of Liminality: – the 5th cup at the Passover Seder – Havdalah – Blessing after bread (<i>birkat ha-mazon</i> , and the blessings of the Haftarah etc . . .

Over the course of this analysis, I demonstrated a transformation of Elijah's biblical image as harsh zealot in 'historic time,' to the 'wanderer archetype' of the aggadic corpus. In an attempt to harmonize the rabbinic tradition with biblical exegesis, PRE formulates Elijah's task to return to Earth as, on the one hand, a perpetual act of penance for his severe judgment of Israel, and, on the other, as a "guardian of the covenant" to guarantee it is preserved. The link between the two time zones—the precedent-setting time zone in the Hebrew Bible (what Eliade calls '*in illo tempore ab origine*') and the contemporary or rather transcendent time zone in the rabbinic sources—is established by ritual itself. In the case of Elijah, the seat of honour at the *brit milah* constitutes a portal where the prophet may move between the two realms and enact a *tikun*, spiritual repair, in testifying to the preservation of the covenant. This, in turn, opens a third portal—along the eschatological axis—where Elijah is completely transformed, from claimant "for the father's honor" to "claimant for the son" as the agent of the final redemption.

In this paper, I also suggested that the identification of Elijah with Phinehas may have been an exegetical motif that was suppressed in the classic rabbinic

sources either to downplay the prophet’s zealotry, or to elide over his association with the priesthood (and, by proxy, the Christian association of Elijah with John the Baptist). PRE resurrects this association of Phinehas-Elijah as herald of the Messianic era in order to convey the sense of living on the verge of the End. The zealot prophet-priest is presented as a hero to be reclaimed. I traced the exegetical workings and principles underpinning the midrashic text back to sources in the Second Temple period. The comparison between the text in *LAB*, a genuine example of the genre “Rewritten Bible,” and the later Narrative Midrash, PRE, informs our reading of the inner workings of both sources. It also suggests why it is important to make a distinction between the two genres—the latter is overtly exegetical, relying heavily on intertextuality and earlier rabbinic traditions, while the former makes its interpretive strategies more oblique.

Bibliography

- Adelman, Rachel. 2009. *The return of the Repressed: Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer and the Pseudepigrapha*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Adler, E. Nathan. 1896. Ms. Of the Haftaras of the Triennial Cycle. *JQR* 8: 527–528.
- Albeck, Hanoah and Theodor Jehuda eds. 1965. *Genesis Rabbah*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: 1965 (1st ed. Berlin, 1912–31).
- Alexander, Philip S. 1988. Retelling the Old Testament. Pages 99–121 in *It is Written—Scripture Citing Scripture; Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aptowitz, Victor. 1927. *Parteiopolitik der Hasmonäerzeit im rabbinishecne und pseudepigraphischen Shrifftum*. Vienna: Verlag der Kohut-Foundation.
- Ayeli, Meir. 1994. Eliyahu me-heikhan b’a: yihuso u-motza’o shel eliyahu ha-navi be-drashot Hazal [Where does Elijah come from: his genealogy and origins in rabbinic homilies]. *Tur’a* 3: 43–66 (Hebrew).
- Bernstein, Moshe. 2005. ‘Rewritten Bible’: A Generic Category which has outlived its usefulness? *Textus* 22: 169–196.
- Börner-Klein, Dagmar. 2004. *Pirke de-Rabbi Elieser: Nach der Edition Venedig 1544, unter Berücksichtigung der Edition Warschau 1852*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Brooke, George J. 2000. Rewritten Bible. Pages 777–781 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* 2. vol. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University of Press.
- . 2002. The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible. Pages 31–41 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*. Edited by E.D. Herbert and E. Tov. London/New Castle/Grand

- Haven: The British Library & Oak Knoll Press in association with The Scriptorium: Center for Christian Antiquities.
- Büchler, Adolf. 1894. The Triennial Reading of the Law and the Prophets. *JQR* 6: 1–73.
- Charlesworth, James H. ed. 1985. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* 2 vols. New York: Doubleday.
- Cohn, Leopold. 1898. Apocryphal Work Ascribed to Philo of Alexandria. *JQR* 10: 277–332.
- Collins, John J. 2003. The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence. *JBL* 122: 3–21.
- Clarke, Ernest G. ed. 1984. *Targum-Pseudo-Jonathan*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publishing House.
- Dan, Joseph. 1974. *Ha-sipur ha-'ivri be-yamei ha-beinayim* [The Hebrew Story in the Middle Ages] Jerusalem: Keter (Hebrew).
- Elbaum, Jacob. 1992. Ha-melitzah, ha-motif, ve-ha-'inyan: le-derekh 'itzuv shel ha-sipur be-Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer. [Rhetoric, Motif and Subject-Matter-Toward an Analysis of Narrative Technique in Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer] *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Folklore* 13/14: 99–126 (Hebrew).
- Faierstein, Morris M. 1981. Why do Scribes say that Elijah must come first. *JBL* 100 1: 75–86.
- Feldman, Louis H. 2002. The Portrayal of Phinehas by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus. *JQR* 92: 315–345.
- Fisch, Harold, ed. 1980. *The Jerusalem Bible*, Jerusalem: Koren Publishers.
- Fraade, Steven D. 2006. Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash as Commentary. Pages 59–78 in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*. Edited by C. Bakhos. Leiden: Brill.
- Friedlander, Gerald. 1981. *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer*. 4th ed. New York: Sepher-Hermon Press. (1st ed. London, 1916).
- Frymer-Kensky, Tikva. 1992. *In the Wake of the Goddesses*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Ginzberg, Louis. 1928. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Translated by H. Szold. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- . 1976. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary.
- Hayward, Robert. 1978. Phinehas—the same is Elijah; the origins of a Rabbinic Tradition. *JJS* 29: 22–34.
- Heinemann, Joseph. 1966. *Ha-tefilah be-tekufat ha-tan'aim ve-ha-a'amor'aim*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press (Hebrew).
- . 1974. *Aggadot ve-Toledotav*. [Aggadah and Its Development] Jerusalem: Keter (Hebrew).
- Herr, Moshe D. 1972. Persecutions and Martyrdom in Hadrian Days. *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 13: 85–125.
- Hill, Andrew E. 1998. *Malachi—A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* AB 25D. New York: Doubleday.
- Ish Shalom, Meir. 1969. *Seder Eliyahu Rabbah ve- Seder Eliyahu Zuta* (incl. “Pirque de-Rabbi Eliezer,” and “Pirque ha-Yeridot,” in the addenda) Jerusalem: Wahrman (Hebrew).

- James, Montague R. 1971. *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. Rev. and repr. New York: Ktav Publishing House (1st ed. London, 1917).
- Kermode, Frank. 1996. *The Sense of an Ending*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Klausner, Joseph. 1955. *The Messianic Idea in Israel*. Translated by W.F. Stinespring (from the 3rd Hebrew ed.) New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Mack, Hananel. 1992. Kinato shel Pinḥas ben Elazar ben Aharon ha-Cohen. *Maḥanayim* 5: 122–129 (Hebrew).
- Margoulies, Mordechai. 1960. *Eliyahu ha-navi be-sifrut Yisrael be-emunato u-be-ḥayei ruḥo*. Jerusalem: Kiriyat Sefer (Hebrew).
- Martyn, J. Louis. 1976. We have found Elijah. Pages 181–219 in *Jews, Greeks and Christians* Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. Leiden: Brill.
- Najman, Hindy. 2003. *Seconding Sinai. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: Brill.
- Noy, Dov. 1960. Eliyahu ha-navi be-leil ha-seder. *Maḥanayim* 44: 110–117 (Hebrew).
- Rubin, Nissan. 1995. *Reshit ha-hayim, tiksei leidah, milah, pidayom ha-ben be-meqorot Hazal*. [The Beginning of Life—Rites of Birth, Circumcision, and Redemption of the First-born in the Talmud and Midrash] Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).
- Segal, Moshe Tzvi. 1958. *Sefer ben Sira*. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik (Hebrew).
- Segal, Michael. 2005. Between Bible and Rewritten Bible. Pages 10–28 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. SSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Spiro, Abram. 1953. The Ascension of Phinehas. *PAAJR* 22: 91–114.
- Stein, Dina. 2004. *Meimra, magia, mitos—Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer le-or ha-sifrut ha-‘amamit* [Maxims, Magic, Myth: A Folkloristic Perspective of Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer] Jerusalem: Magnes Press (Hebrew).
- Strack, Hermann L. and Günther Stemberger. 1991. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Syrén, Roger. 1986. *The Blessings in the Targums*. Abo: Abo Akademi.
- Vermes, Geza. 1973. *Scripture and Tradition: Haggadic Studies*. 2nd rev. ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Vermes, Geza, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman eds. 1986. *History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, 2. vol. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.
- Wiener, Aharon. 1978. *The Prophet Elijah in the Development of Judaism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Wink, Walter. 1968. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yisraeli, Oded. 2003. The Zealotry of Elijah in the Tradition of the Midrash and the Zohar. *Derekh Aggadah: bit'on ha-Merkaz le-hora'at ha-Aggadah* [Pathways through Aggadah] 6: 103–124 (Hebrew).

Adam or Adams?

*Genesis and the Mythical Anthropology in the Writing without Title on the Origin of the World from Nag Hammadi (NHC II,5)*¹

Csaba Ötvös

Introduction

The creation of man represents one of the central narratives in those ancient mythological texts that are labelled as Gnostic. The primary sources delineate several accounts, which are divided into two main types in the current literature.² According to the researchers' opinion, the common and principal sources of both types are the biblical accounts from Genesis (Gen 1:26f.; 2:7 and 3:21) and Pauline theology (1 Corinthians 15).³

The question of the sources inevitably raises the ongoing issues of the origin of this ancient religious and philosophical phenomenon. The question of sources and of points of origin is related to the question of the use of Scripture in Gnostic texts.⁴ In addition to these debated issues, one should raise questions concerning the methodology of the authors. These questions might be dealt with in a more specific and more satisfactory way than previously.

This paper examines only the second group of questions, modeling a possible answer by the close examination of the primary source. The basis for this inquiry is a tractate from the Nag Hammadi Library (NHC II,5) and the much debated anthropological system presented by the text.⁵

In this paper, I shall not attempt to present an elaborated and detailed examination of the whole development of anthropology.⁶ As a consequence, first I will sum up, as concisely as possible, the events of Adam's mythological creation and restrict myself to seeking the reconstruction of the process. This part will take into close consideration not only the use of Scripture, but the analysis is intended to underline the author's own way of reading of Scripture. Secondly, based on the results of the reconstruction, I shall demonstrate

1 This paper was supported by the OTKA 81278.

2 See e.g., Schenke 1962, Jervell 1960.

3 Pearson 1973, Conzelmann 1975, Horsley 1976, Sellin 1986, Painchaud 1990, Hultgren 2003.

4 E.g., Wilson 1973, Wintermute 1972, Pearson 1988, Painchaud 1996.

5 The main commentaries are Böhlig-Labib 1962, Tardieu 1974, Bethge 1975, Painchaud 1995a.

6 Painchaud 1990, 1991, 1995a, 1995b.

the manner in which the author constitutes the coherent and thoroughly considered theological system of the tractate. This part will illuminate the second aspect in question, and it will allow us to illustrate why and how the author used, reevaluated, and interpreted the biblical passages and their terminology in order to create his own “Gnostic” narrative. From this point we shall turn to the question whether one could speak of a rewritten Bible⁷ or not in the case of the tractate.

The Tractate

The Coptic tractate *Writing without Title on the Origin of the World*⁸ (OrigWorld) is one of the most disputed texts among the tractates from Nag Hammadi.⁹

The dating of the original Greek is debated; most commentators accept that it was composed between the second and fourth centuries.¹⁰ The dating of its Coptic translation is also equivocal. The codex and the texts found in Nag Hammadi were probably composed at the end of the third or at the beginning of the fourth century.¹¹

The tractate has been much disputed in modern literature. The tractate’s mythological narrative has a lot in common with other contemporary narratives, which can be explained either by the heterogeneous traditions of religious and philosophical schools or by a common and inherited Gnostic source material found in a variety of primary Gnostic texts (the main parallels are in ApJohn, ApAdam, SJC, HypArch),¹² or by other Gnostic materials (known from Church Fathers, e.g., Ophite, Sethian, Valentinian, and probably Manichean), or by other, non-Gnostic (Jewish, Christian, Greek, and Egyptian) sources. The author accommodated these heterogeneous materials to express his theology.¹³

7 As to my knowledge Pearson used this category for the first time concerning the tractate (Pearson 1988), and later this was followed by other scholars, e.g., Painchaud 1996.

8 Later I quote the Coptic text and Bethge’s English translation (occasionally with modifications) from Layton 1989a.

9 The tractate was well known. It has a fragmentary version from the XII Codex and another, Subachmimic version from the British Library. For this, see e.g. Layton 1989a, 18.

10 See e.g. Bethge 1989, 12 and Perkins 1980, 37.

11 E.g. Bethge 1989, 13.

12 Painchaud 1995a and Rasimus 2009.

13 Bethge 1989.

Despite a number of different opinions that have developed in the long and colorful history of research,¹⁴ there are two recurrent viewpoints in scholarship. The first one is that this mythological material, as a work of syncretism,¹⁵ has no identifiable link to the one and only early Gnostic school identified by the Church Fathers,¹⁶ or to any other tractates from Nag Hammadi. The second one is a redactional hypothesis:¹⁷ according to Painchaud, this heterogeneous content could be the result of a development of two successive remodelings of the first basic text.

The Summaries

Turning to the wider context of the anthropology, it is worth noting that the most distinctive feature of the tractate is that the events of the mythological narrative quite clearly follow the text and the events of the creation story in Genesis, which has no parallel in the Nag Hammadi corpus.

By focusing on the tractate's anthropology, we may agree with the recurrent opinion in scholarly writing concerning this concept, namely that there is a heterogeneous system originating from a number of different sources¹⁸ and redactions¹⁹ occurring in the tractate.

Two significantly different accounts stand in the center of this question, the consequences of which determine the whole process of anthropology. One of the most distinctive features of this theology is that the anthropogonical summary²⁰ introduces three types of Adam (pneumatic, psychic, and earthly), although later, in the tractate's eschatological part, a fourth one, i.e., the perfect race appears. This type has no parallel in the codices of the Library or in the heresiological literature; as a result, it can be held as an important witness to this distinctively Gnostic tractate.

Both types are integral parts of the anthropological teaching, but owing to the limited length of this paper, in the following I shall deal only with the tripartite type.

14 The detailed examination of its history in Painchaud 1995b.

15 Böhlig 1962 and Tardieu 1974.

16 Bethge 1975.

17 Painchaud 1990, 1991 and 1995b, 109–115.

18 Bethge 1975 and 1989.

19 Painchaud 1990 and 1995b.

20 According to Painchaud the summary is a secondary addition. Painchaud 1995b.

Before the examination, I shall quote the disputed passage:

There are three men—and his descendant unto the consummation of the world—the pneumatics of this aeon, the psychic, and the earthly. (122.6–9)²¹

<...> ὡοῖτ ῥῥωμε ἢε ἀγῶ νεφγεμεα ὡα τςῦντελεια ἡπκοςμος
πνευματικός ἡπαιων μῆ ψυχικός μῆ πχόικός

This short and apparently clear summary is equivalent to the description of the anthropogonical summary, which comes earlier (117.28–118.2) and reads as follows:

the first Adam, Adam of light, is pneumatic, and appeared on the first day. The second Adam is psychic and appeared on the fourth day,²² which is called Aphrodite. The third Adam is earthly, that is the man of the law, and he appeared on the eighth day (after) the repose of the poverty, which is called Sunday.

πῶορπ σε ἡαΔΔμ ἡτε πογοειν ογπνευματικός πε ἀφογῶνῆ εβολ
ἡπῶορπ ἡροογ πμαρσναγ ἡαΔΔμ ογψυχικός πε ἀφογῶνῆ εβολ
ἡπμαρ[χτο]ογ ἡροογ παει ετογμογτε εροχ Δ[ε α]φροδειτη
πμαρῶομτ ἡαΔΔμ ογχόικός πε ετε παει πε πρῆῆῆνομος ἡτταρογ[ῶνῆ]
εβο[λ] ῆμ πμαρῶομγν ἡροογ [τανα]παγςις ἡτῆῆτρηκε ταει
ετογμογτε ερος Δε ῆμερα ἡλιογ

This passage begins in a way reminiscent of the former quotation, and the types seem to be repeated. Implying the distance in time between the types, the new elements illuminate the whole creation story backwards and multiply the questions, if we seek to confirm its events with textual references. We should note here that according to Painchaud this section is a part of the redaction of the basic text, and the aim of its redactor (in this summary) was to debate Paul's anthropology in 1 Cor 15:45–47.²³

21 Translations from Bethge 1989, with modifications.

22 I accept here the reconstruction of Böhlig-Labib and Bethge 1975 and not the reconstruction of the sixth day (ἡπμαρ[σο]ογ ἡροογ). Later I argue for this reading.

23 See e.g., Painchaud 1995b, 424–25; later I will return to this question.

As a consequence, we should turn to the mythological process and do our best to reconstruct the stories of the three different Adams mentioned above.

The First, Pneumatic Adam

The mythological anthropology that we are to examine starts—like several other accounts in these mythological systems—with the appearance of a heavenly likeness. In this case it is of Pistis on the waters (108.2) after the vain proclamation (the blasphemy) of the first ruler (archon), Yaldabaoth.²⁴ Pistis answers as follows (103.18–23):

You are mistaken, Samael, that is, blind god. There is an immortal man, the light man who has been before you and who will appear among your modelled forms, he will trample you and to scorn just as potter's clay is pounded.

κῤῥῖπλανα σαμανῆ εἶτε παει πε πινοῦτε βῆλλε οὐν̄ οὐρωμε ἡθανατος
 ῤῥῖμοῦοειν ὡοῦν̄ ρι τεκρη παει εἶτναοῦωνε εβολ ρῖν̄ νετῖπλσμη
 φηαῤῥκαταπατει ἡμοκ ἡθε ἡνιομε ἡκεραμεγς ὡαγσομοῦ

At the center of the narrative a common topos can be found about the blasphemy and the appearance of a heavenly likeness of the human shape.²⁵ But the description of the mythical process and the concept involved (the likeness comes from Pistis, with the purpose of judging and unveiling the rulers' work) has no exact parallel in the tractates, in the accounts of the polemical writings, or in the contemporary religious and philosophical literature.

From our point of view, it is worth noting here that this heavenly figure is identified later as the immortal light man (107.17–25) by the first archon, Yaldabaoth and by the other rulers.

According to the commentators' opinion, the usage of the Greek *phos* (man or light) lies in the background of this concept (from Gen 1:2).²⁶ Even more importantly to our examination, this concept offers the first trace of a

24 The author uses the first archon's name Yaldabaoth and Samael in this writing. These show the knowledge of a common tradition that was widespread among the authors of the tractates. Concerning this question, see e.g., Segal 1977 and 1980, Barc 1981, Dahl 1981, Logan 1996, Williams 1996, King 2003.

25 Barc 1981. Dahl 1981.

26 It is accepted among the commentators.

connection with the biblical account of Genesis that utilised one basic term and transferred it to the anthropological context.

In our case the connection is supported in yet another way: the first archon, Yaldabaoth says after Pistis Sophia's answer "if something was before me, let it appear, in order that we might see its light" (107.35–108.3).²⁷

The first Adam's figure is called an angel, the light Adam, and the radiant man of blood in the writing.²⁸

The Second or Psychic Adam

The identification of this figure is rather obscure, and it has been much disputed in modern literature. The reasons come from the text, i.e., that (i) there is no direct textual evidence for his creation; (ii) there is no anthropogonical context where the term psychic Adam occurs in the tractate; and (iii) after the appearance of the likeness, where this narrative should be paid close attention to, the subsequent stories complicate the meaning of the reference by multiplying the perspectives from which the myth is narrated.

