

Heavenly Tablets

BRILL

*Interpretation, Identity and Tradition
in Ancient Judaism*

Edited by

LYNN LIDONNICI & ANDREA LIEBER

Heavenly Tablets

Supplements
to the
Journal for the Study
of Judaism

Editor

John J. Collins

The Divinity School, Yale University

Associate Editor

Florentino García Martínez

Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Advisory Board

J. DUHAIME — A. HILHORST — P.W. VAN DER HORST

A. KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN — M.A. KNIBB — J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUTTEN

J. SIEVERS — G. STEMBERGER — E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR — J. TROMP

VOLUME 119

Heavenly Tablets

Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in
Ancient Judaism

Edited by

Lynn LiDonnici
Andrea Lieber



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

ISSN: 1384-2161

ISBN: 978 90 04 15856 6

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints BRILL, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

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

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

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	xi

Introduction	1
Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber	

I. INTERPRETING RITUAL TEXTS

Three Jewish Ritual Practices in <i>Aristeas</i> §§158–160	11
Benjamin G. Wright III	

Prayers in Jubilees	31
John C. Endres, S.J.	

Amulets and Angels: Visionary Experience in the <i>Testament of Job</i> and the Hekhalot Literature	49
Rebecca Lesses	

Is the Prayer of Manasseh a Jewish Work?	75
James R. Davila	

“According to the Jews:” Identified (and Identifying) ‘Jewish’ Elements in the <i>Greek Magical Papyri</i>	87
Lynn LiDonnici	

II. MAPPING DIASPORA IDENTITIES

The <i>Imago Mundi</i> of the <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	111
Esther Eshel	

<i>Jubilees</i> in the Hellenistic Context	133
Cana Werman	

“Gather the Dispersed of Judah:” Seeking a Return to the Land as a Factor in Jewish Identity of Late Antiquity	159
Esther G. Chazon	
Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls	177
John J. Collins	
Between Motherland and Fatherland: Diaspora, Pilgrimage and the Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Philo of Alexandria	193
Andrea Lieber	
III. REWRITING TRADITION	
The Case of the Blasphemer (Lev. 24:10–16) according to Philo and Josephus	213
Louis H. Feldman	
Chaste Betrayals: Women and Men in the Apocryphal Novels	227
Adele Reinhartz	
The Damascus Document’s “Three Nets of Belial:” A Reference to the <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i> ?	243
Hanan Eshel	
Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall (II Maccabees 9:7)?	257
Daniel R. Schwartz	
The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6–13 and the Unity of the Book	267
James C. VanderKam	
Bibliography	285
Index of Modern Scholars	307
Index of Ancient Sources	331
Subject Index	327

PREFACE

This volume was created to honor our dear friend, colleague and teacher, Betsy Halpern-Amaru. Betsy received her PhD in Renaissance and Reformation History from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in 1967, having studied previously also at Harvard, Brandeis and Barnard. She began teaching as a graduate student, and after that held many visiting and part-time positions at colleges and universities throughout the Hudson Valley, while raising a family of four children. During this period, Betsy was also intensely involved in Jewish education in the Poughkeepsie area, both creating curricula and publishing on the subject. She came to the Religion Department at Vassar as a Visiting Assistant Professor of Religion in 1981, and was such an integral part of the Department that she became first a full-time member, then a tenured one, then chair, eventually reaching the rank of full professor, and today she holds the rank of Professor Emeritus. This uncommon career progress is a testament to Betsy's determination and to the excellence in teaching and scholarship that was recognized and highly valued by her colleagues and students at Vassar.

Betsy's many interests in Jewish Studies and European history and religion converged in the courses she taught at Vassar. These included Second Temple literature courses, seminars on the representations of biblical women in post-biblical literature and on the biblical matriarchs in literature and art from the middle ages through the contemporary period, special studies on the narratives of Adam and Eve, the history of Anti-Semitism, and relations among Jews, Christians and Muslims in the Middle Ages and Renaissance. She also participated in the creation of the multidisciplinary Program in Jewish Studies at Vassar. Through these classes and activities Betsy made important contributions to the College, the Religion Department, and to hundreds of students—one of whom, Andrea Lieber, is delighted to co-edit this volume.

After a significant experience studying texts of Early Judaism with Louis Feldman through an NEH Summer Seminar for College Teachers (an important program that unfortunately no longer exists), Betsy's intellectual focus shifted almost exclusively to the area of Early Judaism, Pseudepigrapha, and midrash. Her monographs (*The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*) [Brill, 1999], and *Rewriting the Bible: Land and*

Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature [Trinity Press International, 1994] focus upon two of her abiding passions, both in her literary studies and in her life: the relationship between the land of Israel and its people, and the roles and representations of women in Jewish texts. These interests are further articulated in her many articles and book chapters, a list of which follows this Preface. In addition to her active research program and a full load of teaching at Vassar, Betsy also served for years on the Steering Committee of the Society of Biblical Literature's Pseudepigrapha Group, through which she became known personally as well as professionally to the major scholars of Early Judaism throughout the world, many of whom are contributors to this volume.

Since leaving Vassar, Betsy has continued an active program of research, writing, teaching, and studying, working with her beloved 'library crew' at Hebrew University's Jewish National and University Library, in her new home of Jerusalem. Along with Jacob Milgrom, Israel Eyal and others, she is a member of a Shabbat Torah study group in the home of Moshe Greenberg. She has held positions at both the Schechter Institute of Jewish Studies and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Rothberg International School, Division of Graduate Studies, and was a Visiting Scholar at the Orion Center in 2001–02, where she continues to be an active participant. Her recently completed, in-press works include a new commentary on the Book of Judith, the edition (with Esther Chazon and Ruth Clements) of *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, January 2005 (STDJ, Brill), and several further studies of various aspects of the Book of Jubilees, an abiding interest and passion. We celebrate Betsy's achievements, past, present and future, with all best wishes.

Publications of Betsy Halpern-Amaru

- "Judith, Book of." In *Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans (*forthcoming*, 2008).
- "Land, Concept." In *Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by J. J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans (*forthcoming*, 2008).
- New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, January 2005*, ed. E. G. Chazon, B. Halpern-Amaru, and R. Clements. STDJ series, Leiden: Brill (*forthcoming*, 2007).
- "Pesah and Massot in Jubilees 49." *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (*forthcoming*, 2007).
- "The Book of Judith." In *The Lost Bible: Ancient Jewish Writings Outside of Scripture*. Edited by L. Feldman, J. Kugel, L. Schiffman. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society. *Forthcoming* 2007.

- “A Note on Isaac as First-Born in the *Book of Jubilees* and Only Son in 4Q225.” *DSD* 13.2 (2006): 127–33.
- “Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in *Jubilees* 46.” In *Reworking the Bible at Qumran*. Edited by E. Chazon and D. Diamant. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005, 135–52.
- “Joy as Piety in the *Book of Jubilees*.” *JJS* 66.2 (2005): 185–205.
- “Midrash in the *Book of Jubilees*.” In *The Midrash: An Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation in Formative Judaism*. Edited by J. Neusner and A. Avery Peck. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2005, 333–349.
- Review Article, J. T. A. G. M. van Ruiten’s *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 66, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2000). *JSP* 14.1 (2004): 78–80.
- “Flavius Josephus and the *Book of Jubilees*: A Question of Source.” *HUCA* 72 (2001): 14–44.
- The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 60. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.
- Review Article, *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, eds. M. Albani, J. Frey, A. Lange (TSAJ 65, Tübingen: Mohr, 1997). *Journal of Religion* 79.4 (1999): 697–98.
- “Bilhah and Naphtali in *Jubilees*: A Note on 4QTNaphtali.” *DSD* 6 (1999): 1–10.
- “The Empowerment of Rachel in the *Book of Jubilees*.” In *The Bible and Its World*, ed. R. Margolin. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1999, 189–98.
- “The Renaming of Levi.” In *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. M. Stone and E. Chazon. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999, 59–70.
- “The Portrait of Sarah in *Jubilees*.” In *Jewish Studies in a New Europe*, ed. U. Haxen, H. Trautner-Kromann, K. Goldschmidt Salamon. Copenhagen: Reitzel A/S, 1998, 336–48.
- “Exile and Return in the *Book of Jubilees*.” In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*, ed. J. M. Scott. JSJSup 56. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997, 127–44.
- “Jewish Civilization in Christian Academic Settings.” In *Teaching Jewish Civilization*, ed. M. Davis. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1996, 138–42 (Hebrew).
- “The Journey of Susanah Among the Church Fathers.” In *The Judgment of Susanna: Authority and Witness*, ed. E. Spolsky. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996, 21–34.
- Review Article, “Christopher’s Wright’s *God’s People in God’s Land*.” *Hebrew Studies* 56 (1995): 162–4.
- Review: Christopher Begg, *Josephus’ Account of the Early Divided Monarchy*. *Religious Studies Review* (1995).
- Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- “The First Woman, Wives and Mothers in *Jubilees*,” *JBL* 113/114 (1994): 609–26.
- “Teaching Judaism in a Christian Academic Setting.” In *A Global Approach to Higher Education*, ed. M. Davis. New York: New York University Press, 1994, 148–52.
- Review Article, “The Land of Israel in Judaism: W. D. Davies’s *The Territorial Dimension of Judaism*,” *Midstream* (February–March 1993): 38–40.
- “Redesigning Redemption: Covenant in the Testament of Moses.” In *Covenants in Law and Literature: Essays in Honor of Harold Fisch*, ed. E. Spolsky. Albany: SUNY Press, 1993, 131–52.
- “Portraits of Women in Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*.” In “*Women Like This*,” *New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. A. J. Levine. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 83–106.
- Preliminary Report on the Teaching of Jewish Civilization in Christian Seminaries and Faculties of American Universities*. Jerusalem: International Center for the University Teaching of Jewish Civilization, 1991.
- Review Article, “Mendels’ *Israel As A Political Concept*,” *JQR* 79:2–3 (1989): 259–63.
- “Portraits of Biblical Women in Josephus’ *Antiquities*,” *JJS* 39:2 (1988): 143–170.
- Review Article, “*The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes Toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* by John Gager,” *Journal of Reform Judaism* (Spring 1988): 96–98.

- “Martin Luther and Flavius Josephus.” In *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1987, 411–26.
 Review: *Contemporary Jewish Civilization: Selected Syllabi*, ed. Gideon Shimoni Choice, January 1987, 24:788.
 Review: Alan F. Segal, *Rebecca’s Children: Judaism and Christianity in The Roman World*. Choice, March 1987, 24:1086.
- “Land Theology in Philo and Josephus.” In *Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives*, ed. L. Hoffman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986, 65–93.
 Review: Alan H. Cutler, *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim: Medieval Root of Anti-Semitism* Choice, November 1986, 24:496.
 Review: Simon P. Markish, *Erasmus and the Jews*, tr. Anthony Olcott Choice, November 1986, 24:498.
 Review: Zvi Kurzweil, *The Modern Impulse of Traditional Judaism* Choice, April 1986, 23:1228.
- “Martin Luther and Flavius Josephus.” In *Josephan Studies*. Edited by L. H. Feldman and G. Hata. Tokyo: Yamamoto Shoten, 1985, 317–42 (Japanese).
 Review: *The Jewish People in Christian Preaching*, ed. Darrell J. Fasching Choice, September 1985, 23:136.
 Review: *A Dictionary of the Jewish-Christian Dialogue*, eds. Leon Klenicki & Geoffrey Widoger (Choice, December 1984) 22:571.
 Review: S. Friedman, *The Oberammergau Passion Play: A Lance Against Civilization* Choice, October 1984, 22:288.
 Review: Hans Oberman, *The Roots of Anti-Semitism in the Age of the Renaissance and Reformation* Choice, September 1984, 22:120.
 Review: Charles S. Liebman & Eliezer Don-Yehiya, *Religion and Politics in Israel* Choice, September 1984, 22:149.
 Review: Merrill Simon, *Jerry Falwell and the Jews* Choice, July–August 1984, 21:1624.
- “Martin Luther and Jewish Mirrors,” *Jewish Social Studies*, 47 (Spring 1984): 95–102.
 Moses Mendelssohn, *Jerusalem*, tr. Allan Arkus, Introduction and Commentary by Alexander Altmann Choice, May 1984, 21:1320.
- “Conservative Judaism: One Lay Perspective,” *Conservative Judaism*, 37:1 (Fall 1983): 23–28.
- “The Killing of the Prophets: Unraveling a Midrash,” *HUCA* 54 (1983): 153–80.
- “Land Theology in Josephus’ *Antiquities of the Jews*,” *JQR* N.S.71:4 (April 1981): 201–229.
- “Curriculum Guideline for Judaic Studies.” School G in *Curriculum Compendium For Solomon Schechter Day Schools*. New York: United Synagogue of America, 1978.
- Flexible Education in the Afternoon Hebrew School* (co-authored with A. Brown). Boston: Institute For Jewish Life, 1972.

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
APOT	<i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</i> , ed. R. H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913
BASP	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
BETL	Biblioteca ephemeridum theologiarum Iovanensium
BJS	Brown Judaica Series
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
ConBNT	Coniectanea Biblica: New Testament Series
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testament
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium. Edited by I. B. Chabot et al., Paris, 1903–
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HTS	<i>Harvard Theological Studies</i>
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
HUCM	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus Hellenistisch—Römischer Zeit
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods</i>
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JSQ	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
MBS	Message of Biblical Spirituality
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OTP	<i>The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> , ed. J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–85.
OPIAC	Occasional Papers of the Center for Antiquity and Christianity
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RGRW	Religions in the Graeco-Roman World
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature

SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations
SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Cerf, 1943–.
SDSS	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
StPh	Studia Philonica
StPhA	Studia Philonica Annual
SPM	Studia Philonica Monographs
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia post-biblica
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

INTRODUCTION*

Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber
Vassar College/Dickinson College

I. *Interpreting Ritual Texts*

In honoring Betsy Halpern-Amaru, this volume brings together a wide range of international scholars in the field of Ancient Judaism. The breadth of the essays collected here reflects the diversity of Betsy's own scholarly interests. As a professor of religion, her teaching has always emphasized the analysis of Judaism as a living, evolving tradition. We thus thought it fitting to begin with *Interpreting Ritual Texts*. This group of essays examines various aspects of Jewish ritual praxis in late antiquity, highlighting the ways in which text and ritual intersect in the process of interpretation.

In *Three Jewish Ritual Practices in Aristeas §§158–160*, Ben Wright asks what we can know about the ways Jews actually put certain biblical commandments into practice in the Hellenistic Era, what the commandments were understood to mean, and the degree to which Hellenistic Jews worked with and through the biblical text, transforming it and renewing it, without being strictly literal. Wright situates the phrasing and details of the LXX base text for the three ritual practices of the wearing of fringes and the use of mezuzot and phylacteries in relation to comparanda within the LXX Psalms, to word usage in Philo and Josephus, and to relevant finds from the Judean desert, contrasting these with the later Rabbinic prescriptions that have become normative for these practices. Through these comparisons Wright demonstrates that while *Aristeas* is firmly committed to the idea of an authoritative text in writing, the author's own practice in composition (and perhaps in ritual as well) is equally concerned with the renewal and performance of the oral or oracular divine speech that underlies that text.

John C. Endres, S.J. analyzes several prayers in the *Book of Jubilees*, comparing them with the biblical base text, with the LXX, and with

* The editors wish to thank Professors Esther Chazon and Benjamin G. Wright III for their help and advice with this volume. We also thank Barbara McDonald, Staff Associate of the Judaic Studies Program at Dickinson College and the Dickinson College Research and Development Committee for a generous grant to support publication expenses.

Qumran materials, using these texts to enrich our view of early biblical interpretation and of attitudes toward prayer. Endres identifies significant features of the understanding of prayer in Jubilees: 1) the fact that all five examples discussed relate in various ways to the powers of God to protect his people from demonic powers and the hope of those powers to lead people astray; and 2) the persistent mention of God's role as the creator of the world. Together these features express a dualistic world view, which invokes "the power of God the creator to save Israel's faithful from the power of the evil spirits..."

Rebecca Lesses probes the ways ritual objects such as amulets and phylacteries are used in visionary rituals in *Amulets and Angels: Visionary Experience in the Testament of Job and the Hekhalot Literature*. The daughters of Job are transformed by the powerful cords, phylacteries, that are bequeathed to them, allowing them to speak in the languages of the angels. In this as in other cases drawn from Hekhalot literature and the Greco-Egyptian and Coptic Christian magical papyri, Lesses argues that these ritual objects function both to protect the practitioner from hostile forces that surround ritual practice, as well as to enhance, perhaps even to create, the visionary experience itself. Through her analysis, Lesses highlights the differences between the dichotomous categories of modern scholarship and the texts themselves, which do not appear to draw sharp distinctions between "magic" and mysticism, but rather to understand these as existing along a continuum.

James Davila also calls attention to the ways in which modern scholarly assumptions about the Jewish origins of pseudepigraphic texts may confuse the issues, rather than clarifying them. In asking the question, *Is The Prayer Of Manasseh A Jewish Work?*, Davila proceeds by surveying the extant witnesses to the text, which are in Greek, Syriac and Hebrew fragments from the Cairo Geniza. Such Geniza fragments, which sometimes reveal lost Hebrew *vorlagen* for texts otherwise unknown in that language, may also sometimes include Hebrew retroversions from other languages; and this may or may not indicate the involvement of Jews or the use of a given text by Jewish communities. Davila pursues the methodology of considering the text along with others that appear with it in early manuscript collections and asking what these collections suggest about the people who were interested in it and copied and preserved it. This analysis indicates that the text was certainly circulating among Christians possibly as early as the 3rd century C.E., and that it is likely that the work was composed by a Christian, though Jewish or "pagan" authorship cannot be completely ruled out.

Employing a similar method, Lynn LiDonnici also calls attention to the ways in which modern scholarly assumptions about the definition of Jewish identity can mask the cultural and religious complexity of the ancient milieu that gave rise to the Greek Magical Papyri. Through a detailed reading of several spells from the *PGM* that label themselves Jewish or Hebrew, LiDonnici demonstrates that such labeling actually complicates the process of identifying these spells as “Jewish.” Focusing mainly on texts of Egyptian provenance, LiDonnici suggests that labels marking the Jewishness of certain spells actually call attention to the fact that the Jewishness of these texts was not self-evident, and that the labels thus function to authenticate the formulae as “real Jewish magic.” Her analysis illustrates the ways in which the concept of “Jewishness” in the cultural world of the magical formularies was defined from a multiplicity of perspectives and must be understood with a great deal of fluidity.

II. *Mapping Diaspora Identities*

Mapping Diaspora Identities is a tribute to Betsy’s early scholarship on land and covenant theology in post-biblical Judaism. In *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* [Trinity Press International, 1994], she explored the way land symbolism is developed in post-biblical Jewish texts. How did Diaspora communities come to understand the Bible’s preoccupation with land? How did land figure in ancient authors’ depictions of “center” and “margin” in drawing the boundaries of Jewish communities? The essays in this section consider related questions with respect to Diaspora and Jewish identity.

Both Esther Eshel and Cana Werman are concerned with the geography of Jewish Hellenistic texts, focusing literally on the way ancient texts map the cosmos. In *The Imago Mundi of the Genesis Apocryphon*, Eshel considers the geographical perspectives expressed in the accounts of the division of the post-Flood world among Noah’s sons in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Jubilees*, and Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*. Although these texts share a basic template for the map of the world, originating in the Ionic map that places Delphi at the center, the *Genesis Apocryphon* approximates this model most closely and is also likely to be the oldest of the examples discussed. Eshel argues that it was the source for the “map” in *Jubilees*, which reflects many changes reflecting the author’s own ideology, moving, for example, the center of the world

from Delphi to Jerusalem, and taking the powerful and wealthy region of Asia (Minor) away from Japheth, its inheritor in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and giving it to Shem. In these and other examples we see the greater interest in physical geography on the part of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, in comparison with the greater ethnographic detail in Josephus, and the ethnographic and ideological differences with *Jubilees*.

In *Jubilees in the Hellenistic Context*, Cana Werman also reflects on *Jubilees*' map of the world to demonstrate that the book shows knowledge of (and even dependence upon) Hellenistic scientific knowledge. Although the map is redrawn to locate Mt. Zion at its center, *Jubilees*' use of this basic paradigm suggests its close relationship to the Greek scientific tradition. At the same time, Werman argues, *Jubilees* shows knowledge of specifically Hellenistic Jewish historiographic and philosophical works such as Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus, the *Third Sibylline Oracle*, and the *Wisdom of Solomon*. In these cases, however, Werman suggests that the author of *Jubilees* alludes to these texts mainly in order to refute them.

Essays by Esther Chazon, John Collins, and Andrea Lieber take up questions of land, Diaspora and Jewish identity. In "Gather the Dispersed of Judah:" *Seeking a Return to the Land as a Factor in Jewish Identity of Late Antiquity*, Chazon examines recent arguments that suggest texts created in Palestine view the Diaspora much more negatively than Diaspora texts themselves. This dichotomy is complicated in relation to the Qumran community, which, though technically Palestinian, construes its identity as a 'House of Exile.' In relation to Qumran liturgies containing petitionary prayers for an ingathering of the exiles, Chazon notes that, although exceptions exist, these texts do indeed reflect a negative attitude toward the Diaspora. At the same time, Chazon argues for the consideration of many different features in the construction of models for ancient Jewish identity, taking historical changes and the ideological goals of individual authors into account.

The issue of the ideological self-separation of the Qumran community from the larger world of Judaism is pursued by John Collins in *Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, considering the way the *yahad* construes its separation, what it means, and how it began. Collins notes that several of the texts that are unambiguously considered the sectarian literature of Qumran and other similar sectarian groups, such as the *Community Rule*, the *Damascus Document* and *4QMMT*, define their separation in terms of superior spirituality (both predestined and

earned) and of behavior: social and ritual choices (including physical migration itself) that make the separation physically and socially real. This is contrasted with the perspective of *4QInstruction*, which reflects a sense of spiritual separation that does not seem to involve social or ritual difference. This may suggest that *4QInstruction* derives from a group or rather, a looser conglomeration of individuals that understood itself to be different from the mainstream but that had not yet crystallized a way to actualize this or live in accordance with it.

The link between group identity and spiritual superiority is pursued in the Diaspora setting in Andrea Lieber's study, *Between Motherland and Fatherland: Diaspora, Pilgrimage and the Spiritualization of Sacrifice in Philo of Alexandria*. Lieber discusses Philo's use of the model of Greek colonization to attach a positive valence to the Jewish dispersion. This positive theology of Diaspora thus legitimates Jewish settlements in locations outside the mother city of Jerusalem, and by extension outside of Palestine altogether. Going beyond simple affirmation and legitimation, however, Lieber suggests that the religious duties of pilgrimage and cultic sacrifice are reworked in Philo's writing to affirm a spiritual condition for Diaspora Jews that is actually superior to those of Judea, and one that is only attainable in the Diaspora.

III. *Rewriting Tradition*

A collection in honor of Betsy Halpern-Amaru would not be complete without reference to the genre of ancient biblical interpretation. *Rewriting Tradition* acknowledges the centrality of the re-written bible in all of Betsy's academic work.

In *The Case of the Blasphemer (Lev. 24:10–16) according to Philo and Josephus*, Louis Feldman draws attention to the way that the biblical "case of the blasphemer" is transformed in Philo. In discussing the passage, Philo draws a distinction between cursing God generically (a law that extends to pagan gods as well) and cursing God specifically through the pronunciation of his name. Philo expresses a respectful attitude toward the Greco-Roman gods of polis and Empire, rational and philosophical in both form and expression. The blasphemer, of mixed parentage but considered Jewish, is cast as Egyptian by Philo, whose advocacy of tolerance and respect toward other religions does not extend to the

Egyptians or their gods, as he regards the Egyptians as completely ‘without religion.’ Through this interpretation Philo aligns both himself and the Jewish tradition with Greek rationality and philosophical values.

In *Chaste Betrayals: Women and Men in the Apocryphal Novels*, Adele Reinhartz discusses four stories from the Apocrypha, in which women are paired in significant ways with men who are not their husbands. In the narratives of Susannah, Judith, Sarah (daughter-in-law-to-be of Tobit) and Esther, as in much Hellenistic Jewish literature, core values of the tradition are maintained in spite of the problems of Diaspora life—values of Sabbath and holiday observance, as well as chastity and endogamy. Given the importance of these last two, it is interesting to note the romantic possibilities of alternative pairings in the tales, possibilities that, in other cultures or literary settings, could be made much more explicit. Reinhartz traces the romantic stories that form an imaginary counterpoint to the moral tales, tracing literary parallels between Susannah and Daniel, Sarah and Tobit, and Esther and Mordecai. In the case of Judith and Holofernes, the pairing is explicit in the text, as Judith’s eroticized preparations for her political act creates the “romantic” counter-story. Through this analysis Reinhartz explores the interplay between entertainment and moral instruction in Hellenistic Jewish narrative and characterization.

In *The Damascus Document’s “Three Nets of Belial:” A Reference to the Aramaic Levi Document?*, Hanan Eshel traces the origins—or resonances—of a motif in the *Damascus Document*: that Belial has created three snares for Israel that appear to be paths of righteousness: fornication, avarice, and defilement of the Temple. Although the *Damascus Document* rarely seems to use apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works, it does allude both to Jubilees and to a work attributed to “Levi, son of Jacob.” Eshel probes the likelihood that this refers specifically to the Aramaic Levi Document, a suggestion initially made by Jonas Greenfield. In that text, the words are spoken by Isaac, to his grandson Levi. Though two of the three sins are the same, Aramaic Levi has harlotry, instead of avarice. If the *Damascus Document* uses this as a source, why would it make this substitution? Eshel argues that the text interprets its source in terms of the values of the Qumran community, which were against private property. Thus, the text makes a link between the two in its perception of the avarice of the priesthood, which caused it to go astray in “wantonness.”

In *Why Did Antiochus Have to Fall (II Maccabees 9:7)?*, Daniel Schwartz traces the literary threads from which the author of 2 Maccabees wove

his story of the death of Antiochus IV. The Greek historiographic tradition of Antiochus' death names its cause as disease, but in 2 Maccabees and texts that derive from it, separate incidents of falling and disease are narrated. Through analysis of 2 Maccabees' literary techniques and its concern with making the punishments of Israel's enemies fit their crimes, Schwartz demonstrates the text's use of images of the Arrogant King of Babylon of Isaiah 14 to shape the construction of Antiochus in 2 Maccabees, whose high arrogance necessitated a 'fall.'

Finally, James VanderKam surveys a variety of hypotheses about redactional stages in different parts of the *Book of Jubilees* in *The End of the Matter? Jubilees 50:6–13 and the Unity of the Book*. Such suggestions have typically been motivated by what the investigator saw as inconsistent style or chronology as reflected by the book in its present form. By reference to Qumran fragments and to a different approach to the way the book is organized and understands its chronology, VanderKam argues for the unity of the book in opposition to the idea of redactional layers. This argument also applies to the last eight verses of the book, which have most recently been suggested to be editorial additions. By providing an overview of how each verse in *Jubilees* 50 fits together in harmony with the general structure of the book, the idea that these verses are secondary is refuted.

PART I

INTERPRETING RITUAL TEXTS

THREE JEWISH RITUAL PRACTICES
IN *ARISTEAS* §§158–160*

Benjamin G. Wright III
Lehigh University

In the *Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates* §§128–171, the Jewish high priest, Eleazar, who speaks to the deputation sent from Ptolemy II to Jerusalem in order to fetch the scholars who would translate the Law into Greek, presents an *apologia* for Judaism, primarily organized around a criticism of Gentile idol worship and an allegorical interpretation of the Jewish food laws.¹ Included in this rather long section, Ps.-Aristeas describes in §§158–160 three Jewish ritual practices: the wearing of fringes on clothes, the placing of mezuzot on doors and gates, and the binding of phylacteries (tefillin) on the hands. Through the consistent deployment of similar vocabulary, Ps.-Aristeas specifically connects these practices to one of the major themes of the larger *apologia*, that the statutes and commandments in the Jewish law, particularly the food laws, have been “set out allegorically” (τροπολογῶν ἐκτέθειται), and thus they function as “signs” (παράσημον), “symbols” (σημεῖον), and “reminders” (μνεία) for the Jews that the Law contains deeper spiritual truths about the will of God.

While almost all commentators note that *Aristeas* §§158–160 refers to these Jewish ritual practices, we know little about them in the centuries before the rabbis regulated their form and contents, even in light of the discoveries in the Judean desert, among which a number of textile fragments with fringes, thirty fragments of phylacteries and fragments of seven mezuzot were found.² In fact, outside of the biblical commands, *Aristeas* is the first Jewish text to mention that Jews actually performed these biblical rituals. The passage is worth citing in full at the outset:

* I am grateful to the editors for the opportunity to contribute to a volume honoring Betsy Halpern-Amaru, who has been a friend and colleague for lo these many years.

¹ Although *Aristeas to Philocrates* is not really a letter by the canons of ancient letter writing, the title has become conventional in modern scholarly parlance, and I use it here. I also distinguish between the title of the book and the author by referring to the author as Pseudo-Aristeas, especially since almost unanimously, scholars recognize that a Ptolemaic courtier named Aristeas was not the author of this work. The usual date given to *Aristeas* is somewhere in the middle of the second century B.C.E.

² For the textiles, see G. M. Crowfoot, “The Linen Textiles,” (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 18–38. The phylacteries come from Qumran (Phylactery A–U), Wadi

§158 For also with food and drink, he has commanded those who have offered first fruits to avail themselves of them right away. And indeed also he has given us a symbolic reminder on our clothes, just as also on doors and gates he has prescribed that we set up the sayings (τὰ λόγια) to serve as a reminder of God. §159 And also he has commanded us expressly to fasten the sign upon our hands, showing clearly that every activity must be accomplished with righteousness, keeping in mind our own constitution, and above all the fear of God. §160 And he has also commanded that when sleeping and rising we study God's provisions, not only in word, but also in judgment, observing their own movement and impression when sleeping and waking, that there is a certain divine and incomprehensible interchange between them.³

Beyond listing the specific biblical passages alluded to in this section, commentators say very little about the description of these practices in *Aristeas*. Yet, these paragraphs raise a number of interesting questions about them. Can we tell from these paragraphs what Jews actually did? Do the texts and artifacts from Qumran shed any light on understanding what is in *Aristeas*? How should we translate the rather ambiguous Greek phrase τὰ λόγια? Since the Judean desert finds have shown that there was a developing corpus of texts that would have been copied in phylacteries and mezuzot, does this Greek phrase indicate that Ps.-Aristeas is aware of specific texts used in phylacteries and mezuzot? What is the relationship between *Aristeas* and the Jewish-Greek scriptural texts?

“He has given us a symbolic reminder on our clothes”

Ps.-Aristeas mentions the first of the three practices in §158 in a short notice. In the cases of food and drink, they are to be consumed immediately after offering them. This statement presumably clarifies the preceding sentence in §157 about calling to mind “the ruling and preserving nature of God.” Apparently, the immediate consumption

Muraba'at (Mur 4), and Nahal Se'elim (XHev/Se 5 A, B). The mezuzot are from Qumran (Mezuzah A–G). See Lawrence H. Schiffman, “Phylacteries and Mezuzot,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford, 2000), 2:675–77.

³ The Greek of these paragraphs is sometimes obscure, especially the transition from first-person plural to third-person plural in §160. The translation is my own, prepared for an upcoming commentary on *Aristeas*.

of the sacrificed items constitutes a reminder of God’s nature to the one eating.⁴

Then follows the enigmatic statement that God “has given us a symbolic reminder on our clothes” (καὶ μὴν καὶ ἐκ τῶν περιβολαίων παράσημον ἡμῖν μνείας δέδωκεν). This reference cannot be to phylacteries, since Ps.-Aristeas explicitly discusses them in §159. Moses Hadas gives the most reasonable interpretation of the clause arguing that the author is referring to the “fringes” or “tassels” that according to Num 15:38–39 and Deut 22:12 Israelites were to wear on their clothes.⁵ Indeed Ps.-Aristeas connects the fringes with the Law in a manner similar to the Numbers passage. Along with τὰ λόγια, whose mention comes later in the same sentence, the fringes in *Aristeas* serve as a “reminder of God” (πρὸς τὸ μνείαν εἶναι θεοῦ). In Numbers God addresses Moses and says, “Speak to the Israelites, and tell them to make fringes on the corners of their garments throughout their generations and to put a blue cord on the fringe at each corner. You have the fringe so that, when you see it, you will *remember* (μνησθήσεσθε) all the commandments of the Lord and do them, and not follow the lust of your own heart and your own eyes.” The command in Deuteronomy, by contrast, does not contain any notion of remembrance of the Law; it simply enjoins tassels “on the four corners of the cloak with which you cover yourself.” Even though the mention of the fringes in *Aristeas* is not a citation of Num 15:38–39—it does not even share its major vocabulary items—it is difficult to think that the author does not have in mind the command in the form we find it in Numbers.

“On doors and gates he has prescribed that we set up the sayings”

As part of the same sentence in which he alludes to the tassels on Jewish garments, Ps.-Aristeas mentions mezuzot, which, he says, Jews fasten “on doors and gates” (ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν καὶ θυρῶν). Certainly Ps.-Aristeas has in mind the obligations placed upon Israel that we find in Deut 6:4–9 and 11:13–21 in which God commands that “these words of mine”

⁴ The Greek word for offering sacrifice is ἀπαρξάμενους, which can indicate the offering of firstlings or first fruits. If that is the case, Ps.-Aristeas could be referring to the eating of the firstlings of the flocks commanded in Deut 15:19–23. Moses Hadas [*Aristeas to Philocrates* (Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1951), 163] understands the term more generally and translates “after first having offered a portion as sacrifice.”

⁵ Hadas, *Aristeas*, 162.

(MT דברים האלה [6:6], דברי אלה [11:18]; LXX τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα in both places) be placed as a sign on the hand, on the forehead, and on doorposts and gates (see below on phylacteries). Unlike its description of the tassels, the text of *Aristeas* bears at least some minimal resemblance to the command in Deuteronomy. The LXX of both Deut 6:9 and 11:20 has the commandment concerning mezuzot in identical language—καὶ γράψετε αὐτὰ ἐπὶ τὰς φλιάς τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν πυλῶν ὑμῶν. With Deuteronomy, *Aristeas* shares part of the prepositional phrase indicating where the “words” should be placed—ἐπὶ τῶν πυλῶν, “upon the gates.” Instead of Deuteronomy’s “doorposts of your houses” (τὰς φλιάς τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν), *Aristeas* has the much more streamlined “doors” (θυρῶν) which, in fact, is actually a different location from the Deuteronomic one. The command in Deuteronomy enjoins the Israelites to “write” the “words” (αὐτὰ in v. 9 with ῥήματα in v. 6 as the antecedent), but the command in *Aristeas* makes the form of the obligation to “place” (τίθειναι) “the sayings.” Although we might see the command to set up mezuzot in *Aristeas* as a closer reflection of the LXX, the differences between *Aristeas* and the Greek biblical text remain substantial.⁶

One critical interpretive problem with this paragraph is the meaning, and hence translation, of the phrase τὰ λόγια, a much more ambiguous reference than the LXX’s unambiguous τὰ ῥήματα, “words.” Modern scholars have understood the phrase in *Aristeas* in different ways. Moses Hadas renders it “the chapters,” as if Ps.-Aristeas was referring to a clearly delineated group of texts that he knows should be included in mezuzot.⁷ R. J. H. Shutt translates it as “Words,” apparently understanding the phrase to refer to the Jewish Law more generally. In this he seems to follow André Pelletier who translates “les divines <<Paroles>>”⁸ As part of a larger word group, Ps.-Aristeas employs both the noun λόγος and the verb λογίζομαι extensively in the book. In *Aristeas* the noun has a range of meanings including “word,” “argument,” “speech,” and “reason.” The verb usually means “to use or to apply reason.”

⁶ In his translation, Hadas places language that reflects the LXX in capital letters, but my analysis of §§158–160 makes me wonder the extent to which these phrases could be classified as quotations. Some of the language, like “on the gates” for example, might simply be a serendipitous overlapping of language that parallels the biblical texts only accidentally.

⁷ Hadas, *Aristeas*, 163.

⁸ R. J. H. Shutt, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 2:23; André Pelletier, *Lettre d’Aristée à Philocrate* (SC 89; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1962), 177.

Despite the frequency of these words throughout the work, they do not provide much help in determining the meaning of τὰ λόγια in §158. We do find the noun λόγιον in two other places in *Aristeas*, however, §§97 and 177, and both bear directly on how scholars have understood the noun in the passage on mezuzot.

Paragraphs 96–99 comprise a short section on the vestments of the Jewish high priest Eleazar. The entire section reflects the vocabulary of LXX Exodus 28 and 29, which describe the priestly garments. Among these is the “breastpiece of judgment” (NRSV)—חֹשֶׁן מִשְׁפָּט in the MT and τὸ λόγιον τῶν κρίσεων in the LXX—translated “oracles of judgments” in the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS).⁹ The LXX translator clearly understood this article of high priestly clothing to be connected with oracles, especially since Aaron’s breastpiece contained the Urim and Thummim or sacred lots by which he divined God’s will (see, for example, Num 27:21). The translator thus selected the Greek λόγιον to render the Hebrew חֹשֶׁן. This meaning is consistent with the way the word is used in classical writers like Herodotus who uses it in the plural to refer to oracles.¹⁰ The appearance of this term in *Aristeas* for the high priest’s breastpiece probably derives ultimately from the Greek translation of Exodus, even though some textual confusion has crept into the LXX during the process of its transmission.¹¹

Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, Ps.-*Aristeas* does not seem concerned about any connection between Eleazar’s λόγιον and any high priestly oracular activity, even though that is the main idea of the biblical passage. For Ps.-*Aristeas* the entire spectacle of Eleazar dressed in his priestly outfit “produces awe and distraction, so that one might think that he had gone out of this world into another. And I insist that any

⁹ NETS translations are to be published by Oxford University Press. Until full print publication, NETS is posted in a provisional edition on the NETS website at <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/>.

¹⁰ Hadas, *Aristeas*, 138. LSJ, see under λόγιον.

¹¹ A number of LXX manuscripts have the Greek term λογεῖον in place of λόγιον in Exodus. The first word means “a place for speaking, especially a term in Attic theater,” whereas the second indicates an “oracle or utterance.” John Wevers in his Göttingen edition of Exodus has λόγιον in his main text, and Peter Walters (Katz) has made a compelling case that the translator of Exodus would have used λόγιον and that λογεῖον represents an itacistic variant despite the fact that it is a separate Greek word. Both Philo and Josephus, who both refer to this object as λόγιον, provide additional evidence that the Hebrew חֹשֶׁן was rendered by λόγιον in the Jewish-Greek scriptures. See Philo, *Legum allegoria* III.126, 132 and *De fuga et inventione* 185; Josephus, *Ant.* III.167, 217.

person who comes near to the sight of those things that I have previously recounted will come into amazement and indescribable wonder, turning his mind to the sacred construction of each thing” (§99). In this light, how then ought we to translate the word *λόγιον* in this passage? Certainly, the evidence from the LXX and Ps.-Aristeas’s usage of the term consistently with the LXX suggests that the English “oracle” is the most appropriate translation for the word when used to refer to this article of high priestly clothing.¹²

Although Ps.-Aristeas employs the term *λόγιον* in §97, it occurs in the singular denoting an article of clothing. The use of the plural *τὰ λόγια* in §177 matches much more closely the way the phrase appears in §158. After Eleazar sends the translators to Alexandria, the king receives them, but he is most interested in the manuscripts that they have brought with them. When the Jewish translators unpack and unroll the scrolls, the king “pausing for a long time and doing obeisance about seven times, said, ‘I thank you, O men, and even more the one who sent you, but mostly the God whose sayings/utterances (*τὰ λόγια*) these are.’” In this instance, the Greek phrase almost certainly refers to the entirety of the Jewish law written on the scrolls brought by the prospective translators.

Several occurrences of the term *λόγιον* in the LXX, Second Temple Jewish literature, and the New Testament help us to understand its use in *Aristeas*. In the LXX of Num 24:16, at the beginning of his second prophecy, Balaam refers to himself as one who hears *λόγια θεοῦ*, “oracles of God.” (The identical phrase occurs in 24:4 as well.) In its context, the term almost certainly has its more classical sense of prophetic oracle, and it does not denote any scriptural tradition, especially since it comes from a non-Israelite prophet who “hears” (*ἀκούων*) them. In Deut 33:9–10, the translator appears to have used the plural *λόγια* to refer to the scriptures. In Moses’ blessing of Levi, the MT has “for they observed your word (*ךְתַּרְתּוּם*) and kept your covenant. They teach Jacob your ordinances and Israel your law.” The LXX translator rendered the singular *ךְתַּרְתּוּם* by the plural *λόγια*, and given the parallel context, which contains the terms “covenant,” “ordinances,” and “law,” the plural might well have significance and could refer somehow to some scriptural or authoritative sayings. Since 33:10 refers to ordinances and law, the plural *λόγια* used together with

¹² Hadas, *Aristeas*, 138 gives this English as the translation.

“covenant” (διαθήκη) could identify the corpus of divine sayings that contains the ordinances and laws. A similar situation obtains in Psalms, which has more than 20 occurrences of the word. Two, however, illustrate the possibilities in Psalms. In 19(18).14 the Psalmist says, “Let the words (דְּבָרִים) of my mouth . . . be pleasing unto you.” The translator renders דְּבָרִים with λόγια, here certainly “sayings” or “utterances” in English. In Ps 119(118).148 the second line of the Hebrew verse reads, “that I may meditate on your promise (דְּבָרֶיךָ).” The entire phrase in the Greek is τοῦ μελετᾶν τὰ λόγια σου, “in order to mediate on your λόγια.” The Greek verb μελετάω translates ΠΨ, which is not the usual rendering in Psalms. The usual translation, even within this Psalm is ἀδολεσχέω (see vv. 15, 23, 48, 78 where one meditates on “ordinances” and “commandments”). The conclusion here is that, at the very least, the translator understands τὰ λόγια σου as something that can be studied. Elsewhere, in Ps 1:2 the same verb appears as a translation of דָּרַשׁ and has the object “law” (νόμος). Whether there is an intertextual relationship within the corpus of Psalms going on here is difficult to know, but the parallel idea in Greek, that one can study the Law and the “sayings,” lends support to understanding the latter term as referring to scripture in some form.

Philo uses the word in two places, *On Rewards and Punishments* 1 and *On the Contemplative Life* 25. In both cases, it refers to Jewish scripture, clearly with the meaning of prophetic oracle. Philo begins *On Rewards and Punishments* by saying, “The oracles (λογίων) delivered through the prophet (προφήτου) Moses are of three kinds.”¹³ Moses here takes on the role of prophet, not lawgiver as in *Aristeas*, even though these three kinds of oracles—“the creation of the world,” “history,” and “legislation”—undoubtedly refer to the Pentateuch. In a similar vein, when Philo describes the houses of the Therapeutae in *On the Contemplative Life* 25, he says, “They take nothing into it [their house], either food or drink or any other thing necessary for the needs of the body, but laws (νόμους) and oracles (λόγια) delivered through the mouth of prophets, and psalms (ὕμνους) and anything else which fosters and perfects knowledge and piety.” Again, even though he does not indicate that all these spiritual resources are from Moses and that laws are different from oracles, the word λόγια has to indicate prophetic oracles in this case.

¹³ Translations of Philo are taken from those of F. H. Colson in the Loeb Classical Library series.

Josephus's use of the term in *Jewish War* 311 is a bit more ambiguous, but probably it refers to the Jewish scriptures as having within them prophetic oracles. Commenting on the fact that due to "folly and calamities of their own choosing" Jews were responsible for their own destruction, he writes, "Thus the Jews after the demolition of the Antonia, reduced the temple to a square, although they had it recorded in their own oracles (λόγιοις) that the city and sanctuary would be taken when the temple should become four-square." Whatever source Josephus had in mind here, the plural of λόγιον seems to indicate the collective Jewish scriptures, which contained this prophetic oracle. Thus, both Philo and Josephus emphasize the predictive, oracular character of the word λόγιον, a meaning consonant with its classical usages, but with the clear intention that these oracles either comprise the Jewish scriptures (Philo) or are contained within the Jewish scriptures (Philo and Josephus).