I shall begin with presenting the opinions of the commentators.

The first hypothesis comes from Bethge, and a similar one was held by Painchaud.²⁹ In their reading, the second Adam is identified with the creation of Zoe. It came from the bodily Adam who received the psychic element from her while he was still lying on the ground and unable to stand up.

Now, on the fortieth day Sophia Zoe sent her breath into Adam who had no soul. He began to move upon the ground. And he could not stand up.
(115.11–15)

ϗ̅ⲙ ⲡⲙⲁϗ̅ⲙⲉ ⲁϷ̅ ⲛ̅ϣ̅ⲟⲟϣ̅ ⲁⲧϣⲟⲫⲓⲁ ⲛ̅ϣ̅ⲟⲩ ⲧ̅ⲛ̅ⲛⲟⲟϣ̅ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϣⲛⲓⲣⲉ ⲉϣⲟϥⲛ ⲁⲁⲁⲁⲙ
ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̅ⲛ̅ ⲡ̅ϣ̅ϫⲏ ⲙ̅ⲙ̅ⲟⲩ ⲁⲓⲓⲁⲣ̅ⲭⲉⲓ ⲛ̅ⲕⲓⲙ ⲉⲓⲧ̅ⲙ̅ ⲡ̅ⲕⲁϗ̅ ⲁϣ̅ⲱ ⲙ̅ⲡⲉϣⲟⲩⲟⲙ̅ ⲉⲧⲱⲟϥⲛ

This interpretation seems to be viable, as the term psychic Adam appears in the text. However, we come up against the following problems: (i) Sophia's creation is not connected to the fourth day; (ii) the focus is placed on the process

27 Based on this quotation we could bring into play Tatian's interpretation and raise the possibility of common source material, if we accept the account from Origen (*de Oracione* 24), where Gen 1:3 was interpreted as *optativus* of the Demiurge.

28 All terms go back to a Jewish or Jewish Christian background.

29 Painchaud 1995a, 426.

of the bodily Adam's creation in this narrative; and (iii) this character plays the role of the second (psychic) stage of the third, earthly Adam. Consequently, this proposed solution is not convincing.

According to Böhlig's argumentation,³⁰ Pistis' first creation should be this figure. Pétrement followed this interpretation.³¹ Tardieu's opinion was similar,³² and, lastly, Dunning holds this view with certain modifications.³³ This creature comes into being from a fallen drop of light (from Pistis) and appears in the shape of an androgynous being (who later metamorphoses into a female, related to the archons). The beast (as the archons named it) or the instructor (as the writer) comes from her.

Now the creation of the instructor came about as follows. When Sophia let fall a drop of light, it floated on the water. Immediately a human being appeared, being androgynous. The drop she moulded first as a female body. Afterwards she moulded it with the body, in the likeness of the mother who appeared. And she finished it in twelve months. An androgynous human being was conceived whom the Greeks call Hermaphrodites and whose mother the Hebrews call Eve of Life (Zoe), namely the (female) instructor of life. Her child is the creature that is lord. Afterward, the authorities called it the beast, so that it might lead astray their fashioned bodies. The interpretation of beast is the instructor. (113.21–114.4)

πλπο δε ἠπρεϋταμο ἠταϋϋωπε ἠτεερεε τσοφια ἠταρεσνοϋδε
 ἠοϋτῆλε οϋοειν ἀσρατε εἰμ ἠμοοϋ ἠτεϋνοϋ ἀπρωμε οϋωνη εβολ
 εϋο ἠροϋτςριμε τῆλε ετῆμαϋ ἀσῖτϋποϋ ἠμοσ ϋορι ἠνοϋσωνα
 ἠςριμε ἠἠἠσως ἀσῖτϋποϋ ἠμοσ ϋῆ πσωνα ἠπεινε ἠτημαϋ
 ἠταροϋωνη εβολ ἀσϋοκτ εβολ ϋιτῆ ἠἠτσοοϋς ἠεβοτ ἀϋππο
 ἠοϋρωμε ἠροϋτςριμε παει ενρελλην μοϋτε εροϋ δε ϋερμαφροδιτς
 τεϋμαϋ ἠδε ἠρεβραιος μοϋτε ερος δε εϋρα ἠζων ετε τρεϋταμο
 τε ἠπωνη πεσωνρε δε πε πλπο ετο ἠϋοεισ ἠἠἠσως ἀν[ε]ϋοϋσια
 μοϋτε εροϋ δε πῆριον ἀτρεϋῖπλανα ἠνοϋπλσμα ῆερμἠνεια
 ἠπῆριον πε πρεϋταμο

30 Böhlig 1962, 72.

31 Pétrement 1990, 124.

32 Tardieu 1974, 104–107.

33 Dunning 2009, 55–84. I will return to his interpretation later.

The aforementioned commentators' opinion is that this creature born from the heavenly Eve is the psychic man, and the author of the tractate used Gen 1:26–27 (the created and genderless man) in a mythological exegesis.³⁴

There are a number of arguments for this above mentioned correlation, but I am inclined to contradict their interpretation by referring to textual allusion; although an androgynous man appears in the mythology, it metamorphoses into a female being (an earthly avatar of the heavenly Pistis Sophia) and becomes the mother of the instructor (or beast), whose role will be fulfilled in the story of the tree.³⁵

If the connection to the second Adam and the fourth day is kept in mind,³⁶ the text offers another solution. I argue for this option by returning to the myth of the Light Adam on the one hand, and to the events of the biblical fourth day, on the other.

The tractate narrates two mythological events, which apparently have no direct connection with the anthropology. The first one is a myth of Eros in a new mythological dress. It narrates the creation of the plants, the paradise, and the animals (109.25–111.28). This mythical unit uses clearly recognisable elements from the biblical third day (the creation of the plants) and from the fifth day (the animals), but the writer seems to avoid commenting on the events of the fourth day. Nevertheless, this is not the case. Probably, we can derive the first argument from this fact, namely to presume that the writer had another purpose with the biblical story and that the change of the order of the biblical events serves a theological aim.

The second myth, for the most part, concerns Zoe, Life, who is Pistis' daughter. At first, her role is to proclaim the existence of the heavenly man to the archons. Her second role was quoted before in connection with the figure of the instructor or the beast (both are mythical transformations of the biblical snake), and we should note again that the aim of this part is to tell the story of the teacher's (the snake's) origin explicitly.

34 This quotation also remains central to Painchaud's interpretation. According to this redactional hypothesis, the text is a mythological commentary on Gen 1:26–27, and it was introduced on the second stage of redactions to illuminate the origin of the fourth race. For this, see Painchaud 1995a, 386–387. Painchaud gave another reconstruction of the creation of man. According to his interpretation, the unit 112,25–115,11 is the description of the creation of man by the archons. For the detailed commentary, see Painchaud 1995a, 405–407.

35 See later in the writing.

36 Based on the reading of the text, see footnote.

Partly in connection with this myth, we shall return to the myth of Light Adam.

When he appeared on the first day, he remained upon the earth about two days. And left the lower Pronoia in heaven and ascended toward his light. And immediately darkness covered all the cosmos. (11.29–34).

Ἰταρεῖοϋωνε εβολ Ἰπποριῖ Ἰροοϋ σναϋ αϋσω ριχῖ Ἰκα[ρ] Ἰπρητε
Ἰροοϋ σναϋ αϋκω Ἰππρονοια ετῖἸσα Ἰππῖ Ἰν Ἰπε αϋβωκ ερραῖ
επεῖοϋοειν αϋω Ἰτεῖνοϋ ἀπκακε ωωπε α.χ.Ἰ Ἰροσομο[ρ] Ἰρη

In the next sentence the story turns to Sophia and Pistis and describes the creation of the planets and stars (112.1–9):

Now when Sophia who was in the lower heaven, wanted to receive authority from Pistis, and created great luminaries and all the stars. And she put them in the sky to shine upon the earth and to render temporal signs and seasons and years and months and days and nights and moments and so forth. And in this way the whole region was adorned upon the sky.

Ἰσοφια δε ετῖἸ Ἰπε ἸἸσα Ἰππῖ Ἰταρεσοϋωω α.χ.Ἰ οϋεζοϋσια
Ἰτοοτε Ἰππῖσῖσῖ α.σ.α.μ.Ἰ ἸρῖἸνοσ Ἰρεῖρ οϋοειν ἸἸ Ἰσιοϋ Ἰρηοϋ
α.σ.κα.α.ϋ ἸἸ Ἰπε α.τ.ρο.ϋ.ρ. οϋοειν ε.χ.Ἰ Ἰκαρ αϋω σε.χ.ω.κ εβολ ἸρῖἸσ.η.μ.Ἰο.Ἰο.Ἰ
Ἰχρονος ἸἸ ἸἸκαῖρος ἸἸ ἸἸρῖἸποοϋε αϋω ἸἸνεβατε ἸἸ ἸἸροοϋ ἸἸ
ἸἸοϋωη ἸἸ ἸἸσοϋσοϋ ἸἸ Ἰκεσεεπε Ἰρη αϋω Ἰτεεῖρε ἀπμα Ἰρη
Ἰκοσμει ριχῖ Ἰπε

After that the story turns back to the Adam of light (112.10–24):

Now when Adam of light wanted to enter his light, that is the eighth heaven, he was unable to do so because of the poverty that had mixed with his light. Then he created for himself a great aeon. In that aeon six realms and their worlds, six in number, that were seven times better than the heavens of chaos and their adornments. Now all these aeons and their adornments exist within the infinite region that is between the eighth heaven and the chaos below it, being counted with the cosmos that belongs to the poverty. If you want to know the arrangement of these, you will find it written in the Seventh Cosmos of the Prophet Hieralias.

α.α.α.Ἰ δε οϋοειν Ἰταρεῖοϋωω α.β.ω.κ εροϋν επεῖοϋοειν ετε παει πε
ετμαρωμοϋνε Ἰπερω.σ.Ἰ.σ.Ἰ.ε.τ.βε ἸἸἸρῖἸηκε Ἰτατωρ ἸἸ πεῖοϋοειν

ΤΟΤΕ ΔΑΤΑΜΕΙΟ ΝΑΪ ΝΟΥΝΟΣ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΑΥΩ ΖΜ ΠΑΙΩΝ ΕΤΜΑΥ ΔΑΤΑΜΙΟ
 ΝΣΟΥ ΝΑΙΩΝ ΜΝ ΝΟΥΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΕΥΕΙΡΕ ΝΣΟΥ ΕΥΣΟΤΤΙ ΔΗΜΠΗΥΕ ΜΠΧΑΟΣ
 ΜΝ ΝΟΥΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΝΣΑΩΪ ΝΚΩΒ ΝΕΕΙΔΙΩΝ ΔΕ ΤΗΡΟΥ ΜΝ ΝΟΥΚΟΣΜΟΣ
 ΕΥΩΟΠΙ ΖΜ ΠΕΤΕ ΜΠΤΕΥ ΔΡΗΧΪ ΕΦΟΥΤΕ ΤΜΑΖΩΜΟΥΝΕ ΜΝ ΠΧΑΟΣ
 ΕΤΜΠΓΤΝ ΜΜΟΣ ΕΥΗΠΙ ΜΝ ΠΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΕΤΕ ΠΑ ΤΜΝΤΖΗΚΕ ΠΕ ΕΩΔΕ ΚΟΥΩΪ
 ΕΕΙΜΕ ΝΤΔΙΑΘΕΣΙΣ ΝΝΑΕΙ ΚΝΑΖΕ ΕΡΟΣ ΕΣΧΖ ΖΜ ΠΜΑΖΣΑΩΪ ΝΚΟΣΜΟΣ
 ΝΩΙΕΡΑΛΙΑΣ ΠΕΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ

According to this whole section (11.29–12.24), the mythological narrative describes the story of the Adam of light: this figure (the likeness of Pistis) remained on the earth for two days after appearing on the waters. From this point on, we apparently have two different story lines. One of them tells us that when he left the earthly sphere the whole earth was covered in darkness. To correct this deficiency, Pistis Sophia creates the great lights (Sun and Moon), and the stars.³⁷ The story then returns to the figure of the Adam of light and to chronicles of him desiring to revert to his original place. He was not able to achieve his plan because of the earthly element, and he only ascended to heaven between the eighth and chaos and created a new aeon for himself to dwell there. The discrepancies between the two story lines disappear if we assume that the writer connected the functions of the Adam of light and the Sun and Moon, based on both having the nature of light.

The first part of my hypothesis is constructed mainly on these two stories. I postulate that these parts are interconnected, form one and the same narrative, and chronicle the same myth from different perspectives. The first part concerns the creation of the luminaries and their characterization, which corresponds with the biblical account (Gen 1:14–18), adding to the narrative of Sophia's active role (probably by using the book of SapSal or other source material, as did the author of HypArch). The light Adam and his desire to ascend back stands in the center of the other story. To be able to locate his ultimate place will help us understand the last sentence concerning the seventh heaven (referring to a probably apocryphal writing).

If we accept that (i) both are connected to the fourth day and (ii) the symbol of light (the lightning and the light-nature) dominates in both narratives, we can assume that at this point we are dealing with a commentary on the figure of Adam, who partly lost his light nature and remains in seventh heaven, on the top of the psychic sphere.

This whole section with its obscure mythological story written in symbolic language attests the knowledge of a special anthropogonical teaching and can

37 In HypArch Pistis creates the planets for the archons to dwell (87.8–11).

be analyzed as a mythical variant of a theological teaching, which was known in the early Christian tradition. It appeared in the Antiochene exegesis (the *anthropos* as a symbol of the fourth day of creation, e.g., Theophil of Antioch, *ad Aut II,15,4*), and later it developed further and served as the source in the Alexandrian tradition concerning the created Adam in Gen 1:26 as light or light-nature (*augoeides*).³⁸

Briefly, the discrepancies between the two lines disappear if we assume that the writer narrates from two perspectives, and the link between them is the common function, namely the light. With this hypothesis we accept Böhlig's opinion when he wrote in connection with the summary quoted above: "Auch aus diesem Grunde ist 160,1–10 nach dem Weggang des Licht-Adam die Erschaffung der Lichter etc. angefügt, die Aufgabe des 4. Tages in Gn 1,14–19."³⁹

In short, if Painchaud's solution is partly accepted and, moreover, done so in a slightly modified way, in this narrative we are able to identify the psychic Adam who inherited the light nature but who remains in the psychic (the seventh) heaven (between the eight and the chaos).

The weak point of this hypothesis is that the term of psychic Adam is absent in this section. However, the tractate offers other ground for the assumption. First, if this heaven is the seventh, then the light Adam dwells together with Sabaoth⁴⁰ (after his enthronement, sitting on the throne of light) and Zoe (105.26–30) or Sophia (106.3–11) or Sophia Zoe (113.12–13) who created the church (*ecclesia*) of angels. Second, adding to the first argument, the myth connects this place to the souls: "Now these things were revealed to the souls who will come to the fashioned bodies (*plasmata*) of the rulers by the will of Sabaoth and his Christ" (114.15–20).⁴¹

The myth was built on similar etymological wordplay as in the former parts, and utilising the biblical terms of lightening and ruling above the darkness (Gen 1:14–18) offers ground for the correlation between the figure of psychic Adam and the planets created on the fourth day in the biblical account. If this was the case, we would be able to point out the methodology of the writer, who not only utilized the meanings of the terms but also changed the order of the biblical events. The sources of this mythological concept could be early Christian theology, namely the Antiochene and the Alexandrian exegetical traditions.

38 If my hypothesis is right, the author used here material that has similarities with the Origenian exegetical tradition.

39 Böhlig-Labib 1962, 84.

40 For the account of Sabaoth, see Fallon 1978.

41 Irenaeus has an account about a similar concept, see e.g., *Adversus Haeresis* III,17,1.4.

The Third or Choic Adam

The narrative of the creation of the third Adam has three distinctive steps that form a coherent theological interpretation on the Genesis account. At first sight it is an orderly system with the well-known characters and location, with an elaborated structure. The main parallels come from tractates from the codices of the Nag Hammadi Library (ApJohn and HypArch), showing that these systems draw upon common or almost identical material, but there are some data that can illustrate the different theological point of views of the authors, as well as the main points of connection with contemporary exegetical traditions.

These sections have been thoroughly studied in the current literature⁴² and that is why I will only summarize the main steps of the process. From our point of view the main characteristic element is that from now on the author clearly reinterprets the biblical account of the creation of Adam.

Before the analysis of the steps, three insights are worth noting. With the first one we should point out that the duality of light and shadow/or darkness is the key for the tractate's mythological theology. The second one is that the archons as instruments and actors—following the first archon's strategy—try to capture the light (the light Adam) by means of creation (112.33–113.5). This plan and purpose is the proper reason for the creation of man in the storyline, on the one hand, and at this point it will connect the mythological narrative with the Genesis account, on the other. The third point is that the questions of the created man's status, origin, and birth are related not only to the difference of heavenly and earthly Adams but also to the dualism between the first God and the creators of earthly man.⁴³

1) Before the examination of the creation of the earthly man, we should turn to another passage of the tractate, because this has been interpreted as an important part of the creation by some scholars.⁴⁴

The text of Gen 1:26 occurs elsewhere in the tractate, after the story of the Troublemaker. The first archon invites the other archons to the creation with this plan (112,33–113,1):

42 As far as I know the most recent and detailed interpretation of the creation of man in these group is from Rasimus 2009, 159–188.

43 We should keep in mind next to the question of monotheism and dualism that the tractate's narrative has much in common with the Ophite's system, where the first being is named as first man (Irenaeus, *Adversus Haeresis* I,30).

44 For this see Painchaud commentary 1995a.

Let create a man out of earth, according to the image of our body and according to the likeness of this being

ΜΑΡΨ̄ΝΤΑΜΕΙΟ ΝΟΥΡΩΜΕ ΕΒΟΛ Ζ̄Μ ΠΚΑΖ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΖΙΚΩΝ̄ ΜΠ̄ΝΣΩΜ̄Δ ΑΥΩ
ΚΑΤΑ ΠΕΙΝΕ ΜΠΗ.

The biblical passage serves as an introduction for the creation narrative—as it is widespread in similar narratives, although this description concerns only the archons' plan and gives the author's commentary on it. The two references of this planned body are the bodies of the archons and the heavenly likeness.

The next sentences give another detail of the creation from the perspective of the heavenly beings. In this model the archons play only an instrumental role and serve the purpose of Sophia's Pronoia and Sophia Zoe, who is the direct agent in this present case and gives the knowledge of the creation (113.10–14). The author comments on this act and predicts the consequences (113.14–16).

Adding to this interpretation, the next sentence describes Sophia's creature and his role among the creatures of the archons⁴⁵ (113.17–20)

That is why she anticipated them and made her own man first, that he might instruct their creatures how to despise them and thus to escape from them

ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΣ̄Ρ ΩΡΟΠ ΕΡΟΥΥ ΑΣΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΩΡΟΨ̄ ΜΠΕΣΡΩΜΕ ΩΝΑ
ΕΦΝΑΤΑΜΕ ΠΟΥΠΛΑΣΜΑ ΝΘΕ ΕΦΝΑΡ̄ΚΑΤΑΦΡΟΝΕΙ ΜΜΟΥΥ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΕΕΙΖΕ
ΦΝΑΝΟΥΖ̄Μ ΕΡΟΥΥ

Directly before the creation of man the author mentions a new element in the archons' act (114.27–29):

Then each of them cast his sperm into the midst of the navel of the earth

ΤΟΤΕ ΑΠΟΥΑ ΠΟΥΑ ΝΖΗΤΟΥ ΝΟΥΧΕ ΜΠΕΦΣΕΡΜΑ ΕΧ̄Ν ΤΗΝΤΕ ΝΘΕΛΠΕ
ΜΠΚΑΖ.

With this sentence the perspective turns to the earth, the level of archons who prepare for the creation with their semen (*sperma*). This maintains not only

45 This role helps to unveil this figure.

the biological (the earthly) procreation but on a terminological level expresses the change in the method of creation.⁴⁶

The process of creation begins with a commentary on Gen 2:7 combined with the terms from the Gen 1:26, but it uses *motives* known from the mythological theologies (114.29–32):

since that day the seven rulers have fashioned (*plassein*) man with his body like their body, but his likeness is like the man who had appeared to them (114.29–32).

ΧΙΜ ΦΟΟΥ ΕΤΥΜΑΥ ΑΠΣΑΟΥQ ΝΑΡΧΩΝ ΡΠΛΑCCE ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΕΠΕCΩΜΑ ΜΕΝ
ΕΙΝΕ ΜΠΟΥCΩΜΑ ΠΕΦΕΙΝΕ ΔΕ ΕΨΕΙΝΕ ΜΠΡΩΜΕ ΝΤΑΡΟΥΩΝΖ ΕΒΟΛ ΝΑΥ

The motives and the concept that appear here are well known in the other writings (e.g. ApJohn, HypArch),⁴⁷ namely the distinction between image (*eikon*) and likeness (*homoiosis*), as it was present earlier in the archons' plan. In a strict sense this description gives an altered version of the creation that concerns the bodily man and literally does not mention the psychical or spiritual part of man. It speaks only of "likeness." In other words, this could be interpreted as if the process of the creation of the earthly Adam began at this point in the tractate's anthropological system. This *choic* Adam has two parts, as is common in contemporary theologies—but the author mentioned the created body and likeness, one from the archons and the other an imprint from the heavenly likeness. This theologically motivated variant points out not only that this Adam has two clearly distinguishable parts, and participates in the heavenly, as well as in the archons' nature, but also, more importantly that this creature clearly plays the role of an earthly creature in the tractate's system.

After the reconstruction we have gained new proof for the interpretation of the distinction between the archons' plan and the actual creation. The main distinctions are the following: (i) here the seven archons are the agents; (ii) the verb forming occurs (and not creation); (iii) here the text refers clearly to the man's body and its heavenly image; and (iv) all archons take part in the work.

The next sentences opens a new perspective (114,35–115,3).

Afterward he appeared as prior to him. He became a psychic man. And he was called Adam, that is father, according to the name of one that existed before him.

46 This section follows the Eros' narrative in the tractate.

47 See Rasimus 2009, 159–188.

ΜΗΝΝΩΩΣ ΑΦΟΥΩΝΣ ΕΒΟΛ ΖΩΣ ΑΤΕΦΕΖΗ⁴⁸ ΑΦΩΩΠΕ ΝΟΥΩΜΕ
 ΜΨΥΧΙΚΟΣ. ΔΥΩ ΔΥΜΟΥΤΕ ΕΡΟΥ ΔΕ ΑΔΑΜ ΕΤΕ ΠΑΕΙ ΠΕ ΠΕΙΩΤ ΚΑΤΑ
 ΠΡΑΝ ΜΠΕΤΣΙΤΕΦΕΖΗ

This passage offers two solutions. According to the first model—which scholars accept—the text quoted is a part of the psychic Adam’s story. This interpretation is based on the term “psychic man.” This model raises two questions. The first one is that there is no proof for the transformation or change of the earthly man into a psychic being. In other words the author left discrepancies in the text because he mentioned the creation of the body first, but next he turned the story to the psychic man (115,1) and last he described the earthly type again, who is without psyche (115,10–11). On the other hand, its consequences lead us to a new question, since in this model Pauline terminology gives no satisfactory solution. According to the hypothesis I propose, the passage quoted above is about the light Adam, who appeared before the archons (108.8–9) and was called Adam (108,19–24); he is the “father” (that is “the name of the one who existed before him,” 115.2–3).⁴⁹

With this hypothesis the narrative re-establishes its unity, and all steps of the story become an integral part of this mythological narrative.⁵⁰

2) The second step is the aforementioned soul-receiving from Zoe (115,10–11). Before we turn to the close examination of this passage, it is worth noting that this step of the creation mirrors the presence of the heavenly sphere.

But on the fortieth day Sophia Zoe sent her breath into Adam, who was without soul. He began to move upon the earth but he could not stand up.

ΖΨ ΠΜ[ΑΖ]ΖΜΕ ΔΕ ΝΖΟΥ ΑΤΣΟΦΙΑ ΝΖΩΗ ΤΝΝΟΥ ΜΠΕΣΝΙΦΕ ΕΖΟΥΝ
 ΑΑΔΑΜ ΠΑΕΙ ΕΤΕ ΜΝ ΨΥΧΗ ΜΝΟΥ ΑΦΑΡΧΕΙ ΝΚΙΜ ΖΙΧΜ ΠΚΑΖ ΑΥΩ
 ΜΠΕΦΩΣΜ ΣΩΜ ΕΤΩΟΥΝ

We are now dealing with the second step, namely the reception of souls. The passage offers new details for understanding the process of the differentiation of likeness (probably the inner man). The concept can be the first actualiza-

48 The expression ΖΩΣ ΑΤΕΦΕΖΗ could be erroneous coming from ΖΩΣ <ΠΕΤΣ>ΑΤΕΦΕΖΗ. See Bethge, Layton, Painchaud.

49 The last unit alludes back to Pistis’ proclamation.

50 The shorted hypothesis is based mainly on the terminology; here we notice only the usage of “*skeuos*,” “*kerameus*,” and “*aggeion*.”

tion of the given imprint and shows the author's concept of the soul characterized by life and moving.⁵¹ The process can be analysed as a commentary based on the reinterpretation of the Gen 2:7 where the author used the differentiation between soul and breath well known in contemporary Christian theology.⁵² According to Painchaud, the terminology used, the personified *pnœ* and the expression $\mu\pi\epsilon\varrho\omega\sigma\bar{\iota}\ \sigma\delta\mu\ \epsilon\tau\omega\omicron\gamma\eta$ comes from a biblical source. We should add here that with the breath of life Adam becomes a psychic man. With this step the mythological theology arrives at the Pauline concept in 1 Corinthians 15 about the psychic man. But what is interesting to note is that here the life is breathed into Adam by the words. In spite of this modification the consequences are drawn as in other accounts, because the first act of the breath in Adam is the one that begins to move and speak. And what he said is one and the same with the light Adam's role in Pistis' proclamation.⁵³

3) Eventually (115.30–116.8) the heavenly Eve awakes Adam with her creative words. With this act he receives the pneumatic part (on the eighth day), hence he becomes spiritual, and able to stand up, speak, and understand; however, the text does not call Adam spiritual. We should note here that this figure cannot be identified with the first Adam. The author follows an exegetical tradition that emphasizes the importance of the eighth day, probably influenced by Christian tradition.⁵⁴

After the day of rest, Sophia sent Zoe, her daughter, who is called Eve, as an instructor to raise up Adam, in whom there was no soul, so that those whom he would produce might become vessels of light.

When Eve saw her male partner cast down, she pitied him and she said: Adam, live, rise up on the earth. Immediately her word became an accomplished deed. For when Adam rose up, immediately opened his eyes and

51 There is a discrepancy in the text about the condition of this creature, because some lines later the text runs as follow: Adam who has no soul (115.35).

52 E.g. Irenaeus, for this see Painchaud 1995a, 405.

53 After this the archons take Adam and place into paradise and leave alone. The terminology and symbolism of the narrative has parallels with the Christian symbolism of Good Friday, when Jesus' body was placed in tomb in a garden near the site of crucifixion. Adding to Painchaud's hypothesis we hint to PsCyprian (*De duo montibus*, 3 and 7) who used similar parallels.

54 For the importance of the 8th day, see Danielou 1956, 222–286, Pétrement 1990, 69–70 and for the most detailed analysis in the early Christianity, see Bacchiocchi 1977.

when he saw her, he said: you will be called the mother of living, because you are the one who gave me life. (115,36–116,8).

Μῆνῆσα πρῶογ ἡτανάπαγσις ἀτσοφία χροὺ ἡζῶη τεσῶερε εἶμογτε
ερος χε εἶγα ρῶς ρεφταμο ἀτρεστογνος ἀδδμη παει ἐμῆ ψγχι
ἡρητῷ χεκαασ νετεφνα.χποογ [ε]γναῶω πε ἡαγγειον ἡπογο[εῖν

νη]α[ρ]ε εἶγα ἡαγ επεσῶβρεῖνε ἐφῆη.χ ἀσῶἡ ρθης ραροφ ἀγω
πεχας χε ἀδδμη ὠηρ τῶογν ριχῆ πκαρ ἡτεγνογ ἀπεσῶαχε ῶωπε
ἡογεργον ἡταρε ἀδδμη γάρ τῶογν ἡτεγνογ ἀφογῆν ἡνεφβδλ
ἡταρεφναγ ερος πεχασ χε ἡτο εγναμογτε ερο χε τμααγ ἡνετονε
χε ἡτο πεταρτῆ ἡαι ἡπῶηρ

This section is the closing part of the story of the creation of man. In the center of the narrative unit the basic motives are directed by the theological system of the tractate. These motives are the following: (i) the life-giving spirit is identical with the heavenly Eve; (ii) this spirit is not identical with the heavenly man; but (iii) the earthly man received this spirit at his creation (on the 8th day). These specific features of the narrative testify that this variant has no exact parallel, neither among the tractates nor in contemporary traditions.

The three sections of the process in the narrative are analogous with the three parts of the earthly Adam; body, soul, and spirit. Zoe-Eve serves as an instrument of the heavenly world. Her role is clearly the role of a life-giving entity. The author tried by this invention to adopt and adapt the Pauline term of life-giving spirit in this way.

However, the distinction between soul and life-giving spirit in the narrative can be interpreted as the distinction between lower and higher soul, since in both cases Adam received the heavenly parts and these will be actualised in the process of creation. The question of whether this concept alludes to Jewish or Christian sources remains open, but the conclusion that can clearly be drawn from this narrative unit is that this theologically motivated teaching is based on the biblical creation of Adam.

According to Painchaud the third steps of the process has soteriological and eschatological aspects, and the main source could be the New Testament accounts on Christ's tomb.⁵⁵

55 Painchaud 1995a, 410. We should note here that the supposed parallel between the garden of paradise and the messianic garden has its own Christian tradition. See Shaper 2010, 17–27.

Short Summary of the Anthropological System

As a conclusion of this part of the investigation, we can state that the complicated mythological narrative serves to demonstrate the transition from the heavenly Adam to the psychic and finally to the earthly Adam. To add to this vertical hierarchy, the anthropogonical process continues and turns into a horizontal one, i.e., explains the process of the creation of the earthly Adam. Both have temporal implications and are connected to the biblical story of creation. If my hypotheses are not mistaken, two tripartite anthropological systems have been identified, which correspond only on the level of terminology.

The mythical process that we were to examine starts with the appearance of a likeness (of the heavenly Adam) and ends with the appearance of the earthly Adam (the tripartite Adam composed of body, psyche, and spirit). First, the mythical place of the events is the border of heaven; subsequently the story continues on a cosmic level and ends in the garden of paradise.

According to the opinions of the commentators, it is possible that the author creating this text used concepts and terms from Genesis, from the Letter to the Corinthians, and further material from Valentinian sources,⁵⁶ which have influence him. It may be supposed that the author worked on the basis of an inherited knowledge originating from another “Gnostic” source, but in any case, these were reshaped and adapted for the purpose of constructing this complicated narrative. In the light of the examination we can summarize: (i) the main source and the target of the mythological narrative was the biblical story of creation from LXX; (ii) the language of the tractate was deeply influenced by biblical references, which shows that the author was very familiar with the Scriptures (both the Old and New Testaments); and (iii) the concepts used by the author testify his knowledge of early Christian theological trends.

In the following I will concentrate only on those elements and motifs that originated from or are clearly connected to biblical verses.

The Author's Methodology

After the procedure of reconstruction, we have gained a better understanding of what the mythology narrates. As we have seen, the events of the story take place in at least two different realms, in heaven and on earth, and the main characters that appear on stage come along and act in the story of creation.

⁵⁶ Painchaud 1995b, Rasimus 2009, 166–169.

Before closely observing the writer's methodology, it is worth noting a few generally accepted points from the current literature focusing on the tractate.

The first point is that the basic source of the original Greek tractate was the Septuagint; however, some of the wordplay and etymological interpretations may come from either a Jewish source or from a source that had preserved this knowledge.⁵⁷

The second point is that the author's aim as an educated apologist⁵⁸ and/or a good orator⁵⁹ at the beginning of the tractate was to demonstrate⁶⁰ the mistaken opinions of men and of worldly gods concerning the originality of the primeval chaos; this polemical tone, nonetheless, later disappears from the text.

The third point is that all sections follow the author's aim to present his own mythological system directed by the rule of the narration with its nonlinear argumentation.⁶¹ In our case, it means not only that there is an arbitrarily constructed frame behind the text but also that there are more perspectives that focus on the same subject from different points of view.

The fourth point is that our writer did not reject the Bible and that the tractate does not present a polemical commentary. Although the text clearly testifies to a critical view of the Bible his work has been considered rewriting,⁶² simply biblical exegesis, or Gnostic midrash.⁶³ But what is more significant is the author's use of a manifold methodology to create his own narrative proffering another meaning that was held true and fit well into his theology.

A Few Examples

Finally, I attempt to point out the different levels, instruments, and techniques of the writer's methodology via closer observation. Hence I shall offer typical examples from the tractate, with the aim of examining the manner in which the Bible is used. Most of the selected examples could be said to originate from Alexandrian biblical exegetical traditions,⁶⁴ or at least they attest the

57 See e.g., Böhlig 1968, 80–101 and 102–111.

58 See Bethge. 1989, 14.

59 Painchaud 1990 and 1995a, 69–89.

60 The demonstration has a revelation status, and in order to fulfil it, the author invites the audience to the truth.

61 Painchaud 1995b.

62 The term is used in connection with the tractates in modern literature, but it seems not to be applied in a precise way; e.g., Fossum used it in connection with the ApJohn (Fossum 1996, 255).

63 Pearson 1976.

64 Pearson 1976 and Nagel 1980.

knowledge of them, or familiarity with them. However, the question whether they have a Jewish or a Christian origin remains open.⁶⁵

1 Quotation

The writer quotes a term, sentence, or passage from his or her sources.

- Terms: Greek *plassein/plasma* from Gen 2:7.
- Sentences: the ego-proclamation of God/ the vain wish of the first archon (“It is I who am God and there is no one that exists apart from me”) Isa 45:5–6.21; 46:9.⁶⁶
- Passages: from an unidentified holy book (*hiera bibloi*):

it is you who are the tree of gnosis, which is in the paradise, from which the first man ate and which opened his mind, and he loved his female counterpart and condemned the other, alien likeness and loathed him (110.31–111.1).

2 Scriptural Allusion

The text only alludes to or paraphrases words or terms without quoting the exact form of biblical text.

- Terms: Image and likeness (Coptic εἰνε in the plasma) Gen 2:7.
- Sentences: “Since that day the seven rulers have fashioned (*plassein*) man with his body (*soma*) like their body (*soma*), but his likeness is like the man who had appeared to them.”

3 Terminological Change

The text offers wordplays:

- a. etymologies based on Hebrew or Aramaic⁶⁷ serpent-Eve-live//*hewyā'-hawāh-hawā'*
- b. Changes of words *pnoe/pneuma* from Gen 2:7

“Now on the fortieth day Sophia Zoe sent her breath.”

65 For the types, see Wintermute 1972, but here I introduce more groups.

66 For this Dahl 1981, Painchaud 1996.

67 Pearson 1976, 45.

4 Order of Events

Adam in the garden-naming of animals-creation of Eve (Gen 2:15–25) // eating from the tree-naming of the animals (as a test of knowledge).

5 Commentary

The sentence occurs after the blasphemy of the first ruler: “When he said this, he sinned against all the immortals” (103.13–14).

6 Explanation

From the proclamation of Pistis: “You are mistaken, Samael, that is blind god” (103.18–19). This example shows the author’s knowledge of contemporary angelology (Hebrew or Aramaic).

7 Summary

The three Adams.

8 Conceptual change

Earlier in the history of research this type was analyzed by scholars, and they pointed out its importance in the interpretation of the mythology.

- a. Changes of the function and the role of the biblical figures⁶⁸
 - the story about the beast/instructor (the biblical snake).
 - the story of Eve Zoe (the biblical Eve).
- b. Reference to other biblical or extra-biblical writing. According to Pearson, the myth of the golem was significant in the story of the third Adam, which is probably connected to the Psalm. Adam as golem on the ground, Ps 139:16.⁶⁹

Concluding Remarks

In this short paper, I have made an attempt to shed light on two main questions. First, I focused on the reconstruction of the mythical story of the creation of Adam. The scope of the investigation extends over the reconstruction of the myth of the three Adams and probably succeeded in pointing out not only the questions, but by introducing a hypothesis it also offers a viable reading of the tractate’s anthropogony. In my view, the author had two tripartite

68 See e.g., Nagel 1990.

69 Pearson 1976, 37.

anthropological systems in mind, and the discrepancies between the anthropological accounts probably point to the consequences of the different points of view. In other words, we have arrived at a modified version of Painchaud's conclusion.⁷⁰

The second part was dedicated to the methodology of the writer, based on the parts examined. It is possible to continue the list; however, it is probably long enough to show how the writer used his sources and created this obscure narrative in order to express his theology. These examined devices within the text point to the use of Scripture and illuminate the way in which the author used the biblical verses.

In the light of these observations, we may be confident that what we labelled as Gnostic anthropology in this text had drawn a number of instruments and methods from contemporary exegetical traditions, and incorporated them into the interpretation of the text of Genesis. The author used a thoroughly mythological language, but the terminology has features in common with contemporary theological and philosophical traditions that he or she not only used but extensively utilized. The reasons lie in the fact that the author, by focusing on Adam's figure, was certainly concerned with connecting his own anthropological teachings closely to the text of Genesis and to Pauline theology in 1 Cor 15:45–47. The aim behind this exegetical technique in the same case—explicitly or tacitly—was to create a narrative that binds these theological insights as a true and authoritative interpretation of the account of Genesis. When locating the place of the writing among the controversies over the true meaning of the Bible, we would suggest that it stands on the ambiguous boundary between orthodoxy and heterodoxy in the early developments of Christian theology.

Abbreviations

ApAdam	<i>The Apocalypse of Adam</i>
ApJohn	<i>The Apocryphon of John</i>
HypArch	<i>The Hypostasis of Archons</i>
OrigWorld	<i>On the Origin of the World</i>
SJC	<i>The Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>

70 Painchaud 1990 and 1995b.

Bibliography

- Bacchiocchi, Samuel. 1977. *From Sabbath to Sunday. A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity*. Rome: The Pontifical Gregorian University Press.
- Barc, Bernard. 1981. Samaël—Saklas—Yaldabaóth. Recherche sur la genèse d'un mythe gnostique. Pages 123–150 in *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi*, Edited by B. Barc. BCNHE 1. Québec/Louvain: Les Presses de l'Université Laval/Peeters.
- Barnstone, Willis and Marvis Meyer. eds. 2003. *The Gnostic Bible*, Boston/ London: Shambhala.
- Bethge, Hans-Gebhard. 1989. Introduction. Pages 12–19 in *Nag Hammadi Codex 11, 2–7*, vol. 2. Edited by B. Layton. NHS 21. Leiden: Brill.
- Böhlig, Alexander. 1968. *Mysterium und Wahrheit. Gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte*. AGSU 6. Leiden: Brill.
- Böhlig, Alexander and Pahor Labib. 1962. *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex H von Nag Hammadi*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung 58. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Borsch, Frederick H. 1970. *The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man*, SBTh 2/14. London: SCM Press.
- Bullard, Roger A. 1970. *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, PTS 10. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Conzelmann, Hans. 1975. *Corinthians*. Translated by J. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Crum, Walter E. 1939. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon (reprinted 1962).
- Dahl, Nils A. 1981. The Arrogant Archon and the Lewd Sophia: Jewish Traditions in Gnostic Revolt. Pages 689–712 in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Volume 2: Sethian Gnosticism*. Edited by B. Layton. SHR 41. Leiden: Brill.
- Danielou, Jean. 1956. *The Bible and the Liturgy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Dunning, Benjamin H. 2009. What Sort of Thing is This Luminous Woman? Thinking Sexual Difference in On the Origine of the World. *J ECS* 17(1): 55–84
- Fallon, Francis T. 1978. *The Enthronement of Sabaoth: Jewish Elements in Gnostic Creation Myths*. NHS 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Fossum, Jarl. 1983. Jewish-Christian Christology and Jewish Mysticism. *Vigiliae Christianae* 37: 260–287.
- . 1985. *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord: Samaritan and Jewish Concepts of Intermediation and the Origin of Gnosticism*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- . 1996. The social and institutional conditions for early Jewish and Christian interpretation of the Hebrew Bible with special regard to religious groups and sects.