In Rom 3:2, Paul writes about the advantages of the Jews. "First of all," he notes, "they have been entrusted with the oracles of God (NRSV)" (πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ). Paul does not elaborate on the meaning of the phrase "oracles of God," but given the context in which he uses it—he speaks of the unfaithfulness of some Jews in v. 3—he more than likely intends the entire corpus of the Jewish scriptures.¹⁴ The same holds true for Heb 5:12. The author of Hebrews upbraids his readers. They should be teachers themselves, but they still need to be taught "some of the first principles of the sayings/utterances of God" (τινὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ). In this case, the "utterances" probably refer to the Jewish scriptures, especially as they are the repository of divine revelation.¹⁵ The NRSV translates the phrase in Hebrews as "word of God," understanding τὰ λόγια as a reference to the collective Jewish scriptures. In both of these cases, τὰ λόγια is accompanied by the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ, which qualifies who made the utterances. The same thing happens in *Aristeas* §177 with the relative οὗτινος that introduces the clause and whose antecedent is God.

The term also appears without any genitive complement in Acts 7:38, part of Stephen's speech before his death. As he gives a rehearsal of

¹⁴ On τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ in this passage as a reference to the entire Old Testament, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 326.

¹⁵ See Harold W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 159.

Israelite history, he speaks about the Israelite rejection of Moses. “This is the Moses,” he says, “who said to the Israelites, ‘God will raise up a prophet for you from your own people as he raised me up.’” This Moses was with an angel who spoke to him at Sinai and “he received living oracles (λόγια ζῶντα) to give to us.” Connected as they are with Stephen’s injunction of the “prophet like Moses” (Deut 18:15), the “living oracles” seem to play a double role. They comprise the Law that God gave to Moses on Sinai, but they also serve as prophetic predictions of the coming of Jesus, who is that prophet like Moses. In this passage, we see as in Philo, for example, a clear connection between the Law and prediction, that is, the oracular origination of the Jewish Law.

In all the cases in the New Testament, the plural τὰ λόγια suggests an understanding of the Jewish scriptures as those things that God had spoken, but also perhaps as oracular predictions of the coming of Christ. While this divine speech ultimately ended up in writing and was transmitted in some relatively fixed form, God initially gave the scriptures as divine utterances, acts of divine speech. Thus, τὰ λόγια, which walks the semantic line of both speech and prediction, is seen as the most descriptive way to refer to them.

Returning to §158, it appears most appropriate to translate τὰ λόγια as “the sayings” or “utterances” or perhaps, although I think it less likely, “oracles,” in line with the use of the term in §177 and in the LXX and the New Testament (and probably Philo and Josephus). The evidence of §158 suggests that Ps.-Aristeas also understood the Jewish Law to originate as acts of divine speech—in this sense they are oracular—even though he consistently attributes the origination of the law to Moses, the lawgiver. Interestingly, nowhere in *Aristeas* does the author talk explicitly of God giving the Law to Moses orally at Sinai in the form of divine utterances. The closest he comes is in §139 when he says that Moses was “prepared by God for knowledge of all things” (ὑπὸ θεοῦ κατασκευασμένος εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῶν ἀπάτων). Ps.-Aristeas does not display any real interest in the potential predictive aspect of the term. The designation of the high priest’s breastpiece as τὸ λόγιον seems to me to be simply conventional by the time of *Aristeas*, and for Ps.-Aristeas it is devoid of any oracular function.¹⁶ Thus, either

¹⁶ In the *Testament of Levi*, Levi’s investment as a priest involves a “breastplate of understanding” (λόγιον συνέσεως). The phrase differs from the Septuagint’s τὸ λόγιον τῶν κρίσεων. The translation above is from H. W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The*

“utterances” or “sayings” makes the most sense to me as a translation of τὰ λόγια in §158.

Another facet of the problem is what exactly the author of *Aristeas* understood the content of τὰ λόγια to be. Almost certainly in §177 the phrase refers to the entire Jewish Law, and Pelletier in his *Sources chrétiennes* edition of *Aristeas* understands it the same way in §158 when he comments, “C’est le plus ancien exemple de τὰ λόγια pour designer l’ensemble de la Loi.”¹⁷ But can this really be the intended content of the mezuzot referred to in §158? Ps.-Aristeas must have known, if he was indeed familiar with the practice of placing mezuzot on doorposts and gates, that these small boxes did not contain the entire Law. In later rabbinic tradition Deut 6:4–9 and 11:13–21, which provide the warrant for the use of mezuzot, always appear as required texts. As we will also see with the phylacteries, the finds from Qumran have provided much additional information about the use of mezuzot in the Second Temple period, including what texts they might contain. The mezuzot from Qumran often include additional texts to those on the rabbinic list, especially Exod 20:1–14, Deut 6:6–18, and the Ten Commandments.¹⁸ It seems unlikely that Ps.-Aristeas simply is referring to the Ten Commandments in §158, since they are not called λόγια in the Greek Pentateuch, but λόγοι in LXX Exodus (20:1) and ῥήματα in Deuteronomy (5:22).

So what does the phrase τὰ λόγια refer to in *Aristeas* §158—the collective Jewish Law or some smaller collection of texts? Several considerations provide a basis for some informed speculation about the answer to that question. First, I do think that Ps.-Aristeas is familiar with the practice of Jews affixing mezuzot to their doors and gates. *Aristeas* does not demonstrate a clear enough relationship with the LXX to argue that the author directly depends on the biblical text for his description of the mezuzot. If he was interested in reflecting directly the text of the LXX, we would expect closer conformity with the LXX than we find, not only in the wording of the descriptions in *Aristeas*, but also in the manner that Jews employ mezuzot. So, for example, one might

Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary (SVTP 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 151. They comment that the phrase is reminiscent of the high priest’s breastplate in Exodus 28 and that the “term ‘understanding’ may refer to the ability of the priests to interpret God’s will and predict the future by means of the Urim and Tummim kept in the breastplate (one should note that λόγιον [also] means ‘oracle’)”.

¹⁷ Pelletier, *Lettre d’Aristée*, 177, n. 5.

¹⁸ See, Schiffman, “Phylacteries and Mezuzot,” 677 and J. T. Milik in *DJD* 6, 80–85.

reasonably expect Ps.-Aristeas to agree more exactly with the LXX about where the mezuzot are placed—on the doorposts rather than on the doors themselves.

If we assume for the moment that Ps.-Aristeas actually does know about these things first hand, I find it hard to believe that τὰ λόγια in §158 signifies the entire Law. The author had to know better. But is he familiar with a collection of standard texts that should appear in mezuzot? The evidence from Qumran suggests that whoever made the ritual objects found there drew on a relatively well-defined corpus of texts, even if it was not always identical to the corpus approved by the rabbis later on. Indeed, this fascinating question is what initially drew me to this passage. Unfortunately, the evidence in *Aristeas* does not allow us to draw any conclusions about this problem. My suspicion is that the Qumran evidence is relevant only inasmuch as there was probably a “short list” of texts, but which texts got copied into phylacteries and mezuzot might have varied from place to place. There is no reason to assume that the practice at Qumran would have been the same as that in Alexandria.

“He has commanded us expressly to fasten the sign upon our hands”

Unlike his reference to the fringes and even the mezuzot, Ps.-Aristeas more unambiguously reflects the biblical warrant for the use of phylacteries or tefillin. The text of *Aristeas* reads, “καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν δὲ διαρρήδην τὸ σημεῖον κελεύει περιτῆσθαι” (“And also he has commanded us expressly to fasten the sign upon our hands”). *Aristeas* shares some of the vocabulary of the command in the Septuagint, even if it is not a close citation of it. The LXX contains four places where God commands Israelites to wear phylacteries. Deuteronomy 6:8 and 11:18 both report the requirement to bind God’s commandments on the hands and forehead. In Deut 6:8 we read, καὶ ἀφάψεις αὐτὰ εἰς σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός σου (“And bind [sg.] them as a sign on your [sg.] hand”), whereas 11:18, the parallel commandment, differs slightly, καὶ ἀφάψετε αὐτὰ εἰς σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός ὑμῶν (“and you [pl.] shall bind [pl.] them as a sign upon your [pl.] hand”).

The second two passages, Exod 13:9 and 16, do not mention explicitly what is to be on the hands and forehead, nor do they use the verb “to bind.”¹⁹ The injunction, however, as we see when we compare the

¹⁹ I am grateful to Shani Berrin of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for drawing my attention to this passage.

Deuteronomy passage, seems to assume the same practice—placing something on the hands and the forehead as a sign. The commands in Exodus differ from each other in small but important details. Both 13:9 and 16 are the culmination of separate discussions of the divine injunction to “Consecrate to me every firstborn, first-produced, opening every womb among the sons of Israel, from human being to animal.” Exod 13:9 follows immediately after the institution of the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the command to tell one’s son, “For this reason the Lord God acted for me when I was going out of Egypt.” The verse itself reads, καὶ ἔσται σοι σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός σου καὶ μνημόσυνον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, ὅπως ἂν γένηται ὁ νόμος κυρίου ἐν τῷ στόματι σου (“And it will be a sign for you upon your [sg.] hand and a memorial before your [sg.] eyes, in order that the Law of the Lord might be in your [sg.] mouth” [NETS]). The second command comes several verses after the first. Again, the son asks about the meaning of redeeming of the firstborn. After the father’s reply, which notes the divine act of killing the firstborn of Egypt and the redemption of the firstborn, the text continues, καὶ ἔσται εἰς σημεῖον ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός σου καὶ ἀσάλευτον πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου. ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ κραταιᾷ ἐξήγαγέν σε κύριος ἐξ Αἰγύπτου (“And it shall be for a sign on your [sg.] hand and immovable before your [sg.] eyes. For with a mighty hand, the Lord brought you out of Egypt” [NETS]).

Aristeas shares with the LXX of Exodus and Deuteronomy the noun σημεῖον but the author employs the plural of χεῖρ rather than the singular of both Exodus and Deuteronomy; it has the compound verb instead of the simplex in Deuteronomy. (Exodus has no verb either for binding or for writing.) Furthermore the word order of Ps.-Aristeas’s allusion to the biblical commands differs from the text of the LXX in both Exodus and Deuteronomy. Ps.-Aristeas places the prepositional phrase “on the hands” in front of the verb, which in *Aristeas* is an infinitive complement to the main verb κελεύει. In one intriguing way, *Aristeas* echoes the form of the commandment given in Exod 13:9. As I noted above, the entirety of Eleazar’s apologia is dominated by words having to do with signifying and remembering. Both of these ideas find expression in Exodus.²⁰ The command will be a “*sign* upon your hand and a *memorial* before your eyes.” Although no word for remembering occurs in *Aristeas* in direct connection with the practice of using phylacteries,

²⁰ In Deuteronomy one teaches, observes, talks about the commandments, but neither Deuteronomy 6 nor 11 enjoins remembering.

the theme of calling to mind the Law or remembering it permeates the entirety of Eleazar's speech, including two mentions of reminding right at the end of §158.

The greatest difference between *Aristeas* and the biblical injunctions, of course, is Ps.-Aristeas's omission of the second part of the biblical command—to bind the Law on the forehead in addition to the hands. If Ps.-Aristeas were directly dependent on the LXX of Exodus and/or Deuteronomy, then this citation might work as shorthand for the entire commandment. Nothing in *Aristeas* unambiguously indicates that such is the case, however. Perhaps this passage describes the practice as Ps.-Aristeas knew it. Uncertainty remains, however, whether Ps.-Aristeas intended only the binding of the phylactery on the hands or whether he meant to include the binding on the forehead as well. Even if no specific practice lies behind this report, the text in *Aristeas* raises important questions about the relationship between texts and their transmissions as well as the way that these traditions are understood in particular Jewish contexts and communities.

In §159, Aristeas states that the commandment is to fasten “the sign upon the hands”—that is, unlike the commands in Deuteronomy where God's words are the object of the binding or in Exodus where there is no binding mentioned, in *Aristeas* τὸ σημεῖον is the object of the verb. Ps.-Aristeas makes no mention of texts being contained in the phylacteries. As the passage is worded, apparently the phylacteries themselves, not the texts placed in them, are the reminder that one's actions must be accomplished with righteousness.²¹ The reference to the practice using the essential vocabulary of both Exodus and Deuteronomy might indicate that Ps.-Aristeas understood that at least these passages should be contained in the phylactery, but such a suggestion really amounts to little more than speculation. In the phylacteries from Qumran, the four passages that the rabbis later standardized appear—Exod 13:1–10, 13:11–16, Deut 6:4–9, 11:13–21—along with some additional and longer passages, especially Deut 5:1–6:9, 10:12–11:21, Exod 12:43–13:16, Deut 32 (in one case).²² Yet for Ps.-Aristeas, whatever text(s) might be

²¹ Hadas (*Aristeas*, 163) translates the beginning of §159 as “And he has expressly bidden us to ‘bind *them* [emphasis mine] for a sign upon the hands.’” The grammar of the sentence, however, provides no warrant for an unexpressed *them* as the object of the binding. I think that the LXX of Deuteronomy has influenced Hadas here. The grammar of *Aristeas* indicates that τὸ σημεῖον is the object.

²² Sidnie Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, forthcoming). I am grateful to the author for making a prepublication version

contained in the phylactery seems of little consequence when compared to the symbolic value of the object itself.

In the very next paragraph, §160, Ps.-Aristeas does cite at least part of LXX Deuteronomy exactly. Deuteronomy 6:7 enjoins the Israelites to “recite (προβιβάσεις) them (i.e. the commandments) to your children and talk (λαλήσεις) about them at home and when you are away and when you lie down and when you rise (κοιταζομένους και διανισταμένους).” Ps.-Aristeas reproduces these last two participles precisely in these forms. Yet, he claims that the obligation is to study or meditate on (μελετᾶν) the commandments rather than to “recite” them or “talk” about them. Although there is no clear evidence that Ps.-Aristeas is familiar with Greek translations of the Hebrew scriptures other than the Pentateuch, it might be of more than passing interest that the verb μελετάω occurs in LXX Ps 1:2 as what the righteous person does with the law—καὶ ἐν τῷ νομῷ αὐτοῦ μελετήσει ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός (“And in his law he will meditate day and night”). Yet, whether or not Ps.-Aristeas knows an actual translation of Psalms, the use of μελετάω in this passage might well point to an intertextual interplay that results in the interpretations of the Mosaic commandments that we see in *Aristeas* generally.

The object of μελετάω in this paragraph is also of some interest. According to *Aristeas* one is to study the κατασκευάς, “provisions,” when one lies down or rises up. The noun κατασκευή and the verb κατασκευάζω occur with relative frequency as all-purpose words in *Aristeas*, and they have a range of meanings, usually “prepare” or “construct.” So, for example, in §2 a “pure disposition of mind” is “fashioned/prepared” (κατασκευάζεται). In §17, Aristeas prays that God would “dispose/prepare (κατασκευάσαι) the mind” of the king to grant his request for the release of the Jewish slaves. §76 refers to the “construction” (κατασκευήν) of the bowls sent by the king to the high priest Eleazar. In §160, these “provisions” most likely refer to the Mosaic Law, which enables the Jew to judge properly and to observe the “divine and

of one chapter available to me. Since Ps.-Aristeas does not say which passages get included in phylacteries, I am not concerned here with the forms of the text and whether they are sectarian or not. For these issues, see Schiffman, “Phylacteries and Mezuzot,” 2:676; Geza Vermes, “Pre-mishnaic Worship and the Phylacteries from the Dead Sea,” *VT* 9 (1959): 65–72; Esther Eshel, “4QDeutⁿ—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing,” *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117–53; George J. Brooke, “Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 57–70.

incomprehensible interchange” between waking and sleeping. In this case, Ps.-Aristeas apparently is referring to the entire corpus of commandments that God has provided for the Jews. Yet, the repetition of *κελεύει δέ*, “and he commanded,” in both §159 and §160 probably indicates that Ps.-Aristeas thought of the two paragraphs as separate divine commands, even though they are linked together in Deuteronomy. The meaning of *κατασκευάς*, then, in §160 would appear to have no bearing on how we understand §159, especially regarding the identity of specific texts contained in the phylacteries.

“He has commanded”—Aristeas and the sources of Jewish ritual practice

When I initially began to look at the three paragraphs under investigation in this article, I was attracted by the question of whether the phrase *τὰ λόγια* gave any indication that Ps.-Aristeas was aware of a specific corpus of texts that would have been included either in mezuzot or phylacteries. No clear answer to that question emerges from the discussions above. The question that does emerge more forcefully is how the descriptions of these ritual practices relate to the biblical passages from which they most likely derived. Certainly Ps.-Aristeas has a notion of scripture. As we looked at the meaning of *τὰ λόγια* in §158, we saw that the likelihood is that he understood the Jewish scriptural tradition as comprised of acts of divine speech which were given in written form by the lawgiver, Moses. This conclusion finds some additional confirmation in §155, where Ps.-Aristeas, commenting on the relationship between memory and Jewish food laws about cud-chewing animals, offers a passage from what he calls scripture (*γραφή*). Yet, even here he connects a term for writing with an act of divine speech: *διὸ παρακελεύεται καὶ διὰ τῆς γραφῆς ὁ λέγων οὕτως* (“Therefore he also exhorts us through the scripture, when he says . . .”).²³

In the paragraphs before us, however, the references in *Aristeas* are far from what could be called citations. Indeed, we find similar circumstances elsewhere in the work. Perhaps the best places to look for comparison are the descriptions of the high priest’s garments and of the table prepared by the king as a gift for the Jewish Temple. In his description of the high priest’s garments (§§96–99), Ps.-Aristeas does know the

²³ The quotation, however, does not come from any one place, but looks like a combination and adaptation of Deut 7:18 and 10:21.

names of the major pieces of high priestly clothing and their decoration. So, for example, he reports that the χιτῶν has golden bells and pomegranates on its hem. He also says that the priest wears a κίδαρις and a μίτρα on his head. Yet, despite what scholars see as allusions to almost the entirety of Exodus 28, only a select few words or short phrases appear in both the biblical passage and in *Aristeas*. The same holds true of the description of the table for the Temple. Almost the entire description (§§51–72) differs completely from the text of the LXX, with only a few phrases matching the language of the Greek Bible. Two examples will suffice here to illustrate the situation. In §57, the measurements of the table are given as δύο γὰρ πῆχεων τὸ μῆκος πῆχεος δὲ τὸ εὖρος, τὸ δὲ ὕψος πῆχεος καὶ ἡμίσεως συνετέλουν (“So they fashioned [it] two cubits in length and a cubit in width and a cubit and a half in height”).²⁴ These measurements match the language of Exodus almost exactly, except for the last phrase, which Exodus has as ἡμίσεως τὸ ὕψος. Immediately following this clause, *Aristeas*’s description turns to the materials used to construct the table. *Aristeas* agrees with the LXX and Josephus against the MT when it reports that that the table was made “of pure gold” (χρυσίου δοκίμου). Even here, however, where *Aristeas* agrees with the LXX’s description of the table, the text differs from the exact wording of the LXX. Whereas *Aristeas* uses the adjective δοκίμου, the LXX modifies the noun with καθαροῦ.²⁵

The range of examples cited above in §§57, 96–99, and 158–160 are typical of *Aristeas*, and they suggest that even though we do not find direct citation of the Greek Jewish scriptures, Ps.-*Aristeas* probably knew them. These examples also point to larger concerns in *Aristeas*. Recently two scholars have argued that the story of the Exodus plays an important and central role in shaping the narrative in *Aristeas*. Sylvie Hongiman has identified three scenes that she calls the “Exodus paradigm”—the freeing of the Jewish slaves, the selection of the 72 translators, and the community reception of the translation—by which Ps.-*Aristeas* claims scriptural status for the Greek translation of

²⁴ The phrase πῆχεος δὲ τὸ εὖρος does not appear in manuscripts of *Aristeas*, but in the estimation of most scholars, it has dropped out accidentally in the process of transmission and does belong in the text. See, Pelletier, *Lettre d’Aristée*, 134.

²⁵ While the two adjectives can be translated roughly as synonyms here, the manuscript tradition of Exodus does not contain δοκίμου anywhere as a variant of καθαροῦ.

the Law.²⁶ Going much farther than Honigman, Arkady Kovelman contends that *Aristeas* “includes all the major contents of the Exodus, from Egyptian enslavement of the Jews to the gift of Torah on Mount Sinai, from the construction of the tabernacle to the banquets of the elders. What looks like digression on the surface is the real essence inside [sic].”²⁷ Whether one agrees with Honigman or Kovelman on how influential the Exodus is in *Aristeas*, it clearly frames a number of important features of the story, even if Ps.-Aristeas does not appear interested in citing the biblical form of the narrative directly.

Thus, when talking about the relationship of *Aristeas* to the LXX, two basic questions seem to confront the interpreter. First, how do we understand the role of this “big picture” in which the Exodus story seems so critical to the way that Ps.-Aristeas composed his narrative? Second, to what degree can we speak of Ps.-Aristeas being dependent on the text of the LXX for individual passages or sections?

Despite the fact that Ps.-Aristeas portrays the LXX as a *text*, indeed an *authoritative text derived from an authoritative text*, he also appears heavily invested in the oral nature of the Jewish scriptures as acts of divine speech. This portrayal of scripture (γραφή) as originating or grounded in divine speech might provide some entrée into thinking about the bigger picture. Writing about ancient texts and scribal education, David Carr, in his recent book *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, argues,

The fundamental idea is the following: as we look at how key texts like the Bible and other classic literature functioned in ancient cultures, what was primary was not how such texts were inscribed on clay, parchment, or papyri. Rather what was truly crucial was how those written media were part of a cultural project of incising key cultural-religious traditions—word for word—on *people’s minds*. . . Scribal recollection of early traditions was assured partly through teaching students to read and reproduce written copies of the key traditions. Nevertheless the aim of the educational process was ultimately the scribe’s memorization of the cultural tradition and cultivation of his (or occasionally her) ability to perform it.²⁸

For Carr, in antiquity there was a complex and sophisticated interplay between orality and literacy even in cultures where literacy and textuality

²⁶ Sylvie Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship* (London/New York: Routledge, 2003).

²⁷ Arkady Kovelman, *Between Alexandria and Jerusalem: The Dynamic of Jewish and Hellenistic Culture* (Brill Reference Library of Judaism 21; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 131.

²⁸ David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford, 2005), 8–9.

were widespread. Despite the traditional attempt to identify dependence on a written text, *Aristeas* might well testify to the importance of the text inscribed on the heart of the scribe, that is, the text's author, who in his work "performs" the biblical text by embedding it as the foundation and frame of his story of the translation of the Mosaic Law and thereby, by his mastery of the text, manipulates and shapes it in the performance. In Carr's estimation, we should not necessarily look to *Aristeas* to reproduce the exact text of the LXX, even though the work's author almost certainly knew it. In fact, his ability to manipulate the LXX within the context of his own work testifies to his mastery of the biblical text. Might we see in his performance reflections of the LXX text in *Aristeas*? Of course we might, and indeed we should probably expect them. The ancient scribe who learned and performed the text was not necessarily or even primarily interested in a reproduction of the text within another work, even if he had indeed memorized and mastered the text he now performed.

The work of Hindy Najman offers a slightly different, but not necessarily an unrelated, lens through which we might view this set of issues, particularly the way that *Aristeas* treats the Mosaic Law. Najman identifies in Jewish antiquity what she calls a Mosaic Discourse, a discourse tied to a founder, which, beginning with the biblical book of Deuteronomy, ascribes an expanded role to Moses and recognizes an authoritative law that comes to be known as the Torah of Moses.²⁹ Najman writes about Mosaic Discourse,

The idea of a discourse tied to a founder provides, I want to suggest, a helpful way to think about the developing conceptions of the Mosaic Law and figure of Moses. On this understanding of a discourse tied to a founder, to rework an earlier text is to update, interpret and develop the content of that text in a way that one claims to be an authentic expression of the law already accepted as authoritatively Mosaic. Thus, when what *we* might call a "new" law—perhaps even what we might regard as a significant "amendment" of older law—is characterized as the Law of Moses, this is not to imply that it is to be found within the actual words of an historical individual called Moses. It is rather to say that the implementation of the law in question would enable Israel to return to the authentic teaching associated with the prophetic status of Moses.³⁰

²⁹ Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

³⁰ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 13.

She further argues that a participant in Mosaic Discourse incorporates a number of specific features: (1) a text that expands or reworks older Mosaic traditions “claims for itself the authority that already attaches to those traditions;” (2) “[t]he new text ascribes to itself the status of Torah;” (3) “[t]he new text is said to be a re-presentation of the revelation at Sinai;” (4) “the new text is said to be associated with, or produced by, the founding figure, Moses.”³¹ While Ps.-Aristeas does not make these claims about his own narrative, he does make them about the Septuagint. So, in the case of Eleazar’s *apologia*, and more broadly his claims about the LXX, one could claim that *Aristeas* is a participant in Mosaic Discourse.

What I find especially helpful in Najman’s work is the notion of the development of a discourse tied to a founder, which shifts our focus from the particular textual details of agreement or disagreement between *Aristeas* and the LXX to the manner in which Ps.-Aristeas employs what he understands to be Mosaic Law in the service of his larger aims. Thus, through Eleazar’s *apologia* for the Law, one of Ps.-Aristeas’s concerns is to identify those things that distinguish Jews from Gentiles—they do not worship idols and they follow a set of divinely given laws, most visibly having to do with food—while at the same time he argues that Jewish values are consistent with and even superior to those of the dominant Hellenistic culture, since these laws are intended to remind Jews of their moral obligations to God.

So, even as we note in *Aristeas* §§158–160 the similarities with and differences from the biblical text concerning the ritual practices of the fringes, mezuzot, and phylacteries, we are reminded that our conception of what a biblical text is and how it ought to be used probably differs from that of *Aristeas*’s author. These paragraphs fit into larger agendas being played out in *Aristeas*—for example, the scriptural status of the Septuagint and the relationship of Jews to Hellenistic culture.

Nevertheless as scholars try to understand Jewish ritual practice in the Second Temple period, these three paragraphs in the *Letter of Aristeas* will continue to constitute primary evidence for Jewish observance of aspects of Mosaic legislation. Combined with the evidence of the phylacteries and mezuzot from Qumran, the evidence from *Aristeas* helps us to fill in a few more of the details.

³¹ Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 16–17.

PRAYERS IN JUBILEES

John C. Endres, S.J.
Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley

As is well known, Jubilees retells the biblical story in Genesis and the early chapters of Exodus, presenting an adapted version of the biblical narrative from the creation of the world to Moses' life in Egypt. This author expands the biblical story in several ways, including the placement of much legislation from later parts of the Torah into the patriarchal narratives and many narrative expansions of the basic biblical story. But one aspect of this rewriting has received little explicit attention in previous studies: the prayer texts in Jubilees. Since none of these prayer texts has an exact biblical counterpart, we may consider them as compositions by the author of Jubilees. Like some of the speeches created for theological histories such as Joshua through 2 Kings and 1–2 Chronicles, these prayers may enhance the view of the theological and spiritual sensibilities of Jubilees' author and his community.

Written in the mid-second century B.C.E., these prayers in Jubilees provide an important witness to early biblical interpretation and to notions of Jewish prayer. The plan of this paper is to offer a working definition of a prayer text, then survey those texts in Jubilees which we consider as prayers, and finally to determine the particular orientation of these prayers, and the theological contribution they make to the understanding of this text.

A few notes on the texts themselves precede the discussion. Although Jubilees was composed in Hebrew, none of these prayer texts appear among the surviving Hebrew manuscripts of Jubilees known to us, those discovered at Qumran. Additionally, only one of these prayers is witnessed in the Latin fragments of Jubilees found in the Ambrosian library in Milan and published by Ceriani.¹ Thus, any study of these

¹ First published in: Antonius Maria Ceriani, ed., *Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae: Opera collegii doctorum ejusdem*. Mediolani: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1861–. The Latin text is fully reproduced in VanderKam's critical edition of Jubilees; (see f.n. #3) and is also available in R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees: Otherwise Known Among the Greeks as HE LEPTÉ GENESIS*; Edited from Four Manuscripts (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1895).

prayers must be based on the translation of the text into Ge'ez, i.e. classical Ethiopic.² This study relies on the critical text most recently established by James VanderKam and (except where otherwise indicated) also uses his translation of *Jubilees*.³

It is a pleasure to honor Betsy Halpern Amaru with this study because of her vigorous and innovative work on the Book of *Jubilees*. She has provided unique insights into the role of the covenant and land in this and other books of "Rewritten Bible" of this same general era,⁴ and also developed a sophisticated view of the ways in which the expanded roles of women in this work might be interpreted.⁵ Finally, I am still grateful for the opportunity to participate in a Ge'ez reading group in Jerusalem in spring 1997 with her and Esther Chazon, where I first read some of these texts. Those sessions provide a key ingredient in this study.

A Working Definition of Prayer

Several definitions of prayer emerge in the recent study of ancient prayer texts, especially those from the Second Temple and Qumran eras. A very broad definition prefaces a recent anthology of prayers from Jewish, Christian and Classical traditions: "An address to or celebration of a deity."⁶ Eileen Schuller has written extensively on prayer texts from Qumran and recently she spoke of prayers as "words addressed

² James VanderKam, in *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM, 14; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), discerned that in places where the Hebrew text from Qumran is extant, the Ge'ez translation offers a rather accurate translation of the Hebrew version.

³ James C. VanderKam, transl., *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511, Scriptorum Aethiopicum, tomus 88; Louvain: E. Peeters, 1989). In cases of important words or motifs, we attempt to discern their significance through a limited comparison with other usages of the words in Ge'ez texts.

⁴ Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, Pa., Trinity Press International, 1994), especially ch. 3, "The Metahistorical Covenant of *Jubilees*," 25–54.

⁵ Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJSup 60; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999).

⁶ Mark Kiley, ed., *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 2; hereafter cited as: Kiley, *Prayer*. For an earlier collection of studies of prayers, with a full bibliography, cf.: Charlesworth, James H., ed., with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley, *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era* (Valley Forge, Pa., Trinity Press International, 1994), though it lacks a precise definition of prayer.

to God or spoken in praise of God, specifically devotional in intent and expressing fundamental sentiments of thanksgiving, praise, petition, and confession of sin.⁷ In a discussion of prayer texts from Qumran, she lists the following prayers in Jubilees, but notes that nothing of them remains in the Hebrew texts found at Qumran: prayer of Noah (Jub 10:3–6); prayer of Abraham (Jub. 12:19–21; 13:16); prayer of Moses (Jub 1:19–20).⁸ In her study of prayer in the Second Temple era, Judith Newman defines prayer as “address to God that is initiated by humans; it is not conversational in nature; and it includes address to God in the second person, although it can include third person description of God.”⁹ All three definitions include words addressed to God as prayer, and we concur. Both Kiley (“celebration of a deity”) and Schuller (“words spoken in praise of God”) admit praise or hymnic celebration of God into the category of prayer, but we will allow only one case of a blessing, because it leads into a prayer of thanksgiving (22:4 and 6). Thus, we omit numerous “celebrations of God” counted among the list of blessings spoken by one human for another.¹⁰

Four texts begin with the words “he prayed [*wa-šallaya*]” (1:19; 10:3; 11:17; 12:19, 22) which clearly identifies them as prayers. We consider one other case as prayer: Abraham “blessed [*bāraka*] the most high God” (22:6). The latter text connects with ritual activities, particularly the festival of Shavuot/“Oaths” (22:5), the central festival of the community represented by the Book of Jubilees. Drawing on Newman’s definition, we isolate sayings in which the human beings initiate the address to God, and address God in the second person. Later, as we consider the theology of these prayers we shall invoke another strategy suggested by Schuller: “Analyze all the God-language in a prayer (prayers) in terms

⁷ Eileen Schuller, “Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000), 29–45, esp. 30f.

⁸ Eileen Schuller, “Prayer at Qumran,” in *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature: Yearbook 2004* (ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley; Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004), 411–428. These prayers are noted on 417.

⁹ Judith H. Newman, *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBLEJL 14; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1999), 6–7.

¹⁰ Abraham Blesses Jacob (22:10–22), Abraham Blesses Jacob again (22:27–30), Rebecca Blesses Jacob (25:15–22), Isaac Blesses Jacob (26:22–23), Blessing for Jacob (27:11), Jacob Blesses God (29:4), Jacob Blesses Levi (31:13–17), Jacob Blesses Judah (31:18–20), Jacob Blesses God (31:25), Report of a Prayer by Jacob (32:7), Isaac’s Blessing Prayer for His Two Sons (36:15–16).

of the epithets, attributes of God, theological-sounding statements.”¹¹ Here we shall observe a preponderance of language addressed to God as creator.

Prayer against the power of evil spirits was a subject of increasing prominence in several Second Temple Jewish writings. Several of these prayer texts feature the problem of evil spirits: 1:19–21; 10:3–6; 12:19–21. In a recent essay Armin Lange had described two of these prayers, Jubilees 10 (prayer of Noah) and Jubilees 12 (prayer of Abraham), as “hymnic exorcisms.”¹² In addition, in his 2004 dissertation Michael Segal discusses three of these prayers (Noah’s Prayer [10:1–13]; Moses’s Prayer [1:19–21]; and Abraham’s Prayer [12:19–20]) in Part II: “The Origin of Evil.” For Segal, each of these prayers forms an important part of his argument that there is an “editorial layer” in Jubilees which has a markedly dualistic world view.¹³

In addition, these two prayers provide important analogues for the prayers against demons in the Qumran songs or psalms over the Stricken (11QPsAp^a).¹⁴ Recall that a relatively large number of manuscripts of Jubilees were found at Qumran,¹⁵ so the significance of Jubilees for that community may be presumed. Thus it is generally assumed that the Book of Jubilees was well-known and revered by the community which occupied the site at Qumran, and which produced and preserved other prayers designed to ward off the power of evil spirits. So the world-view and theological issues which emerge in these prayers can be presumed to constitute an aspect of the theology and world view of part of the Qumran community. Now we survey the prayers thus identified.

¹¹ Schuller, “Petitionary Prayer,” 34.

¹² Armin Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies* (ed. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez, and John Kampen; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), 377–436; citation from 383.

¹³ Michael Segal, “The Book of *Jubilees*: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology” (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University, 2004 [Hebrew]), 151–161, 216–224, 227–228.

¹⁴ A recent study of Psalm 91 compares its angelology with that of 4Q 510–511, *Songs of the Sage*, and 11Q PsAp^a, and concludes that the demonology of the *Song of the Sage* resembles that found in Jubilees far more than that found in the Cave 11 texts; Matthias Henze, “Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (SDSS 3; ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 2005), esp. 187–189.

¹⁵ There are approximately thirteen (13) manuscripts of this book (from Caves 1, 2, 3, 4, and 11); thus Jubilees is represented/ preserved in a wide range of Qumran caves.

(1) *Prayer of Moses* [1:19–21]

Moses utters this prayer after hearing from God how the people Israel would turn away from him (1:7–14) but then return to God (1:15–18). Moses prays in response to the divine word, since Jubilees presents itself as a revelation to Moses at Sinai. God will not abandon them, even though they deserve it, for God has promised that Israel will turn back to God, who will transplant them “as a righteous plant” (1:16) into a sanctuary. As we learn, this consoling message does not completely assuage Moses’ fears since he still begs God not to abandon his people.

This prayer of Moses includes two wishes and two petitions. First, he prays to God: do not let your people follow their erroneous ways and do not deliver them into the control of enemy nations (v. 19). Second, may God’s mercy be lifted up over Israel. Third, create (spelled out twice) a just and holy spirit for your people. Fourth, and for our purposes a key element: “may the spirit of Belial not rule over them.” These wishes and petitions remind us of traditions in the lament Psalms, and the prayer also articulates a confession of faith: here is God’s people and heritage, whom he rescued from Egypt (v. 21a). The aspect of complaint, however, is quite muted in this prayer.

This prayer reminds us of the scene with Moses at Mount Sinai, so worried about his people that he prays to God for them (cf. Exod 32:11–14 and Deut 9:25–29). A parallel text in Deuteronomy includes language so similar that it could have inspired the composition of this prayer in Jubilees.¹⁶ We can profit from a synoptic view of that text in Deuteronomy with this prayer of Moses.

JUBILEES 1:19–21

(19) [Then Moses fell prostrate and prayed [*wa-šallaya*] and said:

“Lord, my God, do not allow your people and your heritage to go

DEUTERONOMY 9:25–29 [NRSV]

²⁵Throughout the forty days and forty nights that I lay prostrate before the LORD when the LORD intended to destroy you,

²⁶I prayed to the LORD and said, “Lord GOD, do not destroy the people who are your very own

¹⁶ Klaus Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ, II: Unterweisung in erzählender Form; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1981), 317.

along in the error of their minds, and do not deliver them into the control of the nations with the result that they rule over them lest they make them sin against you.

(20) May your mercy, Lord, be lifted over your people. Create for them a just spirit. May the spirit of Belial not rule them so as to bring charges against them before you and to trap them from every proper path so that they may be destroyed from your presence.

(21) They are your people and your heritage whom you have rescued from Egyptian control by your great power. Create for them a pure mind and a holy spirit. May they not be trapped in their sins from now to eternity.”

possession, whom you redeemed in your greatness, whom you brought out of Egypt with a mighty hand.

²⁷Remember your servants, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; pay no attention to the stubbornness of this people, their wickedness and their sin, ²⁸otherwise the land from which you have brought us might say, ‘Because the LORD was not able to bring them into the land that he promised them, and because he hated them, he has brought them out to let them die in the wilderness.’

²⁹For they are the people of your very own possession, whom you brought out by your great power and by your outstretched arm.”
Psalm 51:12 ¹²Restore to me the joy of your salvation, and sustain in me a willing spirit.

In Jubilees, as in Deuteronomy, Moses petitions God not to annihilate his people but to keep in mind his own people whom he had freed. In the following citation, we indicate the additions of Jubilees in italics: “do not allow your people and your heritage to go along *in the error of their minds*” (v. 19) and “May your *mercy*, Lord, be lifted over your people. *Create* for them a just spirit. May *the spirit of Belial* not rule them” (v. 20) and “*Create* for them a pure mind and a holy spirit. May they not be trapped in their sins from now to eternity” (v. 21). In Jubilees Moses speaks much more pointedly of the people’s waywardness and the possibility of error and sin, bringing into sharper focus the petition inherent in the Deuteronomic speech. Here the author articulates what Israel needs from God to maintain their freedom: freedom from the spirit of Belial and creation of a pure mind and holy spirit for them.

In reply, God assures Moses that the people will ultimately return to him, even though he knows their contrary nature. Moreover, he will circumcise their hearts and those of their progeny and he will create for

them a “holy spirit,” purifying them so that they will never turn away from following God (i.e. by doing God’s commandments). God offers more than Moses had even requested: the end result will be a new relationship with God, in which Israel will be called “sons of the living God” (1:25).

In response, God promised that all angels and spirits will know them and recognize this relationship between God and Israel, for the people of Israel “are my sons and I am their father in uprightness and righteousness” (1:25). Angels and spirits bespeak a world-view more familiar in Second Temple times, so Jubilees’ concern with demons emerges here. In addition, God demonstrates “mercy,” and though the prayer does not address God as “creator,” Moses implores God to “*create* for them a just spirit,” echoing language about a creator God. While the diction and theology of this prayer correspond to the narrative *mise en scène* of the revelation and covenant at Sinai, the prayer hints at key aspects of theology that we will observe in the next prayer to be considered, that of Noah: a God of mercy, who creates, and who is powerful enough to prevent the “spirit of Beliar” from ruling over Israel.

(2) *The Prayer of Noah* [10:3–6]

Noah’s prayer may be the most important one of this collection because here the author demonstrates in the story of Noah’s life why people need to be concerned about the influence of evil spirits. The situation that evokes Noah’s words addressing God is considered so dire that the prayer is often described, as we noted earlier, as an exorcism or as magic.

Noah is a very imposing figure in Jubilees, and here is the context of his prayer. After the birth notice for him (4:28), Jubilees lists his sons and all his descendants, then describes the Flood and the covenant that concludes these events. There follows his celebration of the Feast of Shavuot, an exposition of the reasons for using the solar (364 day) calendar, various problems faced by his descendants, and the partitioning of the land between Shem, Ham, Japheth and Cainan. Jubilees concludes its treatment of Noah with a death notice in 10:15–17.

For Jubilees the most significant event of this era was the destruction caused by the Flood. In Jubilees, the reasons for the Flood seem to parallel the Priestly explanation in Gen 6:11–12, that the earth was filled with injustice and violence. In two different texts, both connected with Enoch traditions about the Watchers,¹⁷ the author of

¹⁷ James C. VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century

Jubilees makes a connection between the ‘injustice/violence’ (*ammaḏā*) on the earth and the Flood: 5:2 and 7:23. The Ge’ez term *ammaḏā* is most likely related to the Hebrew substantive צדק,¹⁸ thus securing this interpretive connection.

JUBILEES

(5:2a) Wickedness (*ammaḏā*) increased on the earth. (7:23) When everyone sold himself to commit injustice and to shed innocent blood, the earth was filled with injustice (*ammaḏā*).

GENESIS 6

(11) Now the earth was corrupt in God’s sight, and the earth was filled with violence (צדק). (12) And God saw that the earth was corrupt; for all flesh had corrupted its ways upon the earth.

Jubilees seems to pick up an interpretation of the Genesis text developed in Enochic circles, especially in the Book of the Watchers, and summarized in Eth Enoch 9:9: “And behold, the women have borne Giants, and because of them the whole earth has been filled with blood and wickedness.”¹⁹

Noah details various fractures of justice, and then the author explains how various spirits were contributing factors for the Flood: “For I myself see that the demons have begun to lead you and your children astray” (7:27a). Of course, Gen 6:1–8 had narrated the activity of the Sons of God and their power over humans, but the Priestly tradition—so closely parallel to many details and motifs in Jubilees—did not directly connect this sin with the actions of heavenly beings and clearly blamed the Flood on the “violence” perpetrated by the human race. Jubilees imitates the priestly language, but incorporates blame of the Watchers, known also from older Enoch traditions. Through improper sexual unions with human women (described in Genesis 6:1–4, with parallels

Sources,” in: James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000), esp. 318–326. VanderKam discusses four texts in connection with Enoch materials: 4:15–26; 5:1–10; 7:20–39, 10:1–17.

¹⁸ Cf. C. F. A. Dillmann, *Lexicon linguae aethiopicae* (Lipsiae: T. O. Weigel 1865; reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970), column 958; hereafter cited as: Dillmann, *Lexicon*. Cf. also Wolf Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge’ez [Classical Ethiopic]* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991), 63.

¹⁹ Translation by Daniel Olson, in consultation with Archbishop Melkesedek Workeneh, *Enoch: A New Translation* (North Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL Press, 2004), 37. Hereafter cited as: Olson, *Enoch*.

in 1 Enoch 15:8–16:1 and in Jubilees 10:1–2, 8–11) they spawned offspring which caused much evil behavior by humans.

Before dying Noah prayed to God. He began with negative petitions (may those spirits, descended from the Watchers, not rule over us [v. 3]) and positive requests (bless us, for our increase in posterity). His passionate plea for the increase of his posterity hints at God's creative powers (v. 4) as well as the divine ability to suppress and curb the forces of evil and destruction.

Later Noah petitioned God to preserve him and his descendants from the influence and the power of these spirits descended from the Watchers (vv. 5–6). With a motive clause (a type well-known from the tradition of lament psalms), Noah reminds God of the pattern of divine mercy already directed toward his offspring, implying that God should live up to that image in the present and future generations. Specifically, he wants God to neutralize the power of evil spirits and even to imprison them; he also prays that God bless his sons that they might continue to populate the earth and may not be corrupted, as the Watchers were before them.

JUBILEES 10:3–6

(3) [Noah] prayed (*wa-šallaya*) in the presence of God his Lord and he said: “Lord of the spirits²⁰ which are in all flesh, you, who have shown me mercy and saved me and my sons from the water of the Flood and did not make me perish (as you did to the children of destruction) since your kindness toward me has been great, and great has been your mercy to my soul. May your kindness be raised high over your children's children, and *may the evil spirits not rule over them lest they destroy them from the earth.*

(4) Now bless me and my sons so we might *increase and grow numerous and fill the earth.*

(5) And You know how Your *Watchers* acted—the *fathers of these spirits*—during my days. Now these spirits who are still alive—lock them up and keep them captive in the place of judgment, so may they not cause corruption among the children of your servant, my Lord, since they are *vicious and were created for corrupting.*

(6) *Do not let them rule over the spirits of the living* since You alone know their judgment. Let them have no power over the children of the just from now on and forevermore.