- Pages 239–255. In *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation I.1*. Edited by M. Saebo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Horsley, Richard A. 1976. Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos Distinctions of Spiritual Status among the Corinthians. *HTR* 69: 269–288.
- . 1980–81. Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8.1–6. *NTS* 27: 32–51.
- Hultgren, Stephen. 2003. The Origin of Paul's Doctrine of the Two Adams in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49. *JSNT* 25: 343–370.
- Jackson, Howard M. 1985. *The Lion Becomes Man: The Gnostic Leontomorphic Creator and the Platonic Tradition*, SBLDS 81. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Jervell, Jacob. 1960. *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f in Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. *FRLANT* 76. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- King, Karen L. 2003. *What is Gnosticism?* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Koschorke, Klaus. 1978. *Die Polemik der Gnostiker gegen das kirchliche Christentum*. *NHS* 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W.H. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Layton, Bentley. 1976. The Hypostasis of the Archons (Conclusion). *HTR* 69: 31–101.
- . ed. 1989a. *Nag Hammadi Codex 11,2–7*, vol. 1. *NHS* 20. Leiden: Brill.
- . ed. 1989b. *Nag Hammadi Codex 11,2–7*, vol. 2. *NHS* 21. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1995. Prolegomena to the Study of Ancient Gnosticism. Pages 334–50 in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*, Edited by L.M. White and O.L. Yarbrough. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Logan, Alastair H.B. 1996. *Gnostic Truth and Christian Heresy: A Study in the History of Gnosticism*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- MacRae, George W. 1970. The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth. *NT* 12: 86–101.
- Markschies, Christoph. 2006. *Die Gnosis*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Nagel, Peter. 1980. Die Auslegung der Paradieszählung in der Gnosis. Pages 49–70 in *Altes Testament—Frühjudentum—Gnosis, Neue Studien zu Gnosis und Bibel*. Edited by K.-W. Tröger. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Pagels, Elaine. 1986. Exegesis and Exposition of the Genesis Creation Accounts in Selected Texts from Nag Hammadi. Pages 257–285 in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism & Early Christianity*. Edited by C. Hedrick and R. Hodgson. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Painchaud, Louis. 1990. Le sommaire anthropogonique de l'Écrit sans Titre (NH II, 117:27–118:2) à la lumière de 1 Cor 15:45–47. *Vigiliae Christianae* 44: 382–393.
- . 1991. The Redactions of the Writing Without Title (CG II5). *The Second Century* 8: 217–234.
- . 1995a. The Literary Contacts between the Writing Without Title *On the Origin of the World* (CG 11,5 and XIII.2) and *Eugnoslos the Blessed* (CG 111,3 and V,1). *JBL* 114: 81–101.

- . 1995b. *L'Écrit sans titre, Traité sur l'origine du monde*. BCNHT 21. Québec, Louvain and Paris: Les Presses de l'Université Laval and Peeters.
- . 1996. The Use of Scripture in Gnostic Literature. *J ECS* 4:2,129–147.
- Pasquier, Anne. 1988. Prouneikos. A Colorful Expression to Designate Wisdom in Gnostic Texts. Pages 47–66 in *Images of the Féminine in Gnosticism*. Edited by K. King. SAC. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Pearson, Birger A. 1973. *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism*. SBLDS 12. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- . 1976. Biblical exegesis in Gnostic Literature. Pages 70–80 in *Armenian and Biblical Studies*. Edited by M. Stone. Jerusalem: St James Press.
- . 1988. Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in Gnostic Literature. Pages 635–652 in: *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M.J. Mulder. CRINT 2/1. Aassen/Philadelphia: Van Gorcum/Fortress, 1988.
- Pétrément, Simone. 1990. *A Separate God: The Origins and Teachings of Gnosticism*. Translated by C. Harrison. San Francisco: Harper.
- Quispel, Gilles. 1978. The Demiurge in the Apocryphon of John. Pages 1–33 in *Nag Hammadi and Gnosis*. Edited by R.McL. Wilson. Leiden: Brill.
- Rasmus, Tuomas. 2009. *Paradise Reconsidered in Gnostic Mythmaking. Rethinking Sethianism in Light of Ophite Evidence*. Leiden: Brill.
- Robinson, Gesine. 2000. Sethianism and the Doctrine of Creation in a Partially Restored Coptic Codex (Papyrus Berolinensis 20 915). *Le Muséon* 113: 239–262.
- Rudolph, Kurth. 1987. *Gnosis: The Nature & History of Gnosticism*. Translated by R. Wilson. San Francisco: Harper.
- Schenke, Hans-Martin. 1962. *Der Gott »Mensch« in der Gnosis: Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion über die paulinische Anschauung von der Kirche als Leib Christi*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Shaper, Joachim. 2010. The Messiah in the Garden: John 19.38–42, (royal) garden, and messianic concepts. Pages 17–27 in *Paradise in Antiquity Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and G.G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: University Press.
- Schmithals, Walter. 1971. *Gnosticism in Corinth*. Translated by J. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Segal, Alan. 1977. *Two Powers In Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism*, SJLA 25. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1980. Ruler of This World: Attitudes about Mediator Figures and the Importance of Sociology for Self-Definition. Pages 245–68 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition: Volume Two: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period*. Edited by E. P. Sanders et al. Philadelphia: Fortress.

- Sellin, Gerhard. 1986. *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15*, FRLANT 138. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Tardieu, Michel. 1974. *Trois Mythes Gnostiques. Adam, Éros et les animaux d'Égypte dans un écrit de Nag Hammadi*. Paris: Études augustiniennes.
- Van den Broek, Roelf. 1996. *Studies in Gnosticism and Alexandrian Christianity*. NHMS 39. Leiden: Brill.
- Waldstein, Michael and Frederik Wisse. eds. 1995. *The Apocryphon of John: Synopsis of Nag Hammadi Codices II,1; III,1 and IV,1 with BG 8502,2*. NHMS 33. Leiden: Brill.
- Wedderburn, Adam J.M. 1973. Philo's 'Heavenly Man.' *NT* 15: 301–326.
- Williams, Michael A. 1996. *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wilson, Robert Mc.L. 1977. The Gnostics and the Old Testament. In: *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism, Stockholm, August 20–25, 1973*. Edited by G. Windengren, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Wintermute, Orvel. 1972. A Study of Gnostic Exegesis of Old Testament. Pages 241–270 in: *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays*. Edited by J.M. Efrid. Durham: Duke University Press.

Samaritan Rewritings: The *Toledot* in Samaritan Literature

József Zsengellér

Introduction

Rewritten Bible/Scripture among the Samaritans seems to mean only the Bible of the Samaritans, the Samaritan Pentateuch. But did the Samaritans have only the SP as a sacred, authoritative text during their history, or is it possible to discover any tendency of rewriting in the literature of the Samaritans?

Samaritan literary production is relatively poor compared to Jewish literacy, principally what concerns Antiquity. This fact is due to the relatively small size of the Samaritan community of all periods in and outside Palestine, and the descending tendency of their population through the ages. But the small number of existing literary texts is also the result of limited interest in and capability of producing literature. Nevertheless, orality could also have played an important role in transmitting traditions; consequently some of these traditions never became part of a written text. As a last element in the series of reasons for the lack of a broadly existing Samaritan literature, the loss of texts could be mentioned, loss of which is combined with the vanishing of Samaritan communities in and outside Palestine.

With this situation of Samaritan literacy in mind, the nature of the Samaritan literature should be discussed. It is based far more narrowly on the Pentateuch than Jewish literacy. Samaritan inscriptions of different ages contain quotations only of the SP. From Antiquity our main sources of Samaritan writings are inscriptions, coins¹ and indirect references. None of them contains elaborated Samaritan literary texts. There are, however, some sources referring to lost special Samaritan rewritten traditions from the Second Temple period. The nice poem of the so-called Pseudo-Eupolemus, who some scholars contend was Samaritan, was preserved in Eusebius' *Preparatio Evangelica*.² In praising Shechem and Gerizim, Pseudo-Eupolemus writes that Melchizedek met Abraham on Mount Gerizim. This is an alternative tradition to that of

1 Magen, Misgav and Tsfania 2004, 13. The recent excavations on Mount Gerizim carried out by Itzhak Magen unearthed four hundred inscription fragments written by lapidary and proto-Jewish and Neo-Hebrew scripts.

2 Eusebius, *Preparatio Evangelica* 9.17.1–9.

the Masoretic and Samaritan Pentateuch combining Gen 12:7 with Gen 14:8.³ Steven, the first martyr of Christianity, tells the story of the patriarchs in his speech in Acts chapter 7. In verse 16 he states that Jacob and his sons were buried in the grave of Abraham bought from the sons of Hamor in Shechem.⁴ This is again a clear Samaritan tradition connecting events to Mount Gerizim or to its vicinity, which are described in the SP and MT to have happened elsewhere. Neither of these alterations or rewritings was preserved in later Samaritan texts.

First references to written Samaritan documents are from the 2nd century CE. And the first copies of Samaritan literary texts were preserved from the 11–12th century CE. Four types of texts can be categorized in Samaritan literature: Samaritan Pentateuch manuscripts; exegetical and theological texts; liturgical texts; and historical texts.⁵ Among three of these types we can detect rewriting tendencies by which Samaritan research can contribute to the discussion of the Rewritten Bible phenomenon.

Samaritan Pentateuch

Rewriting as a phenomenon can be detected first of all in the Samaritan Pentateuch. Early modern Hebraists such as Walton, Castellus and Lightfoot recognized dissimilarities between the Masoretic text and the Samaritan Pentateuch in the London Polyglot,⁶ and Gesenius later classified these dissimilarities.⁷ Two of the authors of the present volume earlier discussed the possible rewritten nature of the Samaritan Pentateuch in detail. In his analysis Emanuel Tov demonstrated that the SP and the so called pre-Samaritan text group (4QpaleoExod^m; 4QNum^b; 4QExod–Lev^f) “in their major characteristics . . . usually agree against all other textual witnesses. Foremost among these is the content editing . . .”⁸ The previous remark of Esther Eshel concerning the harmonizing tendency of the SP group was refined by Tov, namely that this harmonizing is inconsistent. Not all the possible cases are harmonized; among others legal portions were left intact. Tov and later Sidnie White Crawford demonstrated the close affinities of SP with the pre-Samaritan group in Exodus, Numbers and Deuteronomy in this harmonizing and

3 For text and translation, see Holladay 1983, 157–188.

4 See Bowman 1967, 72.

5 Tal 1989.

6 Walton 1657, 19–34.

7 Gesenius 1815, 25–61.

8 Tov 1988, 341.

content editing.⁹ White-Crawford labeled this characteristic as a “rewriting technique,” unlike Tov, who denied it.

But both of them agreed that the Samaritan Pentateuch has a “thin” sectarian layer consisting mainly of two major changes: first, the inserting of an altar-building on Mount Gerizim at the end of the Decalogue (SP: Ex 20:17b; Deut 5:18a); and second the consistent changes of the imperfect of **יבחר** to **בחר** in the Deuteronomical text: “the place which YHWH your Lord will choose.”¹⁰ This Samaritan layer seems to be a sectarian rewriting of the pre-Samaritan Pentateuch text. But, recently two text-critical obstacles arose against the supposition of the sectarian character of this whole layer. First, the Gerizim reading in Deut 27:4 seems to be original, rather than the Ebal of the Masoretic text, since it is also attested in the *Vetus Latina* and Papyrus Giessen 19. Adrian Schenker and Stefan Schorch have argued for this position convincingly.¹¹ If this is the case, then the conflation of the portions of Deut 27:2–7 still could have been a later Samaritan edition, but the text was not altered by the Samaritans. Rather they used the original reading in their edition. Second, Schenker pointed out that the LXX minuscule called 72 or “m” from Oxford, the Coptic Bohairic and Sahidic texts, and the *Vetus Latina*—not inconsequently—in all cases have the translation of the perfect form **בחר** instead of the imperfect **יבחר**.¹² Combining these cases with the **בחר** reading of Neh 1:9, Schenker concluded that the Masoretic reading is the theologically motivated correction and not the Samaritan. If this is the case, the main Samaritan theological corrections disappear, and the “thin” sectarian layer is not systematic but part of the pre-Samaritan group’s common type of editing or rewriting. But we can recall the remark of Rabbi Eleazar ben Rabbi Yose from the Sifre who condemns the Samaritans for falsifying the Torah by inserting **מול שכם** (over against Shechem) into the text of Deut 11:30.¹³ Thus theological rethinking of some special points of the Pentateuch also signifies the Samaritan rewriting of the text.

Asatir

Of the second category of literary productions, namely of the exegetical and theological texts, *Asatir* should be mentioned. Moses Gaster, the first to

9 Tov 1988. White Crawford 2008, 19–38.

10 This or similar formulae appear 22 times in the book of Deuteronomy.

11 Schenker 2008 and Schenker 2010. Schorch 2011, 23–37.

12 Cf. the table of Schenker 2008, 351.

13 Sifre 56,1. See Finkelstein and Horovitz 1939, 123–124.

publish this text, described it as “a Midrash, Aggadah, or legendary supplement to the Pentateuch.” But if we compare it to the Jewish texts defined as Rewritten Bible (since the very first use of this term already by Geza Vermes) like *Jubilees*, *1 Enoch*, Pseudo-Philo or Josephus, then we can call Asatir beyond doubt a Rewritten Bible text.

Then again, in his introduction to the publication of the Asatir, Gaster gave the earliest attempt of a terminological definition of the “Rewritten Bible” phenomenon. He called these types of books *Historiated Bible*:

One more word may finally be said about Josephus. He must now be lifted out of the narrower sphere of a mere interpreter of the Biblical narrative, and placed at the head of a whole cycle of literary developments of no mean importance. With him begins the *literature of the Historiated Bible*, which in the course of time was to appeal to the popular taste more strongly, if possible, than the simpler narrative of Holy Writ. His example was imitated, his work enlarged upon or abbreviated, and much of the legendary matter was taken over into other writings and widely circulated.¹⁴

There are more reasons why Asatir could be included in this category. First of all, it covers the period between Adam and Joshua, which, from the Samaritan point of view, covers the whole of Scripture. The original text is not only paraphrased; there are not only extra stories—of which several have parallels in other Jewish texts like the *targumim* or *midrashim*—but sometimes changes of some data of the original version. One of these changes concerns Enoch. There is a broader Enoch story in the Asatir than in the Pentateuch, but interestingly at the end of it Enoch dies. And he is buried on the Mount of Ebal! It is a special Samaritan rewriting. Like *Jubilees*, Asatir also refers to a new calculation of the calendar (Jub 1:1, 26; 6:22; As 4:19–22), and both have a detailed story of the birth of Moses (Jub 47; As 8:21–9:14). There are also parallels with Pseudo-Philo and Josephus.

Therefore it is not surprising that several scholars used references to Asatir as a comparative text to early Jewish texts having similar rewriting elements. Most recently Lester Grabbe made a comparison between *Jubilees* and Asatir. Daniel Machiela referred to Asatir in his new edition and study on Genesis Apochryphon.¹⁵

There are two reasons I do not deal with Asatir alone as a typical Samaritan rewritten Bible text. First, against all these similarities the earliest Aramaic text

14 Gaster 1927, 112. §105. (my italics).

15 Grabbe 2009. Machiela 2009, 18–19, 101. n.103; 115. n.93.

of Asatir is preserved in a manuscript from the 17th century. Although Moses Gaster dated the text to the 2nd century BCE, in more detailed linguistic analysis Zeev Ben Hayyim and Moshe Florentin pointed out Arabic influences in the text and defined its language to be 10–11th century Aramaic.¹⁶ The late date of this text makes its content and references uncertain; thus a thorough analysis of its traditions is needed in the future. Second, now I would like to present a literary motive, which I believe serves as the core element of all the Samaritan historical or religious texts. But before we turn to that question the phenomenon of Joshua rewritings should be presented.

Joshua Rewritings

The Samaritan Pentateuch is held as the holy scripture of the Samaritans. The Masoretic book of Joshua, as the natural continuation of Israel's wandering tradition with the story of the conquest of the Promised Land, is maintained by several biblical scholars, like Julius Wellhausen, Gerhard von Rad and others, as part of the Hexateuch. Though Origen (ca. 185–253) and Epiphanius of Salamis (ca. 314–403) clearly stated that the Samaritans had the Pentateuch as their only holy scripture,¹⁷ Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria of the sixth century CE, mentioned the Dositheans, a sectarian group of the Samaritans, as having a heavily rewritten Octateuch: "He (Dositheus) adulterated the Mosaic octateuch with myriads of spurious changes of all kinds."¹⁸ What the precise content of this Octateuch collection was is unknown, but due to the prominent role of Joshua in the Messianic ideas of this group, we can suppose that next to the Pentateuch, the book of Joshua was included in this Octateuch. Consequently, this is the first known reference to the existence of a Samaritan Book of Joshua and to its scriptural position.

A much earlier reference to an alternative Joshua text-tradition was discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls. 4Q378–379. 4Q522, 5Q9, 4QpaleoParaJosh and MasParaJosh and was labeled by Emanuel Tov as the Apocryphon of

16 Florentin 2005, 21–28. Ben-Hayyim 1943–44. The most recent evaluation of the language of Asatir was made by Christophe Bonnard. He presented a paper at the seventh international congress of the Société d'Études Samaritaines at Erfurt in July 2012 entitled: "The place of the Language of Asfâr Asâtîr in the Evolution of Samaritan Aramaic."

17 Zsengellér 1998, 163.

18 Cited by Photius, *Bibliotheca* 230.285b.2. Text in PG 103. 1084D. and Pummer 2002, 425. Translation in Pummer 2002, 427.

Joshua, or the Rewritten Book of Joshua.¹⁹ The collection of Messianic quotations of 4QTestimonia in lines 21–30 contains a piece of 4Q379.²⁰ The use of this rewritten Joshua text shows its messianic interpretation and the authority of the text in the Qumran community.