²⁰ The expression appears in Numbers 16:22; 27:16; (NRSV) “the God of the spirits of all flesh;” (TNK) “O God, Source of the breath of all flesh;” Jacob Milgrom explains this epithet: *elohei*, “God of” is interpreted as “Source of;” God gives breath to humans at birth, and withdraws it at death; since God is Creator of life, God alone “determines who is to live and who is to die;” cf. Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers [Ba-midbar]: the Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication

These evil spirits “were created for corrupting” (v. 5); they are vicious and they seek to rule over the spirits of the living to corrupt them and destroy them. Direct descendants of the Watchers, their goal is to inhibit the good behavior of Noah’s family and to restrict their healthy process of reproduction and growth.²¹ In Jubilees God ordered that the evil spirits be tied up, but “Mastemah, leader of the spirits” begged God to leave one-tenth of them free (v. 8); so God sent nine-tenths of them down to a place of judgment, and allowed the angels of presence to leave “a tenth of them to exercise power on the earth before the satan” (v. 11). Soon after this, Noah died and “slept with his fathers” (10:15).

Various elements of Noah’s prayer are important for this study. Petitions follow a confession of faith in the God who did not destroy Noah and his family in the flood, but rather showed them mercy. If Noah complains, as in a lament psalm, the charges are only implied: after saving us, You still allow us to fall subject to the corrupting and destructive power of the evil spirits. The petitions are clear: neutralize the power of these evil spirits by binding them up, and bless my offspring with increasing progeny.

This prayer articulates a two-pronged view of God. God has already demonstrated “kindness and mercy” (3), an echo of “mercy and compassion” as divine qualities in biblical texts.²² Next, this particular petition for a blessing reminds hearers of the God of creation in mentioned in Genesis 1: “Now bless me and my sons, so we might increase and grow

Society, 1990), 135. A similar term for God, “Lord of the spirits,” is the favored name for God in the Parables of Enoch (1 Enoch 37B71), occurring there over one hundred times (cf. Olson, *Enoch*, 74).

²¹ VanderKam comments on Noah’s “interesting” connection between “the work of the demons/evil spirits...with the issue of fulfilling the divine command to ‘be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth’ in Gen 9:1, 7. If they kill Noah’s descendants, it would be impossible to carry out that repeated order from God himself;” James C. VanderKam, “The Demons in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (ed. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 339–364, cit. 343. Hereafter cited as: VanderKam, “Demons.” As we shall observe, these prayers maintain interest in the tension between evil spirits and God as creator and author of the ‘blessing’ to be fruitful and multiply.

²² E.g. Psalms 110:5; 117:2; 119:90; 89:2, 5, 14; 108:4. Many other examples can be traced: cf. Toni Craven, *The Book of Psalms* (MBS 6; Michael Glazier Books; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 76f.

numerous and fill the earth.”²³ As others have observed, references to the God of creation abound in literature of this era.²⁴

Following Noah’s prayer and God’s decision to allow some evil spirits to remain, further evil activity crops up in the incident of the Tower of Babel (10:19–26), which includes God’s confusion of their language (10:25) and the dispersion of these peoples (10:25). The report of these events leads naturally into a notice about the continuing movement of peoples to their appropriate sites of living (10:27–36). There follow additional parts of the genealogy of Shem (11:1–10), which leads through Serug (11:2–6) to Nahor, Terah and Abraham.

When Terah was a youth, Mastemah had sent “crows and birds so that they might eat the seed which was being sown in the earth” (11:10).²⁵ These birds progressively devoured more and more of the fruit of the fields and trees and precipitated a disaster. Then Abram was born. Even as a youth he began to understand the straying of the land in matters of graven images and pollution, that is, all the errors of idolatry. As a result of the loss of seeds and plants, the land became unprofitable as the people ate too much fruit and food in the current seasons (11:12–13). Abram soon began to identify the errors of the earth: “that everyone was going astray after the statues and after impurity” (11:16a). These events provide the context of the next prayer.

(3) *First Prayer of Abraham* [11:17]

At age fourteen, Abram separated from his father to avoid falling into idol worship with him (11:16), and “*he began to pray* [*yeṣalli*] to the creator of all that he would *save him from the errors of mankind* and that it might not fall to his share to go astray after impurity and wickedness” (11:17).

²³ The Ge’ez term used here, *bārekani* (from *bāraka*), ‘to bless,’ is used in other contexts that deal with fertility and progeny, e.g. Gen. 1:22, 28; 17:16, possibly 24:1. Cf. Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 504f.

²⁴ Florentino García Martínez, “Interpretación de la creación en el Judaísmo antiguo,” in: *Religions del món antic: La creació* (ed. María Luisa Sánchez León; Palma de Mallorca, Sanostra: Universitat des Illes Balears, 2001), 115–135, esp. 121–122, 126–128, 129 on Jubilees.

²⁵ For studies of this story, cf.: S. P. Brock, “Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to Jubilees 11–12 and its Implications,” *JSS* 9 (1978): 135–152; William Adler, “Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols: Jubilees’ Traditions in Christian Chronography,” *JQR* 77:2–3 (1986–87): 95–117; Michael P. Knowles, “Abraham and the Birds in Jubilees 11,” *NIS* 41(1995): 145–151.

Although idolatry led Abram to separate from his father, it functions only implicitly in the concern of the prayer.

The prayer, reported as indirect speech, focuses on one request: to save him from the ordinary straying of humans, i.e. from “the errors of mankind.” The evil to avoid is the straying after “impurity and wickedness,” which resulted from the pernicious activity of Mastemah and the spirits left under his control after Noah’s prayer (11:1–6). Unlike the prayers of Moses and Noah, Abraham does not here name the issue of evil spirits or demons; still the view of the author persists, that fundamental human wickedness and crises in weather and food production (caused by seed being devoured by crows and birds, v. 10) resulted from activities of Mastemah and the one tenth of the evil spirits under his control. Note also that Abram addresses God with a title now familiar in the Book of Jubilees, as “creator of all.”²⁶

(4) *Second Prayer of Abraham* [12:19–21]

Still, Abraham continues to resist the idol worship of his father Terah, a priest in Ur (12:1–6). His father hesitates since he is afraid to tell the truth to the people of Ur, for fear of being killed (12:7–8). Then Abraham married Sarai (12:9), and in his 60th year he burned down the temple of the idols (12:12), and his brother Haran died in the fire. Then Terah left Ur, bound for Lebanon and Canaan with his sons (12:15) and settled en route in Haran for fourteen years. There Abraham spent a night vigil, gazing at the stars; he was hoping to gain information about weather patterns, especially about the rainy season (12:16). During his vigil he heard a voice reminding him that everything stands under the control of the Lord, leading him to wonder why he should even be investigating the climactic patterns (v. 17). God’s wishes control the rainfall, whenever it occurs, even if not for a long time: everything stands under divine control (v. 18).

Abram was led to utter a prayer (vv. 19–21), confessing that everything has been created by God, the sole God (v. 19). He then begged God to save him from the power of the evil spirits “who rule the thoughts of human minds” (v. 20). His specific goal in the prayer is that those

²⁶ This term for God appears in Jub 7:36; 10:8; 11:17; 16:26; 21:3; 22:6, 27; for similar terminology and further discussion, cf. Christfried Böttrich, “Gottesprädikationen im Jubiläenbuch,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997), 221–241, esp. 228.

spirits not mislead him from following God forever, and that he not go astray.

JUBILEES 12:19–22

(19) That night *he prayed* [*wa-ṣallaya*] and said: “My God, my God, God most high,

You alone are my God. You have *created everything*; everything that was and has been is the product of your hands. You and your lordship I have chosen.

(20) Save me from the power of *evil spirits* who rule the thoughts of people’s minds. May they not mislead me from following you, my God. Do establish me and my posterity forever. May we not go astray from now until eternity.”

(21) Then he said: “Shall I return to Ur of the Chaldeans who are looking for me to return to them? Or am I to remain here in this place? Make the path that is straight before you prosper through your servant so that he may do (it). May I not proceed in the error of my mind, my God.”

(22) When he had finished speaking and *praying*, then the word of the Lord was sent to him through me . . .

Abraham has affirmed faith in God and articulated his general petition. He desires direction where to go—back to Ur of the Chaldeans, or to remain in Haran, or what else? He concludes by hoping that he has not proceeded according to any errors of his own mind (v. 21). The reason for his prayer, at its conclusion, resembles his starting point: to be freed of the errors of the mind by evil spirits, so that he can follow God’s way.

This prayer addresses God in language typical of Second Temple Jewish fashion: God most high, the only God, and the creator God (19) responsible for everything that exists.²⁷ God’s creative activity seems coterminous with his lordship. Again the central petition concerns evil spirits: he begs that “evil spirits who rule the thoughts of people’s minds”

²⁷ Cf. Randall D. Chesnutt, “Prayer of a Convert to Judaism (Joseph and Aseneth 12–13),” in *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 70, f.n. #3: “The creation language which dominates the first two verses [of Aseneth’s prayer] abounds with echoes of both biblical and extra-biblical Jewish sources and articulates many of the fundamental tenets of Jewish cosmology (cf. Genesis 1–2 [LXX]; Isaiah 48:13; Psalms 24:2; 33:9; 136:6; 148:5–6; Wisdom of Solomon 9:1; Wisdom of Solomon 11:25; Judith 16:14; Sirach 16:27–28; 1 Enoch 18:2; 2 Baruch 21:4–5; 48:8; 2 Enoch 24–8; Philo, *Special Laws* 4:35; *Dreams* 1:13; Qumran *Community Rule* 3:15–16; Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.18.6). Creation imagery is not only a conventional element of prayer but is especially suited to Aseneth’s case . . . God’s salvific activity is analogous to his creative activity,” p. 70, n. 3.

(12:20) not have the power to mislead. Jubilees differentiates the role of the spirits between c. 10 and c. 12: here they must be prevented from leading people astray, while the prayer in c. 10 focuses on their power for corruption. Abraham begs God to bless him, just as he had blessed other ancestral heroes. Prayer about the evil spirits aims at their being controlled, so that humans not be led astray.

(5) *Abraham's Prayer at Shavuot* [Jub 22:7–9]

In this final scene of Abraham's life, he joins together with Isaac, Ishmael and Jacob for the festival of Shavuot, which assumes central importance in Jubilees (22:1–5). In this version Rebecca baked bread and provided it to Jacob her son, so that he could bring it to Abraham to "eat (it) and bless the Creator of everything before he died" (22:4b). Isaac also provided offerings for his father, who "blessed the most high God who *created* the heavens and the earth, who made all the fat things of the earth, and gave them to mankind to eat, drink, and bless their *Creator*" (22:6). According to our criteria, blessings are not strictly being considered as prayer texts, but a thanksgiving prayer follows them.

JUBILEES 22:7–9

(7) "Now I offer humble thanks to you, my God, because you have shown me this day. I am now 175 years of age, old and with (my) time completed. All of my days have proved to be peace for me.

(8) The enemy's sword has not subdued me in anything at all which you have given me and my sons during all my lifetime until today.

(9) May your kindness and peace rest on your servant and on the descendants of his sons so that they, of all the nations of the earth, may become your chosen people and heritage from now until all the time of the earth's history throughout all ages."

This text qualifies as prayer because of the second-person address to God (vv. 7, 9). It expresses gratitude, by summarizing Abraham's life as a time "of peace" (v. 7) during which he was not subdued by enemy swords (v. 8). Then he shifts to petitions, begging divine "kindness and peace" for Abraham and his posterity, that they become God's "chosen people and heritage" (v. 9).

This prayer text in its narrative context includes four key elements: (1) God as creator "of the heavens and the earth" and also of Abraham's people; (2) freedom from the sword, leading to days of peace, as a gift of God; (3) "kindness and peace" as God's greatest gift to this family, which (4) shall become God's "chosen people." Although the title "creator" does not occur in this prayer, it may be assumed by association

from the blessing prayers which immediately precede it, in 22:6 where it is mentioned twice.²⁸ The power of the Creator has also preserved him from tragedy in battle and provided a situation of divine kindness and peace for God's chosen people. Language markers here evoke a theological perspective more connected with election theology for Israel than with the life of the earlier, patriarchal families, especially of Noah. Finally, the influence of the demons is not completely absent, even though they are not mentioned in this prayer. In the blessing given to Jacob (22:10–24) Abraham emphasizes the need to avoid the nations because of their impurity and that “they worship demons” (22:17); here Jubilees hints at a further problem brought about by the demons, that they lead this people to idol worship, away from their God.²⁹ Although the demons play a lesser role in the latter chapters of Jubilees, they maintain a strong though partially hidden power and presence.

Synthesis of Jubilees Prayers: Demons and God the Creator

All five prayers connect in some way with the power of evil spirits. Moses prays against the power of the spirit of Belial (1:20), a reference to evil spirits. The Watchers, as progenitors of these evil spirits, appear in Noah's prayer (10:5), and the prayer of Noah also mentions evil spirits (10:3). Abraham's first prayer (11:17) does not mention them explicitly, but Mastemah appears in the narrative background of this prayer (11:7), thus indicating the activity of evil spirits. The second prayer of Abraham also includes a petition against the evil spirits and their power (12:20). Abraham's prayer at the Shavuot festival does not mention the power of evil spirits; rather, he thanks God for protection from the enemy's sword. In the first four prayers, the notion of evil spirits has a particular function: they act maliciously against humans for their corruption, destruction, and to make them deviate from God's paths. The only prayer which does not mention evil spirits also displays a slightly different literary type: it begins with the notion of “blessing” God rather than “praying” to God, as in the previous four prayers.

²⁸ For an earlier discussion of creation theology in this section, cf. John C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (CBQMS 18; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), 41–42.

²⁹ VanderKam, “Demons” 347.

Notions of God as creator appear in all five of these prayers. God is addressed as creator in two prayers of Abraham: “Creator of all” [*faṭāro k^wellu*] (11:17); and “you have created everything” [*k^wello faṭārka wa-gebra*] (12:19). Motifs connected with creation theology appear also in the prayer of Noah (“bless [*bārekani*]...increase and grow numerous” [10:4]; spirits “created [*tafätteru*] for corrupting” [10:5]) and in the prayer of Moses (“create [*feter*]...just spirit/pure mind and holy spirit” [1:20, 21]); and the blessing prayer of Isaac at the celebration of Shavuot (he “blessed [*wa-bārako*] the most high God who *created* [*za-faṭara*] the heavens and the earth... and bless their *Creator* [*faṭārihomu*]” [22:6]. In the first and last examples, I assume a connection between “blessing” and creation, as combined in Genesis 1 (P); otherwise, I consider the Ethiopic word *faṭara*, which is generally translated “create” as evidence of creation activity of God. Still, I should mention that Ge’ez lacks a lexical differentiation when translating the two Hebrew terms in Genesis 1, *bār’ā* and *’āsāh*. In this feature, it follows the LXX translation (Aquila’s translation being the exception) in not distinguishing between “make” and “create”, since it translates both Hebrew terms with the Greek verb *poiéō*. A Greek version of Jubilees probably served as *Vorlage* for the Ethiopic translation, which may simply be representing common LXX usage, i.e. not differentiating two notions of “create.” These prayers in Jubilees share some common motifs and characteristics with various Qumran texts identified as prayers uttered to ward off from humans the power of evil spirits, particularly prayers against demons in the so-called Songs or Canticles over the Stricken (11QP^aAp^a).³⁰ The collocation—now familiar—of God as Creator with

³⁰ In col. II of this text we have language of God the creator: II, 9: “And invo[ke] (9) Israel. Lean (10) [on YHWH, the God of gods, he who made] the heavens (11) [and the earth and all that is in them, w]ho separated (12) [light from darkness...].” A similar phenomenon occurs in col. III (1): “...the depth[s...] (2) the earth and [...the] earth. Who ma[de these portents] (3) and wonders upon the] earth? It is he, YHWH, [who] (4) made t[hese through] his [streng]th, who summons all [his] a[n]gels.” In col. VI there is also language challenging the power of the demons, particularly in a rewritten version of Psalm 91 at the end of this text: the prayer is placed in the mouth of “one who lives] in the shelter of [the Most High, in the shadow of] the Almighty (*sic*) (4) he stays.” Then this person begins to say to “YHWH: My refuge] and [my] fortress, [my God] is the safety in which [I trust]” (VI, 4). Here Psalm 91, long considered a prayer against demons, differs from the form of the other prayers on this manuscript. It may represent a type of prayer with which the author of Jubilees was familiar, one which addressed God directly. Citations are from: Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2 (4Q 274B11Q31 (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill and Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998), 1203, 1205.

prayer to ward off the evil spirits characterizes prayers of this text in a way quite similar to Jubilees.³¹ The dualistic world-view shines forth in these original prayers in Jubilees, and corresponds to a rather contemporary rendition of Psalm 91, which would later serve as the prayer text *par excellence* for magical texts aimed at defeating the power of evil spirits. These prayers, then, help us to identify a significant strain of Jubilees' theological outlook, invoking the power of God the creator in order to save Israel's faithful from the power of the evil spirits, whose leader Mastemah successfully entreated God not to destroy them completely. In Jubilees the need for such help from the God of creation may arise from the specific way that the evil spirits under Mastemah gained the power to perpetuate all kinds of evil behaviors which lead to human maladies and disasters: they were permitted by God to exist and to operate when Mastemah pressed the issue after Noah's prayer (Jub 10:11). The mutual relationship between creation and salvation/liberation in historical narratives (e.g. 2 Maccabees) corresponds to the prominence of creation motifs in Jubilees' prayers for overcoming the power of the evil spirits or demons. These prayers demonstrate in microcosm how the allusions to creation and the praise of the God of creation stand out in the prayers for protection from the demons in Jubilees. They praise a powerful God who stands as creator of all, and this fact must serve stern notice to the demons and evil spirits who would lead humans astray and to destruction.

³¹ Bilhah Nitzan discusses these prayers in 11QPsAp^a in her chapter on "Magical Poetry," with cross-referencing to related views from the Book of Jubilees; in *Qumran Prayer & Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; trans. from Hebrew by J. Chipman; Leiden/New York/Köln: 1994), 232–235, and 231f, n. 18 and n. 19.

AMULETS AND ANGELS:
VISIONARY EXPERIENCE IN THE *TESTAMENT OF JOB*
AND THE HEKHALOT LITERATURE

Rebecca Lesses
Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York

1. *Introduction*¹

In Jewish texts from late antiquity, visionary or transcendent goals are often accomplished through ritual techniques that are also used for healing or protection, as we see from an examination of two disparate sets of texts, the *Testament of Job* and the Hekhalot literature. The *Testament of Job* is a retelling in Greek of the book of Job, dated by various scholars to the first century B.C.E. or C.E., and stemming perhaps from Egypt.² In this rewriting of the biblical story, Job gives his three daughters three shimmering cords that God had given him to heal him from his afflictions. When they bind these cords on themselves, Job's daughters are transformed—they become “heavenly-minded” and begin to speak in the tongues of angels. These cords are called, among other things, a *phylakterion*—a protective amulet. The Hekhalot

¹ I first met Betsy Amaru during the 1998–1999 academic year, when I was doing research in Jerusalem with a Lady Davis Fellowship. I encountered her in the Judaica Reading Room of the Jewish National and University Library at Givat Ram, and came to know her through lunchtime conversations with the “library crew.” Subsequently we became colleagues, and neighbors, for the following year at Vassar College. My final revisions of this paper for publication in this volume honoring Betsy are also being conducted in the Judaica Reading Room in the summer of 2006, where I continue to enjoy her company among the “library crew.”

² Russell P. Spittler, “The Testament of Job: A History of Research and Interpretation,” in *Studies on the Testament of Job* (ed. Michael A. Knibb and Pieter W. van der Horst; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 17–19; idem, “Testament of Job: A New Translation and Introduction,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–85), 1:833 (all translations are from this edition unless otherwise noted); Pieter W. van der Horst, “Images of Women in the Testament of Job,” in Knibb and van der Horst, *Studies*, 93; John J. Collins, “Testaments,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT 2; Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 353; and Robert A. Kugler and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, “On Women and Honor in the *Testament of Job*,” *JSP* 14 (2004): 46–51.

texts are complex Jewish visionary and ritual literature, written largely in Hebrew, dated to the 4th–8th centuries C.E., and stemming from Roman Palestine and Sassanian Babylonia. In the Hekhalot literature, the mystic who wishes to “descend to the Merkabah”³ must show “seals” (*hotamot*), composed of divine and angelic names, to the angelic guardians of each successive *hekhal* (palace), finally reaching the seventh *hekhal* where he gazes upon “the King in His beauty” and joins the angels and the Throne of Glory in their heavenly liturgy of praise.⁴ The Hekhalot texts also give instructions for adjuration rituals to call angels down from heaven to gain divine revelation, which also involve “sealing” oneself for protection during the ritual.⁵

At first glance, it does not appear appropriate to compare *I. Job* and the Hekhalot literature directly, because of the distinct differences between them in language, dating, and genre. A closer reading, however, reveals a whole series of interesting similarities and differences between them. In order to make the comparison more comprehensible, a third term is also necessary—the rituals found in the Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri (conventionally referred to as the “Greek Magical Papyri”). They

³ The Merkabah is the divine chariot described in Ezekiel 1, and is another name for the final goal attained by the mystic when he enters the seventh *hekhal*.

⁴ The term “descending” to the Merkabah is used in some of the Hekhalot texts for the journey to the world of the divine palaces and the throne-chariot, while other texts use the term “ascend.” It is not clear why the term “descent” is used. For the texts of the Hekhalot literature, see Peter Schäfer, ed., *Synopsis zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981) and idem, ed., *Geniza Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984). All translations of Hekhalot texts are mine, unless otherwise noted. For wide-ranging discussions of the Hekhalot literature see Gershom Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (New York: Schocken, 1941); idem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (2nd ed.; New York: JTSA, 1965); Ithamar Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 16; Leiden: Brill, 1980); idem, *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1988); David Halperin, *Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel’s Vision* (TSAJ 16; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988); Peter Schäfer, *Hekhalot Studien* (TSAJ 19; Tübingen: Mohr, 1988); idem, *The Hidden and Manifest God* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1992); Naomi Janowitz, *The Poetics of Ascent* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1989); Michael Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism* (TSAJ 28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992); Joseph Dan, *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism* (Tel Aviv: MOD, 1993); Elliot R. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum That Shines* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); James Davila, *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature* (JSJ Supp. 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001); and Rachel Elijor, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism* (Oxford: Littman Library, 2004).

⁵ For discussions of these texts, see Michael Swartz, *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), and Rebecca Lesles, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (HTS 44; Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1998).

are often useful in explaining ritual features common to the *Testament of Job* and the Hekhalot literature.⁶ In this paper, therefore, I explore the double use of amulets and seals for protection and visionary experience in the *Testament of Job* and the Hekhalot literature, addressing the following questions: how do they protect Job's daughters or the Hekhalot mystic? How do they make the visionary experience possible? What does this double use tell us about the relationship of visionary experience to ritual practices? What might this comparison reveal about the relationship between the *Testament of Job*, the Hekhalot literature, and the Greek magical papyri? Through this discussion, I will suggest that the distinction between "magic" and "mysticism" often made by scholars of mysticism does not hold for these late antique texts, and that, in any case, the basis for such a distinction is often dubious.

Rachel Elior has argued that it is possible to trace a trajectory of visionary descriptions from the Enoch texts (e.g., 1 Enoch 14) of the third century B.C.E. through the Qumran literature to the Hekhalot texts. She has argued for the priestly antecedents of the Hekhalot literature, in part by showing their affinities with the second century B.C.E. Qumranic Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.⁷ A number of scholars have suggested that certain aspects of *T. Job* can also be understood as a reflection of early Merkabah ideas.⁸ One of these has already been

⁶ For texts and translations of the so-called Greek magical papyri, see Karl Preisendanz and Albert Henrichs, eds., *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri* (2 vols.; 2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973–74) and Hans Dieter Betz, ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986). See Lesses, *Ritual Practices*, 279–325, for a discussion of features common to both the Hekhalot literature and the Greek magical papyri.

⁷ Rachel Elior, "The Merkabah Tradition and the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism," in *Sino-Judaica: Jews and Chinese in Historical Dialogue* (ed. Aharon Oppenheimer; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1999), 101–158; eadem, *The Three Temples*, 1–17, 232–265. For the Qumran texts, see especially the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifices; John Strugnell, "4Qserek široṭ 'Olat Haššabbat," in *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament—Congress Volume* (VTSup 7; Oxford, 1959), 318–345; Carol Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985); James H. Charlesworth and Carol A. Newsom, eds., *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* vol. 4B; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1999); and Carol Newsom, "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4, VI. Poetical and Liturgical Texts*, Part 1 (ed. Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, Carol Newsom, Bilhah Nitzan, Eileen Schuller, and Ada Yardeni, in consultation with James VanderKam and Monica Brady; DSD XI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 173–401.

⁸ Kaufman Kohler, "The Testament of Job: An Essene Midrash on the Book of Job Reedited and Translated with Introductory and Exegetical Notes," in *Semitic Studies*

mentioned: the acquisition of heavenly abilities by the daughters of Job. Another suggestive comparison is the use of the term “chariots” in *T. Job*, the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, and the Hekhalot literature. Although Job has lost his earthly kingdom (according to *T. Job* he was the king of Egypt), he attains a better kingdom in God, in the world of the Merkabah (God’s heavenly throne-chariot).⁹ He recites a hymn to this effect to his three friends (who are also identified as kings in *T. Job*), asserting that “my throne is in the upper world, and its splendor and majesty come from the right hand of the Father.” He continues with, “But my throne is in the holy land, and its splendor is in the world of the changeless one.” He concludes by saying, “My kingdom is forever and ever, and its splendor and majesty are in the chariots of the Father (ἐν τοῖς ἄρμασιν τοῦ πατρὸς).”¹⁰ The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice describe the chariots present in the heavenly sanctuary or sanctuaries, which praise God along with the various classes of angels. One passage, for example, reads, “And the chariots of his inner shrine give praise together, and their *cherubim* and thei[r] *ophanim* bless wondrously.”¹¹ The Hekhalot text commonly referred to as *Ma’aseh Merkabah* also refers to many chariots in each of the seven heavenly *hekhlot*.¹² In the *Testament of Job*, Job attains a throne like that of (Enoch translated into) Metatron, next to God, and his kingdom henceforth is “in the chariots of the Father.”¹³ In *Hekhalot Rabbati*, Rabbi Neḥuniah ben HaQanah at one point is seated in the presence of the Throne of Glory.¹⁴ At the entry into the seventh *hekhlot*, the angels “raise him [the Hekhalot mystic] and seat him next to the *cherubim* and next to the *ophannim*, next to the holy *hayyot*, and he sees wonders and powers, pride and greatness, holiness

in *Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut* (ed. G. Kohut; Berlin, 1897), 282, 287–291, 292; Spittler, “Testament of Job,” *OTP* 1:833; idem, “Testament of Job,” 22; Howard Clark Kee, “Satan, Magic, and Salvation in the Testament of Job,” *SBLSP* 1974: 53–55, 66, 71, 75.

⁹ *T. Job* 28:7.

¹⁰ *T. Job* 33:3–9.

¹¹ Newsom, “Shirot,” *DJD* XI, 282; this is from 4Q403 frg. 1 2.6 (Sabbath Song 7). In this volume see also Bilhah Nitzan, “4QBerakot,” 4Q405 frags. 20–22, Col. 2 lines 3–5, 11 (Sabbath Song 11); and 4Q286 frg. 1a, col. ii, b, line 2 (pp. 12–13).

¹² Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§554–555.

¹³ See 3 Enoch, ch. 16 (Schäfer, *Synopse*, §20; trans. Philip Alexander, “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *OTP* I, 268: “R. Ishmael said: The angel Metatron, Prince of the Divine Presence, the glory of highest heaven, said to me: At first I sat upon a great throne at the door of the seventh palace, and I judged all the denizens of the heights on the authority of the Holy One, blessed be He.” *b.Hag.* 15a also refers to Metatron sitting on a throne in heaven.

¹⁴ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §227.

and purity, fear, humility, and uprightness.”¹⁵ I suggest that this element of throne mysticism, along with the angelic speech of Job’s daughters, also belongs to the trajectory that Elior traces from 1 Enoch and the Qumran literature to the Hekhalot literature, obviously at an early stage in the development of the traditions.

An interesting and crucial difference between the Hekhalot texts and the *Testament of Job* is the gender of the people concerned. In the Hekhalot literature, only men engage in rituals of ascent or adjuration. Women are excluded because of their potential impurity, derived from menstrual blood or because of the temptation they offer to men trying to avoid any kind of seminal ejaculation, voluntary or involuntary, which also would cause impurity that would prevent a man from approaching the angels or the Merkabah.¹⁶ In *Hekhalot Rabbati*, the paradigmatic “descender to the Merkabah,” Rabbi Nehuniah ben HaQanah, is called back from his visions of the *hekhalot* because his companions infect him with a very tiny measure of menstrual impurity.¹⁷ In the *Testament of Job*, on the other hand, purity concerns do not enter in. Only women gain the ability to speak in the tongues of angels, and only women see the angels coming for Job’s soul. They are, as it were, translated into the heavenly realm while still dwelling on earth.¹⁸ Pieter van der Horst argues that, “It is probable that this haggada originated in ecstatic-mystical circles of early Judaism from about the beginning of the Common Era, very probably also in a group in which women played a leading role by their greater ecstatic gifts and their superior spiritual insight into heavenly reality.”¹⁹ The *Testament of Job* appears to have been written by people who were not constrained by the purity

¹⁵ Ibid., §236. §411 describes the same scene. See discussion in Wolfson, *Speculum*, 82–85, where he points out that this “signifies his elevation not just to the status of angel, but the highest angel, who alone, apart from God, occupies a throne in the seventh palace of the seventh heaven” (83).

¹⁶ See further discussions in Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power*, 119–144, 195–197, and Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 162–165.

¹⁷ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§224–228. In §227, “they dismissed him from before the Throne of Glory, where he had been sitting and gazing at the wondrous pride and the distinguished power, the pride of majesty and the power of brightness, which rushed to praise three times a day before the Throne of Glory in the Merkabah, since the world was created until now.”

¹⁸ Van der Horst, “Images of Women,” 105.

¹⁹ Van der Horst, “Images of Women,” 113. See also Randall D. Chesnut, “Revelatory Experiences Attributed to Biblical Women in Early Jewish Literature,” in *Women Like This?: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Amy-Jill Levine; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 124–25.

concerns of Qumran or the Hekhalot literature, even though they were also deeply concerned with relations between humans and angels and by the possibility of humans living in a similar manner to angels.

In what follows, I engage in a kind of “switchback” comparison among the *Testament of Job*, the Greek magical papyri, and the Hekhalot literature. I begin with a longer exposition of the story of the *Testament of Job*, focusing on the protective and visionary powers of the cords that Job gives to his daughters. This leads into a discussion of the cords in the context of the many *phylacteria* mentioned in the Greek magical papyri, both those that consist of powerful objects and those whose power is derived from the powerful names written or engraved upon them (names with a clear meaning and those that consist of a seemingly random series of letters). The purpose is to show that the protective function of the cords, both for Job and his daughters, has ample context in the world of late antiquity. The comparison then turns to a similar protective device used in the Hekhalot literature: *hotamot* (seals) to guard the practitioner while invoking angels down from heaven. In this case, the seals are powerful divine and angelic names, perhaps inscribed on something and held during the ritual, or perhaps kept in the mind and recited during the ritual. The discussion then moves to the visionary power both of the cords given to Job’s daughters and of the *hotamot* used for ascent in the Hekhalot literature. This includes an examination of the role of a special language in both—the languages of the angels and the pure language of God. Job’s daughters learn to praise God in the various angelic dialects, and the Hekhalot texts, like the Greek magical papyri, manifestly use humanly comprehensible names, seemingly random assemblages of letters, and permutations of the divine name of four letters, the Tetragrammaton, to provide power for the adjurational rituals.

2. *Testament of Job*

The Testament of Job retells the story of Job from the Bible as a test of Job’s faith. It belongs to the genre of ancient Jewish literature known as testaments, in which a biblical character recounts the lessons of his life to his children as he lies on his deathbed. The best known are the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, comprising the moral lessons given by Jacob’s twelve sons. The Testament of Job is somewhat different from the others, in that it is more like a midrash on the Book of Job, and

less a simple morality tale.²⁰ The largest part of *T. Job* recounts what Job has suffered at the hands of Satan because of his destruction of an idolatrous temple devoted to Satan.²¹ Satan kills Job's ten children, destroys all of his property, and afflicts him with many illnesses.²² He leaves the city and lives outside of it on a dung heap, and his wife, Sitis, is forced into slavery to support herself and her husband.²³ She eventually dies²⁴ and he is finally healed of his illnesses and restored to his good fortune.²⁵ He is married again to Dinah (the daughter of Jacob and Leah), and with her he is granted ten other children.²⁶

As Job is dying, the second group of children gathers around his deathbed: seven sons and three daughters. He begins to tell his children what he will leave them after he dies, beginning with his sons. He bequeaths his estate to his sons only, not to his daughters, Hemera, Kasia, and Amaltheia's Horn.²⁷ This distresses them, and they ask why they were not also given an inheritance. Job replies, "Do not be troubled, my daughters: I have not forgotten you. I have already designated for you an inheritance better than that of your seven brothers."²⁸ At that point he gives them three multicolored cords (*treis chordas tas poikilas*) "whose appearance was such that no man could describe, since they were not from earth but from heaven, shimmering with fiery sparks like the rays of the sun."²⁹ Each daughter receives one cord to bind around herself, so that, in Job's words, "it may go well with you all the days of your life."³⁰ The cords are not, however, a material inheritance; instead, they will lead Job's daughters "into the better world, to live in the heavens."³¹ These were the very cords that God gave Job to heal him of all his afflictions.

²⁰ Van der Horst, "Images of Women," 93; John Collins, "Structure and Meaning in the Testament of Job," *SBLSP* 1974, 35.

²¹ *T. Job* 2–5.

²² *T. Job* 16–20.

²³ *T. Job* 21–25.

²⁴ *T. Job* 39–40.

²⁵ *T. Job* 27, 44.

²⁶ *T. Job* 1.

²⁷ *T. Job* 46:1.

²⁸ *T. Job* 46:3–4.

²⁹ *T. Job* 46:7–8.

³⁰ *T. Job* 46:9.

³¹ *T. Job* 47:3.

3. *Cords for Protection*

What is the power of these cords? They healed Job both body and soul, and enabled him to speak to God and learn about both the present and the future. He was healed of “the plagues and the worms,”³² his body gained strength, he forgot the pains in his heart, and God “spoke to [him] in power, showing [him] things present and things to come.”³³ In addition, as Job says, these cords will protect his three daughters against “the enemy” (Satan): “Now then, my children, since you have these objects you will not have to face the enemy at all, but neither will you have worries of him in your mind, since it is a protective amulet (*phylakterion*) of the Father.”³⁴ Just as the cords healed Job of the injuries and illnesses with which Satan had afflicted him, so they will protect his daughters against Satan, and will ease their minds, just as Job’s heart was eased. A *phylakterion* could be used to heal or protect as part of a ritual, and the ancient ritual literature prescribes the use of amulets for these purposes. In this case, however, the amulet has another purpose as well: to lead Job’s daughters “into the better world, to live in the heavens.”

There is ample evidence for the existence of amulets in the ancient world, both in non-literary documents and among papyri that have been discovered in archaeological excavations. The Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri, written in Greek, Demotic and Coptic, date from second-century C.E. to fifth-century Egypt, and include amulets written on papyrus, as well as instructions for performing rituals that often include directions for making amulets.³⁵ In these ritual papyri, the word *phylakterion* refers to several different kinds of objects. It is most often a piece of paper or metal upon which words of power are written, usually various Jewish, Greek, or Egyptian divine names. They are most often used in spells to exorcise demons or to cure illness, and for this purpose they are usually carried, or hung around the neck or the arm. One ritual, which comprises an “excellent rite for driving out demons,” prescribes that after the demon is expelled, an amulet (*phylakterion*) should be prepared and hung around the patient’s neck.³⁶ It reads: “After driving out the

³² *T. Job* 47:4.

³³ *T. Job* 47:9.

³⁴ *T. Job* 47:10–11.

³⁵ Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*; Preisendanz and Henrichs, *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, passim.

³⁶ PGM IV 1227–64; this papyrus has been dated to the early fourth century C.E.

daimon, hang around him, NN, a phylactery which the patient puts on after the expulsion of the daimon—with these things [divine names, written] on a tin metal leaf.”³⁷ Another example mentions consecrating the amulet as well as wearing it:³⁸

A phylactery, a bodyguard against daimons, against phantasms, against every sickness and suffering. To be written on a leaf of gold or silver or tin or on hieratic papyrus. When worn it works mightily for it is the name of power of the great god and [his] seal, and it is as follows [nomina barbara]. These [are] the names; the figure is like this [drawing of a snake swallowing its tail enclosing magic signs and words]. The whole figure is [drawn] thus, as given below, with [the spell], “Protect my body, [and] the entire soul of me, NN.” And when you have consecrated it, wear [it].³⁹

This *phylakterion* is particularly interesting for comparison because it is used not just against demons, but against “every sickness and suffering,” such as those that afflicted Job.

Phylacteries were also used for the practitioner’s protection during rituals for other purposes. They could be made of various objects, for example a linen cloth,⁴⁰ a sprig of laurel-leaf, or peonies. In an invocation of Apollo to ask him all sorts of questions, the practitioner has to “hold a seven-leaved sprig of laurel in your right hand as you summon the heavenly gods and chthonic daimons,” and he must write a different character on each leaf of the laurel.⁴¹ He must be careful with the laurel, because it (and the signs written on it) will protect him during the ritual:

But be careful not to lose a leaf [and] do harm to yourself. For this is the body’s greatest protective charm (*phylakterion*), by which all are made subject, and seas and rocks tremble, and daimons [avoid] the characters’ divine powers which you are about to have. For it is the greatest protective charm for the rite so that you fear nothing.⁴²

³⁷ This part is in Greek (PGM IV 1252–56): ἐκβαλὼν περιάπτε τῷ δεῖνα φυλακτῆριον, ὃ περιτίθησιν ὁ κάμων μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν τὸν δαίμων ἐπὶ κασσιτερίνου πετάλου ταῦτα.

³⁸ PGM VII 579–90—Preisendanz II, 26; Betz, 134, tr. Morton Smith.

³⁹ καὶ τελέσας φόρει.

⁴⁰ PGM IV 930–1114.

⁴¹ PGM I 262–347. These characters, or *charakteres*, are symbols (usually not taken from any known alphabet) often written in the magical papyri and on amulets; they are also found in both medieval and modern Jewish amulets and manuscripts dealing with ritual matters. For a longer discussion, see John Gager, *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 10–11.

⁴² PGM I 271–77.

Another spell, this time for a man to make a woman love him, also includes a phylactery as part of the ritual: “Phylactery: wrap three peonies around your left arm and wear them.”⁴³

A phylactery need not even be a material object that the practitioner wears or holds; it can also be the divine name kept in the heart. In an incantation addressed to the highest god,⁴⁴ the practitioner says,

Your name and your spirit rest upon the good. Come into my mind and my understanding for all the time of my life and accomplish for me all the desires of my soul. For you are I, and I, you. I have your name for a unique phylactery in my heart, and no flesh, although moved, will overpower me.⁴⁵

Mere knowledge of the divine name(s) gives the possessor power.

While the forms of the amulets mentioned in the papyri are different from those in the *Testament of Job*, they have similar functions—to get rid of the demons who cause disease and suffering, and to protect from demons and other dangers during delicate rituals that could be disturbed. In the *Testament of Job*, all of Job’s troubles come from Satan, and when he gives the cords to his daughters, he tells them: “Now then, my children, since you have these objects you will not have to face the enemy at all, but neither will you have worries of him in your mind, since it is a protective amulet of the Father.”⁴⁶ The cords that healed Job from his injuries and illnesses will protect his daughters from the enemy, Satan. The idea that illnesses come from demons infesting the body of the sufferer is widespread in ancient Judaism, ranging from the Qumran literature and the New Testament, to Byzantine Jewish amulets in Aramaic found in Palestine and incantation bowls from Sassanian Persia. Amulets against demons were used across the ancient world by both women and men, so it would be entirely plausible to the ancient reader that Job’s daughters could receive such objects to protect them from Satan.

There are some important differences, however, between the *phylakteria* mentioned in the Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri and in the *Testament of Job*.

⁴³ PGM LXII 1–24. Line 23: φυλακτήριον. σεληνόγ[ο]να τρία περιελήσας φοροῦ ἀριστερῷ βραχίονι.

⁴⁴ PGM XIII 734–1077.

⁴⁵ PGM XIII 790–806. It reads in part: τὸ γὰρ ὄνομά σου ἔξω ἐν φυλακτήριον ἐν καρδίᾳ τῆ ἐμῆ. Compare also PGM XXI 1–29, which has almost exactly the same wording.

⁴⁶ *T. Job* 47:10–11.

First of all, most of the amulets in the papyri are objects upon which the practitioner writes something—divine names, characters, or the text of an incantation (often all three). The cords in *T. Job* do not have anything written on them.⁴⁷ Secondly, most of the amulets in the papyri are specially made objects: pieces of papyrus, metal plates, and stones of various kinds. It is only in the case of amulets used as part of larger rituals that we see the use of other objects as amulets: linen cloth, laurel leaves, peonies. The cords in *T. Job* could also be specially made, of course—they certainly are not natural objects, since they are multicolored and shimmering (and because God gave them directly to Job!). One could argue, of course, that the cords of the Testament of Job are used in a broader setting than the exorcisms recorded in the papyri; perhaps their curative and protective function is really secondary to the illumination they bestow upon Job's daughters.

4. *Protective Seals (hotamot) in the Hekhalot Literature*

In the Hekhalot texts, the nearest comparison to the *phylakterion* that the daughters of Job receive from their father are the seals (*hotamot*) that are used both to assist in the journey to the Merkabah and to protect during adjurations to bring angels down from heaven and learn the wisdom of Torah.⁴⁸ I will consider here the use of seals for protection during adjurations. In a section of the Hekhalot texts commonly referred to by modern scholars as *Ma'aseh Merkabah*, there is a series of instructions for gaining wisdom through adjuration.⁴⁹ These instructions are part of a longer text that principally focuses on how to ascend to the Merkabah through uttering certain divine names, prayers, and incantations. The instructions for adjurations of angels contain several subsets of instructions, and here I will discuss the adjurations

⁴⁷ This may be because the practice of using names or *charakteres* became widespread in the centuries after *T. Job* was composed. See the discussion in Gager, *Curse Tablets*, 5–7.

⁴⁸ The Hebrew equivalent to *phylakterion* is *qamea'*, but it is not very frequently used in the Hekhalot manuscripts. Many Hebrew and Aramaic amulets from the ancient world do parallel the Greek, Demotic, and Coptic amulets of the Greek Magical Papyri (see for example, Joseph Naveh and Shaul Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1987); idem, *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993); and J. B. Segal, *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*, with a contribution by E. C. D. Hunter (London: British Museum, 2000).

⁴⁹ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§560–569.

of שְׂקִדְהוּזִי מְלֶאךְ פְּנִים (Šaqadhoziy Angel of the Presence)⁵⁰ and פְּדָקְרָם מְלֶאךְ פְּנִים (Padqaram Angel of the Presence).⁵¹ Both are incantations for angels to descend and bestow wisdom, and both contain references to seals that the adept must pronounce or put on his body in order to be protected during the adjurations. Even before these two sections, as part of more general directions on how to adjure, the text says of the practitioner, “he should seal (*yahtom*) himself with his seal (*hotamo*).”⁵² These instructions also include directions to “pray with all his strength, direct his heart in his prayer,” and “mention twelve words.”⁵³

The seals in the adjurations of Šaqadhoziy and Padqaram consist of names that the adept says or keeps in his mind—and not material objects like metal amulets or the cords that Job’s daughters received. The function may be similar, but the forms are quite different. A closer comparison would be to the “unique phylactery” in the heart referred to in one of the Greco-Egyptian texts previously mentioned.⁵⁴ In that case also the phylactery is the deity’s name. As with other ritual texts of late antiquity, divine names, including the Tetragrammaton but not limited to it, are the efficacious sources of power of which humans can make use. In the adjuration of Šaqadhoziy, God is addressed as the one “who gave permission to the troops of your glory to be bound to human beings,” thus granting heavenly sanction for the practitioner’s binding spell upon the angels.⁵⁵ The practitioner then goes on to say: “In purity I pronounce (אֲנִי מְזַכֵּיר) your name, which is one over all of the creatures,” which establishes the practitioner’s authority over the angels through utterance of the divine names. The text then goes on to speak of protective seals on the practitioner’s body. These seals all consist of *vores mysticae*.

The first seal is “Seal of [my] body: קָר יְהִי בְרַךְ בְּרֵאֵי: this is blessed forever, עַף מְעוֹפְפֵא יְהוּ: holy and blessed is his name.”⁵⁶ This seal covers the entire body and may be viewed as an introduction to the section. The next one is over the practitioner’s head: “Seal above my head: Secrets, secret above secrets. יְהוּ יְהִי בְרַךְ יְהוּ: may he be blessed.”⁵⁷ In

⁵⁰ Ibid., §§561–562.