Samaritan manuscripts containing Joshua traditions are preserved only from the medieval and early modern period. There are two Arabic compositions, the first is called the *Arabic Book of Joshua* and was composed in 1513,²¹ the second is part of the chronicle called the *Ta'rikh of Abu'l Fath* written according to the author in 1355 (756 A.H.). Abu'l Fath referred to a certain *Sepher Yehoshua* as one of his sources.²² A Samaritan Hebrew version of the Book of Joshua was presented at the very beginning of the 20th century by Moses Gaster.²³ Several scholars condemned these manuscripts as forgeries or compilations from the Masoretic text and the Arabic versions, but Alan D. Crown pointed out from the territorial allotments portion of MS JRG 864 that it may contain 3–4th century CE traditions.²⁴ If Crown is right, then a Samaritan Hebrew Book of Joshua—not the accessible compilations—existed long before the Arabic compositions.²⁵ All of these Joshua texts belong to Samaritan chronicle literature, having the characteristic of constant *rewriting*, namely re-edition and updating. The Arabic Book of Joshua contains the continuation of history to Alexander the Great; the *Ta'rikh of Abu'l Fath* ends at the time of the writer, i.e. 1355. The Hebrew version, as part of the so-called *Sepher Hayamim* (Chronicle II), leads up to 1902.²⁶

In the Joshua story itself there are interesting differences in the Hebrew versions and more rewritings and midrashic materials in the Arabic versions. As a consequence, in these rewritings the different historical and theological aspects of the writers can be distinguished. Some of these special elements are collected and analyzed by Ed Noort in his a-temporal treatment of the

19 Tov 1998.

20 Mitchell 2005.

21 Juynboll 1848, 35.

22 Juynboll 1848, 75.

23 Gaster 1908.

24 Crown 1964. But Florentin (2005, 357–374) considered the language of the Gaster manuscript to be linguistically identical with JRG 257 (*Chronicle II—Sepher Hayammim*).

25 Hjelm 2004, 188.

26 Macdonald 1969. At the conference Stefan Schorch expressed his doubts about the existence of such traditions in Hebrew among the Samaritans before the time of the Arabic texts. Later this view was published cf. Schorch 2013, 143 n. 22.

Samaritan Joshua material.²⁷ But without temporal location of the texts he failed to find the rewritten character and sequence of the texts.

Toledot

The Samaritan rewriting features discussed hitherto could be well-known and most scholars are familiar with them. But now I want to introduce a fourth phenomenon into the discussion of Samaritan rewritings, and this I would call the *toledot* type. This special feature of the Samaritan historical writings is also rooted in the (Samaritan) Pentateuch.

The *toledot* formula has long been seen as an important structural element of Genesis.²⁸ The composition of Genesis consists of ten *toledot* sections, each appropriately introduced with the formula: “these are the *toledot* of. . . .” Different explanations of its root and role were developed. The common element of these ideas is that the term or the expression containing *toledot* concerns a series of persons with some brief, selected events from their life. In nine of the ten cases it heads the section to which it belongs.²⁹ *Toledot* have two parts: genealogy and short stories. As part of *toledot*, genealogy connects different main stories of the *Urgeschichten*. Genealogies make a line of prominent figures of History. Further in the Pentateuch, genealogies tie the priestly families to their work and service around the Tent of Meeting (Numbers 3–4). Later on, in another inner Biblical rewriting, the Book of Chronicles, genealogies tie rival priestly families to the same root (1Chron 5:27–6:66). Consequently, genealogies have a prominent role in historical thinking, all the more in authoritative views.

The Samaritan Pentateuch is not only the root of the *Toledot* type of rewriting, but it is also the model for this type of rewriting. If we look at the *sefer toledot* of Genesis 5, there is a list of names and dates of birth and dates of having children. Only at some points there is more information about the given person, such as in the cases of Lamech (Gen 4:16–24) or Enoch (Gen 5:24). The *toledot* of the Samaritan chronicles follow this form.

Shalshalah

The first text I would like to present in the series of *toledot* type rewritings is the so-called *Shalshalah* or Chain of Samaritan High Priests. The manuscript

²⁷ Noort 2006.

²⁸ See the monograph long discussions of Hieke 2003 and Thomas 2011, cf. also Carr 1998.

²⁹ Woudstra 1970, 185.

(MS 826) published by Moses Gaster was copied or compiled by Jacob ben Aaron in 1907.³⁰ The work lists the high priests from Adam to *Jacob the son of Amram the son of Shalmah*, to the year of the chronicle and has only some very short expansions to the list, as in the case of the patriarchs: עליו השלום (“upon whom be peace”). Or somewhat more extensive in the case of Shem: “In the 18th year of his life was the flood upon the earth, as it is said: ‘And he begat Arpachshad two years after the flood.’” The text itself is an annalistic writing, recording contemporary history and brief entries. Every scribe continued where his predecessor has left off and sometimes also has added new facts. The most interesting aspect of this chronicle is the comparative method of chronology. It begins with two columns before the names, and there are two different others after some pages. The first column until Moses says how old the person was and when his son was born. In case of the high priests, it is evidently the years of their office. The second column contains the date counted according to the creation.³¹ The third column starts from the entry of Israel into the land of Canaan, which begins with the death of Moses, and also given according to the death of the high priests. The fourth column refers to the dates of the Muslim era.

Around 325 CE Eusebius completed his *Chronicon (Chronological Canons with an Epitome of Universal History both Greek and non-Greek)*. Its first part, called *Chronographia*, is based on the *toledot* part of Genesis. He compared the three versions (MT, LXX, SP) of genealogies from Adam to the patriarchs in two portions separated by the flood. As in the Shalshalah, Eusebius presents several columns with numbers; he has exactly five columns. After each portion he has concluding remarks. This insertion of genealogies into a historical work with concluding remarks has the pattern parallel to that of the Samaritans.

The first line of Shalshalah reads: זה תולדות מן אדם עד היום הזה “These are the generations (*toledot*) from Adam to this day.” By the use of this phrase the text marks out the genre to which it belongs.

Tulidah

The second text is the chronicle published first by Neubauer, later by Bowman and more recently by Moshe Florentin.³² It is called Tolida or Tulidah, which

30 Gaster 1909. Two manuscripts served as basis for Gaster’s edition: MS.862 (Cod. A) and MS.877 (Cod. B) of the Gaster collection.

31 This date is the birth of his son, in case of the fathers, but the date of death in the case of the high priests.

32 Neubauer 1869. Bowman 1954. Florentin 1999.

simply means “chronicles.” The word *toledot* is derived from the same Hebrew word, and thus, this chronicle offers the name of our genre.

The text is a continuous rewriting of the genealogies in different Samaritan languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Late Samaritan Hebrew). There is a tripartite introduction about chronology, jubilee years and the calculation of years and new moons. The main body of the text has the genealogies from Adam to the first compiler of the text, Eleazar ben Amram of the 12th century. There are later additions from different periods up to the 20th century. Parts of the older texts were reformulated by the new scribes. In the portion corresponding to the Pentateuch, there are four expansions. The first two summarize the time between Adam and Noah and between Arpachshad and Abraham. The third defines Moses as a prophet and summarizes the time from Adam to Moses. The fourth expansion is about Abisha, the son of Pinehas, who wrote the first Torah Scroll. Otherwise the text is akin to the first column of the Shalshalah, names and numbers.

Ta'rikh of Abu 'l-Fath

The previously mentioned *Asatir* does not seem to follow this *toledot* type of rewriting, although in chapter 2 it lists the first ten generations with a longer discussion but without dates. But its contemporary, the *Ta'rikh* of Abu 'l-Fath, according to its own witness, has incorporated a certain Tulidah or Shalshalah (the Arabic *shalshalakh* in the Samaritan Hebrew translation is given as *tolidah*).³³ Abu'l Fath has the list of Adam to Abraham (4,5–5,11) and from Abraham to Moses (6,14–7,10) in a similar way as in the two texts discussed previously. But the whole work composed by Abu 'l-Fath is a real chronicle, the history of the Samaritans from Adam to the beginning of the Muslim era. Like the other chronicles, it was also copied, brought up-to-date and sometimes rewritten by later scribes as we can follow this process in several of the manuscripts.³⁴

Later Rewritings

Two further Samaritan Hebrew chronicles have to be mentioned. First the so-called Adler-Seligsohn chronicle from 1900,³⁵ which combines Tulidah, Abu'l Fath, *Asatir* and other sources. The text is arranged as a real *toledot*, following the line of the genealogy from Adam through the high priests. The name and two numbers, the age and the date from the creation are highlighted; then the stories concerning the person or the period are mentioned. The section

33 Stenhouse 1989, 241.

34 Cf. chapter VI. *De Annalis Abulfathiani Additamentis*, in Vilmar 1865, LXXV–LXXXIV.

35 Adler and Seligsohn 1902–1903.

corresponding to the Pentateuch has more or less the same short stories as that of Asatir and Abu'l Fath.

The second Samaritan Hebrew chronicle is the so-called *Sepher Hayamim* or Chronicle II, published partially by John Macdonald and Jeffrey M. Cohen.³⁶ The first part of this chronicle seems to be the same as the Samaritan Joshua published by Gaster. The further portion published by Macdonald covers the storytelling of the biblical books of Judges, of Samuels and of Kings. In genre it is a real rewriting having a special Samaritan point of view, but its date and language connects it to the first years of the 20th century. Without any parallels in Samaritan literature, we can only say that it contains Samaritan traditions, but it could not serve as basis for comparing ancient texts. Moreover, it does not contain the period before Joshua, so it seems to be irrelevant in our context.

Conclusion

Scholars proposed two possibilities concerning the origin of Shalshalah and the Tulidah discussed above. The first, stated by Montgomery for example, is that they were excerpted from a larger text and in this way a shorter form was produced. The other possibility maintained by Macdonald and Bowman is that the larger texts incorporated these shorter portions. The first opinion is supported by the very similar forms of the texts, and the second by the remarks of the larger text on their sources.

My supposition is that the basic form of the historical writings of the Samaritans imitated the text of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and this we can call the *toledot* form, presenting the genealogies with short remarks. This form was used, further rewritten and expanded into the different texts and versions. In his Church History Eusebius mentioned the incorporation of a γενεαλογία (*toledot*?) into a βίβλος τῶν ἡμερῶν (*Sepher Hayamim*?).³⁷ According to Crown this could be a reference to some of the Samaritan historical texts.³⁸ No known Christian or Jewish works bear these names. If this supposition is correct, then Eusebius confirms our theory about the *toledot* form as a portion that could be incorporated in a rewritten form into a larger chronicle. This seems to be a typical form of Samaritan rewriting.

36 Macdonald 1969, Cohen 1981.

37 Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 1.7.14.

38 Crown 1972, 308.

Summarizing, we can maintain that Samaritan rewritings exist, and there is a special type, which can be called the *toledot* type in the genre of “Rewritten Bible” in the Samaritan chronicles modeled on the Pentateuch.

Bibliography

- Adler, E. Nathan and Seligsohn, Max. 1902–1903. Une nouvelle chronique samaritaine. *REJ* 44: 187–122; 45: 70–98.223–254 and 46: 123,–146.
- Ben-Hayyim, Zeev. 1943–44. The Asatir with Translation and Commentary. *Tarbiz* 14: 104–125, 174–191 and 15: 44, 71–87, 128 (Hebrew).
- Bowman, John. 1954. *Transcript of the Original Text of the Samaritan Chronicle Tolidah*. Leeds: University Press.
- . 1967. *Samaritanische Probleme*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Carr, David M. 1998. βίβλος γενέσεως Revisited: A Synchronic Analysis of Patterns in Genesis as Part of the Torah. *ZAW* 110: 159–172.
- Cohen, Jeffrey M. 1981. *A Samaritan Chronicle*. SPB 30. Leiden: Brill.
- Crown, Alan D. 1964. The Date and Authenticity of the Samaritan Hebrew Book of Joshua As Seen in Its Territorial Allotments. *PEQ* 96: 79–100.
- . 1972. New Lights on the Inter-relationship of Samaritan Chronicles from Some Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library. *BJRL* 84: 281–313.
- Finkelstein, A. Eliezer and Horovitz, H. Saul. 1939. *ספרי על ספר דברים*. Corpus Tannaiticum Berlin: Jüdischer Kulturbund (reprint 1969. New York: JTS).
- Florentin, Moshe. 1999. *כרוניקה שומרונית*. Jerusalem: Yad Yizhak Ben-Zvi
- . 2005. *Late Samaritan Hebrew. A Linguistic Analysis of Its Different Types*. SSSL 43. Leiden: Brill.
- Gaster, Moses. 1908. Das Buch Josua in hebräisch samaritanischer Rezension. *ZDMG* 62: 209–279.494–549.
- . 1909. The Chain of the Samaritan High Priests. *JRAS* 31:393–420.
- . 1927. *The Asatir: The Samaritan Book of the ‘Secrets of Moses’ Together with the Pitron or Samaritan Commentary and the Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses*. OTF 26. London: The Royal Asiatic Society.
- Gesenius, Willhelm. 1815. *De pentateuchi samaritani origine, indole et auctoritate commentatio philologico-critica*. Halle: Rengersche Buchhandlung.
- Grabbe, Lester L. 2009. Jubilees and the Samaritan Tradition. Pages 145–159 in *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: the Evidence of Jubilees*. Edited by G. Boccaccini et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hieke, Thomas. 2003. *Die Genealogien der Genesis*, Herders Biblische Studien 39. Freiburg: Herder.

- Hjelm, Ingrid. 2004. *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty. Zion and Gerizim in Competition*. JSOTSup 404. CIS 14. London: T & T Clark.
- Holladay, Carl R. 1983. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors I*. SBL Pseudepigrapha Series 10. Atlanta: Scholar Press.
- Juynboll, Theodor G. J. 1848. *Chronicum samaritanum, arabicae conscriptum, cui titulus est Liber Josuae*. Leiden: S.J. Luchtmans.
- Macdonald, John. 1969. *The Samaritan Chronicle No. II. from Joshua to Nebuchadnezzar*. BZAW 107. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Machiela, Daniel A. 2009. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: a New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. STDJ 79. Leiden: Brill.
- Magen, Yitzhak, Haggai Misgav and Tsfania Levana. 2004. *Mount Gerizim Excavations. Vol. I. The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*. JPS 2. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority.
- Mitchell, David C. 2005. The Fourth Deliverer: A Josephite Messiah in 4QTestimonia. *Biblica* 86: 545–553.
- Neubauer, Adolf. 1869. Chronique samaritaine. *JA* 14: 385–470.
- Noort, Ed. 2006. *Der reißende Wolf*—Josua in Überlieferung und Geschichte. Pages 153–173 in *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament: 18th Congress: Congress Volume*. Edited by A. Lemaire. VTSup 109. Leiden: Brill.
- Pummer, Reinhard. 2002. *Early Christian Authors on Samaritans and Samaritanism*. TSAJ 92. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Schenker, Adrian. 2008. Le Seigneur choisira-t-il le lieu de son nom ou l'a-t-il choisi? Une célèbre différence entre le texte masorétique et samaritain du Deutéronome à la lumière de la Bible grecque ancienne. Pages 339–351 in *Scripture in Transition, FS. Rajja Sollamo*. Edited by A. Vojtila and J. Jokiranta. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- . 2010. Textgeschichtliches zum Samaritanischen Pentateuch und Samareitikon. Zur Textgeschichte des Pentateuchs im 2. Jh. v. Chr. Pages 105–121 in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies*. Edited by M. Mor and F.V. Reiterer. SJ 53. SSam 5. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Schorch, Stefan. 2011. The Samaritan Version of Deuteronomy and the Origin of Deuteronomy. Pages 23–37 in *Samaria, Samaritans, Samaritans*. Edited by J. Zsengellér. SJ 66. SSam 6. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- . 2013. Construction of Samaritan Identity from the Inside and from the Outside. Pages 135–150 in *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Power*. JAJSup 11. Edited by R. Albertz and J. Wöhrle. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Stenhouse, Paul. 1989. Samaritan Chronicles. Pages 218–265 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by A.D. Crown. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Tal, Abraham. 1989. Samaritan Literature. Pages 413–467 in *The Samaritans*. Edited by A.D. Crown. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Thomas, Matthew A. 2011. *These are the Generations: Identity, Covenant, and the 'Toledot' Formula*. OTS 551. London: T & T Clark.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1988. Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention Paid to the Samaritan Pentateuch. *DJD* 5: 334–354. (Reprinted in his *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran. Collected Essays*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008, 57–70).
- . 1998. The Rewritten Book of Joshua as Found at Qumran and Masada. Pages 233–256 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use of and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by M.E. Stone and E.G. Hanson. STDJ 28. Leiden: Brill (Reprinted in his *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran. Collected Essays*. TSAJ 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008, 71–91).
- Vilmar, Edward. 1865. *Abulfathi Annales Samaritani quos arabice edidit cum prolegomenis latine vertit et commentario illustravit*. Gotha: F.A. Perthes.
- Walton, Brian. 1657. *Polyglot Bible. vol. IV*. London: Thomas Roycroft.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. 2008. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. SSSRL. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Woudstra, Marten H. 1970. The Toledot of the Book of Genesis and Their Redemptive-Historical Significance. *Calvin Theological Journal* 5: 184–189.
- Zsengellér, József. 1998. Canon and the Samaritans. Pages 93–106 in *Canonization and Decanonization. Papers Presented to the International Conference of the LISOR held at Leiden 9–10 January 1997*. Edited by A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn. NBS 82. Leiden: Brill.

Index of Ancient Sources

Ancient Hebrew Texts

<i>Mesha stele</i>	168, 170, 175–177
2	171
3	169
5–31a	177
5	170
10	170
14	170
17–18	170
17	170
31b–33	169, 179
32	170
34	171
<i>Ketef Hinnom</i>	
<i>amulets</i>	185
<i>Papyrus Nash</i>	185

Old Testament

Gen 1–Exod 19	34
Gen 1:1–Exod 16:1	54
Genesis	34, 53, 60, 87, 90, 91, 92, 96, 97, 129, 187, 208, 238, 255, 257, 267, 271, 286, 288, 289, 295, 319, 321, 330, 336, 340, 348, 351
1–11	99, 195
1–5	54
1:2	323
1:3	324
1:14–19	333
1:14–18	328, 329
1:26–27	319, 326
1:26	328, 330, 332
2:7	319, 332, 334, 338
2:15–25	339
3:21	319
4:16–24	351
4:26	144
5	97, 351
5:24	351
6–15	97
6–11	53

6:3–8:18	57, 67
6:4	146
8:8	199
10:1–11:19	52
11:26–31	267
11:29	5
11:31	271
12–25	53
12:7	346
12:13	5
13:1–14:24	52
14:8	346
15	148, 149, 150
15:3–6	195
15:3	145
15:9–11	149
16:4–14	131
17:1	300
20:12	5
22–25	267
22:1–25:11	66, 67
22:1–19	52, 53, 66, 67, 267, 270
22:2	195
22:7–11	195
22:20–24	67, 267, 269, 272
23	290
23:1–20	67, 267, 270
24	267, 268, 279, 283–287, 289, 290
24 LXX	285, 286
24:1–67	67, 267, 268
24:1–27	279, 287
24:1–14	268
24:1–9	270, 280
24:1	268
24:2–9	268, 280, 281
24:2–4	268, 269
24:2	269, 270
24:3–4	271
24:3	269, 281
24:5–9	288
24:5–8	268
24:5	268
24:6–8	268
24:6	268
24:7	268, 269

24:8	269	24:34-49	268, 270, 279, 280, 287, 288
24:9	269, 270	24:34-48	287
24:10-14	272, 280	24:34-36	279
24:10-11	270	24:34	279, 290
24:10	288	24:35-36	279
24:10a	270, 286	24:36	280
24:10b	270, 271, 286	24:37-48	279
24:11-12	288	24:37-41	280
24:11	271	24:37	281
24:12-14	271, 273, 282	24:42-47	282
24:12	271, 274	24:42-44	282
24:13	271, 282	24:45-47	282, 289
24:14	271, 272	24:47	275
24:14a	271, 272	24:48	282
24:14b	271	24:49	279, 281, 282, 287
24:15-33	268, 272, 282, 286	24:50-67	268, 283
24:15-27	278	24:50-51	283, 286, 287, 288
24:15-21	272, 275	24:50	274, 280, 283, 284, 286, 287
24:15-16	272, 275	24:50b	283
24:15	272, 278	24:51	284
24:16	274, 290	24:52	283
24:17-18	272	24:53	283
24:19-20	272	24:54-60	288
24:21	272	24:54	284, 289
24:22-27	275, 276, 286	24:54a	283
24:22-25	273, 275, 277	24:54b-55	283
24:22-24	288	24:55	274
24:22-23	273, 275, 281	24:56	283
24:22	275, 278	24:57	283, 290
24:23	274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 288	24:58-60	283
24:24	274, 286, 287, 289	24:58	287
24:25	277, 280, 288	24:59	284
24:26-27	273, 275, 282	24:60	284
24:26	275	24:61	283, 284
24:27	275	24:62-67	284
24:28-33	267, 277, 278, 286	24:62-66	284
24:28-30	278	24:62-65	283
24:28-29	278	24:64-65	290
24:28	274, 277	24:67	283, 284, 285, 287, 290
24:29-33	274	24:67 LXX	286
24:29-31	287	25:1-6	67, 267, 268
24:30-32	278	25:5	280
24:31	278, 289	25:6	284, 286
24:32	272, 278, 284, 287, 288	25:7-11	67, 267, 268
24:33-49	279, 280, 283	25:19	286
24:33-36	282	25:30	268
24:33	272, 274, 278, 279, 287, 289	26-50	53

30:11	307	23:20-23	306
34	140, 141	24:17	226
34:2	145	25-31	88
34:30	141	29:12	193
35:22	52	29:21	193
39:12-41:43	195	32:22	244
39:17	195	34:6	166
39:17 LXX	196	34:14	302
41-49	67	34:27	244
41:8	146	35-40	88, 94, 95
44	147	Exod 34-Deut 23	97
44:12	147	Leviticus	211
49	141	1:1-2a	99
49:3	199	1:2b-7:37	99
49:5-7	141, 143	7:38	99
50:5	147	17:13	192
Exodus	33, 55, 60, 86, 88, 92, 94-98, 119, 127, 129, 208, 238, 240-242, 245, 297, 346	18:19	5
1-16	53	20:17	5
2	234, 237	23:27-29	193
2:5	137, 138, 142	26:1	191
2:14 LXX	244	Numbers	86, 93, 215, 240, 303, 304, 346
2:19 LXX	239	3-4	351
2:47	228	5:14	302
3:1-6	222, 225	5:30	302
3:1-6 LXX	223-226	6:24-26	185
3:1-2	224	6:25-26	185
3:2	226	6:25	185
3:2-4	226	6:26	185
3:4-6	226	11:28	244
3:6	226	11:29	302
3:8 LXX	240	12	187, 212
4:20	244	12:11	244
4:27-31	244	13-14	215
7:11	311	13	187, 212
12	188, 189	20:1-13	240
13	188, 189	21:16-18 LXX	242
15:20-21	290	25	306
20	185	25:1-10	303
20:1-13	243	25:1-2	303
20:2-17	185	25:4	308
20:5	302	25:10	303
20:11	185	25:8	304
20:11 LXX	187	25:11	301, 302, 306
20:15	226	25:12-13	303, 304, 305
20:19	226	25:12	305, 307, 313
		25:13	302, 304, 307

27	96	16:21-22	191
27:2-11	96	17	129
29:12	191	17:1	191
29:21	191	17:4	191
31:16	311	17:16	193
32	234, 237	18:5	193
32:25-27	244	18:21	191
36	96	20:17	193
		21:6	193
Deuteronomy	18, 25, 86, 100, 106, 119, 127, 169, 187, 210, 213, 215, 218	21:23	193
1-2	212	23:22	191
4:12	226	31-34	68
4:24	302	32	186, 187
4:45	185	33:4-5	243
5	185, 186, 187	33:5	244
5:6-21	185	33:5 LXX	244
5:9	302	33:16	224
5:14-15	185	Joshua	73, 88, 91, 92, 307, 348, 349
5:15	185	4	88
6	186	5:2-3	300
6:4-5	185	8	88
8	186, 187	9:2	88
10	186, 187	13:25	307
11	186, 187	18:28	308
11:30	351	22:13	307
12	191, 193	22:30	307
12:15-19	192	22:31	307
12:15	194	22:32	307
12:21	192	24:33	307
12:20-28	192, 193	Judges	73, 88, 92, 307, 354
12:20-28 LXX	195	2:1-5	306
12:20	194	2:1	305
12:21	194	5	290
12:22	193, 194	6:7-10	89
12:23	194	7:20	174
12:24	194	10:17-12:7	52
12:25	193, 195	11	173
12:26	194, 193	11:30-40	307
12:28	191, 193	20:28	302, 307
13:1	191	1-2 Samuel	54, 60, 86, 89, 93, 354
13:7-11	183	1 Samuel	
13:15	191	1	86
13:19	193	2:1-10	290
15:21	191	11:1	86
15:22	194	17-18	89
16:18ff	191		
16:19	193		
16:20	193		

2 Samuel		2 Chronicles	
23:[1-]7	189	17:1-21:3	172
24	86	17:1-19	172
		17:10	177
1-2 Kings	54, 60, 91, 92, 167	18:1-19:3	172
1 Kings	91	19:4-11	173
1 Kings LXX	91, 190	20	168, 172, 175-178
1:8	312	20:1-30	173
5:9-14	87	20:1-2	173
17:1	299, 307, 310	20:3	173
17:4	310	20:6-12	173
17:13	308	20:10-12	173
18:19	299	20:15-17	174
18:40	299	20:17	174
19	300, 310	20:21	174
19:8	300, 310	20:24	174
19:9	300	20:26	174
19:10	301, 302	20:29-30	174
19:14	302	20:31-21:3	173
21:21-22	299		
22	180	Isaiah	89, 98, 100, 106, 196, 208
22:48	171	1-33	99
2 Kings		5:14-24	196
1:1	170, 176, 177	36-39	99
1:10-12	299	40:7ab-8a	89
2:11-12	299	45:5-6:21	338
2:11	307, 310	46:9	338
3	168, 170, 172, 175, 176, 177, 178		
3:5	177	Jeremiah	86, 87, 89, 91, 162, 190, 205-215, 304
3:8	171	2:20	303
3:9-10	171	3:2-4	303
3:9	175	7:29	89
3:11	171	7:30-34	90
3:21-27	177	8:1-3	90
3:22-24	171	8:4	89
3:23	179	9:1	303
3:25	172	25:11-12	211
3:26	172	29:10	211
13:20	176, 177, 178	40-44	205, 215
19	303, 306	40	213
22	177	42	214
25	205, 213	43	214
		43:8-44:30	214
1-2 Chronicles	18, 21, 27, 54, 60, 86, 107, 119, 126, 127, 167	46	214
1 Chronicles		49	162
8:27	311	51:7	205
5:27-6:66	356	52	205, 213, 215

Ezekiel	89, 93, 159, 163, 207, 209, 211, 304	Micah	161, 162
1-39	99	1:2-7	161
1	205	1:5-6	161
12:26-28	90	3	161
16	303	4	163
23	303	5	163
32:25-26	90	6	161, 164
36	89	Jonah	164
36:23c-38	90	Zephaniah	161, 162
37	89, 205	2:4-3:8	161
37:1-17	205	Obadiah	93, 162
38	89	1:21	163
38:22	205	Habakkuk	159, 161
39	89	1-2	196
40-48	99	1:8	196
40	89	1:12	196
Hosea	160-162, 304	3	162
1	160	Nahum	161, 196, 210, 212, 215
4:12	304	1	162, 164
5:3-5	303	3:6	196
6:10	303	3:8-10	212
7:4	303	Haggai	162, 163
9:7	163	2:17	162
10	163	Zechariah	162, 163, 166
10:12	308	1:14	302
12:14	308	9	163
Amos	160-163, 211	10	163
1-2	161	14	163
4:9	162	Malachi	159, 163, 164, 302, 303, 307, 311, 312
7:8	160	1	163
8:2	160	2:5	305, 308, 309, 311, 317
9	162, 163	2:7	305
Joel	159, 161, 162, 303	3	306
1:10-12	162	3:1	299, 301, 305, 314
1:15	162	3:23-24	299, 314
2:2	162	3:23	306, 312
2:10	162	3:24-25	299, 303
2:15	162	3:24	301, 305, 306
2:18-27	174	4:5-6 LXX	299
2:23	162		
2:26-27	162		
3:4	162		
4	163		
4:1	162		
4:2	162		

Job	100, 110
Psalms	84, 87, 90, 93, 98, 184, 186, 187, 188, 190, 198, 208
1–89	188
22:2	38, 312
31	90
31:23–33: 12	190
31:24–33: 18	190
32	91, 188, 190
33	90
38	188
38:16–71: 14	190
71	188
90–150	188
104	188
105	188
106:30	304
118	188
119	187, 189
139:16	339
140	87
133	90
134	87, 90
145	189
146	188
146:9–10	189
147	190
Ruth	93
Proverbs	
1–9	99, 100
10–31	100
Lamentations	214
1:1	216
Daniel	59, 84, 90, 91, 110, 190
1–6	99, 100
4–6	90, 91, 93
7–12	99, 100
9:24	211
Daniel LXX	192
Ezra	110, 158, 161
7	107

Neh 1:9	90, 347
8	107
10:35	98
Esther	59, 92, 107
Esther LXX	190

Deuterocanonical Books

Additions to	
Daniel	93
Prayer of	
Azariah	23
Song of the	
three Young	
Men	23
Additions to Esther	23
A–F	92
Ben Sira	70, 75, 83, 99, 299, 305
Prologue 7–12	83
44–49	16
45:24	306
48:10	299, 306, 312
48	308
50:24–26	306
Baruch	23, 215
1:1–4	216
1:1–8	215
Epistle of Jeremiah	23, 214
4	216
1 Esdras	27, 60
1–4	23
1 Maccabees	49, 70, 71, 76, 99
1:14–13:42	71
1:48	300
2:26	308
2:54	308
2:59–60	99
10:18–12:23	70
10: 18–20	71
10: 25–45	71
11:30–37	71
12: 6–18	71
12:20–23	71

2 Maccabees	71, 72, 214	27:49	312
3-7	71	28	72
2:1-12	213, 216		
3:1-6:17	72	Mark	36-41, 44, 60, 72, 73, 76,
3:1-3	71		123
3:4-40	71	1:2-8	299
4:7-10	71	1:9-11	39
5:1-26	71	1:11	36
6:1-11	71	1:12	36
6:18-7:42	72	8:29-30	72
6:18-31	71	9-10	72
7:1-40	71	9:12-13	311
7:41	71	11-15	72
		14:32-42	38
Tobit	66	14:35f	41
		15:33	312
Psalm 151AB	87	15:34	38
		15:35	312
		16:14	316
New Testament			
Matthew	36-42, 44, 49, 60, 72-74, 76, 77, 311, 312	Luke	38-41, 44, 72, 73, 76, 238, 311
1-2	72	1-2	72
1:18	36	1:16-17	299
1:20-21	36	1:16-18	311
3:1-17	39	3:21f	39
3:4	312	7:24-27	312
3:9-11	37	9:8	312
3:14-15	37	9:51-18:14	72
3:17	36	22:42	41
4:1	36	24	72
5-7	72	John	37-42, 44, 312
10	72	1:1-3.14.18	39
11:1-6	299	1:14.18	40
11:7-15	299	1:21-25	40
13	72	1:21	312
16:14	312	1:29	40
16:16-19	73	1:32	40
17:10-13	312	1:33b-e	40
18	72	1:34	40
21-27	72	1:36	40
23:39b-c	38	3:14f	37, 41
24-25	72	8:28	41
26:36-46	38	12:27	41
26:39	41	12:27b	41
26:42	41	12:27c	41
26:44	41	12:28c	41
27:46	38, 312	12:32	41

17:4f	41		96–98, 100, 105, 109,
19:30b	41		115, 119, 120, 124, 129,
Acts	238		131, 140, 141, 143–150,
7	16, 66, 346		190, 191, 194, 195, 208,
			224, 256, 285, 290,
			295, 348
1 Corinthians		1:1	348
15	319, 334	1:26	348
15:45–47	322, 340	1:4	35
Hebrews 11	16	1:26–29	35
2 Timothy 3:8	311	2–4	53
		2:1	35
		2:24	33
		4:12	144, 145
		5–10	53
		5:1	146
		6:22	33, 348
		6:35–38	34
		8:10–10:35	52
		11–23	53
		11	153
		11:14–12:8	34
		11:19–21	150
		12:16–18	259
		14	149
		14:2	145
		14:12	149, 150
		14:21–24	131
		15:13	145
		16:28–30	35
		19:10	285
		23	210
		24–45	53
		27:14, 17	98
		28:6	35
		30:2	145
		30:4–6	141, 145
		30:8–10	35
		30:12	33
		30:17–18	141
		30: 21	33
		32:10–15	35
		33:1–20	52
		39:9–40:7	195
		39:10	195
		40:1	146
		43, 7	147
		45:15	147
		46–50	53
Old Testament Pseudepigrapha			
<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>	23, 55, 64, 65		
<i>Assumption of Moses</i>	23, 64, 65		
<i>Apocalypse of Moses</i>	23, 295		
2 <i>Baruch</i>	23, 65, 214–216		
10:1–5	213		
4 <i>Baruch</i>			
(<i>Paralipomena</i>			
<i>of Jeremiah</i>)	23, 64, 65, 213, 217, 218		
3	213		
4	213		
5	213		
7	213		
1 <i>Enoch</i>	21, 55, 60, 65, 66, 97, 98,		
	190, 191, 208, 215, 295,		
	348		
6–11	23		
12–16	23		
65–67	23		
83	23		
106–7	23		
4 <i>Ezra</i>	23, 65		
<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>	56, 67, 72		
<i>Jubilees</i>	4, 7, 18, 21, 22, 27,		
	32–35, 44, 49, 51–55,		
	57, 59–67, 73, 74, 76,		

47	348	<i>Isaiah Scroll</i>	89, 197, 203
48:1–2	224		
<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>	70, 71, 73, 76, 158, 234, 252	<i>Reworked Pentateuch</i>	54, 55, 57, 61, 62, 66, 67, 75, 96, 100, 105, 106, 109, 119, 128, 129, 184
<i>Life of Adam and Eve</i>	23, 55, 64, 65, 295	<i>Rule of the Community</i>	69, 203
<i>Lives of the Prophets</i>	21	<i>Temple Scroll</i>	3, 23, 24, 27, 53–55, 57, 60–65, 74, 96, 97, 98, 100, 105, 109, 115, 119, 120, 124, 130, 183, 184, 191
<i>4 Maccabees</i>	71, 72, 73, 74	<i>War Scroll</i>	69, 203
3.20–1	71	1Q3 (paleoLev)	108
4.1–14	71	1Q17–18 (Jub ^{a-b})	109
4.15–20	71	1Q19 and 19 ^b (Noah)	21
4.21–3	71	1Q20 (apGen)	203
4.24–6	71	2:3	97
5–17	71	5:3	97
5.1–6.30	71	6:6	97
8.1–14.10	71	6:11	97
14.11–17.1	71	6:14	97
<i>Martyrdom of Isaiah</i>	21	19:14	97
<i>Pseudo-Ezekiel</i>	204, 205–207, 209, 211	19:25	97
<i>Testament of Moses</i>	55, 68	20:33–22:26	52
<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	21, 308	1Q22 (DM)	49
<i>Test. Dan</i> 5:10	308	1Q28a (S ^a) 5:15	98
<i>Test. Jos.</i> 19:11	308	1Q35 (Hod)	53, 87, 203
<i>Test. Levi</i> 18:1	308	2Q3 (Exod ^b)	109
<i>Test. Reub.</i> 6:6	308	2Q19–20 (Jub ^{a-b})	109
<i>Test. Sim.</i> 7:1–3	308	2Q19 (Jub ^a)	111
		2Q20 (Jub ^b)	111
		3Q5 (Jub)	109, 111, 113
		4Q3 (Gen ^c)	108
		4Q4 (Gen ^d)	108, 187
		4Q5 (Gen ^e)	108
		4Q8b (Gen ^{h-para})	109
		4Q10 (Gen ^k)	109
		4Q11 (paleo Gen–Exod ^l)	110
		4Q15 (Exod ^d)	109
		4Q17 (Exod–Lev ^f)	109, 110, 112, 346
		4Q22 (paleoExod ^m)	86, 87, 90, 95, 109, 110, 111, 112, 346
		4Q25 (Lev ^c)	108
		4Q26 (Lev ^d)	108, 109, 112
Dead Sea Scrolls			
<i>Damascus Document</i>	53, 69, 119, 127		
2–3,	66		
4:13	98		
16:2–4	98		
<i>Habakuk pesher</i>	196, 197, 203		
<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	4–6, 21, 22, 32, 44, 49, 51, 52, 63, 64, 68, 73, 96, 97, 98, 100, 105, 119, 124, 128, 130, 190, 256, 295		

4Q26a (Lev ^e)	108	4Q177 (Catena A)	
4Q27 (Num ^b)	86, 90, 96, 102, 109, 111–114, 346	12–13 I 2.	187
4Q28 (Deut ^a)	112	4Q185	119
4Q31 (Deut ^d)	108	4Q203 (EnGiants)	23
4Q32 (Deut ^e)	108	4Q216 (Jub ^a)	111
4Q33 (Deut ^f)	108	4Q216–224	
4Q37 (Deut ^j)	187	(Jub ^a –pap ^h)	109
4Q38 (Deut ^{k1})	187	4Q217 (Jub ^b)	111
4Q41 (Deut ⁿ)	109, 185, 187	4Q219 (Jub ^d)	111–114
4Q44 (Deut ^q)	87, 91, 187	4Q221 (Jub ^f)	111–114
4Q45 (paleoDeut ^t)	108, 110	4Q222 (Jub ^g)	111–114
4Q47 (Josh ^a)	88	4Q223–224	
4Q49 (Judg ^a)	88	(papJub ^h)	113, 114
4Q51 (Sam ^a)	86, 98	2 v	195
4Q52 (Sam ^b)	87, 91	4Q225 (psJub ^a)	
4Q57 (papIsa ^c)	184	2 i 4–14	195
4Q69 (papIsa ^p)	184	2 ii	195
4Q70 (Jer ^a)	86, 89	2 v 3	195
4Q71 (Jer ^d)	86, 89, 91, 212	4Q228 (citJub) i i 9	98
4Q72 (Jer ^b)	86, 89, 91, 212	4Q242 (PrNab)	91
4Q72a (Jer ^c)	86, 89	4Q243–245	
4Q83 (Ps ^a)	90, 183, 188, 190, 198	(psDan ^{a-c})	91
4Q86 (Ps ^d)	188	4Q252 (pGen ^a)	197, 198
4Q87 (Ps ^e)	188	i 11:–2:5a	57, 67
4Q88 (Ps ^f)	188	i 14	197
4Q89 (Ps ^g)	187	iv 4	197
4Q90 (Ps ^h)	187	4Q253 (pGen ^b)	197
4Q98 (Ps ^q)	90, 91, 185, 188, 190	4Q253a (pMal)	197
4Q101 (paleoJob ^c)	110	4Q254 (pGen ^c)	197
4Q118 (Chr)	107	4Q254a (pGen ^d)	197
4Q123 (paleo Parajosh)	349	4Q256, 258 (Sb ^{b, d})	69
4Q134 (Phyl G)	185	4Q286 (Ber)	186
4Q149 (Mez A)	185	4Q364, 365 (RP ^{b-c})	95, 96, 98, 109, 111–114
4Q158, 364–367		4Q364–367 (RP ^{b-e})	57, 61, 67, 70
(RP ^{a-e})	55, 57, 62, 109	4Q364 (RP ^b)	95, 109, 111–114
4Q158 (RP ^a)	54, 57, 67, 109	frg. 3 ii	98
4Q160 (VisSam)	21, 49, 190	4Q365 (RP ^c)	95, 98, 109, 111–114, 133
4Q162 (pIsa ^b) 2	196	4Q366 (RP ^d)	109
4Q168 (pMic)	184	4Q367 (RP ^e)	109
4Q169 (pNah)	196	4Q369 (PrEnosh)	190
3 iii 2	196	4Q370 (FloodAp)	119
4Q174 (Flor) 1–3 ii 3	211	4Q374 (Discourse)	55
4Q175 (Test)	109	4Q378–379	
21–30	350	(apJosh ^{a-b})	49, 54, 57, 59, 60, 190, 349
4Q176 (Tanh)	197	4Q380–381	
4Q176a (Jub ⁱ)		(apPs ^{a-b})	55
frgs 19–20	109, 111	4Q383–391	205
		4Q383 (apJer A) I	206, 212