⁵¹ Ibid., §§565–566.

⁵² Ibid., §560, MS. Munich 22.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ PGM XIII 790–806, XXI 1–29.

⁵⁵ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §562.

⁵⁶ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §562, MS. Munich 22.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

the next line, the practitioner makes the request: “By Your name may the evil destroyers (מזיקין) disappear.”⁵⁸ This indicates that the seals are intended to protect the practitioner from “evil destroyers” during the prayers and incantations—compare this function to the *phylakterion* that will protect Job’s daughters from the wiles of Satan. The final protection is: “May the majesty of Your pride be a seal on my limbs, by your name: צַר צְרוּנֵי זֶה תִּשָּׂא יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה יְהוָה.”⁵⁹ These seals are thus all-encompassing, protecting the practitioner’s head and limbs from the “destroyers.” Apparently the practitioner would be vulnerable to demonic attack while engaged in this ritual to invoke angels. Such a conclusion is strengthened by the instruction at the end of the prayer to make a circle and stand in it: “He should make for himself a circle and stand in it so that the destroyers will not come and appear to him as angels and kill him.”⁶⁰ Since the practitioner is calling for the angel to descend and give him wisdom, it makes sense that he would want to be protected against the destroyers who might change their likenesses and appear to be angels, and in this way be able to attack him. The text then returns to praise of God and an incantation to induce the angel Šaqadhoziy to bring wisdom to the adjurer.

In the adjuration of Padqaram, R. Ishmael says that he fasted for forty days, prayed every morning, afternoon, and evening, and said twelve “words” each time—these words probably comprising the usual assemblage of divine names.⁶¹ The text then specifies that he “sealed seven seals” at the time that the angel descended. The listing of these seals is more extensive than in the previous adjuration of Šaqadhoziy.⁶²

R. Ishmael said: I myself sealed seven seals at the time that Padqaram the Angel, Prince of the Presence descended.

Blessed are You, Lord, who created the heaven and the earth in your wisdom and understanding. Your name is forever.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §562; cf. the translation in Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Early Judaism*, 237 and in Swartz, *Scholastic Magic*, 75: “He should make a circle for himself and stand in it, so that the demons will not come and liken him to the angels and kill him.” Swartz (168) argues that this means that the adept’s ascetic practices have made him seem like the angels and have thus made him a target of demonic attack, while I argue that it is more likely “that the human practitioner could mistake evil spirits for angels than that evil spirits could think that the adept was an angel” (Lesses, *Ritual Practices*, 420).

⁶¹ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §565.

⁶² Schäfer, *Synopse*, §566. The names in this translation are according to Ms. Munich 22.

Meir Bar-Ilan interprets those passages that prescribe “sealing oneself” for protection at the time that angels descend as physically writing or engraving names or symbols on the limbs of the body. Bar-Ilan says, “It is not clear how exactly they (the seals) were made, but it seems that different seals were engraved on the limbs of the praying mystic, and were an inseparable part of his methods for the attaining of the divine vision.”⁶⁷ He points both to Jewish precedents for the writing of letters or symbols on the body as a sign that the person was a slave of God, and to the same phenomenon in the magical literature.⁶⁸

The Shi‘ur Qomah texts, which form part of the Hekhalot literature in some of their recensions, describe the names and dimensions of the limbs of the divine body; in some places, it seems that these names are also incised or placed in some fashion on the parts of the body.⁶⁹ These names are of the same type as the seals mentioned up until now: assemblages of letters with no explicit meaning. In one version, the measurements of the body and the naming of its limbs begin with the feet, as with the seals on the body of the adept in *Ma‘aseh Merkabah*, and end with the divine head. In this version, it says, “And on his heart are written (כְּרוֹבִים) seventy names.”⁷⁰ On the forehead are also written letters, in this case permutations of the divine name (the Tetragrammaton).⁷¹ In this case, these names and letters are “written” (*katw*) on the divine body. This may serve as a model for the seals that the adept is to place on his limbs in order to protect him when the angels descend.

The Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri and Gnostic ritual texts, as well as a text from the Cairo Geniza, also provide pertinent parallels for the seals in the Hekhalot literature, both those inscribed on the body and those held in the hands (see below). The first example is found in a Greco-Egyptian sex spell for a woman to love a man.⁷² The spell prescribes the making of a model of a man and a woman, and the writing of names on the limbs of the female model, from her head to her feet, including her genitals. The names, which consist of strings of

⁶⁷ Meir Bar-Ilan, “Magical Seals on the Body among Jews in the First Centuries of the Era,” *Tarbiz* 57 (1984), 43.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 37–42, 44.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁷⁰ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §948, MS. Munich 40.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, §949.

⁷² PGM IV 296–466.

incomprehensible letters, are of the same type as found in the passage from *Ma'aseh Merkabah* quoted above. For example, the names to be written on the head include the following “words:” *ISEE IAO ITHI OUNE BRIDO LOTHION NEBOUTOSOUALETH*. This name includes the name of the God of Israel (*IAO*), like the names to be sealed on the limbs of the adept in the Hekhalot text.⁷³ The second example is from a Genizah recipe for a dream-revelation, which includes the phrase “who sits on the wheels of the Merkabah;”⁷⁴ it prescribes that divine names be written on the left hand of the one desiring the revelation.⁷⁵ Despite these parallels, it is still not clear that “sealing” in the Hekhalot texts means an actual writing or engraving on the body, since unlike the passages from rabbinic literature that Bar-Ilan cites, or the passages from the Shi'ur Qomah, the Hekhalot texts never state explicitly that the names are written on the body.⁷⁶

As I commented above, the protective purpose of the seals in the Hekhalot literature may be similar to that of the cords in the *Testament of Job*, but the form is quite different. In addition, in the Hekhalot literature, seals are consciously employed by the practitioners in order to protect themselves during adjurations, while the protective power of the cords is efficacious for Job and his daughters without any connection to the performance of a ritual. A reference in *T. Job* to being “sealed” by an angel may, however, be illuminated by this account of the protective seals of the Hekhalot literature. Early in the book, Job has a revelatory conversation with an angel about whether to destroy the idolatrous temple near him.⁷⁷ The angel tells him that if he destroys the temple, Satan will afflict Job, but that Job will not be killed. Eventually Job will be restored to his possessions, will receive a double payment, and will be raised up in the resurrection.⁷⁸ The text then says

⁷³ In the light of this love-spell, it seems reasonable to suppose that the names were engraved on the divine limbs. A Coptic spell refers to “the seven holy vowels (?) which are tattooed on the chest of the father almighty, AEEIOUO” (Rylands 103, published in *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power* (ed. Martin Meyer and Richard Smith; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994), 231. This motif also occurs in another Coptic spell for a good singing voice (London Oriental Manuscript 6794, Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 280).

⁷⁴ Peter Schäfer and Shaul Shaked, eds., *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza* (3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1994–1999) I.136: T.-S. K 1.28, fol. 1b/2–3.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, fol. 1a/15–1b/5.

⁷⁶ Bar-Ilan refers to m. Makkot 3:6.

⁷⁷ *T. Job* 6.

⁷⁸ *T. Job* 4:6–9.

that before the angel left he “sealed” Job, after which Job destroyed the temple the next night.⁷⁹ Perhaps this “sealing” is for protection, as it is in the Hekhalot adjurations. Although Job was afflicted, Satan was not given permission to kill him, and the angelic “sealing” may be the means through which he is protected from death.

5. *Cords and Seals for Visionary Experience*

In both the Hekhalot literature and the *Testament of Job*, specific means are required to gain visionary experiences—seals for the Hekhalot mystics and cords for the daughters of Job. In addition to their protective purposes, they make it possible to ascend to through the *hekhalot* and gain the vision of the Merkabah and they change the lives of the daughters of Job completely, from earthly to heavenly concerns. Beginning with the *Testament of Job*, let us consider what it means for the daughters of Job “to live in the heavens.” One of their most important attainments is that they begin to speak in the languages of the angels. When the first daughter, Hemera, winds the cord around herself,

She took on another heart⁸⁰—no longer minded toward earthly things—but she spoke in the angelic speech (φωνῆ), sending up a hymn to God in accord with the hymnic style (ὑμνολογίαν) of the angels. And as she spoke the hymns, she allowed “The Spirit” to be inscribed on her garment.⁸¹

Her sister, Kasia, then put her cord on,

and had her heart changed so that she no longer regarded worldly things. And her mouth took on the dialect of the archons (διάλεκτον τῶν ἀρχόντων) and glorified the deed (ποίημα) of the exalted place (τόπου). So, if anyone wishes to know “the deed (ποίημα) of the heavens (οὐρανῶν),” he will be able to find it in the “Hymns of Kasia.”⁸²

⁷⁹ *T. Job* 5:2–3: καὶ μετὰ τὸ σφραγισθῆναί με ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου καὶ ἀπελθόντος ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ. Greek text according to *The Testament of Job According to the SV Text* (ed. Robert A. Kraft, Harold Attridge, Russell Spittler, and Janet Timbie; Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974).

⁸⁰ Cf. 1 Sam 10:9 for “another heart” (van der Horst, “Images of Women,” 103 n. 27).

⁸¹ *T. Job* 48:2–3. Van der Horst (“Images of Women,” 103 n. 28) translates “on her stélé,” because there are writings called “The Stélé of . . .” (in the Nag Hammadi Library) and because the hymns of the other daughters are written in books as well.

⁸² *T. Job* 49:1–2. Van der Horst (“Images of Women,” 103) believes that τόπος here is equivalent to *makom*, which is a well-known rabbinic euphemism for God, as is “Heaven.”

The third sister, Amaltheia's Horn, put on her cord,

and her mouth spoke in the dialect (διαλέκτω) of those on high, since her heart also was changed, keeping aloof from earthly things. For she spoke in the dialect (διαλέκτω) of the cherubim, glorifying the Master of virtues by exhibiting their splendor. And the one who further wishes to grasp the poetic rhythm of the "Paternal Splendor," will find it written down in the "Prayers of Amaltheia's Horn."⁸³

The hearts of the three women were changed from earthly to heavenly concerns, and they began to speak in the languages of the angels: "the angelic speech," "the hymnic style of the angels," "dialect of the archons," "dialect of those on high," and the "dialect of the cherubim." The cords both protect the three women from evil, as an amulet would, and enable them to have an ecstatic experience in which they speak in the tongues of angels and participate in the heavenly praise of God.

In addition, the cords permit the women to see things that others cannot see, namely the angels who come for Job's soul when he dies. "Rise then, gird yourselves with them before I die in order that you may be able to see those who are coming for my soul, in order that you may wonder over the creatures of God."⁸⁴ When Job is about to die, he gave each of his daughters a musical instrument to play when the angels came: "When they took them [the instruments], they saw the gleaming chariots which had come for his soul. And they blessed and glorified God each one in her own distinctive dialect (διαλέκτω)."⁸⁵ They were the only ones to see the angels when they came: "certain others did not see."⁸⁶

In Pieter W. van der Horst's opinion, the "changed heart" of the three women indicates that

their whole being has been transmuted from an earthly into a heavenly one... Their heavenly status becomes still more evident by their newly acquired ability to speak in the languages of the angels. We meet here a Jewish notion, known also from 1 Cor. 13.1, that the angels speak their own language and that the diverse classes of angels speak their own dialect or tongue... Their ability to praise God in the language and in the way of the angels actually indicates that they have already ascended from the earth and that they have their *politeuma* in heaven, to put it in a Pauline way.⁸⁷

⁸³ *T. Job* 50:1–2.

⁸⁴ *T. Job* 47:11.

⁸⁵ *T. Job* 52:6–7.

⁸⁶ *T. Job* 52:9.

⁸⁷ Van der Horst, "Images of Women," 105.

The idea of the exaltation of a biblical figure to heaven is, of course, found in many pseudepigraphic texts, such as *1 Enoch* or the *Apocalypse of Abraham*, as well as the Hekhalot texts (for example, *3 Enoch*) but the case of three women attaining such a level is very rare. What is interesting here as well is that the three women apparently remain on earth while being “heavenly minded:” their transformation occurs while they are still alive, in their own bodies.

Such an experience appears to be described in the account of ascent found in *Hekhalot Rabbati*, when Rabbi Nehuniah ben HaQanah sits in a trance, surrounded by his companions, and tells them of his journey through the seven *hekhalot* at the same time that he is experiencing it.⁸⁸ This narrative provides the literary framework for instructions to his companions on how to accomplish the journey themselves—by means of *hotamot*, or seals, consisting of divine and angelic names, which must be shown to the angelic guardians of each of the *hekhalot*. The goal of this journey is to attain the vision of God—“to see the King in His beauty”—and to participate in the heavenly praise along with the angels.⁸⁹ This is expressed in the description of the entry into the seventh *hekhal*,

That man sweats and trembles, and is upset, fearful and terrified, fainting and falling back, and (then) ‘Anafi’el the Prince, he and the sixty-three guardians of the entrances of the seven *hekhalot*, all of them help him and say to him: ‘Do not fear, son of a beloved seed. Enter and see the King in His beauty. You will not be destroyed and you will not be burned up.’⁹⁰

In order to get to this point, the adept must show two seals at the entrance of each *hekhal* to the guardian angels standing at either side until he reaches the sixth *hekhal*, where he must show three seals, and then again two seals to pass into the last *hekhal*. This is what happens at the entrance to the first *hekhal*:

⁸⁸ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§198–251 describes the circumstances under which R. Nehuniah reveals the “secret of the world” (§198), sits surrounded by his companions as he tells them what he sees, is called back by them to explain something they do not understand, and then continues to give them instructions on how to ascend.

⁸⁹ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §248. Section §251 describes the song that the adept participates in, along with the Throne of Glory. For a discussion of the goal of the Hekhalot journey as a vision of the enthroned God, see Wolfson, *Speculum*, 82–124. Wolfson writes (118): “In the different macroforms included in the corpus of Hekhalot literature that irreducible element still seems to me to be the mystical vision of the divine King in his beauty: the splendor of the enthroned Presence who is designated by a host of often mysterious-sounding names, the *nomina barbara*.”

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, §248.

R. Ishmael said, “When you come and stand at the entrance of the first *hekkhal*, take two seals in your two hands, one of *טוטרסאי יי* (Tōtrosiy’y), and one of *סווריִא* (Sevari’a), the Prince of the Presence. Show that of *טוטרסאי יי* to those who stand at the right, and show that of *סווריִא* to those who stand at the left. Immediately *רהביאל*, the Prince who is chief of the entrance to the first *hekkhal*, and appointed over the first *hekkhal*, and who stands at the right of the threshold, and *טופהיאל*, the Prince who stands to the left of the threshold with him—immediately they seize you, one to your right and one to your left, until they bring and transfer and carefully protect you to *תנריאל*, the Prince who is the chief of the entrance of the second *hekkhal*, and who stands at the right of the threshold, and *מתפיאל*, the Prince who stands at the left of the threshold with him.”⁹¹

It is dangerous to attempt to enter the *hekkhalot* without possession of the seals, as well as without certain moral qualities and rabbinic learning, because the guardian angels are “armed and dangerous,” alert against any unqualified seeker who tries to journey to the Merkabah.⁹² The *Hekhalot* ascent texts do not mention demons as a danger that the adept must confront, but rather the angels, who could destroy the *Hekhalot* practitioner as swiftly as any demon.

The ascent account of *Hekhalot Zutarti* requires the adept to show to the guardian prince of each *hekkhal* a “seal” (חותם) or “ring” (טבעת) on which a divine name is engraved: “You show to him the seal and ring upon which were engraved *שתקיי*, Lord God of Israel, our father who is in heaven . . . Immediately *רנואל* YHWH seizes [him] in his hand and transfers him to *רהיברון* YHWH.”⁹³ Eventually the angels will transfer the adept to the “embrace of *שתקיי* Lord God of Israel,” from whom he can request that all the angels be bound to him to do anything he wants.⁹⁴ Bar-Ilan’s discussion of these passages seems to imply that these seals, like the ones previously discussed, must also be written on the body,⁹⁵ but the wording of the texts suggests that the seals are something that the adept must hold in his hands, a seal for each hand, as

⁹¹ *Synopse*, §219. Names are according to MS. Oxford 1531 (Michael 9).

⁹² See Schäfer, *Synopse*, §224, in which Rabbi Neḥuniah ben HaQanah describes the guardians of the sixth *hekkhal* who destroy those who attempt to enter without permission. *Synopse*, §228 refers to those who are unfit (*eynam haginim*).

⁹³ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §417, according to MS. New York 8128. In the ascent account of *Hekhalot Zutarti*, the angelic names are compounded with the divine name of four letters.

⁹⁴ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §§415–419.

⁹⁵ Meir Bar-Ilan, “Magical Seals,” 47.

the Hekhalot Rabbati text implies, or a ring with something engraved on it, as the Hekhalot Zutarti text instructs.⁹⁶

A Coptic adjuration for help from angels is suggestive in determining what is meant in the Hekhalot text. In this text, the adjurer refers to the “seal” and the fourteen “amulets” that he holds in his right hand. He says,

Listen to me! Come to me, good Gabriel, so that you may listen to me today, on account of the seal of Adonai, the father, and the fourteen amulets that are in my right hand, that you may come to me at this place and become for me a patron, minister, and help all the days of my life.

The incantation continues, “I glorify you, presence of Adonai Eloei almighty, so that you may listen to me this day and send me Gabriel, the angel of righteousness, that he may come to me on account of this seal of the father almighty that is in my right hand, that you may stand at my right and help me.”⁹⁷ Similarly, the ascent text of *Hekhalot Rabbati* requires the adept to show two seals to the angels in the first five *hekhalot*, three to those in the sixth *hekhal*, and two to those in the seventh *hekhal*, making a total of fifteen different seals. Based on this parallel and the wording in *Hekhalot Rabbati* and *Hekhalot Zutarti*, it seems likely that the seals in this case refer to physical objects (metal plates, gems placed in rings, or pieces of paper) with names of God and the Sar ha-Panim written on them, rather than the names being written on the hands of the adept who would ascend to the Merkabah.

To bring the discussion back to the *Testament of Job*, the cords that the women receive from their father are just as necessary for their mystical enlightenment as the seals are for the mystics of the Hekhalot. Without these objects, there would be no experience and no knowledge gained. For Job and his daughters, as for the Hekhalot mystics, the ultimate attainment is to dwell in the heavens with God and his angels, to be

⁹⁶ For a discussion of what these rings might have looked like, see Campbell Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets, chiefly Graeco-Egyptian* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950), 8–13.

⁹⁷ Meyer and Smith, *Ancient Christian Magic*, 136–137. This adjuration has a remarkable number of parallels to the Hekhalot adjurations and deserves a separate discussion. Daniel Sperber discussed its relation to rabbinic literature in “Some Rabbinic Themes in Magical Papyri,” in idem, *Magic and Folklore in Rabbinic Literature* (Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1994), 107–110. It was also extensively discussed by Erwin R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period* (13 vols.; Bollingen 37; New York: Pantheon, 1953–1968), 2:147–188. This adjuration also gives additional evidence for the belief that names were written on the body of the deity: “I invoke you, Gabriel, by the right hand of the father, and the seal that is in the bosom of the father, and these amulets that are written on the bosom of the father” (*Ancient Christian Magic*, 141).

seated on a throne in God's presence, and to speak the same language as the angels.

6. *Angelic and Divine Languages*

The idea that there is a special heavenly language is also important in one of the adjurational texts of the Hekhalot literature, and this might shed light on the nature of the angelic languages that Job's daughters learn. The adjuration of the Sar ha-Panim in the Hekhalot texts mentions a special "language" that the angels understand: the "language of purity" (*lashon taharah*),⁹⁸ or as it is also referred to, "the language of YHWH" (*lashon YHWH*).⁹⁹ In this adjuration, a progressively more powerful series of *voces mysticae* is used to adjure and call upon the Sar ha-Panim to do the will of the adjurer, finally ending with his name itself, which lacks only one letter from the divine name of four letters "by which He formed and established all and sealed with it all the work of His hands."¹⁰⁰ The name appears first as a collection of letters without apparent meaning: פִּיפֵן הוֹנִי הַסֵּס פֵּצֵס יֵה סֵאמִינְסִיֵא קְתוּ הוֹדֵס. אִשְׁשׁ מִקְצַתָּת מִן מִסְצִי מִנִּיקִי This name is then "translated" into the language of purity, which uses the letters of the Name of God: YHWH YW HWH HW HW YHWH YH HYH YHWH YHWH YHWH HY WHYY HYW HYH YH HHW YW HY HWH YH YHWH YWH.

The adjuration then goes on to adjure the angel by "the right arm of the Holy One, and by his faithful and desirable name."¹⁰¹ This name, which begins with קְתַמְפַּתְתָּ קְשַׁמְזִי and continues for several more "words," is also "explained in the language of purity," or alternatively, "in the language of YHWH," depending upon the manuscript: YHWH HH YH, etc. After the name appears, the text goes on to say: "blessed is the name of his glorious majesty forever," the doxology familiar from

⁹⁸ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §637, according to MS. Oxford 1531 (Michael 9).

⁹⁹ Schäfer, *Synopse* §638. MS. New York Jewish Theological Seminary of America 8128: "in the language of purity with *yod he*, how it is read." MS. Oxford 1531 (Michael 9) and Dropsie 436: YHWH. MS. Munich 40 has YHWD, which is a common euphemism for the Tetragrammaton: "language of YHWD."

¹⁰⁰ Schäfer, *Synopse*, §637, according to MS. Jewish Theological Seminary of America 8128.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, §638, according to MS. Jewish Theological Seminary of America 8128.

the response given by the people in the Temple when the priests recited the divine name of four letters.¹⁰²

The “language of purity,” which the angels must understand because it is the language used to adjure them, is not like our ordinary human language, since it is composed solely of the four letters of the divine name.¹⁰³ One of the curious features of the Hekhalot literature is that it is filled with a wide variety of divine and angelic names, many of them incomprehensible, which are composed of a seemingly random string of Hebrew letters, often combined with the four letters of the divine name. In this it bears distinct similarities to many of the incantations found in the Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri, as well as to the names written on many amulets. The *Testament of Job* does not specify what the languages of the angels are, and whether or not they are understandable by human beings. Since two of Job’s daughters (Kasia and Amaltheia’s Horn) are also credited with the composition of hymns, and the reader is directed to these fictitious compositions to learn what the women spoke, it may be that they are in fact comprehensible to human beings, or they may be a combination of comprehensible and incomprehensible elements, like the Hekhalot hymns, prayers, and incantations.

7. *Conclusions*

My concluding comments will begin with a focus on the visionary and protective powers of the cords, amulets, and seals mentioned in *T. Job*, the Hekhalot literature, and the Greek magical papyri, and then turn to a discussion of the ramifications of the comparisons between them. Visions of God or the angels do not “just happen” for Job’s daughters or the rabbinic heroes of the Hekhalot literature, or for those who might use the Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri. They do not occur from meditation or contemplation alone, as in other forms of visionary mysticism. They occur because of the use of powerful amulets and seals, within a ritual framework that the Hekhalot literature and the Greco-Egyptian papyri make obvious. The same ritual objects that

¹⁰² m. Yoma 3:8, 4:1, 6:2.

¹⁰³ For a longer discussion on this point, see Gager, *Curse Tablets*, 9–10, and Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power*, 210–215.

enable Job's daughters, Rabbi Ishmael, or Rabbi Akiba to see the angels or journey to the Merkabah also protect them against evil forces that might prevent them from attaining their goals; and these same objects were used for healing from disease or protecting people from possession by evil spirits and demons. In contrast with the careful distinctions that modern scholars often make between "magic" and "mysticism," the ancient writers and practitioners seem to understand these uses as existing along a continuum.

Let us examine the relationship between the protective and visionary uses more closely. The cords that Job's daughters received came to them from God, via Job—therefore their dual use was divinely sanctioned. Being protected from Satan by wearing the cords was part of what enabled them to speak the languages of the angels and see them descending to take their father's soul to heaven. The power of the cords was both protective and visionary. In the same way, the seals that the Hekhalot practitioner "put on" himself in *Ma'aseh Merkabah* were part of what enabled him to adjure the angels, by protecting him from the possible attacks of evil spirits. The way that he adjured the angels was by making use of "names" that are very similar to the "names" of which the seals consisted. Similar "names" are used by the person who would journey through the *hekkhalot* to seek the vision of God and to participate in the heavenly praise of the angels and the divine throne. The one who "descends" to the Merkabah does not seem to need the protection of seals against the "destroyers," perhaps because he is in a realm where they cannot enter, due to the protection already afforded by the angelic guardians of the *hekkhalot*. Instead, he needs the seals to prove that he belongs in the world of the *hekkhalot*; otherwise, he will be struck down by the guardian angels. In this way, perhaps, they do protect him during the "descent."

From a three-way comparison of the *Testament of Job*, the Hekhalot literature, and the Greco-Egyptian ritual papyri, it is apparent how alike the Hekhalot literature and the Greco-Egyptian papyri are in their use of unintelligible divine names (*voces mysticae*) for ritual purposes. The divine names are an integral part of Hekhalot rituals for ascent or adjuration, and appear in almost all of the rituals prescribed in the papyri, as well as on almost every amulet from late antiquity. The *Testament of Job* does not mention these names on the *phylacteria* that the women get from their father, perhaps because it stems from a period before the names were in widespread ritual use. It is possible, however, that divine names are referred to more obliquely, in the dialects of the

angelic languages that the daughters of Job speak. In any case, for the Hekhalot texts and the *Testament of Job*, knowledge of the languages of the angels is a crucial sign that one has achieved a level of divine understanding that other human beings do not possess. Job's daughters and the pseudonymous rabbis of the Hekhalot literature both acquire their knowledge of these languages through the intermediary of the sacred cords or the protective and visionary seals.

In this article I have sketched out important similarities between the mystical and ritual aspects of the *Testament of Job* and the Hekhalot literature: the use of amulets and seals for both protection and visionary experience; the importance of the languages of heaven; the mention of chariots and thrones in heaven; Job's enthronement in heaven, like Metatron or the Hekhalot mystics; and Job's daughters and R. Nehuniah ben HaQanah being "heavenly-minded" and dwelling in the upper world while still being bodily on earth. These similarities may place *T. Job* in the trajectory of visionary literature described by Rachel Elior that leads from *1 Enoch* through Qumran literature to the Hekhalot literature. It is equally important, however, to point out the differences, which demonstrate how *T. Job* is unlikely to have been produced by the early Merkabah circles, centered in the priesthood, that are posited by Elior. To begin with, the fact that Job's daughters play such an important part in the last part of the book, acquiring spiritual awareness and knowledge that others (men) do not have, militates against the text as stemming from any kind of priestly group, which would have been made up entirely of men. In addition, in the *Testament of Job*, Job's daughters, like many of the other biblical figures (e.g., Enoch in the Enoch literature, Abraham in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*) whose stories are retold in Second Temple Jewish literature, do not seek out heavenly or angelic experiences—they are bequeathed the possibility of such experiences by their father, unlike the rabbinic heroes of the Hekhalot literature, who seek to ascend to heaven or to adjure angels.¹⁰⁴ Unlike parts of the Hekhalot literature, *T. Job* is not intended to instruct the

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, *1 Enoch* 17, when Enoch is taken on his tour of heaven, and *Apocalypse of Abraham* 10, when Abraham is taken up to heaven by Yahoel the angel. This latter case is more equivocal, because before Abraham is taken up, a voice tells him (9:7) "for forty days abstain from every kind of food cooked by fire, and from drinking of wine and from anointing yourself with oil," R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," *OTP* 1:693, which indicates that some kind of preparation is needed before the ascent.

contemporary reader in how to achieve the vision of the Merkabah or adjure angels. Rather, *T. Job* is, above all, a retelling of the Job story that is intended to highlight certain of its aspects that were important to the author(s).¹⁰⁵ Reading *T. Job* with an eye to the similarities with the Hekhalot literature helps focus on those aspects of Second Temple literature that were eventually taken up by it, but it does not tell us that *T. Job* stems from the same circles that produced either the Qumran literature or the Hekhalot literature.

¹⁰⁵ For one interesting recent discussion of the agenda of the author(s) of *T. Job*, see Kugler and Rohrbaugh, "On Women and Honor in the *Testament of Job*," *JSP* 14 (2004): 43–62.

IS THE PRAYER OF MANASSEH A JEWISH WORK?*

James R. Davila
University of St. Andrews

The Prayer of Manasseh is a brief penitential prayer of fifteen verses attributed to the repentant Judean king Manasseh. It was inspired by the story in 2 Chr 33:10–19 which referred to a prayer attributed to the king—a prayer that reportedly was extant in the Chronicler’s time, but has since been lost. All indicators are that the surviving Prayer of Manasseh was composed secondarily and pseudepigraphically on the basis of the passage in Chronicles to make up the loss. It survives mainly in Greek and Syriac versions. Although it is often grouped with the Apocrypha (e.g., in the Revised Standard Version), it technically does not belong there, since it is not part of the Roman Catholic canon, although it is a canonical work in the Orthodox Church.¹ Despite its lack of canonical authority in the West, its influence as a paradigmatic prayer of repentance by a notorious sinner is second only to that of Psalm 51.² It has been far less influential in Judaism, although, as we shall see below, it has not been entirely ignored.

The Prayer of Manasseh is universally agreed to be a late pseudepigraph. Its original language is debated: the majority of commentators think a Greek original is likely,³ but a minority have argued for a Semitic

* It is a pleasure to dedicate this brief article to Betsy Halpern-Amaru in appreciation of her many contributions to the field of early Jewish studies.

¹ For a recent discussion of the history of the major biblical canons in light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Peter Flint, “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–304.

² See, for example, Howard N. Bream, “Manasseh and His Prayer,” *Lutheran Theological Seminary Bulletin* 66 (1986): 5–47, for a discussion of the influence of the work, especially on Martin Luther.

³ Herbert E. Ryle, “The Prayer of Manasses,” *APOT*, 1:612–24, esp. p. 612; Albert-Marie Denis, *Introduction aux pseudepigraphes grecs d’Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 177–81, esp. p. 181; Eva Ößwald, “Gebet Manasses,” *Poetisches Schriften* (2nd ed.; JSHRZ IV; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1977), 15–27, esp. p. 19; Gerbern S. Oegema, “Das Gebet Manasses,” in *Poetische Schriften* (JSHRZ Supplement VI; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2002), 1–10, esp. pp. 2, 4; Daniel J. Harrington, *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 166–69, esp. p. 167; David A. deSilva, “Prayer of Manasseh,” in *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2002), 296–300, esp. p. 297.

original, either the surviving Syriac or a lost Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage*.⁴ The recent recovery of a Hebrew version in a medieval manuscript from the Cairo Geniza does not seem to provide evidence to help resolve the debate (see below).⁵ Commentators generally argue a Jewish origin to be likely or certain, although the possibility of Christian authorship is not always entirely rejected.⁶ The work must have existed by the third century C.E., when it was incorporated into the *Didascalia Apostolorum* (see below), and estimates of its date of composition have usually ranged between about 250 B.C.E. and the first century C.E.

It is worthwhile to take another look at the Prayer of Manasseh not only because new manuscript evidence (the Geniza text) has become available, but also because notable advances have been made in recent years in the methodology for studying such Old Testament pseudepigrapha. The most important basic insight was first expressed by Robert A. Kraft, who argued that instead of assuming an ancient work of this type was of Jewish provenance if it lacked explicitly Christian elements (or if such elements could be removed easily by redaction criticism), we should first try to understand the work in the context of the earliest manuscripts that contain it.⁷ In a recent monograph, I have developed

⁴ James H. Charlesworth summarizes earlier positions supporting both a Greek origin and a Semitic origin and he himself cautions against confidence that the work was composed in Greek ("Prayer of Manasseh," *OTP*, 2:625–37, esp. pp. 626–27).

⁵ T.-S. K 1.144, T.-S. K 21.95.T, T.-S. K 21.95.P, 2a 19–3a 2, published by Peter Schäfer and Shaul Shaked in *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza*, vol. 2 (TSAJ 64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 27–78. This Hebrew version of the previously known Prayer of Manasseh is not to be confused with another Hebrew prayer attributed to Manasseh found among the noncanonical psalms from Qumran (4Q380–81). See Eileen Schuller, "Non-Canonical Psalms," *Qumran Cave 4 VI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I* (ed. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 75–172, esp. pp. 122–26 (4Q381 frags. 33a, b, + 35); William M. Schneidewind, "Manasseh, King," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 504–505.

⁶ Those arguing for or assuming a Jewish origin include Ryle, *APOT*, 1:612; Denis, *Introduction*, 181; Obwald, "Gebet Manasses," 19–20; D. Flusser, "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. Michael E. Stone; CRINT 2; Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 551–77, esp. p. 555; Charlesworth, *OTP*, 2:628; Emil Schürer, Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (3 vols.; rev. ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–87), 3.2:730–33, esp. 731; Oegema, "Das Gebet Manasses," 5. But Harrington writes that the work "was probably written by a Greek-speaking Jew outside the land of Israel, though Christian authorship is not impossible" (*Invitation*, 167).

⁷ Kraft, "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. John C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press,

Kraft's proposal by spelling out the range of possible authorships of ancient Old Testament pseudepigrapha; proposed a detailed methodology for deciding what features in such works constitute positive evidence in favor of Jewish authorship; and shown on empirical grounds that it is entirely possible for a pseudepigraphon to be composed by a Christian but to contain no indubitable Christian "signature features" and that redaction criticism can give misleading results in that Christian compositions sometimes include Christian signature features that give the appearance of being secondary additions.⁸ The object of this article is to reconsider the origins of the Prayer of Manasseh from the perspective of this methodology. My aim is not to present radically new conclusions, but rather to refocus our thinking about this text by approaching what is mostly old evidence with a new perspective.

The Earliest Attestations of the Prayer of Manasseh

Our earliest source for the Prayer of Manasseh, as noted above, is the Syriac version of the third-century *Didascalia Apostolorum*, a pseudepigraphic hortatory and paranetic work claiming to have been written by the Apostles at the time of the Jerusalem council mentioned in Acts 15. The earliest manuscript of this version is from the seventh or eighth century, but the translation itself seems to have been made in the fourth century. A fifth-century palimpsest also preserves about two-fifths of a Latin translation, perhaps made in the fourth century, and later Arabic and Ethiopic translations survive as well. Some small fourth-century fragments of the original Greek survive and the Greek text of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is an expanded version of the *Didascalia*,

1994), 55–86; idem, "The Pseudepigrapha and Christianity Revisited: Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 371–95.

⁸ James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJSup 105; Leiden, Brill, 2005). The basic argument is summarized in idem, "The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha as Background to the New Testament," *Expository Times* 117 (2005): 53–57. By Jewish "signature features" I mean positive indicators of Jewish authorship, particularly authorship by Jews who defined their Judaism rigorously over against other religious traditions such as Christianity or gentile polytheism. Christian signature features are defined analogously. See Davila, *Provenance*, 65–71. I use the term "Old Testament pseudepigrapha" to refer to the pseudepigrapha of the Jewish scriptures which were transmitted to us entirely or mainly by Christians and which, therefore, pertained to the "Old Testament" for the tradents. For further discussion of terminology, see *ibid.*, 2–9.

composed perhaps in the late fourth century.⁹ The *Didascalia* holds up Manasseh as an example to bishops of the possibility of repentance for even the worst of sinners, and in support it quotes 2 Chron 33:1–13 (= 2 Kgs 21:1–17), appending the Prayer of Manasseh as though it were part of the biblical text.¹⁰ The *Didascalia* is the earliest source for the Syriac version and the *Urtext* of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is probably the earliest source for the Greek version.¹¹

In addition the Greek text of the Prayer of Manasseh is given as the eighth of the collection of fourteen Odes immediately following the book of Psalms in the fifth-century uncial manuscript Codex Alexandrinus.¹² This is a Christian collection that in addition to the Prayer of Manasseh includes nine poetic works from the Greek Jewish scriptures; three from the New Testament (the Magnificat [Lk 1:46–55]; the song of Simeon [Lk 2:29–32]; and the song of Zachariah [Lk 1:68–79]); and concludes with the liturgical piece the *Gloria in Excelsis*. Earlier lists of Odes given by Origen, Ambrosius, Philo of Carpasia, and Nicetas of Remesiana contain from five to nine poetic pieces, most of which come from these fourteen, but the Prayer of Manasseh is never one of them.¹³ We do not know where the compiler of Codex Alexandrinus found the work; it may have been taken from the Greek *Didascalia* or the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The Odes, more or less as codified in Alexandrinus, became important for Christian liturgy from this point on and are part of the scriptural canon in the Orthodox Church.

Thus the earliest attestations of the Prayer of Manasseh are all in Christian contexts, going back to a Greek archetype in the third century C.E. There is no evidence for Jewish knowledge of this work until the tenth century (see the next section).

⁹ Arthur Vööbus, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac* (4 vols; CSCO 401–402, 407–408; Scriptorum Syri 175–76, 179–80; Louvain: Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1979), 1:11*–13*; 2:23*–33*; Denis, Introduction, 177–79.

¹⁰ *Didascalia* VII, 1:87–92 and 2:80–88 in the Vööbus edition (see previous note).

¹¹ The most recent edition of the *Apostolic Constitutions* is Marcel Metzger, *Les Constitutions Apostoliques* (SC 320, 329, 336; Paris: Cerf, 1985–1987).

¹² Heinrich Schneider has a thorough discussion in “Die biblischen Oden im christlichen Altertum,” *Biblica* 30 (1949): 28–65, esp. pp. 52–57.

¹³ *Ibid.* 50–52.

The Original Language of the Prayer of Manasseh

In which language was the Prayer of Manasseh composed? The earliest version that survives seems to be the Greek,¹⁴ although James H. Charlesworth translated the Syriac version for his *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* contribution and he even seems to hint at, or at least not quite rule out, the possibility that the Syriac is more original than the Greek.¹⁵ But as far as I am aware, no one has explicitly argued this to be the case and I cannot see any positive evidence for it.¹⁶ The question then becomes whether the Greek text is the original composition or a translation of a Hebrew or Aramaic original.

At first glance it might seem that the question is answered by the recent discovery of a Hebrew version of the Prayer of Manasseh from the Cairo Geniza. The tenth-century manuscript contains a series of prayers and incantations mostly attributed to biblical figures, including Abraham, Jacob, Manasseh, and Elijah. Some of the other compositions are also known from elsewhere.¹⁷ One possibility, of course, is that the Hebrew Prayer of Manasseh is the hitherto lost *Vorlage* of the Greek version. The Cairo Geniza has produced fragments of such lost texts in the past, such as Hebrew material from Ben Sira and portions of Aramaic Levi. Nevertheless, this need not be so, since we know of other cases where works transmitted in Greek or Latin were retroverted

¹⁴ The major editions of the Greek text are found in Henry Barclay Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, vol. 3, *Hosea, 4 Maccabees, Psalms of Solomon, Enoch, The Odes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930) and A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Göttingensis 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931).

¹⁵ Charlesworth, *OTP*, 1:626–27.

¹⁶ The Syriac text is published by W. Baars and H. Schneider in “Prayer of Manasseh,” in *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version, part IV, fascicle 6, Canticles or Odes—Prayer of Manasseh—Apocryphal Psalms—Psalms of Solomon—Tobit—1 (3) Esdras* (Leiden: Brill, 1972). The editors find there to be two recensions of the Syriac, one deriving from the *Didascalia* and the other a Melchite version, which represent different, although not completely independent translations from the Greek (p. v). If correct, this point underlines the dependency of the Syriac version on the Greek.

¹⁷ For the edition of the Hebrew manuscript, see n. 5 above. For *Sheva Eliyyahu* (the *Adjuration of Elijah*) or *Sheva Zutarti* (the *Lesser Adjuration*) see Schäfer and Shaked, *Magische Texte*, 2:6–10; Rebecca Macy Lesses, *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism* (HTS 44; Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity, 1998), 260–73, 381–94; and James R. Davila, *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature* (JSJSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 11–12, 239–40. For the Hebrew version of the *Prayer of Jacob*, see Reimund Leicht, “*Qedushah* and Prayer to Helios: A New Hebrew Version of an Apocryphal Prayer of Jacob,” *JSQ* 6 (1999): 140–76.

back into Hebrew or Aramaic in the Middle Ages. This was done, for example, to Tobit and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*.¹⁸ We may not, therefore, either assume or rule out that a Hebrew or Aramaic medieval manuscript of a work known otherwise in other languages such as Greek or Latin represents a lost original text. Each case must be decided on its own merits.

In the case of the Hebrew Prayer of Manasseh, Reimund Leicht has made a convincing case that it is a retranslation—perhaps from both the Greek and the Syriac—into Hebrew rather than the *Vorlage* behind the other versions.¹⁹ The Hebrew text of v. 13 clearly presupposes and misunderstands the Greek phrase αἰτοῦμαι δεόμενός σου; the Hebrew version has a suspicious number of “etymological congruities” with the Syriac version; it seems to allude in v. 13 to rabbinic debates about whether Manasseh had a place in “the world to come,” a phrase found in the Hebrew of this verse but not in the other versions; and, especially tellingly, the effort of the Hebrew translator to echo passages in the Hebrew Bible has led to a fairly free translation of a number of lines, although the general sense is well presented. Apart from allusions to the Hebrew Bible, the Hebrew language of this version of the Prayer of Manasseh has notable rabbinic traits.

The Greek text, therefore, is our earliest source for the work. Unfortunately, as noted already, for example, by Charlesworth, the text is too brief for the sort of sustained philological analysis that could demonstrate translation from a Semitic original.²⁰ Such apparently Semitic traits as appear in the Greek can easily be explained by the influence of the LXX on a composer striving for a scriptural sound to the work.

In short, we have no persuasive evidence that the Greek text of the Prayer of Manasseh in our possession is not the original composition. If we had solid evidence that it had been composed in Hebrew, a Jewish origin would be exceedingly likely and the best working hypothesis.

¹⁸ For Tobit see Stuart Weeks, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions* (Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes 3; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004). For Pseudo-Philo see Howard Jacobson, “Thoughts on the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, Ps-Philo’s *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and Their Relationship,” *Studia Philonica Annual* 9 (1997): 239–63.

¹⁹ Leicht, “A Newly Discovered Hebrew Version of the Apocryphal ‘Prayer of Manasseh,’” *JSQ* 3 (1996): 359–73, esp. pp. 364–68.

²⁰ Charlesworth, *OTP*, 2:626–27. For the methodological difficulties in establishing that even a substantial Greek document was translated from a Semitic original, see James R. Davila, “(How) Can We Tell if A Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?” *JSP* 15 (2005): 3–61.

But since the philological data are inconclusive, we must turn to other factors that might help us understand the origin of the work.

The Provenance of the Prayer of Manasseh: Jewish, Christian, or Other?

Thus our current evidence indicates that the Prayer of Manasseh is a Greek work that is first attested in a third-century Christian document that perhaps originated in Syriac and which found the prayer interesting for the light it shed on the repentance of egregious sinners. Christians also valued it as a liturgical piece from the fifth century on. The first evidence for Jews taking any notice of it is the Hebrew retranslation found in a tenth-century manuscript, which is dependent on the earlier Christian transmission. Is there anything that compels us not to regard the work as a Christian composition that came into existence sometime between the late first and the third centuries C.E.?

The case for Jewish authorship seems more often to be assumed than argued, but most of the arguments that have been made for it were advanced already by Herbert E. Ryle, so I will base my analysis primarily on his discussion. He writes that “[n]othing would be more natural than for a devout Jew to endeavour to frame in fitting terms the kind of penitential prayer, which, according to the tradition, Manasseh had poured forth when he was in captivity in Babylon.”²¹ In favor of this he writes, first, that “[t]he reader should take notice of the emphasis laid upon the Israelite patriarchs and their true spiritual lineage. The God of ‘our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob’ (ver. 1) is ‘the God of the righteous seed’ (ver. 1) and ‘of the righteous’ (ver. 8).”²²

It is true enough that such words could well have been written by a devout Jew, but by the same token it is equally possible that a Christian could have written them. We must keep in mind that the Prayer of Manasseh is a pseudepigraphon and the writer endeavored to speak through the persona of Manasseh with an air of verisimilitude. And certainly an early Christian would have found it natural for Manasseh to speak of the three patriarchs “as our fathers” and their descendants (in Manasseh’s time) as “their righteous seed.” Indeed, as David A. deSilva

²¹ Ryle, *APOT*, 1:612.

²² *Ibid.*, 615. The revised Schürer cites v. 1 without argumentation as “definitely” indicating a Jewish origin (*History of the Jewish People*, 3.2:731). Similarly Denis quotes v. 1 as proof of Jewish authorship (*Introduction*, 181). OBwald notes vv. 1 and 8 as indicators of Jewish origin, but she also does not argue the case (“Das Gebet Manasses,” 20).

points out, this verse echoes a similar phrasing in the LXX of 1 Chr 29:18 (cf. 17:24).²³ And Daniel J. Harrington notes that the phrase “their righteous seed” may refer to the righteous offspring of the patriarchs as opposed to other offspring who are unrighteous.²⁴ That is, it may not be a blanket approbation of all offspring of the patriarchs.

Moreover, quite early on, Christian supersessionism had advanced to the point that a Christian author could even use language like this of the gentile Christian community. I have pointed out elsewhere that the author of *1 Clement*, a gentile Christian writing in the late first century C.E., refers to “our father Abraham” (*1 Clem.* 31:2); quotes with apparent approval the promises addressed to Abraham’s offspring in Genesis 12:1–3; 13:14–16; and 15:5–6 (*1 Clem.* 10:3–6); and identifies the author and the Christian audience with scriptural Israel (*1 Clem.* 29:1–3; 64:1).²⁵ A Christian author could thus have easily written these passages in the Prayer of Manasseh, speaking with the voice of Manasseh, but thinking of the fathers and their righteous posterity as Old Testament saints subsumed into the redemption of the church.

Second, Ryle notes that according to Pr Man v. 8, “[t]he patriarchs had not sinned against God” and thus “‘repentance’ is appointed by God for certain persons and not for others.”²⁶ At first glance this statement does seem to contradict the Christian doctrine of original and universal sin, a view held even in the earliest New Testament documents (e.g., Rom 3:23). But a closer look shows that the situation is more complicated. In v. 8 the author contrasts the righteous, exemplified by the three patriarchs, with sinners. Repentance was appointed for the sinners, such as Manasseh, not the righteous. It is true that in Christian theology there is a belief that all are sinners and require the redemption of Christ, but there is also recognition that some live righteous lives that do not require the comprehensive repentance of a reforming habitual sinner. Indeed, in 1 Jn 3:4–10 the readers are warned that after Christ has taken away their sins, those who continue to sin are children of the devil. Likewise, the logia of Jesus in Lk 5:32, “I have not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance,” and in Lk 15:7, “there shall be more joy in heaven over one repenting sinner than over ninety-nine

²³ deSilva, *Introducing the Apocrypha*, 298.

²⁴ Harrington, *Invitation*, 168.

²⁵ Davila, *Provenance*, 223.

²⁶ Ryle, *APOT*, 615, 616.

righteous people who have no need of repentance,” might almost be taken as the inspiration behind Pr Man v. 8.²⁷

Third, Ryle cites the “supernatural efficacy ascribed to the sacred Name (ver. 3).”²⁸ This verse describes God’s restraining of the sea by his word and the sealing of the deep by his name during the mythic cosmogonic battle and does not involve any “supernatural efficacy” in the later sense in which the name is used in Jewish incantations. Ryle’s observation is vague and it is not clear what makes this use of the name “characteristic of Jewish religious thought.” The use of the divine word at creation is implicit in Genesis 1 and explicit in LXX Ps 32:4–9 (EV 33:4–9) and 148:3–8 (note the reference to the restraint of the sea in 32:7). It is true that the Greek scriptures do not directly associate the divine name with activity during the cosmogonic myth but, nonetheless, God’s name is very much an active agent (e.g., Isa 30:27). Pr Man v. 3 could have been composed by anyone who had a good knowledge of the Greek scriptures.

Fourth, Ryle refers to “the representation of the under-world (*Sheol* or Hades) as a region containing various grades of remoteness from the light of heaven (ver. 11).”²⁹ Nothing in v. 11 refers to the underworld. Evidently Ryle had in mind the phrase “do not condemn me to the depths of the earth” in v. 13. The identical phrase “in the depths of the earth” (ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τῆς γῆς) appears in LXX Ps 138:15 (EV 139:15) and a very similar phrase that identifies the region with Hades is found in the S text of Tob 13:2 (ἕως ἄδου κατωτάτω τῆς γῆς). Again, anyone who knew the Greek scriptures might have used this phrase in this context.

Fifth, Ryle mentions “the description of the angels as the ‘host of heaven’ (ἡ δύναμις τῶν οὐρανῶν, ver. 15).”³⁰ But once again almost

²⁷ Note that the *Testament of Abraham* 10:13 (long recension) asserts that “Abraham has not sinned” and this is the explanation for his lack of mercy toward earthly sinners. Abraham, however, considers himself a sinner (9:3), and later confesses a sin that God forgives (14:12–14). Perhaps the sense is that Abraham was not a habitual sinner who required a great act of repentance, although he was capable of sin and thus in need of repentance from time to time. Presumably something similar is intended by Pr Man v. 8. I have argued elsewhere that the *Testament of Abraham* is a Christian work in its present forms and that there is no need to posit an earlier Jewish *Urtext*, although such an *Urtext* is not impossible. See Davila, *Provenance*, 199–207.

²⁸ Ryle, *APOT*, 1:616.

²⁹ *Ibid.* But cf. the note to v. 13 on p. 624.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1:616 and note to v. 15 on p. 624.

the same expression (πᾶσα δύναμις τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) appears in LXX 2 Chr 18:18 with the same meaning and this would be a natural way for anyone familiar with the Greek scriptures to express the concept.

Gerbern S. Oegma has also noted the view that similarities between the Prayer of Manasseh and other Jewish works such as Baruch, *4 Ezra*, and Pseudo-Philo suggest a connection with synagogal prayers. More specifically, “auch die Ähnlichkeiten zwischen 4. Esr 8,20–25 und dem Gebet Manasses 1–7 weisen auf eine Interdependenz oder auf einen gemeinsam Hintergrund hin, und sind im Übrigen ein weiteres Indiz für eine Frühdatierung des Gebetes.”³¹ But this is an over-reading of the evidence. These passages share an interest in God’s manifestations of his glory but the similarities are very general and do not indicate literary dependency or a necessarily similar date of composition.

The central theme of repentance for grievous sinners in the Prayer of Manasseh is congenial to both Christianity and Judaism and either a Christian or a Jew could have written the work. None of the features of the work which have been advanced as explicitly or exclusively Jewish bear up under scrutiny; all of them could have just as easily been written by a Christian or, for that matter, a gentile God-fearer or sympathizer. Likewise, we find no features that gentile Christians would have been unlikely to include, such as reference to halakhic issues, Jewish rituals and festivals, and Jewish national issues. Authorship by a Samaritan, however, seems unlikely, since the work is interested in a Judean king and draws on the Greek scriptures in addition to the Hexateuch. The earliest context we have for the Prayer of Manasseh is Christian and it can be read as a Christian composition with no particular difficulty. Granted, there is no mention of Christ’s atonement, which is an important theme for Christian repentance. But the text is set in the mouth of an Old Testament character and the author may simply be avoiding gross anachronism while assuming that the audience would recognize the implicit mediation of Christ’s grace to Manasseh. Note that the immediate context of the passage in the *Didascalia* which contains the Prayer of Manasseh also does not bring in the issue of Christ’s atonement.

³¹ Oegma, “Das Gebet Manasses,” 5.

Conclusions

The Prayer of Manasseh can be traced back to a third-century Christian document, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, in which it was embedded because its teaching about the repentance of egregious sinners was valued by the editors. This context is inferential only in that it involves working backward from a complete Syriac manuscript of the seventh or eighth century, a fragmentary fourth-century Greek manuscript, and a fifth-century Latin palimpsest (along with other, later, manuscripts and sources) to a universally accepted third-century archetype that contained our work. The surviving manuscripts were composed and transmitted by Christians and the Prayer of Manasseh can be read without difficulty as a Christian text. If we therefore proceed on the principle of beginning with the earliest surviving manuscripts and working backwards from them to earlier contexts only as necessary, there is no reason to regard it as anything other than a Christian pseudepigraphon from the first to third centuries. Nothing in it allows us to date it more precisely.

All that said, the Prayer of Manasseh can also be read without difficulty as a Jewish composition and I would not by any means rule out such an origin for it. It could likewise have been written by a non-Christian gentile who was sympathetic to Jewish scriptural traditions. In general, the length of the work makes it difficult to rule out possibilities, and the fact that more obviously Jewish features are not present may simply be due to its brevity. Nevertheless, authorship by a Samaritan seems very unlikely.

In the interest of building a reconstruction of ancient Judaism which is as uncontaminated as possible by non-Jewish material, we should be wary of using the Prayer of Manasseh as a Jewish source. On the basis of the methodology I have established in my book, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, I propose that our primary working hypothesis should be that it is a Christian work that gives us some early and interesting evidence about ideas that some ancient Christians accepted about repentance in the Old Testament dispensation. This much we know to be true from its transmission history. But Jewish authorship remains a real possibility so, although the data in it should not be used to reconstruct aspects of ancient Judaism which are otherwise unsupported by verifiably Jewish sources, one may reasonably use the Prayer of Manasseh as ancillary evidence for aspects of ancient Judaism found elsewhere in sources already established beyond reasonable doubt to be Jewish.

“ACCORDING TO THE JEWS:” IDENTIFIED
(AND IDENTIFYING) ‘JEWISH’ ELEMENTS
IN THE *GREEK MAGICAL PAPYRI*

Lynn LiDonnici
*Vassar College**

Many questions raised in the study of Greco-Egyptian magical formularies¹ share methodological issues with the study of Jewish pseudepigrapha; indeed many of the spells within the formularies can themselves be described as pseudepigraphic, involving some of the same figures (Moses, Solomon),² along with others who trade on Egyptian and Greek rather than Jewish authority. One of these questions is the degree to which the content of a spell can be used to determine the ethnicity, or rather, ethnic or religious self-identification of the author or practitioner. As James R. Davila, pursuing a line initiated by Robert A. Kraft,³ points out in a recent monograph⁴ and in his contribution to

* I thank my friends and colleagues Marc Epstein and Benjamin G. Wright for their help with and comments on this article. I am delighted to dedicate this article to my dear friend Betsy, in all hopes of peace, health and happiness.

¹ The larger formularies are published in *Papyri Graecae Magicae*, ed. Karl Preisendanz (Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1928 [vol. I] and 1931 [vol. II]). A second, revised edition of these two volumes (along with some material from the never-published third) was issued in 1973–74, edited by Albert Heinrichs; references are to this edition (*PGM*). An English translation of these texts along with important Demotic formularies appeared in 1986: H. Dieter Betz, ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Volume I: Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986), after this abbrev. *GMPT*. The indispensable guide to these texts is still William Brashear, “The Greek Magical Papyri: An Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928–1994),” in *ANRW* II.18.5 (1995), 3380–3684. Important textual notes and critical analyses appear in *Abrasax: Ausgewählte Papyri Religiösen und Magischen Inhalts (Papyrologische Coloniensia XVII)* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990–2001), vol. 1 (1990) and 2 (1991), ed. Reinhold Merkelbach and Maria Totti; vol. 3 (1992), 4 (1996), and 5 (2001), ed. Reinhold Merkelbach.

² For full discussion see John G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973); Pablo A. Torijano, *Solomon the Esoteric King* (JSJSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

³ In two important articles; 1) “The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity,” in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. John C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 55–86; 2) “The Pseudepigrapha and Christianity Revisited: Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions,” *JSJ* 32 (2001): 371–95.

⁴ James R. Davila, *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJSup 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

this volume, when pseudepigraphic authors are careful to avoid anachronism or when Christian authors are careful in their creation of a pseudepigraphic text set before the Christian era, then their texts might be taken as authentically Jewish by modern scholars, potentially skewing our vision of ancient Judaism. These insights are also relevant to the Jewish elements in the *PGM*, where modern assumptions about identity and the boundaries between 'Jewish' and 'non-Jewish' can distort our reading of the texts.⁵ The issue is complicated by the likelihood that the extant formularies are compilations from older collections and that the organization of the present formularies may not reflect the same religious attitudes one might have found in the base texts from which they seem to have been compiled.⁶

Elements that "seem Jewish" are pervasive both in formularies and the relics of practical magic.⁷ These elements are of all kinds, but include the divine names Iao,⁸ Sabaoth, Adonai, Pipi,⁹ and various palindromes that may be intended to refer to them. Some of these names and palindromes also appear in the Hebrew or Aramaic texts of undoubtedly Jewish magic, but this does not make the names themselves Jewish, as they may have percolated back into those texts from

⁵ On this see Davila; Shaye D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), esp. 1–68.

⁶ See Lynn LiDonnici, "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV (= P.Bibl.Nat.Suppl. gr. no. 574)," *BASP* 40 (2003): 141–78; Morton Smith, "P.Leid. J 395 (PGM XIII) and Its Creation Legend," in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage À Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud; Leuven/Paris: Editions Peeters, 1986), 491–98 (= *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh* II, 227–34); idem, "The Eighth Book of Moses and How It Grew," *Atti del XVII Congresso internazionale di papirologia* (Naples, 1984), 683–93 (= *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh* II, 217–26). Jewish input into and/or involvement with these texts therefore does not need to have occurred in the centuries in which the present documents were copied. Because of this, I do not intend any suggestions I may make about specific spells necessarily to apply to the corpus overall.

⁷ For an overview of applied or practical magic, see John G. Gager, ed., *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells From the Ancient World* (New York: Oxford, 1992); Campbell Bonner, *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950); and Roy Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets (Papyrologica Coloniensia XXII:1; Opladen: Westdeutsche Verlag, 1994)*.

⁸ Iao was certainly recognized by both Gentiles and many Jews as the name of the Israelite God. For the history of the name Iao, see Sean M. McDonough, *YHVH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting* (WUNT 2:107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999); Frank E. Shaw, *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of IAW* (PhD. diss., University of Cincinnati, 2002).

⁹ Very clear in III 575, IV 595, XVIIa, XIXa 1–54. Elsewhere words resembling this may be intended to refer to Pipi, or Egyptian *p3p3*, 'Great, great,' or have something to do with Ptah; possible examples are III 335, IV 1984, and XXXVI 35–68, 295–311, 333–60, 361–71.

the larger world of ritual magic in late antiquity.¹⁰ It is this larger world of ritual magic with which I am concerned here, a polythetic category including dozens of elements that can be combined in an apparently infinite number of ways.¹¹

This environment was described by H. D. Betz as an “ecumenical” religious syncretism,¹² and John G. Gager discussed the “syncretistic landscape” of the Greco-Roman world, in which Jewish-seeming elements are “permanent elements of the environment and thus... [no] longer strictly Jewish,”¹³ more recently, Gideon Bohak has applied the terms “international magic” and “public domain” to the tradition.¹⁴ It is clear from their settings in *PGM* spells that the elements are not, in Gager’s terms, strictly Jewish in the sense of being used only among Jews or only in the context of other identifiably Jewish things; it is also clear that linguistically one cannot demonstrate that any large number of them derives from Hebrew.¹⁵ But are the elements still regarded by the practitioners (of whatever background) as ‘real Jewish magic,’ or have they so completely dissolved into the landscape of ritual possibilities that they were not recognized as being (or, more exactly, ‘being *supposed to be*’) Jewish? Bohak’s suggestion that some of the *voces magicae* were

¹⁰ Gideon Bohak, “The Impact of Jewish Monotheism on the Greco-Roman World,” *JSQ* 7 (2000): 1–21 (8).

¹¹ According to Brashear (3398–3412), many of the formularies were obtained from the collection of J. Anastasi, a 19th c. Alexandrian merchant and diplomat. Various catalog references and anecdotes link some of Anastasi’s mss., specifically PGM IV, V, Va, XII, XIII, and XIV to a cache of documents discovered in Thebes, possibly in a tomb. Two of these mss. (XII and XIV) appear to have been at least partially written by the same scribe, so a close relationship between them is likely, though its nature is difficult to determine. However, the linkage between these two and the others once owned by Anastasi, or between any of these and a particular Theban tomb, have no primary textual or archaeological basis and must remain hypotheses—interesting ones, granted, but frustrating examples of potential knowledge destroyed by the antiquities market. Other texts owned by Anastasi, which were not linked to this ‘find’ even in the 19th century imagination should not be lumped in together with it; these are PGM I, II, III, VII and LXI. For a different perspective, see most recently Jacco Dieleman, *Priests, Tongues and Rites: The London-Leiden Magical Manuscripts and Translation in Egyptian Ritual (100–300 C.E.)* (RGRW 153; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005); also Garth Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (2nd ed.; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 168–76.

¹² Betz, *GMPT*, xlvi.

¹³ Gager, *Moses*, 135–6.

¹⁴ Gideon Bohak, “Hebrew, Hebrew Everywhere? Notes on the Interpretation of *Voces Magicae*,” in *Prayer, Magic and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World* (ed. Scott Noegel, Joel Walker, and Brannon Wheeler; University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 69–82 (71, al.).

¹⁵ Bohak, “Hebrew,” 71–74; 77–80.

re-appropriated into Aramaic texts without the Jewish scribes' being able to recognize their components would suggest the latter position,¹⁶ but this evidence is far in both time and space from the materials under discussion here.¹⁷ Did the third, fourth and fifth-century Greco-Egyptian magical formularies (or their exemplars) consciously regard certain elements as Jewish (whatever modern philology might make of the attribution), and if they did, what does this mean?

To begin to approach this problem, in this article I survey those rare instances where elements are identified by language or ethnicity, as 'Hebrew' or 'Jewish.' From his study of Egyptian-labeled elements,¹⁸ Jacco Dieleman concluded that they represented a Greek recensional layer and a Greek marketplace¹⁹ for Egyptian magic, later retranslated in whole or part back into the Demotic language realm.²⁰ Dieleman's work focused mainly upon two bilingual mss.,²¹ and it is his presump-

¹⁶ Bohak, "Impact," 8.

¹⁷ Material in the *PGM* that is generally considered Jewish was surveyed by Morton Smith; "The Jewish Elements in the Greek Magical Papyri," reconstructed version in Shaye J. D. Cohen, ed., *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh II* (RGRW 130/2; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 242–56. From this survey Smith concluded that such elements reflect "pagan magicians who were trying to strengthen their spells by calling on the famous Jewish god..." (255)—thus, in his view, intentional use of 'Jewish' elements. Arthur Darby Nock also regarded the name Iao at least as recognizably Jewish in the world of *PGM*; "Religious Symbols and Symbolism I," *Gnomon* 27 (1955): 558–72; repr. in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World* (ed. Zeph Stewart; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 877–94; 891.

¹⁸ There are also labels of Syrian or Nubian. For Nubian, see Dieleman, *Priests*, 139–42; see below for two labels of 'Syrian.' All commentators note that the IABAS in *PGM* V 102 (discussed below) is Samaritan, but since it is not labeled it is not part of this study.

¹⁹ Though I do not subscribe to the idea of the 'magician' to explain these texts, the effect of market forces on the creation and trading of spells seems clear. See David Frankfurter, "Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of the Category 'Magician,'" in *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium* (ed. Peter Schäfer and Hans G. Kippenberg; Studies in the History of Religions LXXV; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 115–136; David Martinez, *Michigan Papyri XVI: A Greek Love Charm From Egypt (P.Mich. 757)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).

²⁰ Dieleman, *Priests*, 103–44, 185–94. Dieleman's view draws heavily upon David Frankfurter's theoretical model of 'stereotype appropriation.' See *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998), *passim*.

²¹ His main examples are 1) the bilingual *P. Lugd. Bat.* J 384 (V) [Dieleman's terminology is P.Leiden 384 I verso]; Greek sections only published in Preisendanz as *PGM* XII; English translation of both Greek and Demotic sections in Betz, *GMPT*, 153–172. An essential resource for this ms. is R. W. Daniel, *Two Greek Magical Papyri in the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden. Papyrological Coloniensia XIX* (Opladen, 1991)]; and 2) the mainly Demotic *PLond.demot. 10070* + *PLugd. Bat.* J 383 [Dieleman's terminology is P.London-Leiden; this text is frequently also referred to as PDM or DMP (Demotic

tion (a rather likely one)²² that any scribe able to read and copy the tortuous Demotic script would have had Egyptian temple training and thus be Egyptian. It does not follow as easily, however, that anyone from outside the world of the scribe-priests who wanted access to their ritual expertise or magic and who would be impressed by labels of things as ‘Egyptian’ or linked to famous Egyptian magicians must necessarily be non-Egyptian or ‘Greek.’ Although Egyptians, especially in the *chora*, never seem to have lost the spoken Egyptian language,²³ literacy levels were never high. For this reason, they also can be presumed to be impressed by material linked to great Egyptian gods, kings or magicians of the past. Thus, things in written Demotic texts clearly come from an Egyptian temple setting, but things in Greek cannot be taken as necessarily ‘non-Egyptian.’

In the case of material labeled Jewish or Hebrew, we are in a similar position. Bohak outlined several useful criteria for determining whether a given *vox magica* actually derives from Hebrew,²⁴ but in the Egyptian environment of the formularies, not being Hebrew is not the same as 1) not being Jewish, or 2) not being *thought to be Jewish*.²⁵ In Egypt, some Jews did lose their linguistic capability in Hebrew, even if they continued to reverence the language. Egyptian Jews had many different levels of observance, identification, and openness to religious input from their neighbors,²⁶ and so the combination of a seemingly Jewish element with, e.g., Jesus, Osiris, or Bes is not a reliable diagnostic criterion for exclusion of Jewish involvement (however dreadful this may have seemed to other Jews with a different view, in antiquity or today), any more than the presence of a random Hebrew word would be an indicator of it.

Magical Papyrus); three small Greek sections published in Preisendanz as PGM XIV; English translation of full text published in Betz, *GMPT*, 195–251.

²² However, in the earlier period some Jews might have learned Demotic; John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora From Alexander to Trajan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 25 n. 15.

²³ At least, their speech can be used to identify them for being thrown out of Alexandria; Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, 35, 35 n. 34.

²⁴ Bohak, “Hebrew,” 78–81.

²⁵ *contra* Bohak, “Hebrew,” 71–72.

²⁶ Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness*, esp. 25–106. One implication of Bohak’s study (“Hebrew,” suggested especially by p. 74) is that the Greco-Egyptian formularies are influenced by (or witnesses to) a tradition of magic among Greek-speaking Jews that developed independently of the Aramaic and Hebrew traditions and that is profoundly marked by the Egyptian environment in which it developed.

In assembling my list of labeled elements, I found to my surprise that this criterion eliminates some of the most ‘apparently Jewish’ texts, such as *PGM XXIIa = The Prayer of Jacob*,²⁷ the main bulk of *PGM XIII*, and *PGM XXXVI* 295–311.²⁸ Far from their not being thought to be Jewish, I think that this pattern probably suggests that these examples were obviously Jewish and required no labels, while the Jewishness of the labeled things was in some way unexpected and might escape notice without the label. What do the labels suggest about who wanted to know about ‘real Jewish magic’ and what they expected it to look like?

PGM III 1–164 (119): The Hebrew Sound

The great multipurpose cat spell with which *PGM III* opens has a great deal of unlabelled material that is sometimes considered Jewish, but just as much if not more clearly Egyptian material, and a selection of traditionally Greek elements. However, only one element in the whole panorama is given any identification. Among dozens of invocations we read, ἔξορκίζω σε κατὰ τῆς ἑβραϊκῆς [φ]ωνῆς . . . , “I invoke you by the Hebrew sound . . .”²⁹ This clause does not appear to refer to the various strings of magical names that surround it. Whether [φ]ωνῆς is translated generally as ‘sound,’ or more specifically as ‘voice,’³⁰ in its context, “The Hebrew Sound” appears itself to be a name of power.³¹ After this the text concludes with many Egyptian and Greek elements within which a small ‘constellation’ of Jewish (though unlabelled) elements appears

²⁷ On the *Prayer of Jacob*, see *OTP II*, 715–23; Merkelbach, *Abrasax* 4, 105–110.

²⁸ For discussion of this spell, see Gideon Bohak, “A Jewish Myth in Pagan Magic in Antiquity,” in *Myths in Judaism: History, Thought, Literature* (ed. Ithamar Gruenwald and Moshe Idel; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2004), 97–122 (Hebrew).

²⁹ Line 119. All translations of *PGM* materials are mine unless otherwise noted.

³⁰ As in Merkelbach-Totti, *Abrasax* I, 90–91, 100. The sense ‘in the Hebrew language,’ used by Preisendanz and J. M. Dillon, in Betz, *GMPT*, 21 is unlikely. The formula ἔξορκίζω σε κατὰ followed by a genitive is a common structure in the *PGM*, and means an invocation by something or someone. κατὰ followed by the genitive does not mean an invocation “in” a language. Thus, whether φωνῆς is read as language, sound or voice, it is not the language in which the invocation comes, but by which. This being the case I prefer ‘sound’ or ‘voice,’ but ‘language,’ though more awkward, can work in this sense as well.

³¹ For the power of sounds in this literature, see the classic study by Patricia Cox Miller, “In Praise of Nonsense,” in *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality: Egyptian, Greek, Roman* (ed. A. H. Armstrong; World Spirituality 15; New York: Crossroad, 1989), 481–505.

together (Adam the Forefather, Iao, Abaoth, Adonai, Michael, Souriel, Gabriel, Raphael, Abrasax Ablanathanalba Akrammachari).

The spell provides a perfect example of the general conundrum here. The label, which in this case seems to appear without a “signified,” is not applied to a series of elements that we ourselves recognize as Jewish—for which no footnotes are needed to explain, e.g., that Adam appears in Genesis, etc. Do they stand unlabelled in the spell because they were similarly obvious to the compilers of the text?

Excursus: Typhon, Seth and the God of Israel

The phrase “The Hebrew Sound” occurs in a hymn that makes reference to the solar bark, which carries the sun god through the underworld at night. Of the dozens of powers involved, the main addressee seems to be Seth-Typhon (l. 87), who in this setting is a fairly positive figure who protects the god by killing the serpent Apep or Apophis,³² which threatens every night to swallow the sun. In other roles, Seth was a chaotic storm and desert god associated with the borderlands and eventually with foreign people.³³ He was identified with Baal, and as Egyptian xenophobia rose the god came to be hated and identified with the very Apep or Apophis whom he himself destroys in the earlier sources. It is through Apophis that Seth became identified with Greek Typhon, who is sort of ‘snaky,’ but who is, more importantly, a storm god, as were Seth (and Baal) and the God of Israel.

In the *PGM*, Seth and the Israelite God frequently co-occur, and both of them are also linked to the donkey.³⁴ As is well known to scholars of early Judaism, the claim that Jews worship an ass or have images of the head of an ass in the Temple in Jerusalem appears in various Greco-Roman sources, and several scholars have worked to locate the origin of these claims in a specific controversy that would have resulted in

³² H. Te Velde, *Seth: God of Confusion* (Probleme de Ägyptologie 6; 2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 99–108.

³³ Te Velde, *Seth*, 109–51.

³⁴ The identification of the “Seth Animal” that represents the god in early documents remains undetermined; Te Velde, *Seth*, 7–26. The papyri, however, are comfortable with the equation of the donkey with Seth. Representations of the donkey-headed Seth are especially numerous in *PGM XXXVI* (= P.Os. 1), and rituals for Seth often request donkey material.

anti-Jewish sentiment.³⁵ Peter Schäfer notes the importance of remembering the Egyptian setting of Apion's role in the perpetration of this tale and its attestation as early as Manetho.³⁶

The already-existing association of Seth with foreign countries in general and Semites in particular³⁷ helps to explain how this particular constellation of details could develop. However it may have begun, the *PGM* assume that the identification is real and useful, very possibly involving the extremely similar sounds of the name Iao (and its various magical permutations) with two common Egyptian words pronounced 'ʕ ('a-a'), one of which is an adjective denoting various states of greatness, hugeness and power, and the second of which is the noun for donkey, which from Coptic appears to have been pronounced **ⲉⲓⲱ**, **ⲉⲱ**, **ⲓⲱ**, **ⲉⲱ** (eiō, eōw, iōw, eō).³⁸ It is likely that similarity between these two words is what led the scribes to identify more confidently the "Seth animal" as the donkey in the first place, using the image of the donkey to solve a problem and to remind one of the greatness of mighty Seth. It is also likely that it was the similarity of the name Iao with the semantic field "great, huge, powerful" of 'ʕ, rather than the "donkey" field, that contributed most to the interest in the divine name Iao in the papyri. The fact that "great, huge, powerful" and "donkey" have entirely different writings in the Demotic script might further suggest that the identifications between the two words, if not the further link to Iao, did not originate exclusively among scribes but rather among Egyptian speakers without Demotic literacy; on the other hand, scribes do love puns, both phonetic and pictographic.

Given the anti-Jewish use to which the Seth-Typhon-Iao-"donkey" identification was put in Manetho and other authors, it is clear that

³⁵ The sources and arguments are discussed fully in Peter Schäfer, *Judeophobia: Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 55–62.

³⁶ Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 56–8.

³⁷ The association of Seth with the Hyksos is earlier than Manetho; note esp. Te Velde, *Seth*, 119–24. As far as I can tell, however, it is Manetho who makes the further identification with the Jews; Schäfer, *Judeophobia*, 57–8.

³⁸ W. Erichsen, *Demotisches Glossar* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954), 53–54. The relationship between the sounds was also noted by Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976) I:98. Like Peter Schäfer (*Judeophobia*, 235, n. 166), I do not suggest this phonetic relationship as the *origin* of the identification between Iao and Seth, but as an important part of the world of correspondences, slang, folk-etymologies and magical equivalencies that are operative in the *PGM*.

the priest-scribes did use the identification when it suited their purposes. Seth (or at least his color, red) can appear in a positive role in the *PGM*,³⁹ but more frequently he appears as a terribly negative force who is avoided in every possible way, including keeping all red things away from the ritual.⁴⁰ It is probably significant that most recipes with the latter attitude are lamp divinations that very clearly emerge from the Egyptian priestly temple scribal tradition, a group whose bitter experience of Hellenization and Roman rule left them no affection for foreigners or their gods.

*PGM IV 3007–86 (3019–20; 3084–86): The Hebrew God Jesus;
The Hebrew Spell*⁴¹

This ritual exorcism begins with the lemma πρὸς δαιμονιαζομένους Πιβήχεως δόκιμον, “For those possessed, from Pibechis, a real one.”⁴² The content of the exorcism that follows is full of references to Jewish mythology, and contains two specific labels: 1) l. 3019–20: ὀρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων Ἰησοῦ, “I command you by the God of the Hebrews, Jesus;” and 2) l. 3084–6, ὁ γὰρ λόγος ἐστὶν Ἑβραϊκός καὶ φυλασσόμενος παρὰ καθαρῶν ἀνδράσιν, “. . . for the spell is {Hebrew? Hebraic?}, and guarded by pure men.” In between these are multiple magical names both of the Hebrew-sounding and Egyptian variety, as well as many references to biblical and parabiblical narratives,⁴³ though the order is strange. The catalog includes 1) the creation of people in ‘paradise,’ 2) the shining pillar and cloud pillar that appear to ‘Osrael,’ 3) salvation of the people from Pharaoh and the ten plagues on Egypt, 4) an episode involving the use of the Seal of Solomon to

³⁹ The positive associations of the Sethian color red are surveyed in J. Gwyn Griffiths, “The Symbolism of Red in Egyptian Religion,” in *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studia Geo Widengren I* (ed. C. J. Bleeker et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1972), 81–90.

⁴⁰ The negative Seth is explored in Robert K. Ritner, *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice* (SAOC 54; Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1993), esp. 144–79.

⁴¹ This particular text is very well-known; see A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (repr. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1978), 250–60; C. K. Barrett, *The New Testament Background* (rev. ed., San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1989), 34–37; S. Eitrem, *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament* (Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. XII; Oslo: Brøgger, 1950).

⁴² or, “a tested one,” as Preisendanz.

⁴³ Although as noted the Jewish or Hebrew-sounding magical names are pervasive throughout the *PGM*, allusions to biblical and parabiblical narratives are less common, and it is even less usual to find so many grouped together.

make or allow Jeremiah to speak,⁴⁴ 5) the creation of humans from dust, 6) the halting of the Jordan River and the reassembling of the Red Sea after the Israelites had passed, 7) the confusion of languages, 8) the destruction of the giants with lightning, 9) cherubim engaged in praise, 10) “the one in holy Jerusalem before whom the unquenchable fire burns for all time,” and 11) fiery Gehenna. This list suggests a fairly wide acquaintance with Jewish mythology, but whether this familiarity derives from written or oral sources is uncertain.

Should this text be regarded as Jewish,⁴⁵ Christian, or ‘other?’ The demon name PHARISAIOS, that according to Deissman has evolved from the “Hittites, Perizzites and Jebusites,”⁴⁶ combined with the name of Jesus with which the invocations begin might indicate a Christian setting for the ritual, although Eitrem points out that Jews could use the name of Jesus in exorcisms, at least according to Irenaeus,⁴⁷ and ‘Jewish’ and ‘Christian’ are not always mutually exclusive terms in many forms of ancient literature.⁴⁸ The text avoids both explicitly Christian narratives in this catalog and the kind of Jewish messianic and royal material in which Christians were often interested.

The narratives are not used as *historiolae*, effective tales whose narration is meant to create a similar effect for the patient or practitioner.⁴⁹ Rather, they are simply narrative epithets for the great god who is the source of power for the exorcist. They may function as compulsive elements of the invocation, but if so their form is unusual. More likely,

⁴⁴ See Daniel Sperber, “Some Rabbinic Themes in Magical Papyri,” *JSS* 16.1 (1985): 93–103 (95–99).

⁴⁵ Merkelbach describes the text as traveling a middle path between Judaism and Christianity, though for me it is not clear from this what kind of people would be involved; *Abrasax* 4, 30. W. L. Knox regards the text as Jewish with “slight emendation at one point by a heathen...,” “Jewish Liturgical Exorcism,” *HTR* 31 (1938): 191–203 (198).

⁴⁶ Deissmann, *Light*, 261.

⁴⁷ Eitrem, *Some Notes*, 10 quoting Iren. II.5. Eitrem regards the name Jesus as an intrusion into the text, replacing a now-missing Iao. For the use of Jesus’ name for healing among Jews in the 14th and 19th centuries, see Claudia Rohrbacher-Sticker, “From Sense to Nonsense, From Incantation Prayer to Magic Spell,” *JSQ* 3 (1996): 24–46 (27–28); for an example from the Cairo Genizah, see Gideon Bohak, “Greek, Coptic and Jewish Magic in the Cairo Genizah,” *BASP* 36 (1999): 27–44 (35–6).

⁴⁸ Davila, *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, 21–63.

⁴⁹ Biblical narratives are used as *historiolae* in unambiguously Jewish magic of the same period; see Bohak, “A Jewish Myth in Pagan Magic,” 117–18.

they are meant to be persuasive and perhaps calming to a Jewish or Christian patient or customer who has sought out ‘real Jewish magic’ at this crisis point of someone’s illness/possession. In my estimation, this catalog of events would be less impressive to a ‘pagan’ customer, but this depends on the degree of Jewish knowledge and interest that person might possess.⁵⁰

After the lengthy catalog, the practitioner is addressed: ὀρκίζω δέ σε, τὸν παραλαμβάνοντα τὸν ὀρκισμόν τοῦτον, χοίρον μὴ φαγεῖν, καὶ ὑποταγήσεται σοι πᾶν πνεῦμα καὶ δαιμόνιον, ὅποιον ἐὰν ᾦν, “I command you, who receives this exorcism, don’t eat pork and every spirit and demon will be subject to you, whatever its kind” (3079–81). The law is related to the performance of this spell, suggesting that you could eat pork at other times, just not when getting ready for the exorcism. Other than this, the text expresses little regard for ritual laws, Jewish or otherwise. While it is possible that the phrase is meant to stand in for the whole of Jewish ritual law,⁵¹ it seems more like a stereotype that in itself functions as a label, applying the ‘heksher’ to the spell and assuring the consumer of its Jewishness. The question remains, however, for whom this assurance would have had the greatest impact. Christians in the market for a Jewish spell would certainly be impressed by this, still one of the most easily recognized Jewish laws, and there are more Christians than Jews to be found in Egypt after 117. However, it is not impossible that such a detail might be impressive to Jewish customers, especially if they were encountering it in a mixed formulary, or getting it from an Egyptian ritual expert,⁵² perhaps the only source for

⁵⁰ One of the narrative epithets involves “the one in holy Jerusalem, before whom the inextinguishable fire burns for all ages” (3069–71). According to Morton Smith, this phrase refers to the altar fires of the Jerusalem temple, which could be described in the present tense only up to the destruction of the Temple in 70 C.E.; *Jesus the Magician* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978), 113. Knox goes further, saying the line must have been composed before 70 though he does not date the whole spell by this; “Jewish Liturgical Exorcism,” 200–01. The undying flame is also mentioned in IV 1167–1226 (1219), and in V 96–172 (147–8). Personally, I doubt such labels are of much use in dating the material; both the destruction of the Temple and its great lamp were common knowledge in antiquity.

⁵¹ There were also various kinds of Egyptian prohibitions against pork which, if Pibechis is taken to represent an Egyptian priest (as Dieleman suggests, *Priests*, 267, 280), may be the intention of these lines. The overall context of the prohibition, however, suggests a Jewish setting.

⁵² On the transformations of the Egyptian ritual expert, see Frankfurter, *Religion in Roman Egypt*, 198–237.

religious healing in the *chora* after the infrastructures for Jewish life were so severely disrupted after 117.

Whatever our ideas about the identities of the ‘consumers’ of the spell, the text seems to be designed to appear to be ‘real Jewish magic.’ What then is to be made of the initial attribution of the spell to Pibechis? The name is Egyptian, meaning either ‘the falcon’ (an epithet of Horus), or ‘he of the falcon,’⁵³ both (with variations) known as personal names in use in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.⁵⁴ Dieleman also suggests that it appears as a magical name in *PDM*,⁵⁵ and refers to the particular Pibechis of this spell variously as a ‘a famous Egyptian magician,’⁵⁶ and an Egyptian priest, though beyond this spell itself there seem to be no indications of this. The name appears in various lists of alchemical practitioners.⁵⁷ Preisendanz suggested an identification between Pibechis and Apollobex,⁵⁸ who is named in PGM XII 121 as someone who had used a particular spell and who is mentioned in Pliny and Apuleius as a famous magician, called “the Copt” by Pliny,⁵⁹ but grouped with Moses and Iannes by Apuleius.⁶⁰

The various groups with which Apollobex is associated present the same question we have been pursuing throughout, namely, what is the particular authority that through its labels the spell attempts to claim: Egyptian, through the name Pibechis, or Jewish, through the narratives evoked?⁶¹ Is their combination natural for a certain group, for example, ‘syncretistic Jews,’ or Egyptian sympathizers with Judaism,⁶² or does

⁵³ Dieleman, *Priests*, 75 n. 77.

⁵⁴ Preisendanz, *P-W* 20:1, 1310–12; Dieleman, *Priests*, 75 n. 77. Someone of the same or similar name is also known from alchemical texts, but there is no reason to assume that the same person is meant.

⁵⁵ Dieleman, *Priests*, 75 n. 77. The word is Demotic *pšybyeg*, glossed **ϣΙΒΙΗΚ** in Coptic.

⁵⁶ Dieleman, *Priests*, 75 n. 77.

⁵⁷ Preisendanz, *P-W* 20:1:1310–12 (1310).

⁵⁸ Preisendanz, *P-W* 20:1, 1311–12; Dieleman, *Priests*, 263 n. 195.

⁵⁹ *NH* 30.9.

⁶⁰ *Apology*, 90. The list runs Carmendas, Damigeron, Moses, Jannes, Apollobex, Dardanus, or any magician ‘from the time of Zoroaster and Ostanes till now.’

⁶¹ On this Dieleman remarks that “the spell combines the authority of the Egyptian priest Pibechis with the prestige that was afforded to Jewish magic,” 280.

⁶² Whether these Egyptian sympathizers are Christian or otherwise; Davila, *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, 29–36.

it signal that we have moved into an imaginary world, as Dieleman argues:⁶³

...the advertising statements do not relate to historical reality, but to a universe of preconceived ideas about authority and ritual power. Moreover, they testify to the fact that the compilers and authors of the Greek magical spells were not striving for exclusive cultural or ethnic categories when composing the spells. According to them, a spell's efficacy did not depend on upholding a rigid separation between ritual traditions.

However, even if so, for the combination to signal 'imaginary world,' it seems to me that we have to assume the audience would know that ordinarily these elements do not go together for the combination to effect the mood of, e.g., the lion lying down with the lamb.

PGM V 96–172 (109–10): The Headless God of Israel

The main text of this spell is also an exorcism. It is lemmatized “Stele of Jeu the Painter,”⁶⁴ and in the course of the prayers the practitioner identifies himself as “Moses, your prophet to whom you have transmitted your mysteries celebrated by Israel” (109–110), shortly after which he says, “I am the messenger of Pharaoh Osoronnophis [a name of Osiris];⁶⁵ this is your name which has been transmitted to the prophets of Israel” (114–17).⁶⁶ The exorcism uses an invocation to the Headless God,⁶⁷ which is also found in three other places in the *PGM*, where

⁶³ Dieleman, *Priests*, 277.

⁶⁴ Ἰέου τοῦ ζωγράφου, *contra* the suggestion “hieroglyphist” in Preisendanz and Betz, *GMPT*, ad loc.; Dieleman, *Priests*, 267 n. 214.

⁶⁵ *Osoronnophis* is the Egyptian *Wsir Wn-nfr*, Osiris the Beautiful (or Good); Merkelbach-Totti, *Abrasax* II, 163.

⁶⁶ It is this which for the purposes of this study I consider a label. The spell actually says Ἰσραήλ in both places; for this spelling see Blass, Debrunner and Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 39; 39.5.

⁶⁷ Although fascinating to scholars, the Headless God is not a major figure or a frequently-occurring epithet of any god. Various proposals were surveyed in Abel, ‘Akephalos,’ *PRE Supp.* XII (1970), 9–14, and in Karl Preisendanz, *Akephalos: Der Kopflose Gott* (Beihefte zum *Alten Orient* 8; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926 [mainly a descriptive survey, written before his edition of the *PGM*]). In the most recent discussions strong evidence associating the Headless God with Osiris has been assembled; Merkelbach-Totti, *Abrasax*

it is addressed to the god Bes,⁶⁸ who is a generally lucky or protective figure, often a hypostasis of the sun god and as such, to be identified with Osiris during the sun's night-passage through the underworld.⁶⁹ Here it would appear that Bes and Osiris share their identification with the mighty solar power with the Israelite God.⁷⁰

In the version of Jeu, the descriptive terms used for the deity are similar but not identical to biblical prophecy, though the terms used were just as much at home in Greek and Egyptian religious forms:⁷¹ he is creator of earth and heaven, night and day, light and dark; he differentiates the just and the unjust, made female and male; revealed seeds and fruits, and made men love or hate each other (99–109); later the prophet says the god made all things by command of his voice (133). After this the text moves into direct speech by the god, who declares himself in terms nearly identical to the three versions directed to Bes. The significant changes are both deletions and additions, as can be seen from this chart:

II, 153–71; Merkelbach, *Abrasax* V, 14–42. This is clearly the intention of the spells under discussion. In addition to the four spells enumerated here, it is likely that both revelatory spells in *PGM* II (also directed toward solar powers) are familiar with the concept, as the magical figure that concludes the papyrus has five of the Egyptian flags representing the word “divinity” where the figure’s head would be expected. In later texts, *akephaloi* are nuisance demons in two Christian amulets from the 6th c. C.E. (*PGM* 15 frag. a, multiple *akephaloi*; fragment b, a headless dog, but a demon is meant). Also, the demon ‘Murder’ in *The Testament of Solomon* has no head and goes about devouring heads in an attempt to get one; T.Sol. 9. This demon sees through his breasts, not his feet as in the prayer under discussion here. The identification of the later headless beings with the βίαιοθάνατοι (ghosts of the recently and violently dead who are often used as intermediaries in magic) may explain these instances, but this model does not seem relevant to the texts under discussion, where the Headless God is a (or the) supreme power and creator of the world.

⁶⁸ *PGM* VIII 64–110 (94 ff.); *PGM* VII 222–49 (@232 ff.); and P.Oxy. XXXVI 2753, frags. E, D, C.; Robert W. Daniel and Franco Maltomini, *Supplementum Magicum* II (Papyrologica Coloniensia XVI: 1–2; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1989–91), # 90, 196–210 (the text is translated as “PGM” CII 1–17 in Betz, *GMPT*). These three texts are discussed by David Frankfurter, “Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of the Category ‘Magician,’” in *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium* (ed. Peter Schäfer and Hans G. Kippenberg; Studies in the History of Religions LXXV; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 115–136 (122–25).

⁶⁹ Véronique Dasen, *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 46–83.

⁷⁰ Linkage between Bes and the Israelite God is not new in the papyri; several scholars have argued that the figures on the Kuntillet ‘Arjud pithos represent Bes.