1:1	214	4Q534-536	
1, 2	206	(BNoah ^{a-c})	49
2, 2	206	4Q542 (TQahat)	21
4Q385-390		4Q543-548 (Amram)	21
(apJer C)	204-214, 216	4Q552-553a	
4Q385 (psEzek ^{a-e})	55, 190, 385b-c, 386,	(4Kgd ^{a-c})	91
	388, 391	5Q5 (Ps)	187
4Q385 ^a (apJer C ^a)	206	5Q9 (Top)	349
1	206	5Q11 (S)	69
3	206	6Q3 (Deut?)	109
4	206	8Q3 (Phyl)	185
16-17	206	11Q2 (Lev ^b)	111
17	212	11Q3 (Deut)	186
18	213, 214	11Q5 (Ps ^a)	23, 87, 90, 183, 187-190,
18-i-ii	206, 213		198
18 i 2, 6, 8;	206	2:1-5	189
18 ii 3, 4, 6	206	15-17	189
4Q386 (psEzek ^b)-i-iii	205	16	189
4Q387 (apJer C ^b)	206	19	189
1-4	206	22	189
2	208	26	189
2 i-ii	208	27:11	87
2-ii-4	211	27	189, 190
4 i	205	11Q6 (Ps ^b)	188
4Q388 ^a (apJerC ^c)	206	11Q12 (Jub)	109, 111, 113, 114
1	206	11Q13 (Melch)	
3	206	2:18	211
7 ii	205	11Q19 (Temple ^a)	
4Q389 (apJerC ^d)	206	16:3	191
1	206, 210, 212, 214, 215,	16:16	191
	217	25:10-12	193
1, 5	206	45:14	97
2	206, 212	50:7	191
4	206	50:17	191
6-7	206	51:11	191
8-ii	205	51:12	193
4Q390 (apJerC ^e)	206-208, 211	52:1-3	191
4Q400-407		52:3-4	191
(ShirShab ^{a-h})	186	52:4	194
4Q462 (Narr ^c)	119	52:9	191
4Q463 (Narr ^d)	119	53:1-3	191
4Q504 (DivHam)	119, 186	53:2-8	192, 193
4Q507-509		53:2	193
(prFêtes ⁱ⁻ⁱⁱⁱ)	186	53:3-4	192
4Q512 (papRitPur)	186	53:4-5	193, 195
4Q522 (prophJosh)	349	53:4	194
4Q524 (RoulTemp)	109, 111, 113, 114	53:7	193

53:9–10	193
53:11	191
53:12	191
54:5–7	191
54:5–6	191
55:6	191
55:11–	193
55:14	193
55:19	191
56–59	132
56:16	193
56:20–21	191
61:3	191
63:5	193
11Q20 (Temple ^b)	109, 111, 113, 183
XI 21–24	183

MasParaJosh	349
-------------	-----

Gnostic Writings

<i>The Apocryphon of John</i>	320, 330, 332
<i>The Apocalypse of Adam</i>	320
<i>The Hypostasis of Archons</i>	320, 328, 330, 332
87.8–11	328
<i>The Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>	320
<i>On the Origin of the World</i> (NHC II, 5)	319, 320
103.13–14	339
103.18–23	323
103.18–19	339
105.26–30	329
106.3–11	329
107.35–108.3	324
107.17–25	323
108.2	323
108.8–9	333
108, 19–24	333

109.25–111.28	326
110.31–111.1	338
111.29–112.24	328
111.29–34	327
112.1–9	327
112.10–24	327
112, 25–115, 11	326
112.33–113.5	330
112, 33–113, 1	330
113.10–14	335
113.12–13	329
113.14–16	331
113.17–20	331
113.21–114.4	325
114.15–20	329
114.27–29	331
114.29–32	332
114, 35–115, 3	332
115, 1	333
115.2–3	333
115, 10–11	333
115.11–15	324
115.30–116.8	334
115.35	334
115, 36–116, 8	335
117.28–118.2	322
122.6–9	322
160.1–10	333

Greek and Latin Writings

(a) Classical

Cassius Dio	
<i>Roman Histories</i>	261
Homeric Songs	16, 30
Homer	
<i>Odyssey</i>	279
Pliny the Elder	
<i>Natural History</i>	250
Vergil	
<i>Aeneid</i>	30

(b) Jewish

Ezekiel the Tragedian	23, 224
<i>Exagoge</i> fr. 6	244
fr. 7	244

Josephus Flavius			
<i>Antiquitates</i>	4, 6, 8, 21, 23, 24, 32, 44, 51, 52, 105, 224, 238, 249–254, 256–263, 264, 299	1.242–255 1.242–245 1.242b–243 1.242 1.242a 1.242b 1.243 1.244 1.244a 1.244b 1.244c 1.245 1.246–253a 1.246–252a 1.246 1.247–251 1.247–249 1.247 1.247b–251 1.247b 1.248 1.249 1.249a 1.249b 1.250 1.250a 1.250b 1.251 1.252b–255a 1.252 1.252a 1.252b 1.253 1.253a 1.253b 1.254 1.254a 1.255 1.255a 1.255b 1.256 2.264–268 2.264–265 2.267 2.268 2.348	67, 267, 268, 286, 290 268 269 268, 271, 274, 280, 289 269, 286 269 269 271, 276, 282, 285, 289 270, 282, 286 270 271, 272 271, 282 282 268, 272, 286 276, 277, 292 273 279 273, 276 286 289 272, 274, 275, 277, 278, 280, 283, 286, 288, 289 282 275 275, 288, 289 273, 276, 277, 278 289 288 273, 277, 278, 288, 289 268, 278, 279, 282, 287 279 272, 278–280, 282, 286–289 279, 284, 287, 289 284 280, 283, 284 281, 283 281, 282 282, 283, 287 242, 286 282, 287 268, 283, 289 67, 268 231 231 231 231 231 258
1–11	22, 49, 52, 54, 57, 59, 62–66, 68–71, 73, 74, 76, 249		
1	267		
1.1–11.296	32, 285		
1.1–9	262		
1.1–3	256		
1.4	256		
1.5–6	254		
1.5	253, 254, 260, 262, 264		
1.7–9	253		
1.8–9	253		
1.9	253, 256		
1.10–17	262		
1.10–12	256		
1.10–11	252		
1.12	261		
1.14–17	258		
1.17	255		
1.18–26	262		
1.18–25	262		
1.18	263		
1.25	256		
1.93–95	257		
1.107–108	257		
1.118–119	258		
1.151–152	267		
1.151	5		
1.152	271		
1.153	67, 267, 269		
1.158–160	258		
1.198	254		
1.222–256	66, 67		
1.222–237	53, 66		
1.222–236	67, 268		
1.222–223	52		
1.225	258		
1.228–231	258, 261		
1.237	67, 268, 290		
1.238–241	67, 268		
1.239–242	241		
1.239–241	258		
1.239	284		

3.84	263	<i>Vita</i>	251
3.101–102	131	361	254, 259
3.224–286	254	362	254, 259
4.109	258	363	250, 260
4.196	255	364	260
4.197	254	422–423	259
4.199–301	254	425	252
5	73	428	259
9.28	258	429	259
9.29	307	430	251, 252
10.245–246	213		
10.267–269	213	Philo	
10.249	213	<i>De Abrahamo</i>	245
12	73	69–71	259
12–22	71	<i>De Allegoriis Legum</i>	23
12–13	70, 73, 74, 76	<i>De Decalogo</i>	
12.1–118	70	32–49	226
12.226–13.170	70	<i>De Josepho</i>	245
12.226–227	71	<i>De Legatione ad</i>	
12.241–13.214	70	<i>Gaium</i>	242
13.45	71	48	243
13.48–57	71	281–282	240
13.126–128	71	<i>De Migratione Abrahami</i>	
13.166–170	71	47–49	226
16.291	277	<i>De Posteritate Caini</i>	
20.263	253	39–45	273
20.268	254	132–153	273
		<i>De Specialibus Legibus</i>	
<i>Bellum Judaicum</i>	249, 250, 252–254, 256, 259–261	3.1–6	243
1.1–3	256	3.159–162	242
1.1	250	<i>De Vita Mosis</i>	23, 222, 229, 231, 233–243, 245, 248
1.17	252	1.1	235
1.274	277	1.2	238, 243
		1.3	238
<i>Contra Apionem</i>	251, 252, 256, 261	1.4	222, 235, 238
1.1–3	250, 256	1.9	244
1.2	254	1.32	244
1.3	250	1.35–37	242
1.4	254	1.35	243
1.38–41	8	1.58–59	239
1.51	254, 259	1.65	229, 230, 232
1.53–55	257	1.65–66	224, 227, 230
1.218	253	1.66	225, 229, 230
2.10–11	239	1.67	226, 227, 234
2.29	239	1.68–70	228
2.164–165	262	1.68	230
2.185–186	262	1.69	228, 230
2.190–217	254	1.70	231

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| 1.71 | 240, 241 | | |
| 1.148–162 | 241 | | |
| 1.148 | 244 | | |
| 1.149 | 244 | | |
| 1.150 | 244 | | |
| 1.151 | 244 | | |
| 1.163 | 240, 241 | | |
| 1.170 | 240 | | |
| 1.189 | 234 | | |
| 1.195 | 240 | | |
| 1.210–213 | 240 | | |
| 1.217 | 234 | | |
| 1.220 | 240 | | |
| 1.239–242 | 241 | | |
| 1.255 | 240, 244 | | |
| 1.264–265 | 231 | | |
| 1–267 | 231 | | |
| 1.278 | 241 | | |
| 1.288 | 241 | | |
| 2.8–65 | 234 | | |
| 2.66–186 | 234 | | |
| 2.96 | 234 | | |
| 2.99 | 234 | | |
| 2.109–140 | 234 | | |
| 2.180–183 | 234 | | |
| 2.187–291 | 234 | | |
| 2.213 | 226 | | |
| 2.232 | 243 | | |
| 2.288 | 241 | | |
| 2.292 | 235 | | |
| <i>In Flaccum</i> | 242, 243 | | |
| 29–30 | 243 | | |
| 29 | 243 | | |
| 38 | 243 | | |
| 45 | 243 | | |
| 48 | 242 | | |
| 54 | 243 | | |
| <i>Mutatione Nominum</i> | | | |
| 117–120 | 239 | | |
| <i>Questiones . . . in Genesim</i> | | | |
| 3.1 | 259 | | |
| 4.86 | 270 | | |
| <i>Questiones . . . in Exodum</i> | | | |
| 2.47 | 228 | | |
| Philo the Epic Poet | 23 | | |
| Pseudo-Philo | | | |
| <i>Liber Antiquitatum</i> | | | |
| <i>Biblicarum</i> | 4, 7, 8, 21, 22, 24, 32, 33, | | |
| | 44, 49, 51, 52, 57, 63, 64, | | |
| | 72, 73, 105, 195, 224, 285, | | |
| | 295, 298, 302, 309, 310, | | |
| | 311, 315, 348 | | |
| 8.4 | 285 | | |
| 10.1 | 224 | | |
| 28.2 | 311 | | |
| 39.1–40.9 | 52 | | |
| 47.41 | 311 | | |
| 48 | 310 | | |
| 48.1 | 308 | | |
| 50.3 | 310 | | |
| 52.2 | 310 | | |
| Theodotus the | | | |
| Epic Poet | 23 | | |
| (c) <i>Christian</i> | | | |
| Cyprian | | | |
| <i>De duo montibus</i> | | | |
| 3 | 334 | | |
| 7 | 334 | | |
| Eusebius | | | |
| <i>Ecclesiastical History</i> | | | |
| 1.7.14 | 354 | | |
| 3.9.2 | 260 | | |
| <i>Chronicon</i> | 352 | | |
| <i>Preparatio Evangelica</i> | 345 | | |
| 9.17.1–9 | 345 | | |
| Gregory of Nazianzus | | | |
| <i>Orationes</i> 11.2 | 244 | | |
| Gregory of Nyssa | | | |
| <i>Vita Mosis</i> | 234 | | |
| Irenaeus | | | |
| <i>Adversus Haeresis</i> | | | |
| I, 30 | 330 | | |
| III, 17, 1.4 | 329 | | |

- Jerome
De viris illustribus 13 260
- Origen
On John 6:7 303
De Oratione 24 324
- Photius
Bibliotheca 230.285 349
- Pseudo-Jerome
On 1 Samuel 2:27 303
- Theophil of Antioch
Ad Autolyicum II, 15, 4 329
- Rabbinic Judaism**
- Palestinian Targums 3, 5, 6, 22, 26, 29, 49, 54, 68, 295
- Targum Pseudo-Jonathan 3, 138, 302
 Gen 20:12 5
 Gen 24:33, 55 274
 Exod 4:13 303
 Exod 6:18 303, 308
 Exod 40:10 303
 Num 22:22 311
 Num 25:12 305
 Deut 30:4 303
 Deut 33:11 309
- Targum Onkelos 6, 138
- Mishna
Megillah 4:9–10 255
Eduyot 8:7 309
- Tosefta
Megillah 3:31–41 255
- Babylonian Talmud
Eruvin 43b 299
Pesahim 13a 299
Mo'ed Qatan
 18b 283
 26a 214, 307
Nedarim 50a 298
- Sotah*
 11a 311
 12b 138
Baba Qama 92b 279
Baba Metzia 114b 308
Baba Batra
 14b 110
 15a 110, 214
 121b 305, 307
- Sanhedrin*
 44a–b 311
 95a 270
 106a 311
Zevahim 101b 307
Menahot 95a 311
Avot of Rabbi Natan B
 13 298
 47 302
Derekh Eretz
 11:8 307
- Palestinian Talmud
Shekalim 6,
 49:4 309
Sotah 8, 22:3 309
Horayot 3, 47:3 309
- Midrashim
Mekhilta of Rabbi Shim'on bar Yohai
Bo 1 302, 313
Shir (3) 8 227
Vay 6 310
Sifre Num 131 305
Sifre Deut 56, 1 347
Genesis Rabba
 59.11 269, 270
 60:3 271, 307
 60.12 277
 71:9 307
 71.11 307, 308
Exodus Rabba 2:1 229
Leviticus Rabba
 1:1 305
 37:2 307
Numbers Rabba
 16:1 305
 21:3 305

- Lamentations*
- Rabba* 214
- Song of songs*
- Rabba*
- 1:29 302
- Pesiqta of Rav Kahana*
- 17:1 302
- Tanhuma*
- Ki Tissa* 19 300
- Shelah* 1 305
- Pinhas* 1 305
- Pesiqta Rabbati*
- 26 213, 216
- 4:2 308
- Seder Olam*
- Rabba* 1b 305
- Midrash Psalms*
- Pirqe of Rabbi*
- Eliezer* 295, 301, 302, 319
- 1 298
- 3-9 297
- 16.3 269, 270, 271
- 22 304
- 27 308
- 29 299, 300, 301, 304, 306,
311, 313, 314
- 29.4 300
- 29.5 300
- 29.6 301
- 29.7 301
- 40 308
- 43 299, 306, 308, 312
- 47 299, 303, 304, 311, 313
- 47.4 304
- 47.5 304
- 54 297
- Yalkut on*
- Proverbs* 308
- Midrash Proverbs*
- 9:3 308
- Seder Eliyahu*
- Rabba* 303, 308
- 18 307, 308
- Seder Eliyahu Zuta*
- 8 302
- 15 307
- Other works
- Zohar*
- Gen 95a 300
- Exod 192a 300
- Sefer ha-Yashar* 4, 5, 20, 22, 26, 49
- Menorath*
- ha-Ma'or* 80 300
- Shulhan Arukh*
- Yoreh De'ah* 265, 300, 301
- Sha'arei Zedek*
- V. 10 300
- Samaritan Writings**
- Asatir* 347-349, 353, 354
- 4:19-22 348
- 8:21-9:14 348
- Arabic Book of Joshua* 350
- pre-Samaritan*
- Pentateuch* 55, 61, 62, 64, 66, 75,
148, 346
- Samaritan Book*
- of Joshua* 349
- Samaritan*
- Pentateuch* 84-88, 90-91, 95, 96,
100, 106, 110, 115, 140,
141, 142, 144-147, 194,
195, 197, 223, 300,
345-347, 349, 351,
354
- Genesis*
- 1-11 195
- 4:26 144
- 4:26b 144
- 6:4 146
- 15:3 145
- 34:2 145
- 39:17 195
- 41:8 146
- 44:12 147

49:5-7	142, 143	27:2-7	347
50:5	147	27:4	91, 347
Exodus		<i>Shalshalah</i>	351-354
20:17[17a]	90	<i>Sepher Hayamim</i>	350, 354
20:17b	347	<i>Ta'rikh of Abu'l Fath</i>	350, 353, 354
Deuteronomy		4, 5-5, 11	353
5:18a	347	6, 14-7, 10	353
5:21[18]	90	<i>Tulidah</i>	353, 354
11:30	347		
12:20-28	195		
12:22	195		

Index of Modern Authors

- Ackroyd, P.R. 168, 174, 178
Adelman, R. 296, 300, 303, 304, 306, 309, 315
Adler, E.N. 303, 315, 353, 355
Aejmelaeus, A. 86, 88
Ahlström, G.W. 169, 178
Albeck, H. 307, 308, 315
Alexander, Ph. 4, 9, 14, 16, 22, 23, 31, 44, 49, 52–59, 64–67, 73, 75, 77, 119, 133, 134, 221, 231, 233, 237, 246, 296, 297, 315
Allen, L.C. 174, 175, 178
Allison, D.C. 123, 124, 133
Aptowitz, V. 308, 315
Assman, J. 125, 127–131, 133
Atkins, P. 121, 125, 131, 133
Attridge, H. 23, 117, 209, 216, 263, 264, 282, 291
Auld, G. 60, 77
Avermarie, F. 13
Avigad, N. 6, 9
Ayeli, M. 308, 309, 311, 315

Bacchiocchi, S. 334, 341
Ballagi, M. 169
Baly, D. 177, 178
Barc, B. 323, 341
Barr, J. 139, 150
Barrett, C.K. 39, 44
Barthélemy, D. 89, 101
Barton, J. 49, 56, 57, 59, 77
Barton, S.C. 125, 133, 136
Baumgarten, A.I. 123, 125, 133
Begg, C.T. 66, 271, 274, 280, 291
Ben-Hayyim, Z. 142, 144, 150, 349, 355
Bernstein, M. 4, 9, 21, 26, 29, 45, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54–59, 65–67, 69, 70, 75, 76, 78, 119, 133, 197, 198, 203, 209, 216, 295, 296, 315
Bethge, H-G. 319–322, 324, 333, 337, 341
Bienkowski, P. 170, 178, 179
Birnbaum, E. 242, 246
Bloch, R. 5, 9, 229, 231
Blenkinsopp, J. 238, 246
Bockmuehl, M. 121, 133, 343

Bogaert, P.M. 7, 9, 86, 87, 101, 103
Bonnard, C. 349
Borgen, P. 23, 45, 233, 243, 246
Bowman, A.K. 239, 246
Bowman, J. 346, 352, 354, 355
Böhlig, A. 319, 321, 322, 325, 329, 337, 341
Börner-Klein, D. 300, 304, 315
Brady, M. 204, 205, 207, 210, 211, 216
Brenner, A. 126, 133
Britt, B. 235, 246
Brooke, G.J. 13, 14, 18, 24, 25, 32, 33, 45, 51, 55–62, 64, 77, 78, 96, 101, 106, 116, 120, 127, 134, 190, 196–198, 201, 203, 204, 209–211, 216, 217, 232, 237, 246, 295, 315
Broshi, M. 209, 216
Brown, R.E. 36, 45
Brownlee, W.J. 196, 198, 199
Burrige, R.A. 234–236, 246
Büchler, A. 303, 316
Byrskog, S. 123, 135

Campbell, J.G. 15, 16, 25, 45, 50, 53, 57, 59, 66, 78, 203, 217
Carr, D.M. 73, 78, 351, 355
Cary, E. 261, 264
Cazeaux, J. 7, 9
Chalcraft, D.J. 125, 134
Chalmers, A. 14, 45
Charlesworth, J.H. 21–23, 34, 45, 80, 88, 91, 101, 127, 134, 224, 232, 310, 311, 316
Chazon, E.G. 45, 136, 185, 188, 199
Clarke, E.G. 305, 316
Cleassen, H.J.M. 168, 178
Coggins, R.J. 173, 174, 178
Cohen, J.M. 354, 355
Cohen, S.J.D. 250, 255, 264
Cohn, L. 238, 246, 310, 316
Collin, M. 197, 199
Collins, J.J. 9, 48, 60, 78, 80, 81, 104, 117, 125, 135, 136, 191, 199, 202, 302, 316
Collins, N.L. 158, 164
Colson, F.H. 238, 246
Conzelman, H. 319, 341

- Coogan, M. D. 72, 78
 Coote, R.B. 123, 136
 Cotton, H.M. 254, 259–261, 264
 Courtés, J. 36, 46
 Cox Miller, P. 235, 246
 Crown, A.D. 350, 354, 355, 356
- Dahl, N. 323, 338, 341
 Dahmen, U. 189, 199
 Dalley, S. 157, 164
 Damgaard, F. 246
 Dan, J. 295, 316
 Danielou, J. 334, 341
 Davidsen, O. 37, 45
 Davies, Ph. 125, 127, 128, 134
 Davis, C.J.P. 208, 211, 214, 217
 Davis, M.T. 125, 134
 Dawson, D. 242, 246
 Dearman, J.A. 169, 170, 178
 Delamarter, S. 108, 116, 224, 232
 De Pury, A. 158, 160, 165
 DeSilva, D. 71, 72, 79
 Dietzfelbinger, Ch. 7, 9
 Diez Macho, A. 6, 7, 9
 Dihle, A. 234, 246
 Dimant, D. 24, 45, 54, 78, 79, 204–215,
 217–219
 Docherty, S. 51, 53, 56, 65, 67, 68, 72, 79
 Downing, F.G. 70, 73, 79
 Duhaime, J. 69, 79
 Duncan, J. 187, 199
 Dunn, J.D.G. 124, 134
 Dunning, B.H. 325, 341
- Eck, W. 254, 259–261, 264, Eco, U. 19,
 45, 46
 Edwards, M.J. 234, 235, 246, 248, 251, 264
 Elam, Y. 126, 134
 Elbaum, J. 295, 297, 316
 Eliade, M. 313, 314
 Elliger, K. 197, 199
 Emerton, J.A. 176, 179
 Endres, J.C. 290, 291
 Epstein, J.N. 227
 Erler, M. 234, 247
 Erll, A. 121, 134
 Eshel, E. 185, 199
 Eshel, H. 127, 134, 211, 217
 Eyerman, R. 125, 126, 134
- Fabry, H.-J. 188, 199
 Faierstein, M.M. 298, 306, 308, 312, 316
 Falk, D.K. 78, 96, 102, 188, 190, 199, 210, 217,
 237, 247
 Fallon, F.T. 329, 341
 Feist, U. 159, 164
 Feldman, H.L. 7, 70, 79, 253, 255–259, 263,
 264, 266, 267, 272, 275, 279, 285, 288–291,
 302, 316
 Finkelstein, A.E. 347, 355
 Fisch, H. 298, 316
 Fishbane, M. 106, 116
 Fisk, B.N. 233, 237, 247
 Fitzmyer, J. 130, 134, 217
 Flint, P.W. 25, 46, 50, 81, 89, 104, 187, 188,
 199, 216, 217
 Florentin, M. 349, 350, 352, 355
 Fossum, J. 337, 341
 Foster, H.B. 261, 264
 Fraade, S.D. 221, 226, 232, 296, 316
 Francis, F.O. 70, 79
 Franxman, T.W. 256–258, 264, 267, 288,
 291
 Frei, P. 158, 165
 Frickensmith, D. 234, 235, 247
 Friedman, M. 306
 Friedlander, G. 300, 304, 316
 Frymer-Kensky, T. 304, 316
- García Martínez, F. 24, 46, 47, 80, 104, 135,
 184, 199, 207, 210, 217, 218
 Gaster, M. 347–350, 352, 354, 355
 Gedi, N. 126, 134
 Geljon, A.C. 236, 247
 Gelston, T. 49
 Genette, G. 18, 25, 46
 Gesenius, W. 346, 355
 Ginsberg, H.L. 25, 209, 217
 Ginsburger, M. 138, 151
 Ginzberg, L. 227, 232, 303, 308, 309, 316
 Goodenough, E.R. 238, 247
 Gooding, D.W. 89, 91, 101, 102
 Goodman, M. 21, 22, 48, 78, 81, 261, 264,
 265, 295, 317
 Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. 188, 199
 Gottwald, N. 94, 102
 Goudriaan, K. 239, 247
 Grabbe, L.L. 348, 255
 Greifenhagen, F.V. 240, 247

- Greimas, A.J. 36, 46
 Grossman, M.L. 116, 125, 134
 Gruen, E.S. 242, 245, 247
- Hägg, T. 235, 247
 Halbwachs, M. 124–126, 131, 134
 Hanneken, T.R. 208, 217
 Haran, M. 188, 199
 Harrington, D.J. 7, 9, 22–24, 46, 49, 54, 55,
 57, 64, 65, 75, 77, 79, 195, 200, 233, 247, 310
 Harris, W.V. 260, 264
 Hayward, R. 303, 305, 308–310, 316
 Heinemann, J. 295, 297, 298, 316
 Hempel, Ch. 69, 79
 Hendel, R.S. 88, 102, 195, 200
 Henze, M. 47, 80, 201, 203, 204, 209–211,
 216, 217, 232, 317
 Herr, M.D. 300, 316
 Hess, R.S. 88, 102
 Hieke, T. 351, 355
 Higger, M. 301, 304
 Hill, A.E. 299, 316
 Hjelm, I. 350, 356
 Hodossy-Takács, E. 169, 179
 Holladay, C.R. 346, 356
 Horbury, W. 244, 247
 Horsley, R. 319, 342
 Horovitz, C.M. 302, 313
 Horovitz, H.S. 347, 355
 Hort, F.J.A. 183, 202
 Hughes, J.A. 53, 79
 Hultgren, S. 319, 342
 Hultinen, Ch. 108, 116
- Ish Shalom, M. 303, 307, 308, 317
- Jackson, K.P. 169
 Jackson, H.M. 342
 James, M.R. 310, 317
 Jassen, A.P. 204, 210, 212, 217
 Jastrom, N. 96, 102
 Jeremias, J. 160, 164
 Jervell, J. 319, 342
 Jokiranta, J. 103, 125, 134, 356
 Jones, B.C. 177, 179
 Jones, S. 248
 Jonquière, T.M. 282, 291
 Joosten, J. 91, 102
 Juynboll, T.G.J. 350, 356
- Kahle, P. 6, 7, 9, 197, 200
 Kasher, A. 242, 317
 Katriel, T. 126, 135
 Kelber, W.H. 123, 135
 Kermode, F. 297, 317
 King, K.L. 323, 342, 343
 Kisch, G. 7, 9
 Klausner, J. 306, 309, 317
 Kleer, M. 189, 200
 Klein, R.W. 88, 102
 Knauf, E.A. 173, 179
 Knierim, R.P. 238, 247
 Knoppers, G. 91
 Koch, K. 158, 165
 Kraft, R.A. 24, 25, 46, 79, 218, 247
 Kratz, R.G. 78, 126, 135
- Laato, A. 120, 135
 Labib, P. 319, 322, 329, 341
 Lake, K. 260, 264
 Lange, A. 16, 25, 26, 45, 46, 103, 116, 134,
 188, 189, 197, 200, 209, 217, 218
 Laqueur, R. 249, 264
 Layton, B. 320, 333, 341, 342
 Le Donne, A. 123, 135
 Leiman, S.Z. 107, 116
 Leisegang, H. 238, 246
 Leo, F. 234, 247
 Levinson, B.M. 60, 79
 Lévi-Strauss, C. 126
 Lierman, J. 244, 247
 Lim, T.H. 9, 48, 81, 104, 125, 135, 136, 196,
 197, 199, 200, 202, 211, 214, 218
 Logan, A.H.B. 323, 342
 Lust, J. 89, 90, 101, 102
- MacDonald, B. 171, 177, 179
 Macdonald, J. 350, 354, 356
 Machiela, D.A. 97, 102, 348, 356
 Mack, H. 307, 311, 317
 Magen, Y. 345, 356
 Magness, J. 110, 116
 Mansfeld, J. 236, 247
 Marcus, R. 266, 270, 277, 291
 Margoulies, M. 298, 308, 317
 Martyn, J.L. 312, 317
 Mason, S. 63, 71, 79, 250–253, 261,
 263–265, 281, 291
 Mattingly, G.L. 170, 177, 179

- McDonald, L.M. 79, 80, 81, 104, 107, 116
 McGing, B. 233, 234, 248
 Meeks, W.A. 243, 248
 Melammed, E.Z. 227
 Mendels, D. 125, 135
 Merrill, E.H. 167, 179
 Metso, S. 69, 79, 116
 Metzger, B. 85, 102
 Milik, J.T. 206, 207, 218
 Millar, F. 21, 22, 48, 81, 265, 295, 317
 Millas Vallicrosa, J.M. 6
 Miller, J.M. 170, 177, 179
 Minns, D. 254, 265
 Misgav, H. 345, 356
 Mitchell, D.C. 350, 356
 Mittmann-Richert, U. 209, 218
 Molin, G. 196, 200
 Momigliano, A. 234, 236, 248
 Monroe, L.A.S. 170, 179
 Montgomery, J.A. 91, 102, 354
 Moore, C.A. 92, 102
- Naber, S.A. 277, 291
 Nagel, P. 337, 339, 342
 Najman, H. 14, 32, 34, 35, 46, 78, 116, 120, 122, 135, 207, 208, 218, 232, 295, 317
 Neubauer, A. 352, 356
 Newsom, C.A. 26, 46
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 22, 23, 46, 47, 52, 71, 79, 97, 102, 247
 Niehoff, M.R. 224, 229, 232, 239, 242, 248, 258, 265
 Niese, B. 277, 285, 291
 Nitzan, B. 188, 200
 Nodet, E. 256, 265, 267, 277, 291
 Nogalski, J.D. 161, 162, 165
 Noort, E. 350, 351, 356
 Nora, P. 125
 Noth, M. 94, 102
 Noy, D. 299, 317
 Nünning, A. 121, 134
- Olick, J.C. 121, 123, 124, 128, 135
 Oulton, J.E.L. 260, 264
- Painchaud, L. 319–322, 324, 326, 329, 330, 333–338, 340, 342
 Parry, D.W. 186, 200, 209, 218
 Parvis, P.M. 254, 265
- Paton, L.B. 92, 103
 Pearce, S. 239, 240, 248
 Pearson, B. 319, 320, 337–339, 343
 Pelletier, A. 70, 79
 Perkins, S. 320
 Perloff, M. 56, 79
 Perrot, Ch. 7, 9
 Pétrement, S. 325, 334, 343
 Petersen, A.K. 13, 15, 20, 25, 28–30, 36, 39, 47, 49, 52, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 73, 77, 79, 96, 103, 120, 135, 203, 218, 251, 265
 Pillinger, R.J. 16, 45, 46, 134
 Polak, F.H. 126, 133
 Powery, E.B. 72, 80
 Priest, J.F. 68, 80
 Prießnig, A. 235, 248
 Pummer, R. 349, 356
- Rabin, I. 112
 Rackham, H. 250, 265
 Rajak, T. 250, 252, 256, 265
 Rasimus, T. 320, 330, 332, 333, 343
 Rathbone, D. 239, 246
 Reed, A.Y. 259, 261
 Regev, E. 125, 135
 Reiter, S. 238, 246
 Rendtorff, R. 158, 165
 Reventlow, H.G. 163, 165
 Reynolds, B.H. 211, 218
 Richardson, E.C. 260
 Robbins, J. 121, 123, 124, 128, 135
 Rogerson, J.W. 119, 126, 135
 Routledge, B.E. 170, 179
 Römer, T. 134, 160, 165
 Rubin, N. 301, 306, 317
- Said, E. 18
 Sanders, J.A. 79–81, 104, 188, 200
 Schaff, P. 260, 265
 Schart, A. 161, 162, 165
 Schechter, S. 302
 Schenke, H-M. 319, 343
 Schenker, A. 90, 102, 347, 356
 Schiffman, L.H. 45, 46, 78, 103, 194, 199, 200, 216, 218, 219, 246, 315
 Schmid, K. 126, 135
 Schorch, S. 85, 139, 140, 142, 145, 151, 347, 350, 356
 Schorn, S. 234, 247

- Schürer, E. 261, 265
 Segal, A. 323, 343
 Segal, M. 21, 26, 27, 47, 55, 61, 67, 70, 80, 96, 103, 190, 201, 295, 296, 306, 317
 Segal, Moshe 306, 317
 Segert, S. 197, 201
 Seligsohn, M. 353, 355
 Sellin, G. 319, 344
 Shaper, J. 335, 343
 Shinan, A. 309
 Sinclair, L.A. 197, 201
 Skalník, P. 168, 178
 Skehan, P.W. 188, 201
 Smelik, K.A.D. 169, 170, 177, 179
 Smith, J.Z. 43
 Smith, M.E. 168, 179
 Smith, M.S. 126, 130, 136
 Sonnabend, H. 234, 248
 Sontag, S. 125, 138
 Speiser, E.A. 270, 292
 Spence, K.E. 168, 179
 Spicq, C. 273, 276, 277, 292
 Spilsbury, P. 252, 254, 255, 265
 Spiro, A. 310, 317
 Stähli, H-P. 138, 151
 Stachowiak, L.R. 273, 292
 Steck, O.H. 164
 Stein, D. 295, 298, 317
 Steiner, M.L. 168, 179
 Stemberger, G. 297, 317
 Stenhouse, P. 353, 356
 Sterling, G.E. 222, 231, 232, 251, 252, 255, 257, 259, 265
 Sternberg, M. 267, 279, 292
 Stone, M.E. 45, 47, 52, 79, 343, 357
 Strack, H.L. 297, 317
 Strawn, B.A. 125, 134
 Strugnell, J. 206, 207, 218
 Stuart, D.R. 234, 243, 248
 Stuckenbruck, L.T. 122, 125, 127, 133, 136, 232
 Swain, S. 234, 246, 248
 Swanson, D.D. 24, 47, 49, 53, 54, 80, 130, 136
 Syrén, R. 309, 317
 Tal, A. 346, 356
 Talmon, Sh. 24, 47, 84, 103, 188, 201
 Tamási, B. 211, 218
 Tardieu, M. 319, 321, 325, 344
 Tatlock, J.R. 172, 180
 Thackeray, H.S.J. 249, 250, 253, 261, 266, 267, 292
 Theodor, J. 307, 308, 315
 Thomas, M.A. 351, 357
 Tigay, J.H. 185, 201, 218
 Tigchelaar, E. 47, 78, 80, 113, 116, 135, 218
 Tomson, P. 254, 266
 Treballe Barrera, J. 60, 80, 88, 91, 103, 104, 199, 217
 Tsfania, L. 345, 356
 Tcherikover, V. 242, 248, 260, 265
 Tov, E. 45, 46, 48, 50, 55, 70, 78, 80, 86, 87, 89–92, 96, 101, 103, 105, 106, 108, 109–114, 116, 117, 122, 136, 139, 151, 184, 186, 187, 190–194, 200, 201, 209, 213, 218, 2190, 246, 315, 346, 347, 349, 350, 357
 Ulrich, E. 24, 47, 48, 50, 59, 80, 85, 86, 88–93, 96, 99, 102, 103, 104, 106, 110, 113, 117, 122, 136, 188, 189, 190, 201
 Utzschneider, H. 163, 165
 VanderKam, J.C. 15, 24, 25, 45, 48, 50, 60, 77, 78, 80, 81, 103, 104, 140, 151, 195, 199, 201, 216, 217, 219, 246, 315
 van der Horst, P. 242, 243, 248
 van der Ploeg, J.P.M. 183, 197, 200
 van der Steen, E.J. 169, 171, 179
 van der Toorn K. 62, 81, 157, 165, 167, 357
 van der Woude, A.S. 184, 202
 van Ruiten, J. 120, 135
 Vermes, G. xi–xii, 3–5, 7, 9, 13, 15, 16, 19–24, 26, 27, 29, 43, 48, 49–52, 54, 55, 57–59, 62, 64, 68, 75–77, 81, 105, 117, 203, 219, 254, 265, 266, 295, 317, 348
 Vilmar, E. 353, 357
 Wace, H. 260, 265
 Wachholder, B.Z. 14, 48, 189, 202, 203, 207, 219
 Walters, S.D. 86, 104
 Walton, B. 346, 357
 Watts, J.W. 158, 165, 166
 Webster, B. 110, 117
 Wevers, J.W. 244, 248
 Weinfeld, M. 187, 202
 Weiss, H-F. 281, 292

- Weissberg, L. 125, 135, 136
 Weissenrieder, A. 123, 136
 Wellhausen, J. 126, 135, 349
 Wendland, P. 238, 246
 Werman, C. 211, 219
 Westcott, B.F. 183, 202
 Wiener, A. 298, 299, 301, 306, 307, 308,
 317
 White Crawford, S. 3, 9, 15, 25, 28, 47, 48,
 53, 55, 59–64, 77, 81, 91, 96–98, 101–103, 106,
 107, 109, 115–117, 120, 134, 190, 202, 203, 217,
 296, 317, 346, 347, 357
 Whybray, R.N. 238, 248
 Williams, M. 323, 344
 Williamson, H.G.M. 9, 44, 60, 77, 81, 133,
 231, 246, 315
 Wilson, G.H. 188, 189, 202
 Wilson, R.McL. 319, 343, 344
 Wink, W. 312, 317
 Wintermute, O.S. 34, 319, 338, 344
 Wittgenstein, L. 14, 48
 Wold, B.G. 119, 122, 125, 127, 133, 136
 Wolff, H.W. 160
 Woudstra, M.H. 351, 357
 Wöhrle, J. 163, 164, 166
 Wright, B.G. xiii, 70, 81, 205, 219
 Yadin, Y. 6, 9, 105, 109, 117, 193
 Yisraeli, O. 302, 308, 309, 317
 Younker, R. 168, 180
 Zahn, M. 3, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 25, 48–51, 53,
 58, 61–63, 67, 73, 78, 81, 96, 98, 104, 119, 120,
 124, 121–123, 128, 136, 190, 202
 Zevit, Z. 172, 180
 Zunz, L. 159
 Zsengellér, J. 3, 19, 49, 103, 203, 349, 356,
 357