⁷¹ For commentary on these epithets, see Merkelbach-Totti, *Abrasax* II 164–70.

PGM VIII 91–102	PGM VII 233–42	PGM V 145–58	P.Oxy. XXXVI 2753
I call on you, the headless god with sight by your feet	I call on you, the headless god with sight by your feet	I am the headless daimon with sight in my feet, the strong <god> (who has) the immortal fire.	[I call on you,] the headless god with his sight [on your feet]
who thunders and lightens	the thunderer, the lightener	<i>I am the one who lightens and thunders (out of sequence)</i>	who thunders [and lightens]
		I am the truth, hating injustices that happen in the world. <i>I am the one who lightens and thunders.</i> I am the one from whom the sweat pours as rain on the earth, for fertilization.	
It is you whose mouth is always filled with fire	It is you [whose] mouth always pours.	I am the one whose mouth burns completely.	It is you from whose mouth fire always [pours]
		I am the one who creates and produces. I am the grace of the Aion, my name is a heart girded by a snake. ⁷²	
who is placed above Necessity. I call on you, the god above Necessity... <i>omissions</i>	It is you who is over Necessity...		[It is you who is over] Necessity...
It is you who lies on a myrrh coffin, with a resin and asphalt elbow cushion... <i>omissions</i>	It is you who lies on a coffin with a resin and asphalt elbow cushion by your head...		[It is you who lies on a myrrh coffin] with a [resin] elbow cushion by your head, and an asphalt [...]
You are not a daimon, but the blood of the two falcons by the head of Osiris, chattering and keeping watch.	You are not a daimon, but the [blood] of the two falcons by the head of Ouranos, chattering and keeping watch.		You are not a daimon, but the blood of...and of the thirty and of the 104 falcons that chatter and [keep watch] by the head of Osiris...
You are the god who gives oracles...	Raise your nightly form, in which you proclaim all things...		

⁷² The phrase “my name is a heart girded by a snake” recalls the numerous amulets representing the ouroboros serpent enclosing various names; the ‘heart’ probably

This comparison suggests that while the text is comfortable with the Headless God invocation, the title ‘Pharaoh’ and the identification of the Israelite God with Osiris and Bes, it avoids the myrrh coffin, resin and asphalt elbow cushion, and protective falcons; for these elements language about truth, injustice, creation, and fertilization is substituted. This version also substitutes δαίμον for θεόν and applies the prayer to exorcism, not prophecy. This pattern of difference may suggest nothing more than our entrance into the great hodge-podge of magical borrowings and correspondences, but at the same time, it seems important to note that the changes specifically avoid explicitly Osirian iconography and the idea that not only does the god have a body, but that body is a mummy in a tomb. It does this while retaining the language that exalts the Headless God as the master and creator of the universe. The presence of elements of Judaism is not enough to make us certain that a spell is Jewish, but does the presence of blatantly non-Jewish elements automatically mean that the text is not Jewish (or designed for use by or for Jews), regardless of its inclusion of some Jewish elements?

PGM V 459–89: The Hebrew Name of High-Thundering Zeus

The divinity is invoked as the creator of earth, bones (or stones), flesh, and spirit; who founded the seas and shook⁷³ the heavens, divided the light from the darkness, and administers all in justice, using a term that is found in Philo and Hermetic literature;⁷⁴ it uses various Greek epithets, including great nous, eternal eye, demon of demons, god of gods, lord of the spirits, and the unerring Aion Iao. The deity is then invoked as “high-thundering Zeus, Zeus king, Adonai, Lord ιαουουηε.”⁷⁵ The great name of the Israelite God seems to be fully pronounced in this vowel sequence.

refers to a visual arrangement of characters within the ring or snake. Various other shapes are mentioned throughout the *PGM*; the most common are heart, wing, and bunch of grapes. The heart in this passage is discussed in Merkelbach-Totti, *Abrasax* II, 169. They note that a marginal note at this place in the ms. provides a 49-letter vowel name that adds up to 9999.

⁷³ The ms. says σαλευ; Preisendanz restores <πασ>σαλεύ[σαντα].

⁷⁴ Betz, *GMP*, 110 n. 62 (note by D. Aune).

⁷⁵ This is the reading of Merkelbach-Totti, *Abrasax* II, 148. They note the presence of all seven vowels.

At this stage, the text gives two labels. The first identifies the magical name ζααλαηριφφου as ‘Syrian,’⁷⁶ and the second, possibly intended as a translation of this, says “Ἐβραϊστί: ἀβλαναθαναλβα ἀβρασιλωα.”⁷⁷ After this the text continues with further magical names of various kinds that do not seem to fall under this label.

The palindrome ἀβλαναθαναλβα is one of the most commonly occurring magical names in the *PGM* and on inscribed amulets. It occurs both alone and in combination with other names of many different kinds. Though not exclusive to them, its frequency in Jewish settings has led to various attempts to decode the word as Hebrew or Aramaic, either directly or as an acronym,⁷⁸ which have not generally been accepted by scholars. For this text, however, the word is identified as Hebrew and used as such in a text that otherwise contains few elements that would ordinarily be considered Jewish. The point is not whether the word can actually be traced to Hebrew, but rather, how the Hebrew label is understood and used by the text.

By making only the Syrian and Hebrew languages necessary complements to Greek, the spell would seem to identify itself both ethnically and philosophically. Does this identification also describe the people creating or using the spell? Unlike the previous case of exorcism, where critical need could send a family to the local ritual expert, this multipurpose spell is used for “untying fetters, invisibility, sending dreams, and as a favor amulet” (488–9). These are common goals that pertain in one way or another to getting along with superiors and people in power.⁷⁹

⁷⁶ The Syrian name does not appear elsewhere, though whatever its origin it is used as Syrian by the text, and is clearly intended as the name of the deity invoked, a translation of Zeus under these various epithets. The designation of a string of magical names as Syriac appears also in *PGM* IV 2604. The names there are completely different from this.

⁷⁷ Merkelbach-Totti here restore a repetition of the self-declaration from the previous line with the Syriac declaration; *Abrasax* II, 149. They regard this and the Headless God spell as parallel texts for which an original can be reconstructed; 171–3.

⁷⁸ See David Martinez, *Michigan Papyri XVI: A Greek Love Charm From Egypt (P.Mich. 757)*; (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 108–10; Brashear, “Greek Magical Papyri,” 3577.

⁷⁹ Invisibility is less common, but ordinarily refers to ‘remaining un-noticed,’ also useful with superiors. See Lynn LiDonnici, “The Disappearing Magician: Literary and Practical Questions About the Greek Magical Papyri,” in *A Multifform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft* (ed. Benjamin G. Wright; Scholars Press Homage Series 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 227–43. For a more metaphysical interpretation of invisibility spells, see Richard L. Phillips, *Invisibility Spells in the Greek Magical Papyri: Prolegomena, Texts, and Commentaries* (PhD. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2002).

To whom would Hebrew and Aramaic speaking people appear to be more successful at ingratiating themselves with the people in power? This question would be answered differently depending upon the date of the spell, but Egyptian anti-Judaism often involved the idea that the Jews had a closer relationship with first the Greek and then the Roman rulers of Egypt—however the Egyptian Jews themselves might have perceived these relationships.

PGM XII 201–69: According to the Jews

This spell is the first of two ring consecrations in *PGM XII*.⁸⁰ The image to be carved on the stone is the *ouroboros* encircling images of Hekate and Helios,⁸¹ along with the name ABRASAX. The reverse of the stone will simply have the name Abrasax, surrounded by the name Iao Sabaoth, which is described as “the great and holy and good-for-all-things name” (207). The stone will be consecrated while the practitioner invokes the solar god in his three well-known Egyptian forms, dawn, noon, and setting sun. Many magical names are used, but toward the end of the text there is a list that identifies several as words in the languages of Egyptians, Jews (specifically δ’Ἰουδαίους), Greeks, ‘high priests,’ and Parthians. The Jewish name given is ἀδωναίτε σαβαώθ. The Greek and High-Priest ‘names’ are perfectly comprehensible Greek epithet-phrases (sole ruler of all things, and hidden, unseen ruler of everything). They needed no label to make them intelligible.

In his careful analysis of the spell, Dieleman suggests that this list of translated names is comparable to other prayers that identify many different god-names with one single divinity; the most well known of these involve Isis.⁸² The invocation does indeed seem to fold many forms of deity into one power, and the comprehensibility and strange form of the list of languages also suggests an intentional identification and a pantheistic bent.

⁸⁰ Only the Greek sections of this bilingual formulary were included in Preisendanz’ *PGM*, but the full text is translated in Betz, *GMPT*, 153–172, trans. Janet H. Johnson.

⁸¹ Cp. n. 72 on *PGM V* 96–172, above.

⁸² Dieleman, *Priests*, 165–170. I believe that Dieleman is correct in his interpretation here, but I disagree with his application of this view to some of the other examples considered in this paper.

For the subject at hand, the relevant point is that in a list of names that seem to be comprehensible, the Jews' use of *αδωναίε σαβαώθ* is not presented as secret or mysterious, while the description of the *praxis* with which the text begins does ascribe specific effective power to the names Abrasax and Iao Sabaoth, without labeling either as Jewish or Hebrew.⁸³ Whether or not the author of the spell knew that *αδωναίε σαβαώθ* was similar in meaning to the other epithets he lists, the multi-ethnic invocation of the Lord of All does not suggest any particular knowledge of or interest in Jewish things, beyond the recognition of the Jews as a people to be explained and incorporated into the invocation and worship of the sun god.⁸⁴

*PGM XIII 81–86 et al.*⁸⁵ *Birdglyphic, Hebrew, Baboonic*

All of *PGM XIII* is taken up with various texts relating to Moses, one of which, called the *Eighth Book of Moses*, appears in multiple versions.⁸⁶ In strong contrast to the international comprehensibility of the previous list, the languages and names here are clearly meant to be impressive for their secrecy and authority: Birdglyphic, Hieroglyphic, Hebrew, Egyptian, Baboonic, Falconic, and Hieratic. Whatever Birdglyphic may be, Hieroglyphic and Hieratic are writing systems rather than languages, and it is interesting that they are listed separately from 'Egyptian,' which in this context may mean either spoken Egyptian or Demotic.

Baboonic and Falconic, which link to the sacred animals of Thoth and Horus, reflect the ritual world of Egyptian priests, where they ordinarily appear to reference modes of breathing, exhalation and pronunciation of the vowels and are sometimes accompanied by other directions about hissing, popping and so forth, which probably also refer to the breath.⁸⁷ In this spell, the Falconic names CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI CHI

⁸³ For the logos and praxis of a spell to have somewhat different thrusts is not uncommon and attests to the development of these texts over time.

⁸⁴ The Parthians are also recognized as such a people in need of incorporation, but the word given as their name is said by Robert Ritner to be Egyptian; Betz, *GMPT*, 163 n. 79.

⁸⁵ Due to the composite nature of the text, the list appears with variations in four places: lines 81–86, 149–59, 454–470, and 593–602.

⁸⁶ The textual development of this chaotic document was studied by Morton Smith, "The Eighth Book of Moses," n. 6, above. For full analysis see Gager, *Moses*, 146–51.

⁸⁷ See, e.g., *PGM V*, 1–53; *XII* 84–5.

CHI TIF TIF TIF may be intended to resemble the sounds of the sacred bird of the solar god.⁸⁸ The Baboon name, however, is the familiar ABRASAX.⁸⁹ The name that is claimed to be Hebrew is comparatively long: ἀνοχ βιαθιαρβαθ βερβριρ εχιλατουρ βουφρουμτρομ. The first of these words, ἀνοχ, often occurs in strings of magical words and is probably the Egyptian word for “I am,” which appears often in the corpus.⁹⁰ The rest of the formula does not seem to appear outside of *PGM XIII*.

Although the text is interested enough in Jewish things to use the name Moses and throw in occasional mentions of details such as the Jerusalem temple,⁹¹ it is clearly Egyptian in form. However, since except for magical words the text is simply in Greek, this does not really tell us about the identity of the author, practitioner or collector. Even though names such as Iao, Sabaoth, Adonaie, and so forth appear throughout the text, when the time comes to ‘speak Hebrew,’ none of these is used, but rather a prayer-formula that on some level may have been understood as Egyptian (because of ἀνοχ). The inclusion of Hebrew in the middle of an unambiguously Egyptian set of languages and scripts has the opposite effect from the catalog of nationalities discussed in the previous spell, where Hebrew is one among many rational nationalities that appreciate the all-encompassing god. Here, Hebrew is grouped as though it were an Egyptian linguistic form, a holy language like Falconic or a script that can now ‘speak,’ like Hieroglyphic, Hieratic, and perhaps whatever Birdglyphic may be.

⁸⁸ Jan Bergman, in Betz, *GMPT* 174 n. 22, remarks that CHI is appropriate for the morning sun, as TIF is for the evening sun. I have no further information on this, however.

⁸⁹ In all four cases. In other texts, however, the Baboon language may also attempt to imitate animal sounds; see David Frankfurter, “The Magic of Writing and the Writing of Magic: The Power of the Word in Egyptian and Greek Traditions,” *Helios* 21.2 (1994): 189–221 (204–5).

⁹⁰ In his note, Morton Smith says that the Hebrew *anoki* means the same thing and that this shows that “The author seems to have known Hebrew and Egyptian badly enough to mix them up,” *GMPT*, 174 n. 21. However, the frequency with which ANOK and its variants appear suggest the memory of the sound of oral recitation of Egyptian prayers without necessarily the knowledge of what even very familiar words mean.

⁹¹ Lines 96 and 233–4; see Gager, *Moses*, 147 n. 41.

PGM XIII 975–78: As the Law Explains in Hebrew

The manuscript concludes with a list of versions of powerful magical names as they appear in a variety of mystical, poetical and esoteric texts, citing such authorities as Orpheus, Erotylos, Hierocles, Zoroaster, and of course Moses.⁹² Most of these are the usual kinds of vowel permutations and magical names; Moses' includes the phrase BA ADAM but does not otherwise seem to be Hebrew. After Moses' quote, and distinguished from it, comes this: ὡς δ' ἐν τῷ νόμῳ διαλέυεται ἀβραϊστί: ἀβράαμ, ἰσάκ, ἰακωβ, αἠω ἠωα ωαἠ ἰεοῦ ἰεῖ ἰεο ἰαω ἰα ἠι αο εἠ οε εω, 'as it is explained in the Law, in Hebrew...' The magical name marked as Hebrew contains the three biblical patriarchs and a vowel permutation on Iao. This is followed by a quote from the Ptolemaica, and then the last version is 'the great name in Jerusalem.' I enumerate these to demonstrate that the this list does not group things that we ourselves would group as 'Jewish.' Moses, the Law, and the Name in Jerusalem are considered different things, or have at least been found in different texts. Indeed, the reference to the Great Name in Jerusalem is introduced by distancing language—this is the name 'they' have and here is what 'they' do with it.

Conclusions

Given the composite nature of the *PGM* formularies, no one theory or model will explain every element, or even most elements. The same is true with this small selection of examples that label themselves Jewish or Hebrew. Two examples, IV 3007–86 and V 96–172, at least allow for the possibility that the versions were deliberately tailored for Jewish or Christian consumers, but Jews or Christians with a religious style that would not be approved by 'boundary keepers'⁹³ of either tradition. One example, XII 201–69, includes the Jews among the enlightened peoples of the world who can appreciate the universal God. Three examples, V 459–89, XIII 81–86, and XIII 975–78 may attempt to invoke Jewish magic, or what they think of as Jewish magic, from the outside, for various reasons.

⁹² It quotes a book that we do not have, the *Archangelic [Teaching]*, which may also be mentioned in a Nag Hammadi text; Gager, *Moses*, 149–50.

⁹³ This useful phrase is Davila's: *Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*, 49 and throughout.

These indications exist only in the context of each spell or its setting within groups in its specific formulary, and as we see, many different points of view are suggested throughout the *PGM* collection. These become visible only when we abandon the idea that these formularies were created and used by ‘practicing magicians,’ for whom, to the extent that they were not insane, some kind of consistent sense (or intelligible market forces) must be presumed for all the things that made up their magical books. This is important especially for the question of Jewish involvement or input into the formularies, since over the centuries of their development there were such drastic changes in the position of Jews and Judaism in Egypt, and in their relationships with Egyptian scribes, priests and traditions. There are also several different kinds of Jews and Judaism in the cultural background of the formularies—many of which sharply disapproved of each other. This final consideration is easy to overlook, given the dominance in the literature of the perspectives of the ‘boundary keepers.’ No doubt they would be outraged by the idea of Jews invoking Bes or describing the body of God, headless or otherwise. For many other Jews in antiquity this combination may have made sense, and like going to the movies on Christmas Day, may have been a meaningful part of their approach to Jewishness.

PART II

MAPPING DIASPORA IDENTITIES

THE *IMAGO MUNDI* OF THE *GENESIS APOCRYPHON**

Esther Eshel
Bar Ilan University

In their constructions of the inhabited world, ancient authors often rely not only on Genesis 10's Table of Nations, but also on the *mapa mundi* with which they were familiar.¹ The division of the world among Noah's sons and grandsons in the texts examined here—the *Genesis Apocryphon* (cols. 16–17), *Jubilees* (8–9), and Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities* 1.122–47)—reflects both their reliance on Genesis 10 and a shared cartographical basis for their construction of the world.² Of these texts, the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) is, in my opinion, the oldest surviving Second Temple period text mapping the inhabited world.³ It comprises the focus of this paper, alongside comparison to its closely related parallels in *Jubilees* and Josephus.

The twenty-three, poorly preserved, columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*—an Aramaic parabiblical text—recount, with additions, omissions, and expansions, some of the stories from Genesis 5–15.⁴ Generally attributed to the second or first centuries B.C.E., an earlier date cannot

* I am honored to dedicate this article to Betsy, a very dear friend and colleague.

¹ For a detailed study of cartography in the ancient Near East, archaic and classical Greece, and the Hellenistic and the Early Roman periods, see J. B. Harley and D. Woodward, eds., *The History of Cartography*, vol. 1: *Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient, and Medieval Europe and the Mediterranean* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 107–16; 130–76; 276–79.

² Such constructs also appear in Pseudo-Philo, *Antiquities of the Bible*, 4:1–10; *Sib. Or.* 3:110–14; Acts 2:9–11, and later, in *Gen. Rab.* 37:1–8. The *War Scroll* (1QM 2:10–14) also contains a Genesis 10–based list of nations to be fought in the third phase of the thirty-three-year war. See Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 26–33. 1QM 10:14–15 also alludes to the division of the world.

³ See J. A. Fitzmyer, “Genesis Apocryphon,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), I: 302. Fitzmyer argues for its literary dependence on *Jubilees*, therefore suggesting a possible 1st century B.C.E. dating. See, however, M. E. Stone, “The Book(s) Attributed to Noah,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 9.

⁴ See M. J. Bernstein, “From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 39–63.

be ruled out for the composition of this work,⁵ which, like the other Aramaic texts found at Qumran, is not considered sectarian.⁶

The surviving columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon* are devoted primarily to the lives of Noah and Abraham.⁷ The story of Noah starts with his birth, as told by his father Lamech (col. 2), and continues with Noah's biography, a first-person account preceded by the title "[a copy of] the book of the words of Noah" (col. 5:29).⁸ The following topics are covered: Noah and the Flood (cols. 6–10); God's covenant with Noah, Noah's descendants, and the wine celebration (cols. 11–12); Noah's visions (cols. 13–15); and Noah's division of the earth (cols. 16–17).⁹ An empty line (col. 18:23) marks the end of Noah's story.

Noah's story incorporates many extrabiblical segments, including Noah's dream visions, which refer to future events, some related to Noah's life and others to the End of Days.¹⁰ In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, Noah's dream vision of the cedar precedes and anticipates the divi-

⁵ For the latest edition of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*, 3rd ed. (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004). The readings and translation of the *Genesis Apocryphon* are based on this edition. Some readings were arrived at in conjunction with M. Bernstein; others were formulated in the course of working on this article.

⁶ Note that Noah waited until the fifth year to drink the fourth-year wine (1QapGen 12:13–15; see also *Jub.* 7:1–2), as in sectarian law, rather than in the fourth year, as in rabbinic law. See M. Kister, "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakhah," *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2: 581–6. On the other hand, a reference to Noah's endogamy in choosing his children's spouses (col. 6) may point to general, nonsectarian, Second Temple practice.

⁷ The first passages preserved tell the story of the Watchers in a very broken fashion (cols. 0–5).

⁸ Some argue that this part of the *Genesis Apocryphon* originated as an independent composition, probably from the Book of Noah. See R. C. Steiner, "The Heading of the *Book of the Words of Noah* on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995): 66–71. For a discussion of the possible existence of a lost book (or books) of Noah, see Stone, "The Book(s) Attributed to Noah," 5–9, where he also relates to earlier studies.

⁹ See Fitzmyer, "Genesis Apocryphon," 302–3.

¹⁰ Similar stories about Noah and his sons are found in 1 Enoch 106–107, *Jub.* 5:19–10:36, and 1Q19, frag. 3. See G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the *Genesis Apocryphon*," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 137–58; M. E. Stone, "Noah, Texts of," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford, 2000), II: 613–15; J. C. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 396–412.

sion of the world among Noah's sons.¹¹ Although the dream vision is fragmentary, a partial reconstruction of the cedar and the three scions is possible, based on its interpretation (col. 14:9ff.), which makes reference to the fate of Noah and his sons.¹² The image of the cedar, which echoes Ezekiel 17's symbolization of Israel as a tall cedar, also appears in Shem's name-midrash (14:12), where Shem, or his descendants, are designated "an upright planting" (14:13). In Noah's vision, Shem is the first scion "that comes forth from it and rises to its height" (14:10),¹³ and clings "to the stump of the cedar" (14:10–11). The cedar dream vision also refers to Ham and Japheth's future, according to which they will depart from their father, moving "left", that is, north,¹⁴ and "right", to the south. This, in turn, foreshadows Japheth's inhabitation of Europe, and Ham's of Africa, as later described in the division of the world (cols. 16–17). Another significant feature of the vision, to be discussed below, is that both Ham and Japheth take action against Shem or his descendants, by invading his portion.

The Division of the World according to 1QapGen

At least two columns—cols. 16 and 17 and perhaps some of the poorly preserved col. 18—are devoted to the division of the earth among Noah's sons. Accordingly, the author of the Noah story endows this topic with considerable weight. The structure of the surviving text of the division of the world is outlined schematically below. The section following Noah's awakening from his dream visions (15:21) is illegible, and the next decipherable portion is the conclusion of Japheth's portion.

¹¹ See M. J. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199–231.

¹² A similar symbolic dream of Noah as a tree with three shoots is related by Hahyah the Giant in the *Book of Giants* (4Q530 II 7–12; see also 6Q8 frag. 2:1). A later reference to one of the Giant's dreams in which the angels cut down all trees but one with three branches, interpreted as referring to Noah's family's survival of the Flood, is found in *Midrash shemhazai and 'Aza'el*; For a study of the development of these traditions, see E. Eshel, "The Dream Visities in the Noah Story of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Related texts" in *Qumran in the context of Second Temple Judaism* (eds. A. Kloostergaard et al., Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

¹³ This translation is based on Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 91; but see M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron and D. Sivan, "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (1995): 49.

¹⁴ See 1QapGen 21:8, 22:10.

 Noah's sons

Japheth	[?]-16:12
Shem	16:14-[25] ¹⁵
Ham	[16:26] ¹⁶ -17:6

 Shem's sons

Elam	17:7-8
Asshur	17:8
Aram	17:8-9
Lud	17:9-10
Arpachshad	17:11-15

 Japheth's sons

Gomer	17:16
Magog	17:16
Madai	17:17
Javan	17:17
Tubal	17:17
Meshech	17:18
Tiras	17:18-19

The translated text of the division of the world according to 1QapGen, reconstructed with the aid of parallels from *Jubilees* and Josephus, follows:

Japheth's Lot

Col. 16

[From lines 1-8, 23-34 almost no letters have survived]

⁹...] the bays which are from between them, the beginning of the Euphrates River [רַאֲשֵׁי בַעֲרִי] until the Tina River and [...] the Euphrates River [בַּעֲרִי...], ¹⁰ the whole land of the whole north until it reaches [...]¹⁷ ¹¹and this boundary passes (from) the waters of the Great Sea until it

¹⁵ This short line, which ends with a large *vacat*, may mark the end of Shem's lot. Ham's lot probably followed in the next line.

¹⁶ After some unreadable words at the beginning of the line, we can perhaps read ׀הל in line 26, and understand this line as marking the beginning of Ham's lot.

¹⁷ This reconstruction is based on *Jub.* 8:26: "It goes due north and goes toward the mountains of Qelt, to the north and toward the Mauq Sea" (J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, CSCO 511, *Scriptores Aethiopi* 88 [Louvain: Peeters, 1989], 55).

reaches [Gadir. That] ¹² he divided by lot to Japheth and his sons to possess as an eternal possession.¹³ *vacat*

This fragmentary description of Japheth's boundary clearly grants Europe to Japheth. Based on a new reading of **בְּעֵין רַשִׁישׁ** here translated as "the Euphrates,"¹⁸ and on the parallel texts, I reconstruct the border of Japheth's portion as follows: according to the *Genesis Apocryphon* his lot probably started at Gadir,¹⁹ which is near Gibraltar, and went through the European Mediterranean shores, including its three tongues, which are the Aegean, the Adriatic, and the Tyrrhenian seas. From there it proceeded through the Taurus and Amanus mountains, through the sources of the Euphrates River to the Tina River [= the Don] including "the land of the whole north," namely, Europe, to "the Great Sea," which is probably the Maeotis of the Greeks, the modern Sea of Azov (see *Jub.* 8:26: "Mauq Sea"), and back to Gadir.

Shem's Lot

¹⁴[And] there came forth the second lot for Shem, for him and for his sons to inherit [as an everlasting inheritance ¹⁵... It begins from the sources where] the waters of the Tina River start [and continues] ¹⁶as far as the Tina River [...until it gets] ¹⁷to the Great Salt Sea. And his boundary runs (to?) the Euphrates (River.)²⁰ From this gulf, wh[ich...¹⁸...],²¹ which turns westward and crosses¹⁹ [...] until it reaches east, the ^{Head} of the World (= Garden of Eden)²²...²⁰[...until it gets to the Gihon (= Nile) river, which is on the shore of the Great Sea, going through the Taurus Mountains, going] to the east²³ [²¹on the Tina river, then going] eastward [²²to its source, then back to] the east,²⁴ [to the sources of the Tina River...]²⁵

¹⁸ This identification is supported by Josephus' description of Japheth's lot (*Ant.* 1.122). The Euphrates also appears in Josephus' description of the border of Shem's lot (*Ant.* 1.143). See E. Eshel, "Isaiah 11:15: A New Interpretation Based on the *Genesis Apocryphon*," *DSD* 13 (2006): 38–45.

¹⁹ Gadir is a city in southern Spain, now known as Cadiz.

²⁰ I read **בְּעֵין**. Accordingly, I translate "(to?) the Euphrates [River]," whereas Fitzmyer reads **כַּעֵין** "as a spring;" Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 94–95.

²¹ For Fitzmyer's reconstruction [**וְיֵאָדָה לְתֵדָה וְיֵאָדָה**], "[and] the boun[d]ary go[es?]," which is uncertain, see *ibid.*

²² The last three words are **קְדָמָה רַשִׁישׁ עֵלְמָא**.

²³ I read here **לְמִדְנָהּ**.

²⁴ I read **קְדָמָה** here as well.

²⁵ Lines 21–22 are poorly preserved, and only the twice-repeated word **קְדָמָה** can be made out (lines 21 and 22). The reconstruction of these lines is based mainly on

The exact borders of Shem's lot did not survive in full. Based on Shem's borders with his brother Japheth, the division of Shem's lot among his sons, and the description of Abram's tour in 1QapGen col. 19, which parallels Arpachshad's lot, I suggest the following reconstruction of his portion. Shem's allotment probably started at the sources of the Tina River, which *Jubilees* situates in "the middle of the mountain range of Rafa" (8:12). The border then proceeded west to the Great Salt Sea, that is, to the Mediterranean, through Shem's border with Japheth, which, as we have already seen, goes through the Taurus and Amanus mountains and the sources of the Euphrates. It turned westward, to the Mediterranean, and then probably north to the Gihon River, which is the Nile, east and then north around the Arabian Peninsula to the head of the world, which is the Garden of Eden.²⁶

Ham's Lot

Until now, no textual remains of Ham's portion have been identified in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and this section was thought irrecoverable. I suggest that, previously undecipherable fragment belongs to Ham's lot. One of more than twenty, never deciphered, small fragments belonging to 1QapGen, this fragment measures 3.7 × 2.5 cm, including an upper margin. Based on its shape, I assign it to the top of column 17. Its barely legible remains of 13 letters read as follows:

¹[...]Meshech, (and²) the sons (?) of [...ll. 2–6] *vacat*

Because Meshech's allotment is described later in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (17:18), in the division of Japheth's lot among his sons, I tentatively assign this fragment not to the text of Meshech's portion, but rather to Ham's. Admittedly, this fragment provides no direct evidence for the *Genesis Apocryphon's* definition of Ham's lot. However, *Jubilees* places of Meshech's lot east of Gadir (9:12), and mentions Gadir as a border in Ham's allotment (8:22–23). I therefore surmise that it belongs to Canaan's lot, which is the westernmost part near Gadir. This is

the preceding description of Japheth's lot (col. 16:9), and especially on the parallel description of Japheth's boundaries in Josephus (*Ant.* 1.122), as well as on *Jubilees*.

²⁶ Based on *Jubilees'* location of the Garden of Eden in the easternmost part of Shem's lot (8:16), I surmise that the Head of the World mentioned in the *Genesis Apocryphon* refers to the Garden of Eden.

described by *Jubilees* as follows: “to the west of him (one) for Canaan; and to the west of him was the sea” (9:1). If this proposed placement of the fragment is accepted, Ham’s lot in the *Genesis Apocryphon* begins with col. 16:26, after the *vacat* at the end of line 25²⁷—followed by a description of the division of Ham’s lot among his sons—and ends at col. 17:5. Column 17:7 marks the beginning of the division of Shem’s lot among his sons.

Shem’s Sons

Col. 17

⁷ [And] Shem divided his [po]rtion among his sons. There fell first to [E]la[m] in the north (an area) alongside of the waters of the Tigris River until it reaches the Great Sea ⁸and the R[ed S]ea [...]; <From the Tina River, to the Nile> from the sources <of the Nile, at the Garden of Eden> which is in the {north} <east> and it turns to the west, for Asshur, until it reaches the Tigris [River...]; After him, ⁹for Aram (there fell) the land that is between the rivers, until it reaches the peak of the m[ountain]s of A[sshur] and everything north of it(?) and the land of] Arara, for Lud ¹⁰ there fell the Taurus Mountains, and the lot crosses and goes westward until it reaches Magog and [...to the shore] of the Sea of the East, ¹¹in the north, which embraces (?) this bay which is at the head of these three portions alongside of that sea. For Arpachshad, to the [Red] Sea [...] ¹²the [boundar]y that turns to the south, all the lands that the Euphrates waters, and all [...¹³...] all the valleys and the plains that are between them, and the islands that are in the midst of the gulf, all of which [...] [¹⁴...the entire land of Lebanon, Samir] and Amana²⁸ until it reaches the Euphrat[es], [the islands of Kaphthor?] [This is] ¹⁵the portion which Noah divided and gave him. *vacat*

This detailed description of the division of Shem’s allotment differs from the parallel in *Jubilees* (9:2–6). The main difference is *Jubilees*’ inclusion of ethnographical detail and names of countries (e.g., in Elam and Aram’s portions), whereas the *Genesis Apocryphon* focuses on geographical features alone.

²⁷ The scribe perhaps left this entire line empty as he did between Japhet and Shem’s lots (16:13).

²⁸ Based on “Amana,” the preceding words are reconstructed according to the parallel from *Jub.* 8:21.

Japheth's Sons

[¹⁶ And] Japheth divided among his sons. First he gave to Gomer (an area) in the north until it reaches the Tina River; and after him to Magog and after him ¹⁷to Madai; and after him to Javan, all the islands that are near Lud and between the gulf [which] is ne[ar] Lud; and the second gulf to Tubal [which] crosses [¹⁸...] in the land; and to Meshech the sea [of...], [and] for Tiras [...] the four [*large? islands*] [...] gulf, in the midst [¹⁹*of the sea*]²⁹ [*which is alongside the po*]rtion of the sons of Ham.
[lines 19–25 did not survive well enough to be reconstructed]³⁰

This description of the division of Japheth's portion among his sons is relatively brief; for some of the sons, only their names appear.

The Division of the World According to Jubilees and Josephus

A better understanding of the text of the *Genesis Apocryphon* requires closer comparison with the parallel divisions of the world in *Jubilees* and Josephus. Of the two, *Jubilees* 8–9, which has been termed “the most important surviving document of early Jewish geography” and “virtually unparalleled within Jewish tradition” for a thousand years after its composition,³¹ is of greater import to our discussion. As noted earlier, in my opinion the *Genesis Apocryphon* most likely represents an earlier stage of the Jewish geographical tradition.

The Division of the World According to Jubilees 8–9

The many studies devoted to the division of the world according to *Jubilees* 8–9 address its sources, the parcellation's place in its author's worldview, try to identify the places mentioned, and draw comparisons to other Second Temple sources, mainly Josephus.³² The Greek world

²⁹ The reconstruction is based on *Jub.* 9:13.

³⁰ I note here two more, small, previously undeciphered, fragments, which, based on their readings, may belong to cols. 16–17, though their poor preservation makes their precise placement difficult. The first reads: “[...] fell all [...].” The verb ‘fell’ (פִּלַּל) is infrequent in the division of the world segments, e.g., 17:7, “(And) as for my son Shem, he [di]vided it among his sons. The first lot fell to [El]a[m] in the north.” The second reads פִּלַּל, “[...] the head/source [of...]” (see col. 17:8, 11). These two surviving words seem to fit the context of the division of the world.

³¹ P. S. Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi’ of the Book of Jubilees,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 213.

represented the earth as a disc surrounded by oceans and divided into three continents—Asia, Europe, and Libya (= Africa)—and the author of *Jubilees* pictured the world according to an updated version of this ancient, sixth-century-B.C.E. Ionian world map, based on Dicaearchus' (fl. 326–296 B.C.E.) division of the world by a median running through the Pillars of Hercules, the Taurus mountains, and the Himalayas.³³ But, whereas the Ionian map places the *omphalos* at Delphi, *Jubilees* situates it at Mount Zion.³⁴

Jubilees' description of the division of the world, like the other sources considered here, is based principally on Genesis 10's Table of Nations. It differs significantly from the biblical account, however, in including two stages in that division:³⁵ the first designated "a bad way" (8:9), and the second a proper division (8:10). Peleg's name-midrash is linked to the first division: "because at the time when he was born Noah's children began to divide the earth for themselves" (8:8). As VanderKam notes, in so doing, the author of *Jubilees* "reproduces the Shemite genealogy as far as Peleg so that it can locate the division of the earth at the etymologically appropriate junction".³⁶ Noah is informed of this inappropriately implemented division only after the fact (8:9).

One possible explanation for *Jubilees'* disapproval of this division, as VanderKam suggests, is its infelicitous timing—at the end of a jubilee.³⁷ I propose, in addition, that *Jubilees* here interprets the double biblical

³² J. Maier, "Zu ethnographisch-geographischen Überlieferungen über Japhetiten (Gen 10, 2–4) im frühen Judentum," *Enoch* 13 (1991): 157–94; J. M. Scott, "Jubilees 8–9," in *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 23–43; J. C. VanderKam, "Putting Them in Their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool," in *From Revelation to Canon* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 476–99. For a detailed bibliography on this subject, see J. T. van Ruiten, "The Division of the Earth," in *Primaeva History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 320, n. 29.

³³ Alexander, "Imago Mundi," 204; L. H. Feldman, *Judean Antiquities 1–4*, vol. 3 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (ed. S. Mason; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 43.

³⁴ P. S. Alexander, "Jerusalem as the *Omphalos* of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 104–19.

³⁵ Because of its partial preservation, the *Genesis Apocryphon* could arguably also have included two world divisions, of which the first perhaps appeared in the missing portions. Nevertheless, no indications of such a dual division have survived.

³⁶ VanderKam, "Putting Them in Their Place," 487. This explanation differs from the rabbinic one, which understood Peleg's name midrash in Gen. 10:25 as referring to the Tower of Babel (Gen. 11:9). See M. Segal, *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 2004), 117 (Hebrew).

³⁷ VanderKam, "Putting Them in Their Place," 487.

reference to the division of the world, presented first in general terms: “These three were the sons of Noah, and from these the whole world branched out (נִפְצַחַ Gen. 9:19), and later detailed and summarized in Genesis 10: “and from these the nations branched out (נִפְרְדוּ) over the earth after the Flood” (v. 32). Perhaps *Jubilees*’ censorious attitude toward the first distribution originates in a negative association with the root פִּרְץ repeated three times in the Tower of Babel story (Gen. 11:4, 8, 9). On the other hand, the timing and implementation of the second division are carried out properly: “at the beginning of the thirty-third jubilee,” by Noah, based on an authoritative written source: “the book from the bosom of their father Noah”, and supervised by an angel of the presence (Jub 8:10–11).³⁸

Following this determination *Jubilees* provides a detailed description of each son’s allotment. The first, and most detailed, of Shem’s portion (8:12–21), includes Noah’s happy reaction. *Jubilees* goes on to describe the lots of Ham (8:22–24) and of Japheth (8:25–30), followed by the particulars of each son’s distribution of his portion among his sons (9:1–13). This story concludes with Noah’s binding them “by oath to curse each and every one who wanted to occupy the share which did not emerge by his lot” (9:14), to which his three sons agreed.

An outstanding feature of *Jubilees*’ description, to be compared to its parallels below, is its emphasis on Shem’s superiority and its bestowal of all of Asia Minor, together with Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine, on Shem. According to Josephus and, I submit, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, this area belonged to Japheth.

The Division of the World According to Josephus

As mentioned earlier, Josephus also bases his division of the world (*Ant.* 1.122–47) on the biblical Table of Nations.³⁹ According to Josephus, Noah’s three sons “were the first who came down from the mountains into the plains and made their dwelling there” (*Ant.* 1.109), but their attempt to persuade others to follow failed because the latter feared

³⁸ As VanderKam notes, the scroll Noah holds in his bosom (*Jub.* 8:11) is probably also related to Josh. 18:8–9, where a book is mentioned in relation to the land division (“Putting Them in Their Place,” 488). For the authoritative nature of Noah’s scroll, as compared to similar cases, see H. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: *Jubilees* and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JStJ* 30 (1999): 382.

³⁹ For a detailed study of this text, see T. W. Franxman, *Genesis and the ‘Jewish Antiquities’ of Flavius Josephus* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979), 100–16.

a recurrence of the deluge. Josephus then reports a divine attempt to initiate a colonization process, “because of their large population,” but “they did not listen to God owing to their ignorance.” Only later, after misfortunes, did they “come to realize their error” (1.110).⁴⁰ The distribution of the nations is also linked to the biblical Tower of Babel story: “From that time on they were scattered owing to their diverse languages and they established colonies everywhere, and each group occupied the land that they came upon and to that God led them” (1.120). Thus, Josephus attributes the settling of the earth to divine intervention (cf. Paul’s speech on the Areopagus, Acts 17:26). His description of the actual inhabitation of the earth by Noah’s sons and grandsons (*Ant.* 1:122–147) focuses on the various nations inhabiting the earth,⁴¹ making scant reference to the geographical boundaries of Noah’s sons’ lots. These appear as a short introduction to the description of each son’s portion. The relevant parts are cited below:⁴²

Japheth	Ham	Shem
Now Iaphtha [= Japheth], the son of Nochos [= Noah], had seven sons. These inhabit the land beginning from the mountains of Tauros ⁴³ and Amanos, ⁴⁴ and they advanced in Asia up to the river Tanais ⁴⁵ and in Europe up to Gadeira. ⁴⁶ (<i>Ant.</i> 1.122)	The children of Chamas [= Ham] secured the land from Syria and the mountains of Amanos and Libanos, ⁴⁷ occupying as much of the area as was situated toward the sea and appropriating to themselves the regions up to the ocean. ⁴⁸ (<i>Ant.</i> 1.130)	To Semas [= Shem], the third of Nochos’ [= Noah] sons, five sons were born, who inhabited Asia up to the Indian Ocean, beginning with the Euphrates. (<i>Ant.</i> 1.143)

⁴⁰ See G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 259, where he suggests that Josephus’ recasting of the biblical account into a colonization movement was influenced by Hecataeus.

⁴¹ For a survey of the different explanations for Josephus’ Table of Nations, see Feldman, *Antiquities 1–4*, 42–3, n. 308.

⁴² Translation based on Feldman, *Antiquities 1–4*.

⁴³ A mountain range in southern Asia Minor, northwest of Tarsus.

⁴⁴ A mountain range in Asia Minor, now named Giaour Dagr.

⁴⁵ The Don River in European Russia in the north Caucasian area.

⁴⁶ That is, Gadir.

⁴⁷ Biblical Lebanon; the modern Syrian Jebel Libnan mountain range.

⁴⁸ I.e., from the Mediterranean Sea to the Indian Ocean.

Despite its brevity, Josephus' geographical description clearly differs from that of *Jubilees* in placing the border between Shem and Japheth in the Taurus and Amanus mountains and in only part including of Asia Minor in Shem's lot.

The Division of the World among Noah's Sons according to 1QapGen

We now return to the focus of this paper, an attempt to better understand the *Genesis Apocryphon's* division of the world via a comparison with its parallels in *Jubilees* and Josephus, briefly outlined in the preceding. One significant point of comparison between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* inheres in *Jubilees'* expansionist tendency, both with regard to provision of greater geographical detail, and more particularly, of ethnographic information, namely, which nations inhabit a particular area. Josephus gives even greater emphasis to the latter.⁴⁹ The sections of *Jubilees* devoted to Noah's grandsons illustrate this point; witness *Jubilees'* description of Aram. To the similar geographical descriptions, the *Genesis Apocryphon's* "the land that is between the rivers," and *Jubilees'* "the entire land of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and the Euphrates," the latter adds ethnographic detail: "to the north of the Chaldeans" (*Jub.* 9:5). Elam's lot also exemplifies *Jubilees'* expansionist tendency. Following its geographical description (9:2), *Jubilees* notes geographical, and perhaps, ethnographical detail: "until it reaches the east of the entire land of India, in Erythrea on its border, the waters of the Dedan, all the mountains of Mebri and Ela, all the land of Susan, and everything on the border of Farnak" (*ibid.*). Similarly, although parts of Japheth's lot are missing from the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the preserved sections indicate that its author provided no description of Magog and Madai's allotments (17:16–17), whereas *Jubilees* more extensively describes their lots (9:8b–9). Nevertheless, *Jubilees* is not always more detailed than the *Genesis Apocryphon*. For the portions allotted to the other sons (Gomer, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras) the *Genesis Apocryphon* elaborates more than *Jubilees*. The surviving text indicates shared, similar geographical traditions. Both mention the land of Arara,⁵⁰ and in both Javan receives the islands which border Lud's share, and Tiras, the four islands that border Ham's portion.

⁴⁹ Thus, Alexander was able to identify each grandson's territory ("Imago Mundi," 209).

⁵⁰ I suggest identifying it as Urartu, near the Van Lake.

The shared features of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*, namely, the Ionian map reflected in their verbal geographical descriptions, underpin my premise that the *Genesis Apocryphon*, or a similar verbal description, served as the basis for *Jubilees*' depiction, so much so, that the parallels enable the identification of a number of mistakes in *Jubilees*. According to *Jubilees*, the Kamaturi Islands belong to Shem's son Arpachshad; they were, however, mistakenly appended to the portion of Japheth's sons, after Tiras' portion (9:13b). Although no reference to these islands has survived in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the disposition of these islands was clearly not appended to Tiras' portion there. Another mistake relates to the portion allotted to Aram, where *Jubilees* reads "the entire land of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and the Euphrates to the north of the Chaldeans;" based on the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s description, it should read "to the east."⁵¹ Another obvious mistake in *Jubilees* results from a misreading. In Lud's allotment, where the *Genesis Apocryphon* reads, "for Lud it fell the Taurus mountains טור תורא; 17:10), *Jubilees* has "for Lud these emerged as the fifth share the mountain range of Asshur..." (9:6). The Asshur mountains are unknown from the Bible but, based on the *Genesis Apocryphon*, I submit that this reflects a scribal misreading: טור אתור.

As noted, although the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* share the same, or a similar map of the world, *Jubilees* is distinguished by its emphasis on Shem's superiority and by its ethnographic interest. As for the prominence *Jubilees* ascribes to Jerusalem, the surviving text of the *Genesis Apocryphon* documents no such concept. Indeed, based on the mention of "the Sea of the East" (17:10) in Lud's allotment, I submit that the *Genesis Apocryphon* did not share this bias. This sea can be identified as *Jubilees*' Mauq Sea, the present-day Sea of Azov. More importantly, the reference to the Sea of the East reflects the orientation from Greece, namely, with Delphi at the center. Thus, as opposed to *Jubilees*, which converts the Ionian map to a Jewish perspective, placing Jerusalem at the center of the world, the *Genesis Apocryphon* retains the focus of the original Ionian map. Thus, someone using Delphi as a reference point could refer to the Sea of Azov as "the Sea of the East."⁵²

⁵¹ I disagree with Werman's contention that the two descriptions differ; C. Werman, "The Book of Jubilees in Hellenistic Context," *Zion* 66 (2001): 281 (Hebrew [translated in this volume]).

⁵² Probably from the Greek ἀνατολή; see Ezek. 47:18 מנבול על הים הקדמוני המדור; which *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* translates as מן מדנתא, and the LXX as ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν

Another area of comparison between the three sources for the division of the world relates to the ordering of Noah's sons' names. The discussion starts by comparing their order as listed in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (cols. 16–17) to Genesis 10, assuming that any divergence from the biblical order is meaningful.⁵³ It then notes the differences from, and similarities to, the parallel sources, bearing in mind that the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s fragmentary preservation hampers a full comparison with the other texts' well-preserved descriptions of the division of the world.⁵⁴

The following table illustrates the sequence of the names of Noah's sons in Genesis, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Jubilees*, and Josephus:

A. Noah's sons			
1QapGen 16	Gen. 10:1	<i>Jub.</i> 8:12–29	<i>Ant.</i> 1.109
Japheth Shem Ham	Shem Ham Japheth	Shem Ham Japheth	Shem Japheth Ham
B. Noah's grandsons			
1QapGen 16–17	Gen. 10:2, 6, 22 and <i>Ant.</i> 1.122–47	<i>Jub.</i> 9:1–13	
Ham Shem Japheth	Japheth Ham Shem	Ham Shem Japheth	

Consideration of this table shows, first of all, that the sequences in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Josephus not only differ from each other, but also from Genesis 10:1 and *Jubilees*, which share the same order.⁵⁵

τὴν πρὸς ἀνατολὰς Φοινικῶνος. Furthermore, Greeks from the mainland settled on the western shore of Anatolia, known as Asia Minor (covering the area between the Aegean Sea and the Euphrates River), from the 11th century B.C.E. Thus, the culture created jointly by the Aeolians, the Dorians, and the Ionians is known as East Greek, which probably gave Anatolia its name, based on the Greek word Ἀνατολή, 'east.' See G. R. Tsetschlade, "Anatolia," in *Encyclopedia of Greece and the Hellenic Tradition* (ed. G. Speake; 2 vols.; London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000), I: 67–69.

⁵³ For rearrangement as an exegetical technique in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, see M. J. Bernstein, "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the *Genesis Apocryphon*," *DSD* 3 (1996): 39–40.

⁵⁴ E.g., the twenty lines missing between Noah's awakening from his dreams (15:21) and Japheth's portion (16:8) in 1QapGen.

⁵⁵ For a comparison of Josephus' order to the biblical one, see Feldman, *Antiquities I–4*, 39, n. 274.

The biblical birth order of Noah's sons is Shem, Ham, and Japheth (Gen. 6:10, 10:1), and their descendants are listed in reverse order: Japheth, Ham, and Shem (10:2–32). *Jubilees* preserves the biblical order in both the birth story (4:33) and in the division of the world among Noah's sons (*Jubilees* 8). Underlying the arrangement in the *Genesis Apocryphon*—Japheth, Shem, and Ham—are directional considerations; I suggest that the arrangement is from north to south, clockwise, which is from left to right on ancient maps.⁵⁶ In addition, as noted, Genesis 10 lists Noah's grandsons in reverse order to that of Noah's sons, and Josephus follows this progression. In the *Genesis Apocryphon* as well the names of Noah's grandsons appear in reverse order with respect to its original list of Noah's sons, and *Jubilees* shares this sequence.

The texts of the division of the world also exhibit differences with regard to the listing of each son's children. No list of Ham's sons survives in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, and for Japheth's children, all three sources are parallel. Where the texts reflect different arrangements is in the division of the world among Shem's sons, as seen from the table below:

1QapGen 17:7–15	Gen. 10:22 (MT)	Gen. 10:22 (LXX) and Josephus	<i>Jub.</i> 9:2–6
Elam Asshur Aram Lud Arpachshad	Elam Asshur Arpachshad Lud Aram	Elam Asshur Arpachshad Aram Lud	Elam Asshur Arpachshad Aram Lud

All three sources identify the first two sons as Elam and Asshur. Arpachshad appears as the third son in the MT and the LXX to Genesis 10, and in *Jubilees*. In the MT to Genesis 10 the fourth son is Lud and the fifth Aram, whereas in *Jubilees* the order is reversed: Aram is fourth and Lud fifth. The same order is also found in the LXX to Genesis 10—which may indicate *Jubilees*' familiarity with a text of Genesis 10 close to the LXX—and in Josephus as well (*Ant.* 1.145).

⁵⁶ As suggested by Dan Machiela. I would like to thank him for sharing his ideas with me. The *Genesis Apocryphon*'s ordering of the division among Noah's sons and grandsons is surprising, as earlier, in the dream of the cedar and three scions, Shem was entitled "the first scion" (14:11). Accordingly, we would have expected Shem to be mentioned first, as in Genesis 10 and *Jubilees* 9.

The *Genesis Apocryphon*'s order differs: Aram is the third son, Lud the fourth, and Arpachshad the fifth. This is not their birth order, found in 1QapGen 12:11, which follows the sequence of the MT. Like the sequence of Noah's sons, the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s ordering of Shem's sons in the division of the world is deliberate and can be attributed to geographical grounds. In naming Shem's sons, the *Genesis Apocryphon* proceeds from east to west, counter-clockwise, or from top to bottom on ancient maps.

Following this discussion of specific differences between the sources regarding borders and the sequence of the division of the world, I turn to a broader consideration of their treatment of this division's process and content. Points of comparison, between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* in particular, but also with Josephus, include: (a) the immediate context; (b) divine involvement; (c) terminology; (d) Shem's superiority over his brothers; and (e) a less favorable attitude toward Shem's brothers.

In the immediate context of the division of the world, the biblical Table of Nations appears *after* the death of Noah (9:29). This is also the case in Josephus' account, which reports Noah's death earlier in the story (*Ant.* 1.104) and assigns Noah no role in the division of the earth. *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* reflect a different perspective, viewing Noah as the divider of the world among his sons. *Jubilees*' assigning of an active role to Noah in the division of the world has already been noted. Based on the reference to Noah in the parcellation of Japheth's sons' lots (17:15), this also appears to be the case in the *Genesis Apocryphon*—even though the beginning of the story is missing and no explicit reference to Noah's participation has survived. I suggest that a similar phrase referring to Noah's act of parcellation be reconstructed in the division of the lots among the other sons' families.⁵⁷

Another feature shared by *Jubilees* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* is the involvement of a divine force in the parcellation of the world. According to *Jubilees*, Noah divided the world in "a proper way," based on a book and with the supervision of an angel of the presence (8:10–11). The *Genesis Apocryphon* documents divine division earlier in the story, in Noah's dream vision, where a divine entity announces and interprets the

⁵⁷ The pronoun "he" used at the end of Japheth's portion (1QapGen 16:12) probably refers to Noah. Thus, as we would expect, Noah's active role was probably mentioned in 17:15 as well.

division of the world. Like *Jubilees*, the *Genesis Apocryphon* makes reference to a written source, probably in heaven, in the angel's statement: "So it is written concerning you" (15:20). There is, however, a distinction between the two with regard to the nature of the direct divine involvement in the divisionary process. The biblical account in Genesis 10 cites no divine involvement in the division of the world; there is, however, according to *Jubilees*, direct angelic involvement: "...they divided the earth into three parts... while one of us who were sent was staying with them" (8:10). For its part, the *Genesis Apocryphon* attributes no immediate role to angels in the division itself; rather, general guidelines to the division appear in the dream vision and its interpretation.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* also exhibit linguistic similarities. As VanderKam notes, the language used by *Jubilees* to introduce "the actual division... is reminiscent of Moses and Joshua's distribution of the promised land among the tribes: the assigned portions are called lots."⁵⁸ In its use of עֶרֶב, 'lot' (16:12, 14), the *Genesis Apocryphon* appears to rely on Joshua 15. This term is used by *Targum Jonathan* to translate Hebrew גֹּרֵל (Josh. 15:1; 16:1). The *Genesis Apocryphon* also uses הַדָּוּם (16:11, 17; 17:12), a term found numerous times in *Targum Jonathan* of Joshua 15, as the translation of Hebrew נְבוּל.⁵⁹ Because the Hebrew original of these chapters did not survive, *Jubilees'* precise terminology is impossible to determine; nevertheless, it, too, probably utilized terms from Joshua 15.⁶⁰

Shem's superiority over his brothers, which is reflected in both the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*, receives different emphasis in each. In the *Genesis Apocryphon* the context is Noah's dream vision preceding the division of the world, and Shem is declared the rightful heir, the one in whom Noah's name will be called (14:12). In *Jubilees*, however, Shem's superiority and his lot's special worth are highlighted, as is Noah's satisfaction with Shem's portion:

Noah was very happy that this share had emerged for Shem and his children. He recalled everything that he had said in prophecy with his mouth, for he had said: 'May the Lord, the God of Shem, be blessed,

⁵⁸ VanderKam, "Putting Them in Their Place," 488.

⁵⁹ Another shared term is to have those lots for an "everlasting inheritance" (*Jub.* 8:17, 21; 24, 29; 1QapGen 16:12, 14), to be compared with David's sermon (1 Chron. 28:8, 2 Chron. 20:7; cf. Ezra 9:12).

⁶⁰ As used by 1QapGen, the above-mentioned terminology is also reminiscent of Isa. 34:17.

and may the Lord live in the places where Shem resides.’ He knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies and is residence of the Lord; (that) Mt. Sinai is in the middle of the desert; and (that) Mt. Zion is in the middle of the navel of the earth. The three of them—the one facing the other—were created as holy (places)... He knew that a blessed and excellent share had come about for Shem... (8:18–21)

Furthermore, both the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* have in common a less favorable attitude toward Shem’s brothers Ham and Japheth, the obverse of Shem’s superiority and, as noted, both refer to an invasion of Shem’s portion. In the *Genesis Apocryphon*, the invasions of Shem’s portion appear in Noah’s dream vision, apparently a reference to future violent acts, but no violent invasion is mentioned in the *Genesis Apocryphon*’s actual account of the division of the world. A different approach is documented in *Jubilees*, which reports invasions conducted by Canaan, the son of Ham, and negotiations by Madai, the son of Japheth, for land.⁶¹ *Jubilees* dates these acts to the post-Tower of Babel era, when each of Noah’s sons inhabited his portion: “In the fourth week, during the first year—at its beginning—of the thirty-fourth jubilee [1639], they were dispersed from the land of Shinar” (10:27); that is, seventy years after Noah’s division of the world, Ham and Japheth and their sons were first moving into their allotments! Later in the story, Canaan appropriates some of Shem’s portion in Lebanon and

⁶¹ Thus, both the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* refer to the invasion or sharing of the same parts of land originally assigned to Shem, albeit in different contexts (see discussion in the body of the article). A similar attitude to the deeds of Ham and Shem appears in the Third Sibyl (lines 110–14), in the postdiluvian division of the world into three territories for Gaia and Ouranos’ three sons: Kronos, Titan, and Iapetos (probably referring to Japheth). There too, as in *Jubilees*, the sons were bound by oath not to violate the others’ portions (lines 115–16), but after their father’s death they broke their oath and began to fight. See also Rashi on Gen. 12:6 “‘And the Canaanite was then in the land’—They (the Canaanites) were gradually conquering the land of Israel from the descendants of Shem, for it had fallen to the share of Shem when Noah apportioned the earth amongst his sons...” (A. M. Silbermann, ed., *Chumash with Rashi’s Commentary Translated into English* [Jerusalem, 1985]); see also Ibn Ezra ad loc. A striking parallel to *Jub.* 9:14–15, which recounts Noah’s sons’ vow not to take over the other’s portion, appears in a midrash to Gen. 12:16 from *Midrash Aggadah al Hamishah Humshei Torah* (ed. S. Buber; Vienna: A. Fante, 1894), 27: “‘And the Canaanite was then in the land’. Because the land of Israel fell in Shem’s allotment, as Scripture states, ‘And King Melchizedek of Shalem’ (Gen. 14:18). When God divided the world among his three sons, Noah made them vow not to enter the others’ portions. The seven nations passed through the land of Israel and broke the vow. Accordingly, the holy one, blessed be he, commanded that they be extirpated. But when Abraham passed through [the land] only the Canaanites, but not the other nations, had entered the land.”

on the sea coast, not part of “his hereditary land to the west of the sea” (10:29), and no curses (either by his father Ham or his two uncles) suffice to budge him (10:30–34). This serves as another explanation for why Canaan was cursed, in addition to his having seen Noah inebriated and naked. Subsequently, following in his cousin’s footsteps, Madai, the son of Japheth, also moves out of his designated portion: “Madai saw the land near the sea but it did not please him,” and pleads with Elam, Asshur, and Arpachshad, his wife’s brother, for land (10:35). Thus, according to *Jubilees*, Canaan took parts of Shem’s lot by force, and Madai negotiated for other portions of Shem’s lot.⁶²

But the geographical boundaries between the portions occupied by each of Noah’s sons constitute the most significant difference between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees*. In the *Genesis Apocryphon* (and Josephus) the border between Shem and Japheth runs through the Taurus and Amanus mountains, to the sources of the Euphrates and up to the Don. As noted, both Josephus and the *Genesis Apocryphon* apparently rely on the Ionic map known in their day, in which the median passes through the Pillars of Hercules and the Taurus mountains. The same border—clockwise from the Gihon (= Nile), through the Mediterranean shore of Canaan up to the Taurus mountains, through the Red Sea and the tongue of the Egyptian sea (see the discussion above), back to the Gihon (= Nile),⁶³ which parallels Arpachshad’s allotment—appears in Abraham’s tour of the promised land as described in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (21:16–19). *Jubilees* differs significantly from both the *Genesis Apocryphon* and Josephus in assigning all of Asia Minor to Shem.

A comparison of the description of the portion’s given to Noah’s sons according to *Jubilees* and Josephus, elicits that the major difference between the two descriptions inheres in the size of Shem’s lot, which, according to *Jubilees* 8, is larger than his brothers’ lots. According to *Jubilees*, all of Asia Minor, together with Syria, Phoenicia and Palestine, belongs to Shem, not to Japheth.⁶⁴ A possible explanation for this difference from Josephus has been suggested by Schmidt, who notes that the paraphrases of Genesis 10 by *Jubilees* and Josephus

⁶² See VanderKam, “Putting Them in Their Place,” 491–2.

⁶³ For the Gihon as the border between Shem and Ham, see *Jub.* 8:23.

⁶⁴ F. Schmidt, “Jewish Representations of the Inhabited Earth during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods,” in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel* (eds. A. Kasher, U. Rappaport and G. Fuks; Jerusalem: Yad Itzhak Ben-Zvi and the Israel Exploration Society, 1990), 126.

presuppose two different representations of the Earth. *Jubilees* belongs to a social environment whose very identity is threatened by the lurking danger of Hellenism, a danger which can be warded off by relegating it to some physically remote region. There is no place in Asia for either Japheth or Ham; it belongs entirely to Shem. . . . Conversely, Josephus is representative of a social environment for which Hellenism scarcely constituted a danger; indeed, it was perceived of as a reality with which Judaism had to come to terms. Therefore the image of the world suggested by the historian is altogether different: Shem, Ham, and Japheth share Asia among them; the Greek names of both nations and places are substituted for the traditional ones. The cultural universe is not seen as a threat.⁶⁵

The parallels between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* raise the question of the relationship between the two. Some scholars suggest that the author of *Jubilees* either utilized and adapted the *Genesis Apocryphon* to his needs, or that both authors used a common source.⁶⁶ One significant area noted by scholars in which *Jubilees* reworked the *Genesis Apocryphon* relates to its map of the world, to which the author of *Jubilees* inserted Hellenistic geographical and scientific detail for his own purposes.⁶⁷

Conclusions

As a whole, all three sources discussed above, that is, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, *Jubilees*, and Josephus, seem familiar with and share a common *mapa mundi* originating in the Ionic map, which they use to describe the division of the world among Noah's sons. Of these three, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which provides geographical descriptions of each share given by Noah to his sons, and each son's division of his allotment to Noah's grandsons, appears both to be the oldest tradition and closest to the Ionian map. Evidence for the *Genesis Apocryphon's* knowledge of Greek cartography, and perhaps of its antiquity and originality, comes from its reference to "the Sea of the East" in Lud's allotment. Here, as compared to *Jubilees*, which converts the Ionian map to a Jewish perspective, placing Jerusalem at the "navel" of the world, the *Genesis Apocryphon* retains Ionic map's original focus. Furthermore, the *Genesis Apocryphon* assigns Asia Minor to Japheth, and Phoenicia, Syria, and

⁶⁵ Ibid., 133–4.

⁶⁶ Van Ruiten, "Division of the Earth," 333–370.

⁶⁷ Werman, "The Book of Jubilees," 281.

Palestine to Shem. *Jubilees* awards Shem Asia Minor, the largest and best portion. Although the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s description of the division of the world is more detailed than Josephus, evidently both share the same tradition and map, placing the border between Shem and Japheth in the Taurus and Amanus mountains and the sources of the Euphrates. As for the small details in which the *Genesis Apocryphon* differs from Josephus, these are due to the differing amounts of detail provided, and primarily to Josephus' ethnographic emphasis on which peoples inhabit what lands.

The *Genesis Apocryphon* also shares many features with *Jubilees*: geographical names as well as the tradition favoring Shem over Ham and Japheth, including an account of their violent acts toward Shem. Nevertheless, the differences between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Jubilees* are of greater significance than the similarities, primarily *Jubilees*' interest in using the same map to highlight his particular worldview, namely, Shem's priority, the importance of ethnographic divisions, and above all, the centrality of Jerusalem as the navel of the world, in contrast to the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s greater interest in the geographical aspects of the division of the world. As we have seen, geographical considerations even account for the ordering of the distribution of the lots in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

JUBILEES IN THE HELLENISTIC CONTEXT*

Cana Werman**
Ben Gurion University

The question of the degree to which Hellenistic culture influenced those inhabitants of the land of Israel who worshipped the God of Israel has yet to be settled.¹ As two scholars suggest, any discussion of this issue must distinguish between Hellenism as a movement advocating deliberate public adoption of customs and cults from the Hellenistic world and Hellenization as a process whereby such customs and cults are assimilated and adopted, sometimes unconsciously,² with a resultant reshaping of the local culture, religion, or language.³

Hellenism as a movement certainly existed in Herodian Palestine.⁴ Recent research also indicates that members of the Hasmonean family

* This article is supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 733/03). It appeared in Hebrew in *Zion* 66 (2001): 427–50. Translations of *Jubilees* are cited from James C. VanderKam, transl, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511, Scriptores Aethiopici, tomus 88; Louvain: E. Peeters, 1989). Unless otherwise noted, biblical translations are cited from *JPS Hebrew-English Tanakh*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia, 1999). I would like to thank Dena Ordan for her help in editing this paper.

** Dedicated to Betsy—A mentor and valued companion in the *Jubilees* adventure.

¹ See U. Rappaport's careful assessment in "The Hasmonean State and Hellenism," *Tarbiz* 60 (1990–91): 477–80 (Hebrew). For a survey of the question of Hellenism in the land of Israel, see L. I. Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998), 1–32 and the extensive bibliography cited in the footnotes. Note that the concept of 'Jews' might be anachronistic in this period. On the question of Hellenism and other ethnic groups in the land of Israel, see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 1:32–57, 83–88.

² T. Rajak, "The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism," in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes* (ed. P. R. Davies and R. T. White; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 261–5; Rappaport, "Hasmonean State," 477–80.

³ Rajak, "Hasmoneans," 266; A. Wasserstein, "Non-Hellenized Jews in the Semi-Hellenized East," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 14 (1995): 111–37. Rajak ("Hasmoneans," 265) delimits three possible types of change: (1) "The suppression of a native culture and language and its replacement with a fully or mainly Greek style;" (2) "the creation of a truly mixed, hybrid form;" and (3) "the addition of Greek elements to a persisting culture whose leading features remained visible and relatively constant."

⁴ See D. Mendels, *Identity and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History* (JSPSup 24; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 18; T. Rajak, *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 52–7.

consciously adopted Hellenistic culture.⁵ More difficult, however, is the task of determining the intensity of the process of Hellenization. Martin Hengel's attempt to identify Hellenistic influence in all Jewish literary-cultural strata from the third to the first century B.C.E. has not won scholarly acceptance.⁶ Yet, whereas the majority of Greek Hellenistic Jewish literature—strongly influenced by Greek literature and philosophy—was composed outside the land of Israel, we cannot rule out the possibility that some small part was written there and not in the Hellenistic Diaspora. Nor can we ignore the potential existence of Hellenistic influence on Hebrew and Aramaic works written in the land of Israel during the centuries in question. Accordingly, additional research is called for.⁷ This paper examines the familiarity of *Jubilees*, written in Hebrew,⁸ in the land of Israel, with the Hellenistic world and with Hellenistic Jewish literature. I hope to make a contribution to the discussion of the broader issue outlined above.⁹

The date of *Jubilees*' composition remains a matter of scholarly debate. Some attribute its composition to as far back as the beginning of the second century B.C.E.;¹⁰ others to the time of Antiochus IV's edicts and the Hasmonean Revolt;¹¹ and still others even later, to the

⁵ Rappaport, "Hasmonean State," 480–503; Rajak, "Hasmoneans," 266–71; D. Gera, "The Battle of Beth Zachariah and Greek Literature," in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (ed. I. M. Gafni et al.; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History/Historical Society Jerusalem, 1996), 25–54 (Hebrew).

⁶ See, for example, M. D. Herr, "Ha-Hellenismus ve-ha-Yehudim be-Erez Yisrael," *Eshkolot*, n.s. 2–3 (1977–78): 20–27; M. Stern, "M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*," *Kiryath Sepher* 46 (1970–71): 94–9 (Hebrew).

⁷ See Levine, *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity*, 29–30.

⁸ Preserved in full only in Ge'ez, *Jubilees* was unquestionably written in Hebrew as attested by fragments found at Qumran, written or copied, on paleographic evidence, in the early first century B.C.E.

⁹ An initial discussion of this topic is found in A. Büchler, "Traces des idées et des coutumes hellénistiques dans le Livre des Jubilés," *Revue des études juives* 89 (1930): 321–48. See also D. Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in the Hasmonean Literature* (TSAJ 15; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987), 83–8.

¹⁰ J. L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 922.

¹¹ This dating, based on the assumption that *Jubilees* refers to the Hasmonean wars, has been refuted by Doran. See R. Doran, "The Non-Dating of *Jubilees*: Jub 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context," *JJS* 20 (1989): 1–11; and a discussion in C. Werman, *The Attitude towards Gentiles in the Book of Jubilees* (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1996), 11–26 (Hebrew).

late second or early first century B.C.E.¹² However, even the earliest date proposed for the book places it during the Hellenistic period. Indeed, two outstanding features of the book are related to the Hellenistic period. *Jubilees'* author calculates and dates events according to jubilees, weeks, years, and months from Creation. Interest in chronology is a definitive characteristic of the Hellenistic age, which explains the efforts by the author of *Jubilees* (or by his predecessors) to calculate epochs and years.¹³ In addition, the text stresses the sanctity and importance of the Hebrew language (*Jub.* 12:25–27). The choice of Hebrew testifies to an intercultural struggle during the formative period, between the concepts of Judaism and Hellenism.¹⁴ Thus, while there is evidence that *Jubilees'* author was familiar with and used works written in Aramaic, such as the Ethiopic book(s) of Enoch, the Genesis Apocryphon,¹⁵ and the Aramaic Levi Document,¹⁶ he deliberately chose to write in Hebrew. In the following I point to additional features and details that would not have been included had this work been written earlier. Two broad areas will be addressed here: *Jubilees'* knowledge of Hellenistic science, as evidenced by its map of the world, and of Hellenistic literature, particularly historiographical and philosophical works. Ultimately, I shall attempt to show how *Jubilees* utilized its familiarity with Hellenizing trends in order to rebut them.

¹² M. Kister, "Concerning the History of the Essenes," *Tarbiz* 56 (1987): 1–14 (Hebrew).

¹³ E. Bickerman, "The Jewish Historian Demetrios," *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (AGJU 9;1; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 2:353; and Büchler ("Traces des idées," 331–4) noted the similarity between *Jubilees* and Hellenistic Jewish chronography. For an informative discussion of Jewish chronography in the Hellenistic-Roman period, see the introduction to C. Milikowsky, *Seder Olam: Mahadurah Madait ve-Perush* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Science, forthcoming).

¹⁴ A. Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 95, referring to Ben Sira, comments that the use of Hebrew itself constitutes defiance of Hellenism.

¹⁵ C. Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature* (ed. E. G. Chazon and M. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–81.

¹⁶ C. Werman, "Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period," *DSD* 4 (1997): 211–25, *contra* J. Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 1–64.

I. Jubilees and Hellenistic Science

The chapters of *Jubilees* devoted to the story of the period from Noah to Abraham attest to its author's acquaintance with Hellenistic science. In its description of the division of territory among Noah's sons, the text reveals knowledge of the Ionic map of the world, widely used in the Hellenistic world.¹⁷ This map envisaged the world as a flat disk with its "navel" (*omphalos*) at Delphi, and three continents—Asia, Europe and Africa—in the center, surrounded by the ocean. With a few exceptions, the educated Greek world adhered to this map for an extended period.¹⁸ *Jubilees* utilizes an updated version of the map (that of Dicaearchus, fl. 326–296 B.C.E.),¹⁹ in which the "equator" passes through the Pillars of Hercules (the Straits of Gibraltar), the Taurus Mountains, and the Himalayas. However, the author of *Jubilees*, who views the map from a Jewish, and biblical, standpoint, describes this line as passing through "the mouth of the Great Sea," that is, Gadir (present-day Cadiz, at the Straits of Gibraltar), to Mount Zion, and thence to the Garden of Eden, on the map's eastern side.²⁰ According to *Jubilees*, the *omphalos* is not Delphi but rather Mount Zion. The biblical outlook is particularly prominent in *Jubilees*' assignment of the three continents to Noah's three sons.

There is a fragmentary description of the division of the world among Noah's sons in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, with instructive parallels to *Jubilees*.²¹ The following table sets out the two texts:

¹⁷ P. S. Alexander, "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi' of the Book of *Jubilees*," *JJS* 33 (1982): 197–213; idem, "Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept," in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L. I. Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 104–19 and additional bibliography there.

¹⁸ See Alexander, "Imago Mundi," 211 and n. 14.

¹⁹ Alexander, "Imago Mundi," 204.

²⁰ Alexander, "Imago Mundi," 204, according to *Jub.* 8:19.

²¹ Considerable effort has gone into decipherment of the fragments of the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The final results were published in M. Morgenstern et al., "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (1995): 50–53. For a recent edition with a commentary, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* (3rd ed.; *Biblica et orientalia* 18/B; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004).

<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	<i>Jubilees</i> ²²
<p>[] the tongue that is between them up to the Tina River and [] all the land of the north till it reaches [] (<i>about 23 letters</i>)</p> <p>and this boundary passes (through) the waters of the Great Sea till it reaches [] (2 words)</p> <p>he apportioned to Japheth and to his sons to inherit as an eternal inheritance</p>	<p>For Japheth there emerged a third share on the other side of the Tina River²³ toward the north of the mouth of its waters. It goes toward the northeast, (toward) the whole area of Gog²⁴ and all that is east of them. It goes due north and goes toward the mountains of Qelt,²⁵ to the north and toward the Mauq Sea.²⁶ It comes to the east of Gadir as far as the edge of the sea waters. It goes until it reaches the west of Fara. Then it goes back toward Aferag²⁷ and goes eastward toward the water of the Me'at Sea.²⁸ And it goes to the edge of the Tina River toward the northeast until it reaches the bank of its waters toward the mountain range of Rafa. It goes around to the north. This is the land that emerged for Japheth and his children as his hereditary share which he would occupy for himself and his children throughout their generations forever: five large islands and a large land in the north. (8:25–29)</p>

²² This is a slightly revised version of the translation in J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511; Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989).

²³ The Tina River is the Don and marks the border between Europe and Asia. It rises in the Rafa Mountains (that is, the Greeks' Πίρα) in the northeastern part of the ocean and flows into the Great Sea, which lies in the center of the map's western part. On its way to the Great Sea the Tina River passes through the Sea of Me'at (the Greek's ἡ λίμνη ἡ Μαϊῶτιν), namely, the Azov Sea.

²⁴ According to Ezek 39:2, Gog comes from the far north.

²⁵ The mountains of Qelt are the Alps or the Pyrenees, so called because of their location in the Celtic region.

²⁶ The Mauq Sea is the northwestern part of the ocean. Its name derives from Hebrew *mei ok{ianos}*, "the waters of the oc[ean]."

²⁷ Fara and Aferag are probably different parts of Africa.

²⁸ See note 23.

Table (*cont.*)

<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
<p>[Now] Shem my son divided his share amongst his sons, and first fell to [E]l[am] in the north by the waters of the Tigris, until it reaches the R[e]d [S]ea to its sources that in the north,</p> <p>and turns to the west to Ashur till it reaches the Tigris</p> <p>Japhet also divided between his sons. First, he gave to Gomer, in the north up to the Tina River,</p> <p>and after him to Magog,</p> <p>and after him to Madai</p>	<p>Shem, too, divided (his share) among his sons. There emerged a first share for Elam and his children to the east of the Tigris River until it reaches the east of the entire land of India, in Erythrea²⁹ on its border, the waters of the Dedan,³⁰ all the mountains of Mebri and Ela,³¹ all of the land of Susan, and everything on the border of Farnak as far as the Erythrean Sea and the Tina River.³² For Asshur there emerged as the second share the whole land of Asshur, Nineveh, Shinar, and Sak³³ as far as the vicinity of India (where) the Wadafa River rises (9:2–3).</p> <p>Japheth, too, divided the land among his sons as an inheritance. There emerged for Gomer a first share eastward from the north side as far as the Tina River. North of him there emerged (as a share) for Magog all the central parts of the north until it reaches the Me'at Sea. For Madai there emerged a share for him to occupy on the west of his two brothers as far as the islands and the shores of the islands.³⁴</p>

²⁹ The Erythrean (ἡ Ἐρυθρὸς Θάλασσα) or the Red Sea is the Indian Ocean and the modern Red Sea.

³⁰ Dedan is Abraham's grandson, the son of Yokshan, and brother of Sheva (Gen 25:3). In Jeremiah (25:23) and Ezekiel (38:13) he is listed among the tribes located in Arabia. Thus, we can speculate that *Jubilees* refers here either to the Arabian or the Red Sea.

³¹ These mountains are difficult to identify but refer to the Iranian plateau. Perhaps the name Ela is a misspelling for Eilam, located in the vicinity of Susan mentioned in the same verse. Indeed, Eilam replaces Ela in one manuscript of *Jubilees* (MS 12). This manuscript, however, is influenced by the Ethiopic translation of the Bible; VanderKam, *Jubilees*, xix–xx.

³² This sentence summarizes the dimensions of Shem's lot, which ranges from the Tina River in the north to the Erythrean Sea in the south.

³³ This is apparently Scythia. See VanderKam, *Jubilees*, 56.

³⁴ These are the British Isles.

Table (cont.)

<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
<p>and after him to Javan, all the islands near Lud. And between the tongue [near] Lud and the second tongue to Tubal [.....] in the land</p> <p>And to Meshech the sea [.....] (3–4 words)</p> <p>[and] to Tiras [.....] [f]our [.....] the tongue of the sea that is near the portion of the sons of Ham. (cols. 16–17)</p>	<p>For Javan there emerged as the fourth share every island and the islands that are in the direction of Lud's border. For Tubal there emerged as the fifth share the middle of the tongue which reaches the border of Lud's share as far as the second tongue,³⁵ and the other side of the second tongue into the third tongue. For Meshech there emerged a sixth share, namely all the (region on the) other side of the third tongue until it reaches the east of Gadir. For Tiras there emerged as the seventh share the four large islands³⁶ within the sea which reach Ham's share.</p>

This comparison illustrates at a glance the considerable similarity between the account of the division of the earth among Noah's sons in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and in *Jubilees*. Nonetheless, there are significant differences. The account in *Jubilees* is longer, including many details unknown to the author of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, which predates it. In the *Apocryphon* the description of the northern region of Japheth's portion is extremely brief: "All the land to the north." In contrast, *Jubilees* provides a comprehensive description of the region. Because of the fragment's poor preservation, one line in the *Apocryphon* is illegible and may have included more details. However, in listing the division of Japheth's portion among his sons Magog and Madai, *Jubilees* enumerates geographical areas, whereas the *Apocryphon*, here well preserved, laconically states, "And after that to Magog, and after that to Madai, and after that to Javan. . . ." It is also noteworthy that Meshech's portion in *Jubilees* extends as far as Gadir—information apparently lacking in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The three or four undecipherable words in this line are not sufficient to describe the "tongues" in Meshech's portion or to refer to Gadir.

³⁵ The three tongues are Greece, Italy, and Spain or the waters between them.

³⁶ The four large islands are Corsica, Sicily, Sardinia and Crete.

Another section in which geographical details found in *Jubilees* are lacking in the *Genesis Apocryphon* is the southern part of Japheth's portion. Japheth's boundary is extremely detailed in *Jubilees*, whereas the *Apocryphon* mentions only the Great Sea. The Me'at Sea and the mountains of Rafa, mentioned because of *Jubilees*' familiarity with Greek geographical science, are missing from the *Apocryphon*. Similarly, the portions for the sons of Shem are far more specific in *Jubilees* than they are in the *Apocryphon*. Furthermore, in the *Apocryphon* they are in the Tigris area, while *Jubilees* relocates them to India and Iran.

As noted earlier, comparison of additional chapters in *Jubilees* with their parallels in the *Genesis Apocryphon* suggests that *Jubilees*' author was familiar with, and reworked, the *Genesis Apocryphon* for his own purposes.³⁷ If so, *Jubilees*' account of the division of the earth can be regarded as a revised, expanded version of the account found in the *Genesis Apocryphon*. I argue that the manner in which he reworked and expanded his material, by introducing Hellenistic-scientific additions to the description of the division of the world,³⁸ clearly indicates that he was fully conversant with Hellenistic science.

Based on these additions, it seems likely that the author of *Jubilees* had a detailed, presumably written, description of the Ionic map at his disposal. His use of that literature, however, was quite selective, for his primary purpose was to reject its influence. The map enabled the author of *Jubilees* to ignore the dozens of nations listed in Genesis 10, providing him with the means to enhance Shem's standing. Shem receives the "ideal" continent, and the most fertile region in that continent falls into the hands of Abraham's ancestor Arpachshad.³⁹ This region also contains the *omphalos* of the world, Mount Zion. The rulers of Asia, Greece and Rome, violate the oath sworn by the sons of Noah not to encroach on one another's territory and are consequently doomed.⁴⁰ Seeking to erect a barrier between the Jewish people and a foreign (in his view, idolatrous) culture, and to combat that culture, *Jubilees* borrowed a weapon from Hellenistic culture itself: "It is remarkable how

³⁷ See note 15.

³⁸ *Jub.* 8:9, which informs us of Noah's sons' failure to divide the world among themselves without Noah's help, can now be clarified. To my mind, in explaining why the division in *Jubilees* is the right one, *Jubilees*' author evidently alludes to the division narrated in the *Genesis Apocryphon*.

³⁹ See F. Schmidt, "Jewish Representations of the Inhabited Earth during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays* (ed. A. Kasher, U. Rappaport, and G. Fuks; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi and the Israel Exploration Society, 1990), 119–34.

⁴⁰ Schmidt, "Jewish Representations," 132–3.

energetically and independently the Jews turned Greek ideas on their heads,” as Momigliano says of the book of *Judith*; Schmidt shows, rightly, that the same is true of *Jubilees*.⁴¹

II. Jubilees and Hellenistic Jewish Literature

Jubilees used Hellenistic science to combat Hellenization. I would like to propose that the author of *Jubilees* was also acquainted with other Hellenistic literary works, namely, with Hellenistic Jewish literature, and that the book was written to combat certain tendencies of the latter. It was Victor Tcherikover who first noted that most Hellenistic Jewish literature was not addressed to a gentile audience, and should therefore not be interpreted in an apologetic vein.⁴² Written for a Jewish audience, one of its main purposes was to resolve the conflict that plagued Jews living in the Hellenistic world: how to remain faithful to Judaism while living in an environment that offered the attraction of the glittering culture of Hellenism, in which the Torah's laws and narratives had no meaning and were not held in high regard.⁴³ Hellenistic Jewish literature was concerned, therefore, with the affirmation of both Hellenism and Judaism,⁴⁴ attempting to combine or at least to

⁴¹ A. Momigliano, “The Origins of Universal History,” *On Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 52; Schmidt, “Jewish Representations,” 119; and note Hengel's comment concerning a similar method in Ben Sira—the use of Hellenistic ideas as a tool in the struggle against Hellenism; *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:150.

⁴² V. Tcherikover, “Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered,” *Eos* 48 (1956): 169–93.

⁴³ For a good description, see E. Gruen, “Fact and Fiction: Jewish Legends in a Hellenistic Context,” *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History and Historiography* (ed. P. Cartledge et al.; Hellenistic Culture and Society 26; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 72–4; 87–8.

⁴⁴ Two concepts that are outgrowths of the Hellenistic conquest. See D. R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.), 10–11. According to B. Bar-Kochva, even the author of 2 Macc did not perceive Judaism and Hellenism as being in opposition. See his “Judaism and Hellenism: Between Scholarship and Journalism,” *Tarbiz* 63 (1994): 464–5 (Hebrew). M. Himmelfarb shows that the author of 2 Macc saw a contrast between the two, yet categorizes essentially Greek values and ideas as part of Judaism; “Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees,” *Poetics Today* 19 (1998): 19–40. Similarly, the author of the *Letter of Aristeas* portrays Judaism as representative of Greek philosophy, praises the translators for being knowledgeable in both Jewish and Hellenistic literature (121), and then speaks of the high wall built around Judaism as a barrier to foreign influence. See R. Feldmeier, “Weise hinter ‘eisernen Mauern’, Tora und jüdisches Selbstverständnis zwischen Akkulturation und Absonderung im Aristeasbrief,” *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (ed. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 20–37.

harmonize them.⁴⁵ Efforts toward that goal are evident throughout all genres of Hellenistic Jewish literature. I focus first on works similar in nature to *Jubilees*, that is, historiographic works.⁴⁶

II.A. *Jubilees and Hellenistic Jewish Historiography*

The main thrust of Hellenistic Jewish historiography is to emphasize the Jewish contribution to Hellenistic culture,⁴⁷ and to confirm the Jews' participation in the relevant cultural frameworks without arousing a sense of conflict.⁴⁸ Historians achieved this end through two means: 1) through identification of biblical figures with familiar figures from Greek mythology and historiography, and 2) by designation of Jewish culture heroes.

⁴⁵ Thus, there are two criteria for designating a work as belonging to the Hellenistic Jewish corpus: it must be written in Greek, and it must have a positive attitude toward assimilation of features of the Hellenistic world. M. D. Herr offers different criteria: language and place of composition; "The End of the Jewish Hellenistic Literature: When and Why?" in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World*, 361–78 (367) (Hebrew). Note, however, that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether a particular work was composed in the Hellenistic Diaspora or in the land of Israel. In such cases we are left with the criterion of language alone.

⁴⁶ On the writings that relate to the period in close proximity to their own day and their effort to emphasize the importance of Judaism in Egypt, see, for example, B. Bar-Kochva, *Pseudo-Hecataeus, "On the Jews": Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 21; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996); E. Gruen, "Fact and Fiction," 78–84; D. Gera, "The Tobiads: Fiction and History," *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics, 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 36–58; D.R. Schwartz, "Diodorus Siculus 40.3: Hecataeus or Pseudo-Hecataeus?" in *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land* (ed. Menahem Mor et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003), 181–97.

⁴⁷ The name of the series in which the writings referred to here were published—*Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* (ed. C. R. Holladay; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983)—testifies to the fragmentary nature of the extant texts. One can claim that the preserved fragments do not represent Hellenistic Jewish literature as a whole. If this is indeed the case, my description of Hellenistic Jewish writings fits only part of the corpus. Comparison of these fragments to the Hellenistic Jewish literature preserved in the Septuagint (*Second Maccabees*, *Wisdom of Solomon*), to Philo, to the *Letter of Aristaeus*, and to *Joseph and Aseneth* shows, however, that they also display openness toward Hellenism. I follow Holladay's edition, the most up-to-date one.

⁴⁸ The one exception among Hellenistic Jewish writers is Theodotus. As J. J. Collins notes, the universalism we find in the other writings is missing from Theodotus: Abraham's sons are defined by covenant and by marriage to their own people; *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 48. Theodotus, however, can be included in the Hellenistic Jewish corpus since he wrote in Greek and used a Hellenistic style (he bestows an epic mode on biblical narration) to convey the biblical story. By so doing he blurs the difference between the Bible and Hellenistic literature in an effort to incorporate the Bible into the Hellenistic tradition.

II.A.1. *Identification of Biblical Figures with Greek Ones*

“Pseudo-Eupolemus” is the scholarly designation for a Samaritan who lived and wrote in Palestine and Egypt, and who, based upon his acquaintance with the Temple of Onias, lived no earlier than the mid-second century B.C.E.⁴⁹ Because he takes the Bible as his point of departure, his work has been classified as Hellenistic Jewish literature.⁵⁰ Pseudo-Eupolemus identifies biblical figures from the dawn of human history with gods familiar from the Hellenistic and Babylonian traditions. Enoch, who learned astrology from the angels, is Atlas (credited in the Hellenistic world with teaching mankind astrology); Noah is Bel and Cronos (because he was associated with giants like Cronos).⁵¹ Shem is also Bel (as he bears his father’s name). Bel, the creator of the world according to Berossus, and Cronos, father of Zeus, are thus human beings known to us from the Bible,⁵² making mythology not a religion, but rather part of human history. Pseudo-Eupolemus defends the authenticity of biblical tradition and averts a possible clash between the Bible and foreign literature, between the Jewish faith and the religion of the Hellenistic world.

II.A.2. *Culture Heroes*

Another means of mediating between Judaism and Hellenism was to claim that biblical characters were culture heroes responsible for such significant inventions as astrology, agriculture, and philosophy. The concept of the culture hero, as it developed in the Hellenistic world, played a role in the important debate over which was the oldest nation of the world. “As to the antiquity of the human race,” Diodorus Siculus tells us, “not only the Greeks make their claim, but the barbarians as well; they all believe that they are the autochthonous people, the first to discover things of importance to life; and that the events experienced by their

⁴⁹ He hints approvingly to both the Samaritan temple in Shekhem and to the Temple of Onias in Egypt. See D. R. Schwartz, “The Jews in Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven,” *Zion* 62 (1997): 14–15 and n. 15 (Hebrew).

⁵⁰ Text: Holladay, *Fragments*, 1:174–7. On the question of how this text should be reconstructed, see G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 193. See also the discussion by B. Wacholder, “Pseudo-Eupolemus’ Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham,” *HUCA* 34 (1963): 83–113.

⁵¹ Sterling, *Historiography*, 203–4.

⁵² As Hengel states: “This is demythologizing euhemerism,” *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:89.

people were the earliest events worthy of being told.”⁵³ Greece, Egypt, Babylonia and Phoenicia each claimed the crown of antecedence;⁵⁴ each argued that the most important culture heroes (*Kulturbringer*) came in larger numbers from its nation.⁵⁵

Pseudo-Eupolemus mentions such a culture hero in his attempt to interpret the works of Berossus, a Babylonian author who translated and rewrote Babylonian history in terms of Greek language and concepts. Berossus refers to a righteous man who lived in the tenth postdiluvian generation and who was proficient in Chaldean science. Pseudo-Eupolemus identifies this individual as Abraham.⁵⁶ Abraham was adept at astrology, in which he instructed the Phoenicians and the Egyptians. Aware of the above-mentioned international competition, Pseudo-Eupolemus points to the Phoenicians as the victors: they, not the Egyptians, were the first to learn Chaldean science. But the prime victor was the Jewish people, for the Chaldean sage came from their ranks.

Pseudo-Eupolemus’ argument that this culture hero was a Jew illustrates his desire to include the Jewish people among the most ancient and important nations, and provides a solution to the problem of the conflict between Judaism and Hellenism. Since these culture heroes were Jews, it follows that the Hellenistic culture that they created is not problematic for the Jewish people.

A similar approach was taken by Artapanus,⁵⁷ who depicts the three biblical heroes who lived in Egypt—Abraham, Joseph, and Moses—as the founders of Egyptian culture and religion. Abraham taught the

⁵³ Diodorus Siculus 1.9.3. See the discussion by A. J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26; Tübingen: Mohr, 1989), 1–11; and a short survey by Sterling, *Historiography*, 163–5.

⁵⁴ The chronographer-savant Demetrius (Text: Holladay, *Fragments*, 1:62–79) was apparently familiar with this debate. Using the tools developed in Egypt by such Hellenistic chronographers as Eratosthenes in the third century B.C.E. (see P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972], 1:693–4), he proved the antiquity of the Jewish people by calculating the number of years between biblical events (e.g., the destruction of Samaria and the destruction of Jerusalem) and his own time.

⁵⁵ A. Momigliano, “Origins of Universal History,” 37–9.

⁵⁶ Holladay, *Fragments*, 1:170–7.

⁵⁷ Text: Holladay, *Fragments*, 1:204–25, and a broad discussion by Sterling, *Historiography*, 167–86. See also Gruen, “Facts and Fiction,” 84–7. Artapanus (a dating of the early second century B.C.E. is probable) lived and wrote in Egypt. This can be deduced not only from his education—his writing points to a deep knowledge of Egyptian traditions—but also from his arguments. See below.

Egyptians astrology; Joseph introduced agricultural reform and invented a system of measurements; and Moses invented ships, stone-lifting machines, Egyptian weapons, water pumps, military lore, and philosophy. Furthermore, Moses is identified with Hermes (another example of the above-cited category of identification), who taught the goddess Isis. Moses is also identified with Musaeus, who (according to Artapanus) taught Orpheus. While tradition has it that Musaeus was Orpheus' pupil rather than his teacher, Artapanus inverts the chronological order, and by means of this inversion is able to argue that Greek culture and wisdom, as represented by Orpheus, originated with the Jew Moses (Musaeus). In other words, Artapanus claims that the Jews are the best and most talented nation, the proof being Hellenism itself.⁵⁸

Artapanus' works were perhaps a response to the anti-Jewish propaganda in the work of Manetho, the Egyptian priest who rewrote Egyptian history in a Greek context in the early third century B.C.E.⁵⁹ Artapanus' primary goal was, however, to resolve the conflict of his Jewish contemporaries living in Egypt. The ancient Jewish heroes were not only heroes of the Jewish nation, but also the creators of Hellenistic culture; hence any Jew who adopts that culture is not betraying his national traditions but simply enjoying the fruits of his ancestors' works.⁶⁰

The emphasis by both Artapanus and Pseudo-Eupolemus on the national aspect of Judaism is striking.⁶¹ Because the past heroes of the Jewish people were heroes of humanity as a whole, therefore, in the present, Jews may take pride in their national identity.⁶² Neither author, however, addresses the problem of the meaning of the Torah's laws in the world of Hellenistic culture.⁶³ Neither is this tackled in the

⁵⁸ Artapanus' argument is not so far-fetched because there were Greeks who believed that their culture was a branch of Egyptian culture; see the brief discussion by Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 4. Artapanus' contribution is the claim that the culture hero is not simply Egyptian but an Egyptian Jew.

⁵⁹ Collins, *Athens*, 31–2; Sterling, *Historiography*, 183.

⁶⁰ Like Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus displays a euhemeristic attitude toward the gods. Artapanus does not hesitate to claim that Moses founded the Egyptian cult, an artificial religion with no real gods. Its laws and cult were produced by a human being (a Jew) for the benefit of the Egyptian nation. Consequently, the Jews need not view the Egyptian cult as idolatry and can adopt some of its customs.

⁶¹ Collins, *Athens*, 36–9.

⁶² Bar-Kochva, "Judaism and Hellenism," 461.

⁶³ Furthermore, in describing biblical characters Artapanus does not rely on the Bible (Collins, *Athens*, 36). His fidelity is to the Jewish nation and not to its holy book. Conzelmann argues that parts of Hellenistic Jewish literature indeed relate to Jewish

work of Eupolemus,⁶⁴ a Jerusalem priest with Hellenistic education, who lived around the time of the Hasmonean Revolt. His main goal was to emphasize the centrality of the Jewish people and its leaders to the surrounding world. In the form of a letter,⁶⁵ he tells the story of King Solomon and his relations with Tyre and Egypt during the construction of the Jerusalem Temple, portraying Solomon as the strongest figure in the land of Israel and the neighboring kingdoms. Eupolemus writes of Moses as a culture hero who invented writing, which thus originated in the land of Israel and not in Phoenicia; he was also the first wise man and the first legislator.⁶⁶ Mosaic law, however, has no meaning outside the confines of the Jewish people. Jewish identity is innately linked to the Jewish nation, and its center of gravity is the Temple.⁶⁷ On the other hand, Eupolemus does not reject the religions or laws of other nations,⁶⁸ even relating that Solomon sent the king of Tyre a gold pillar, which now stands in Zeus' temple in that city.

II.A.3. Jubilees' *Use of Identifications*

Jubilees reveals a calculated use of these two tools to achieve a diametrically opposite goal. This is clear in *Jubilees* 10, which tells the story of the Tower of Babel, whose destruction caused the nations to scatter to all corners of the earth, to their assigned territories according to the division of the earth by lot. The story goes on to describe Canaan's invasion of the land of Israel as a grave violation of the oath sworn by Noah's sons not to invade one another's territories (end of chap. 10). It then describes humanity's gradual decline:

law and were written in reaction to the condemnation of the laws of the Jews for commanding hostility to, and separation from, the other nations; H. Conzelmann, *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 139–44.

⁶⁴ On Eupolemus' identity, see Sterling, *Historiography*, 207. There is a debate concerning his origin. Hengel (*Judaism*, 1:90–5) assumes that Eupolemus lived in the land of Israel and that his writings are another proof for the diffusion of the Hellenistic culture there. M. Stern, wishing to invalidate such Hellenistic diffusion, argues for Egyptian or Cyprian origin; "Yahadut ve-yavnut be-erez yisrael ba-me'ot ha-shelishit ve-ha-sheniyah lifnei ha-sefirah," in *Acculturation and Assimilation: Continuity and Change in the Cultures of Israel and the Nations: Collected Essays* (ed. Y. Kaplan and M. Stern; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1989), 56 (Hebrew). See also n. 113 below.

⁶⁵ Sterling, *Historiography*, 217.

⁶⁶ The depiction of Moses as a legislator is also an outcome of the Hellenistic worldview. See Schwartz, *Jewish Background*, 18.

⁶⁷ Sterling, *Historiography*, 221–2.

⁶⁸ Collins, *Athens*, 42.

During this jubilee Noah's children began to fight one another; to take captives, and to kill one another; to shed human blood on the earth, to consume blood; to build fortified cities, walls, and towers; men [*began*] to elevate themselves over peoples, to set up the first kingdoms; to go to war—people against people, nations against nations, city against city; and everyone to do evil, to acquire weapons, and to teach warfare to their sons. City began to capture city and to sell male and female slaves. (11:2)

This censorious description is essential to subsequent developments described in the text. Abraham is presented as the antithesis of sinning humanity, thus justifying his election. Note, however, the nature of the accusations leveled against humanity in *Jubilees*: appointing a king, going to war, and making various conquests. What made the author specify these particular offenses? Why does he mention the crowning of a king, and why are the offenses imputed to that act not the traditional ones of enslaving and exploiting the people (see 1 Sam 8:11–17), but rather the king's preoccupation with war and conquest?

It is possible that these representations implicitly reference the figure of Nimrod,⁶⁹ otherwise not mentioned explicitly in *Jubilees*, who is to be located, chronologically speaking, at that very juncture in history. Biblical Nimrod is a king: "And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land went forth Asshur and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-ir, and Calah..." (Gen 10:10–11; 1917 JPS). The biblical phrase *reshit mamlakhto*, "the beginning of his kingdom," seems to be interpreted in *Jubilees* as "the first kingdom/kingship," the foundation of the institution of monarchy, and perhaps the first existence of a kingdom in the sense of empire.⁷⁰

This is not the only possible interpretation of the biblical phrase, and I would like to suggest a reason for its adoption by the author of *Jubilees*. Greek historiography recounts that Ninus, king of Assyria and Babylonia, was the first ruler of the First Empire.⁷¹ His reign

⁶⁹ Many early commentators link Nimrod, King of Babel, to the Tower of Babel. See Kugel, *Traditions*, 229–31. I believe that *Jubilees* refers to Nimrod in this verse for another reason: the sin of consuming blood. Nimrod was a "mighty hunter before the Lord" (Gen 10:9) and hunting allows neither the proper slaughtering nor the proper handling of the animal's blood.

⁷⁰ According to M. Weinfeld this is indeed the primary meaning in Genesis; *Hamishah Humshei Torah im Perush H'adash*, vol. 1: *Bereshit u-Shemot* (Tel Aviv: S. L. Gordon, 1975), ad loc. Nimrod represents the beginning of territorial conquest and of political centers.

⁷¹ This claim is made by Castias who, in *Persica*, points to Assyria as the oldest civilization. Although there was some doubt in the ancient world concerning this claim, for which see W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography*

also marked the first wars of expansion. Diodorus Siculus, relying on Ctesias,⁷² relates that Ninus was a lover of war who trained his men for battle, concluded a pact with the king of Arabia and conquered Babylonia, whose inhabitants knew nothing of war (II, 4, 1–7). Ninus then conquered Armenia, Medea, and all the land between the Nile and the Don (II, 1, 8–2, 4), and after these wars Nineveh (II, 1, 3–4). The series of accusations—captive taking, enslavement, waging war—is directly associated with Ninus’ generation. Its appearance in *Jubilees* may be explained by the identification of Nimrod, the king of Babylonia and Assyria and builder of Nineveh, with Ninus, king of Assyria and Babylonia, the builder of Nineveh, in the generation of the first wars.⁷³ If *Jubilees*’ description of the division of the world among the sons of Noah shows knowledge of Hellenistic geography, the identification of Nimrod with Ninus points to acquaintance with Hellenistic historiography.

Although it seems likely that the author of *Jubilees* read the history books himself, it is possible that he encountered the identification in a now-lost literary source. *Jubilees* exhibits striking similarities with the text we know as the third book of the *Sybilline Oracles*.⁷⁴ Before embarking on its admonitions to the nations of the world, *Sib. III* describes the three kingdoms of postdiluvian period, those of Cronos, Titan, and Iapetus, who had divided the world among themselves by lot. Having sworn an oath, at first they lived in peace (110–115), but after their father’s death the oath was violated, and the three brothers fought one another, each desiring to rule humanity (117–121). They finally reached an agreement that Cronos would rule over all, but would beget no children, so that Titan would succeed him after his death. Cronos, however, did have children, one of whom was Zeus. Upon hearing of

from *Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989), 16 n. 11. It was generally accepted.

⁷² R. Drews, *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1973), 104, 195 n. 32.

⁷³ It is probable that both Nimrod and Ninus denote one figure: King Tukulti-Ninurta. See E. A. Speiser, “In Search of Nimrod,” *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958): 32–6 (English section). Tukulti-Ninurta was not the first king but the founder of the first empire. He ruled both Babylonia and Assyria in the thirteenth century B.C.E. (1246–1206). Because of his importance, his fame spread outside the borders of Babylonia: to Genesis, where he was designated Nimrod, and to Greek historiography, where he was named Ninus.

⁷⁴ See J. J. Collins, *The Sybilline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1974), 43. The book perceives the Ptolemaic regime as an ideal one, and claims that the messianic dream will be fulfilled in its day.

this, the children of Titan attacked Cronos and Rhea and took them captive (151). Their sons, however, came to the rescue, and a great war ensued (147–153). At this point, the Sibyl sums up, saying: “This is the beginning of war for all mortals” (154–155), and also the beginning of the rule of empires in the world (158–161). Thus, *Sib. III*, like *Jubilees*, describes the division of the world (*Jub.* 8:10–9:13; *Sib. III*, 114–115); the oath sworn by Noah’s sons (*Jub.* 8:14–15; *Sib. III*, 116); Noah’s death (*Jub.* 8:15–17; *Sib. III*, 117–118); violation of the oath (*Jub.* 10:28–33 [referring to Canaan]; *Sib. III*, 118–121); the desire to rule the entire world, the first war, and the taking of prisoners of war (*Jub.* 11:2; *Sib. III*, 120–161).⁷⁵

I suggest that these passages in the *Sibylline Oracles*, like those in *Jubilees*, are based upon the identification of Ninus with Nimrod. In *Sib. III*, the empire begins in the second and third generations after the Flood. This brings us to the generation of Nimrod, grandson of Ham, who lived in the third generation after the Flood. The Sibyl also associates the beginning of the empire with the first wars and the capture of prisoners, as in the description of the first empire in the time of Ninus in Greek historiography.

There are, however, differences between the accounts. In *Jubilees* we have a long account of the division of the earth among Noah’s sons, whereas *Sib. III* describes the division in one terse sentence; *Jubilees* mentions the desire for empires and wars in a single verse, while *Sib. III* is quite detailed, with (euhemeristic) use of Hesiod’s *Theogony* (421–424, 629–638). Such differences suggest that the author of *Jubilees* was most likely not directly acquainted with Book III of the *Sibylline Oracles*. Presumably, both works made use of the same historiographic work—some Hellenistic Jewish work identifying biblical figures with familiar figures from mythology and historiography. I surmise that this unknown work identifies Nimrod with Ninus and incorporates the tradition of empire and wars.⁷⁶ If correct, this conjecture implies that

⁷⁵ This similarity was noted by J. M. Scott, *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians* (WUNT 84. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 36–41.

⁷⁶ Indeed, this Hellenistic Jewish work was not preserved and the statement that Ninus is Nimrod occurs only in a relatively late work, the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*. Book 4, ch. 29 reads: “inter quos primus magica nihilominus arte quasi corusco ad eum delato rex appellatur quidam Nebroth, quem et ipsum Graeci Nimum vocaverunt, ex cuius nomine Ninive civitas vocabulum sumpsit.” B. Rehm, *Pseudoklementinen II: Recognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994), 160. Nevertheless, it seems that this identification was known to Hellenistic Jews. Philo, in mentioning Nimrod, refers explicitly to wars. See *Questiones et solutiones in Genesis*, II.81–2.

the author of *Jubilees* employed a Hellenistic Jewish work to create a barrier between Abraham and the rest of humanity.

II.A.4. *Jubilees' Use of Culture Heroes*

Above I suggested that the concept of the culture hero, so central to Hellenistic Jewish historiography, was a major tool in the effort to promote the integration of Jews and Judaism into the Hellenistic world. It can, however, be argued that *Jubilees'* familiarity with this concept is not necessarily an outgrowth of acquaintance with Hellenism, but rather a reflection of the culture heroes that appear in the book of Genesis, which *Jubilees* rewrites. Thus, we read in Genesis of Jabal, "the ancestor of those who dwell in tents and amidst herds" (4:20); of Jubal, "the ancestor of all who play the lyre and the pipe" (v. 21); and of Tubal-Cain, "who forged all implements of copper and iron" (v. 22). However, *Jubilees'* awareness and deliberate use of the concept of culture hero goes beyond this to take part in what I identify as the book's polemic against Hellenistic Jewish literature.

From its portrayal of Abraham, it is clear that *Jubilees* is aware of the Hellenistic Jewish tradition, found both in Artapanus and Pseudo-Eupolemus, of Abraham as the father of astrology. Because *Jubilees'* author considered astrology a forbidden subject, he deprived Abraham of his role as a culture hero in that realm. *Jubilees* 12 describes Abraham looking at the stars, but as refusing to learn the future from them (vv. 16–18).

The story in *Jubilees* (end of chap. 11) about Abraham's battle with the crows reinstates Abraham as a culture hero. As Brock has shown, this departure from the biblical chain of events draws on an earlier tradition.⁷⁷ Comparing this tradition (preserved in Syriac)⁷⁸ with *Jubilees* reveals the addition of an important detail—Abraham's invention of a plow that buries seeds deep in the earth, making them inaccessible to crows.⁷⁹ This addition, stressing Abraham's contribution in a neutral area—agriculture⁸⁰—is meant to compensate Abraham for his loss of the title in the field of astrology.

⁷⁷ S. P. Brock, "Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to *Jubilees* 11–12 and Its Implications," *JSTJ* 9 (1978): 135–52.

⁷⁸ Both in *Catena Severi* (Severus was a monk who assembled the *Catena* c. 861) and in a letter sent to Jacob of Edessa.

⁷⁹ Brock, "Abraham," 140–1.

⁸⁰ In Babylonian literature the discovery of the plow is attributed to Enlil; see B. Landsberger, "Corrections to the Article, 'An Old Babylonian Charm against *Merhu*,'"

The concept of culture hero is also implicit in *Jubilees* 10, which tells of demons that lead Noah's children and grandchildren astray, of Noah's prayer, and of God's response to it. God imprisons nine-tenths of the evil demons, and then sends Noah angels to teach him how to mislead the remaining ones. As I have argued elsewhere, this chapter is a reworked version of an ancient tale preserved in a later work—the introduction to *Sefer Assaf ha-Rofé*.⁸¹ In that version, the emphasis is on disease-causing demons, and Noah and his sons are taught different remedies. Noah appears there as a culture hero, the father of medicine. In *Jubilees*, however, the emphasis is on sin rather than disease, on prayers to mislead the demons and not on remedies extracted from “medicinal trees with all their grasses and herbs and seeds” (introduction to *Sefer Assaf ha-Rofé*). This shift from medicines to prayers obscures the purpose for which the introduction to *Assaf ha-Rofé* was written, i.e., the dispensation to prepare mixtures of plants and herbs, based on the notion of medicine as God's gift to Noah.⁸² Conceivably, *Jubilees* employs the idea of the culture hero as a tool to prohibit the use of such practices and sciences as astrology and medicine, which had developed and become popular in the Hellenistic world. Thus, whereas Hellenistic Jewry utilized culture heroes as a means of bridging the cultural distance between Judaism and Hellenism, *Jubilees* deliberately uses them to amplify this distance.

II.B. *Jubilees and Hellenistic Jewish Philosophy*

Hellenistic Jewish historians resolved their conflict by portraying Hellenism as being of Jewish origin, a solution that highlights Judaism's national aspect. Yet, as I pointed out earlier, neither Artapanus nor

JNES 17 (1958): 56 and n. 4. It is not surprising to find a positive attitude toward this region in *Jubilees*. See Wasserstein, “Non-Hellenized Jews,” 111–31.

⁸¹ Werman, “Attitude towards Gentiles in *Jubilees*,” 102–8; idem, “Qumran and the Book of Noah,” 172.

⁸² See also A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies* (ed. M. Bernstein et al.; STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997), 384. Lange, who is not aware of *Jubilees*' aim here, argues that the evil spirit story was composed to approve the use of Hellenistic medical science. In describing Enoch, another culture hero, *Jubilees* states: “He was the first of mankind who were born on earth who learned (the art of) writing, instruction, and wisdom and who wrote down in a book the signs of the sky... He was the first to write a testimony...” (4:17–18). These verses show that *Jubilees*' author was familiar with books attributed to Enoch, and approved of what they contained: astronomy and historiography.

Eupolemus attempts to explain the meaning of biblical law in a Hellenistic context. Another approach to the problem of biblical law was to indicate attributes shared by Judaism and the Hellenistic world. This was the approach of the Hellenistic Jewish philosophers, who tried to emphasize those features of Judaism acceptable to the educated non-Jewish public, namely, its philosophical aspects.⁸³ *Jubilees* also aimed to repudiate their views, as we will see through examination of the writings of Jewish philosophers in which reference is made to biblical law.

It appears likely that some Jewish philosophical works were already in circulation when *Jubilees* was composed. One earlier author is Aristobulus, of whose writings only fragments have survived. If the assertion that it was written around 100 B.C.E. is correct, then the *Wisdom of Solomon* was roughly contemporary with *Jubilees*.⁸⁴ And although Philo's prolific writings are later than *Jubilees*, it is generally held that he was preceded by earlier Jewish philosophers.⁸⁵

Just as the Hellenistic Jewish historians attributed the creation of Hellenistic culture to Moses, the Jewish philosophers claimed that Greek philosophy owed its wisdom to Moses, since it was derived from the Torah, which had been translated into Greek in the past.⁸⁶ Because they also assumed that, through its imprint upon Nature, the Law could be learned independently, without an external legislator, this argument was not of central importance for Jewish philosophers.⁸⁷ This statement requires further explanation.

The existence of a world of ideas, a pre-Creation intellectual world imprinted in the universe upon Creation, was a central belief in Second Temple times. An early work, the biblical book of Proverbs, already portrays Wisdom as an independent, pre-Creation entity. The role of

⁸³ Collins, *Athens*, 9.

⁸⁴ Concerning the book's dating, see J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997), 179. Collins rejects the opinion that the *Wisdom of Solomon* refers to contemporary historical events, and dates the book to the early Roman era. It seems to me, however, that an earlier date is also possible.

⁸⁵ B. L. Mack, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in Philo," *StPhA* 3 (1991): 21–9; E. Birnbaum, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews and Proselytes* (Studia Philonica Monograph 2; Brown Judaic Studies 290. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 24–5.

⁸⁶ For a list of sources, see Wasserstein, "Non-Hellenized Jews," 114 n. 8; D. Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 79; and Gruen, "Facts and Fiction," 85–7.

⁸⁷ Moses is thus a philosopher; unlike in the Bible, his knowledge does not derive from God's words. See D. Winston, "Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo's Thought," *StPhA* 2 (1990): 12.

Wisdom, however, reached its full development in Hellenistic Jewish literature,⁸⁸ a development furthered by acquaintance with Stoic philosophy and with the thought of the disciples of the Platonic school.⁸⁹ Wisdom, or more precisely *Logos*,⁹⁰ was created by God prior to Creation, and embedded in the newly formed universe.⁹¹ Any observer of the universe and its operational laws can learn something of the essence of God,⁹² achieve a full understanding of the laws of the universe, and draw conclusions as to what constitutes proper conduct in the created world.⁹³ Any person can apprehend, and should obey, this natural law.⁹⁴ But Wisdom—herein lies the Jewish aspect—is also the law that the Creator gave to the Children of Israel.⁹⁵ Clearly, the laws that can be derived from the order of nature are the ethical laws, and these are indeed mentioned in the Hellenistic Jewish *Wisdom of Solomon*. The laws of purity and impurity, sacrifices and festivals are more difficult to incorporate.⁹⁶

Another characteristic of philosophical inquiry is that, unlike the Bible, the philosopher concentrates on God's dominion over Creation and the natural order, not on God's action in history. Philo interprets historical events as philosophical journeys,⁹⁷ and the *Wisdom of Solomon*

⁸⁸ Hengel, *Judaism*, 1:168 (in reference to Aristobulus' work).

⁸⁹ For its acquaintance with Stoicism, see Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 196–8. On the Platonic school, see D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon: New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979), 33–4; Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*, 20–21, and the bibliographic list in note 47 there. Philo's branch of philosophy is not relevant to this consideration.

⁹⁰ Philo uses mostly 'Logos' but 'Wisdom' can be found also in his writings. Philo does not elucidate, however, on the relationship between the two; see J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977), 163–4.

⁹¹ Winston, *Wisdom*, 38; B. L. Mack, "Imitatio Mosis: Patterns of Cosmology and Soteriology in the Hellenistic Synagogue," *StPh* 1 (1972): 31–2.

⁹² *Wisdom of Solomon* 13:1–9 (Winston, *Wisdom*, 253).

⁹³ W. E. Helleman, "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," *StPhA* 2 (1990): 51–71.

⁹⁴ Philo, *De opificio mundi*, I.3: "It consists of an account of the creation of the world, implying that the world is in harmony with the Law, and the Law with the world, and that the man who observes the law is constituted thereby a loyal citizen of the world, regulating his doings by the purpose and will of Nature, in accordance with which the entire world itself also is administered," trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, *Philo* (LCL; London and New York, 1929), 1:7.

⁹⁵ Philo, *De opificio mundi* I.3; *De vita Moysis* II.48; D. Winston, "Philo and the Hellenistic Jewish Encounter," *StPhA* 7 (1995): 125–6; D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel, 1983), 387.

⁹⁶ Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 192–3.

⁹⁷ See, for example, *De somniis*, I.52–60.

portrays history as a sequence of events that relate stories of righteous men and their rewards, and of sinners and their punishments,⁹⁸ which come not from God, but through the built-in law of the universe, as a natural action of its component parts.⁹⁹ In sum, the portrayal of Judaism as a philosophy involves a double shift: the role of God moves from history to creation; and Jewish law shifts from ritual and ethics to ethics alone.¹⁰⁰

Jubilees also speaks of an entity extant before Creation: the Torah and the *te'udah* (also another name for the book) engraved on the heavenly tablets before Creation. Copied at the time of the theophany (the “jubilee of jubilees” since Creation) and dictated to Moses by the Angel of the Presence, the book of *Jubilees* was brought down to the Israelites when Moses descended from Sinai. I have tried elsewhere to determine the meaning of this Torah and briefly summarize my findings here.¹⁰¹

Jubilees is characterized mainly as *te'udah*—the predestined history. However *Torah* is also integrated into *Jubilees*—the laws which are not found in the biblical story. What is important for our discussion is the relationship between the two. Though *Jubilees* is purportedly a copy of the writing on the heavenly tablets, it contains scattered comments made by the angel who dictates “the Torah and the *te'udah*,” which refer to a time continuum outside the scope of *Jubilees* (the period from Creation to the Sinaitic theophany). These comments generally appear whenever a biblical law influences the course of history in the patriarchal period,¹⁰² and teach us that the law to be given on Mount

⁹⁸ See Mack, “Moses,” 30; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 214.

⁹⁹ *Wisdom of Solomon* 16:24, 19:6, 19:18; Philo, *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim*, II.64; *De vita Moysis* II.266–7; and a short survey by Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 215–16 and additional bibliography there.

¹⁰⁰ See E. J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul* (WUNT 2. Tübingen: Mohr, 1985): “The significance of the particularistic Jewish laws is played down. The ethical perspective of the laws is emphasized” (132).

¹⁰¹ C. Werman, “The Torah and the *te'udah* on the Tablets,” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 473–92 (Hebrew).

¹⁰² For example, chapter 3 relates the creation of Adam and Eve: Adam was created in the first week and Eve in the second. *Jubilees* also informs us regarding the first couple’s entrance to Paradise: Adam was brought there forty days after being created; Eve eighty days thereafter. We witness here how the law of *tum’at yoledet*, postnatal impurity, shapes history. This is evident from what the dictating angel tells Moses, namely, that the children of Israel will abide by this law from Sinai on: “For this reason a commandment was written in the heavenly tablets for the one who gives birth to a child: if she gives birth to a male, she is to remain in her impurity for seven days like the first seven days; then for 33 days she is to remain in the blood of purification.

Sinai shapes historical events. Thus, Adam and Eve were created in accordance with the law declaring a parturient woman to be unclean; the Flood is associated with the law forbidding the consumption of blood; and Dinah died before her time because of the law making marriage between a Jewish woman and a non-Jew punishable by death. The laws, as well as the punishments meted out to their violators, mold historical events, which were predetermined by God before Creation. In *Jubilees* history—*te'udah*—possesses a halakhic dimension, Torah. Furthermore, for *Jubilees*, the belief that history obeys the laws of the Torah is a corollary of the idea that an observer of history will be able to learn the laws of the Torah and their proper interpretation.

In contrast to the emphasis on *Logos*, the order of Creation, and on the laws of nature and ethics in Jewish philosophy, *Jubilees* stresses the course of history and ritual law. Whoever observes the course of Jewish history and the history of other peoples will learn the laws and their interpretation. The emphasis in *Jubilees* is on God's function in history and the biblical laws of purity, tithes, and festivals. Was the book written as an answer to Jewish philosophical literature?² With due caution, I would like to argue that it was.¹⁰³ This becomes evident from comparison of its Creation story to what is related in Hellenistic Jewish literature.¹⁰⁴ *Jubilees* stresses that the world was created not by speech but by action.¹⁰⁵ Though in Genesis 1 speech and action appear together ("Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided

She is not to touch any sacred thing nor to enter the sanctuary until she completes these days for a male. As for a female she is to remain in her impurity for two weeks of days like the first two weeks and 66 days in the blood of purification. Their total is 80 days" (*Jub.* 3:10–11).

¹⁰³ Despite his equation of 'Wisdom' and 'Torah', Ben Sira should not be seen as an anti-philosophy polemic. Collins notes that Ben Sira emphasizes Wisdom but ignores the implications of its identification with Torah (Collins, *Wisdom*, 58–61). According to Schnabel, 'Torah' stands at the center of Ben Sira's thinking and although identifying it with 'Wisdom,' Ben Sira is not aware of the latter concept's complexity. See Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom*, 69–92. Notwithstanding the discrepancy between Schnabel's and Collins' views, they both agree that an anti-philosophical bent is absent from Ben Sira.

¹⁰⁴ In examining the creation story in *Jubilees*, VanderKam cites Hengel's adaptation of Bickerman's assertion that the Hellenizers in the Hasmonean era were philosophers who sought to purify Judaism from wrong opinions and from a mythic conception of God; J. C. VanderKam, "Genesis 1 in *Jubilees* 2," *DSD* 1 (1994): 319–21. This notion was, however, refuted much earlier by M. Stern, "M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*," *Kürjath Sepher* 46 (1970–71): 94–99 (98–9) (Hebrew).

¹⁰⁵ See O. H. Steck, "Die Aufnahme von Genesis 1 in Jubiläen 2 und 4 Esra 6," *JStJ* 8 (1977): 156–9.

the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so" [Gen 1:6–7; 1917 JPS]), the expression "And God said..." does not appear in the Creation story in *Jubilees* 2, which stresses only action ("On the second day he made a firmament between the waters, and the waters were divided on that day. Half of them went up above and half of them went down below the firmament (which was) in the middle above the surface of the whole earth" [2:4]).¹⁰⁶ An obvious effort is made to reject the idea that it was God's "Word," and not his "Hands" that operated.

The anti-philosophical polemic can also be observed in the treatment of the number seven. This number is central both to the biblical Creation account and to the description of nature in Hellenistic Jewish philosophy. Aristobulus sings the praises of the number seven,¹⁰⁷ which is active both in divine (the universe) and in human matters (human nature). The seventh day is the day of rest because the number seven is that light in which everything is correctly perceived and apprehended.¹⁰⁸ The number seven is also of paramount importance in Philo's thought,¹⁰⁹ and his *De opificio mundi* provides a detailed list of its virtues and recounts its revelation in the universe and in man (89–128).¹¹⁰

In *Jubilees*, the number seven also appears in the seven things created on the first day: "For on the first day he created the [1] heavens that are above, [2] the earth, [3] the waters, and [4] all of the spirits who serve before him.... [5] [There were also] the depths, [6] darkness and [7] and light, dawn and evening which he prepared through the knowledge of his mind" (2:2). Although all of these things appear in the biblical account of the first day, *Jubilees* seems to depart from the

¹⁰⁶ Because Gen 1:9 states that "God said" without following what He said with an action ("God said, 'Let the water below the sky be gathered into one area, that the dry land may appear.' And it was so."), *Jubilees* also mentions that God says: "On the third day he did as he said to the waters that they should pass from the surface of the whole earth to one place and that the dry land should appear. The waters did so, as he told them" (*Jub.* 2:5–6).

¹⁰⁷ A. Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (JSJSup 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996), 94–7.

¹⁰⁸ Holladay, *Fragments*, 3:176–8.

¹⁰⁹ Yarbro-Collins, *Cosmology*, 97–9.

¹¹⁰ See also *De decalogo* 20–31, 102–5, where Philo molds these numbers to the biblical laws. Seven also has a prominent place in the Jewish prayers that were preserved in the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*. See D. A. Fiensy, *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum* (Brown Judaic Studies 65. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985), 76–8, 232.

plain meaning of the Bible. The pre-Creation situation as described in Gen 1:2 (“the earth being unformed and void, with darkness over the surface of the deep and the spirit of God sweeping over the water”) is counted among the things created (darkness, abysses [= the deep], spirit, water). A deliberate effort is being made to arrive at the number seven, perhaps in reaction to Hellenistic Jewish interpretation (indeed, the same list is found in Philo’s *De opificio mundi* 27–29). But in *Jubilees* the emphasis is not on the number seven, but on twenty-two, which operates in history, not in nature. Twenty-two “kinds of works” were made from the first day to Sabbath eve, and twenty-two generations will pass from Adam to Jacob, the patriarch of the nation who will observe the Sabbath day. At this point, indeed, the text proclaims: “this is the first *te’udah* and Torah” (2:24). This is the first demonstration of how the Torah—the Sabbath—operates in the *te’udah*—the march of history.

Tentative Conclusions

Though not a Hellenistic Jewish work, the book of *Jubilees* is undoubtedly a product of the Hellenistic world.¹¹¹ The text was aware of and responded to trends of thought present in Hellenistic Jewish literature. If this assessment is correct, what more general conclusions can then be proposed? Were the Jews of the land of Israel familiar with Hellenistic Jewish literature, and if so, was this because such literature was written there, or because of the close ties between the land of Israel and Alexandria? As mentioned in the opening, scholars have noted the existence of active Hellenism in the Hasmonean court toward the late second century B.C.E. This may have promoted the creation of Hellenistic Jewish literature in the land of Israel itself, and perhaps Eupolemus testifies to such a trend.¹¹² Thus it is plausible that *Jubilees*, written c. 100 B.C.E., was acquainted with the Hellenistic world and with Hellenistic Jewish literature from the land of Israel itself.

¹¹¹ I dealt with this subject as well in my paper “The Concept of Holiness and the Requirements of Purity in Second Temple and Tannaic Literature,” in *Purity and Holiness* (ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz; Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 2; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 163–79.

¹¹² As mentioned (n. 64) Stern exiled him to Egypt or Cyprus; Hengel argues that he wrote in the land of Israel.

Nevertheless, it is possible to continue to adhere to the conservative view, which questions the existence of such strong Hellenistic influence in the land of Israel. But if so, it could still tentatively be argued that the circles among which *Jubilees* was written were singularly influenced by Hellenistic culture. Perhaps the Essenes (in my opinion, *Jubilees* was written within circles very close to the Qumran sect) originated in Egypt,¹¹³ in reaction to certain trends common among Hellenistic Jewry. Perhaps the Therapeutae (“healers”) of whom Philo speaks so enthusiastically, noting their diligent preoccupation, night and day, with allegorical interpretation of the Torah and with the study of the laws of nature and the ethical laws that follow from them, were the forerunners of the Essenes (whose name indicates some association with medicine), who were concerned night and day with deriving the Torah from the *te’udah*, and inferring laws from history.

¹¹³ On the similarity between the Qumran community’s rules and Egyptian Hellenism, see M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986). Schwartz (*Jewish Background*, 19–24) points to the similarity between the tendencies found in Qumran writings and between those found in Hellenistic Jewish literature. See also M. Hengel, *The “Hellenization” of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London: SCM, 1989), 47–8; idem, “Qumran und der Hellenismus,” *Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978), 333–72. On the deliberate avoidance of Greek words (which testifies to clear acquaintance with them) see Wasserstein, “Non-Hellenized Jews,” 119–20.

“GATHER THE DISPERSED OF JUDAH:”
SEEKING A RETURN TO THE LAND AS A FACTOR
IN JEWISH IDENTITY OF LATE ANTIQUITY

Esther G. Chazon
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The question of how the identity of Diaspora Jews compares with that of their brethren living in the Land of Israel continues to intrigue and challenge scholars of late antiquity. It is a topic that I believe is of personal and academic interest to our honoree, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, whose collegiality and friendship I now enjoy on a regular basis in Jerusalem, where she has made her home since her retirement from the faculty of Vassar College. With this in mind, I have chosen to devote this study to an aspect of the question of Jewish identity that relates to the subject of her monograph on *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1994).

A telling point of comparison between the identity of Palestinian and Diaspora Jews during the Second Temple period is their respective attitudes to the exile from the Land and the Diaspora phenomenon. In *Land, Center and Diaspora*, Isaiah Gafni has shown that the negative “biblical perception” of the Diaspora as divine punishment for Israel’s sins is typical of “Jewish works of the Second Temple period that were written in Judaea and primarily in the Hebrew language, and which project a sense of continuity with biblical tradition.”¹ *Sirach* 48:15, *Jubilees* 1:9–13, *Judith* 5:18, and *Ps. Sol.* 9:1 are among the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical texts that he cites in this regard. While he also finds this view in some Diaspora books (*Tob* 3:4 and *Syb. Or.* 3.267–76) Gafni uncovers a tendency of authors living abroad to put the dispersion in a more positive light. This is accomplished, for example, by presenting contemporary Diaspora communities as voluntarily populated colonies (*Septuagint*, Philo *Vit. Mos.* 2.232² and Hecataeus of Abdera according to

¹ Isaiah M. Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity* (JSPS 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 24. Gafni shows that this is also the dominant rabbinic view.

² Another Philonic strategy noted by Gafni (*Land*, 28–29) that is relevant to the discussion below is Philo’s allegorical interpretation of the promised return to the Land

Josephus, *Ap.* 1.186–87) or by pointing out the benefits that Jews living abroad bring to local culture (Artapanus) and to universal recognition of Israel's God (*Tob* 13:3, 11).³

The situation of the Qumran community presents an interesting case for the study of identity as Noah Hacham recently demonstrated in his paper on “Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenistic Judaism.”⁴ On the one hand, Qumran is located in Judaea as probably were many if not all of the sect's satellite communities.⁵ On the other, this sect calls its location a “house of exile” (1QpHab 11:6) and defines itself as an exilic group “who departed from the land of Judah” (CD 4:2–3, 6:3–4//4QD^a 2 iii 20, 3 ii 11–12//4QD^b 2 11–12). Significantly, this group understands its exile as self-imposed and prompted by its steadfast desire to observe the Law and remain untainted by sinners and the impure Jerusalem Temple. Two of the many statements that exemplify this self-image are the *Community Rule's* requirement, supported by Isa. 40:3, that “they shall be separated from the dwelling-place of the men of injustice, to go to the wilderness to prepare there the way of the Lord//Truth” (1QS 8:13–16//4QS^c III 3–6) and the *Damascus Document's* injunction, based on Mal 1:10, to be a “‘locker of the (Temple) door’ . . . and to separate themselves from the sons of iniquity,” which immediately follows the exilic description cited above (CD 6:3–7:1).⁶ It is in Hellenistic sources that Hacham finds a

(Deut. 30:4) as a spiritual restoration to wisdom and virtue that still allows for Israel's physical ingathering (*Praem Pen.* 115–117, cf. *Spec. Leg.* 4.178 and *Somm.* 2.250).

³ For a comparison with “dispersion as a universal mission” in rabbinic texts see Gafni, *Land*, 35–40.

⁴ The paper will be published in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, January 2005* (ed. Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, and Ruth Clements; STDJ series; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

⁵ Satellite communities are envisioned in the “camps” discussed in the *Damascus Document* (e.g., CD 7:6; 14:3, 9, 19:2), and probably also by the *Community Rule's* requirement of a fifteen-member quorum (1QS 8:1, cf. 6:3–7). For the non-literal meaning of ‘Damascus’ in the *Damascus Document* see the next note.

⁶ These passages are usually understood as referring to an actual move to the Judean wilderness with the *Damascus Document* speaking metaphorically about the penitents who departed from the land of Judah (i.e., the area of Jerusalem) and dwell in the land of Damascus. Note the Damascus metaphor in the *pesher* on Amos 5:26–27 in CD 7:14–18 and see especially Michael A. Knibb, “Exile in the Damascus Document,” *JSTOT* 25 (1983): 99–117. I have quoted Joseph Baumgarten's translation of the parallel text in 4QD^a from *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (ed. Donald W. Parry, & Emanuel Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 1:85, 89 and I basically follow the translation of 4QS^c by Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, 1.65. On the “wilderness” passage in the *Community Rule*, see George J. Brooke, “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness

similar approach to exile as a voluntary migration by righteous Jews for a higher religious purpose citing, for example, Josephus' accounts of the high priest Onias' move to Egypt and building of the Heliopolis temple to maintain the cult after Antiochus Epiphanes sacked the Jerusalem Temple (*War* 1.32–33, 7:423–425; *Ant.* 13:62–73). Accordingly, Hacham considers this posture a Diaspora trait and sees it as one of several components of Diaspora identity shared by Jews living abroad and the Qumran sect.

The Qumran sect, in Hacham's assessment, basically had a Diaspora identity but, one that differed in certain respects from that of Hellenistic Jews. One of these differences is the sect's "desire to return to Jerusalem and the Temple" as contrasted with Diaspora Jewry's lack of "a strong desire to return to the (Jerusalem) Temple or even to the Land."⁷ On this issue, then, we should expect the Qumran library, both the sectarian documents and the imported non-sectarian scrolls, to tally with other literature produced by Palestinian Jews in the Land of Israel.

The hope for a return to the Land finds a concrete expression in petitions for the ingathering of the Diaspora. In this article, I will examine these petitions as they occur in the now fully published Qumran corpus and, by putting them in the broader literary and historical context, explore their potential as a measure of Palestinian Jewish identity over against Diaspora identity.

The Festival Prayers (1Q34–34^{bis}, 4Q507–4Q509)

The Festival Prayers from Qumran include a petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora in what is almost certainly the liturgy for the New Year

Community," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies, Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. George J. Brooke with Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 117–32; contrast Devorah Dimant's metaphoric reading of "wilderness" in that passage in "Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Peshet of Isa. 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community*," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 21–36 (Hebrew).

⁷ Noah Hacham, "Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenistic Judaism" (paper presented at the 10th Annual Orion Center International Symposium, January 9–11, 2005), transcript pgs. 21–22. Hacham suggests that this difference might have arisen from the two different historical circumstances: the Qumran sect desired, but could not participate in, the Jerusalem Temple whereas Diaspora Jews could visit, but did not really want to live in Jerusalem. Another explanation for this non-Diasporan aspect of the sect's identity lies in Hacham's observation that "not every Diaspora attribute is adopted by everyone who has a Diaspora identity." On this point see also the conclusion below.

(*Rosh Hashana*); the title of the “Prayer for the Day of Atonement” comes just three lines thereafter (1Q34^{bis} 1+2 2-6//4Q509 3 2-8). The other extant title (in 4Q509 131-132 ii 5) is for the feast of the First Fruits (*Bikkurim*, also known as *Shavuot*, the Feast of Weeks) and it confirms that this text is a liturgical collection for the annual biblical holidays. Each prayer in the collection contains historical reminiscences and communal petitions that are connected with the special aspects of the festival (for example, on the Day of Atonement, “Remember, Lord, the set time of your mercies and the time of turning from your anger [...] and you fixed it for us, a set time of fasting, [as] an eternal custom”).⁸ The observation that the year, according to this annual festival liturgy, begins with the autumnal month of *Tishri* rather than with the spring month of *Nisan*, the first month in the sectarian calendar as well as in biblical sources, has been the decisive factor in determining this liturgy’s non-sectarian origin.⁹ Whereas the Qumran community championed the sectarian solar calendar in its own writings, it also imported and preserved works that deviate from that calendar¹⁰ and these, like the Festival Prayers, are thought to be non-sectarian in origin.

The Festival Prayers thus evidently locate the petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora both in an original non-sectarian milieu and in the later context of Qumranic secondary use that is attested by the multiple Qumran manuscripts copied over the course of a century.¹¹ The overlap between three of the four manuscripts in the relevant passage produces a reasonably complete text. The Hebrew text in

⁸ The translation is by Elisha Qimron, “Prayers for the Festivals from Qumran: Reconstruction and Philological Observations,” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. Van Peursen; OLA 118; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 383-93.

⁹ Carol A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (ed. William H. Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-87, especially 177-78.

¹⁰ See Uwe Glessmer, “Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. Vanderkam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1.213-78.

¹¹ 4Q509 is dated to the late Hasmonean period, 70-60 B.C.E., 4Q508 to the Herodian period, and 4Q507 to the early first century C.E. See Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 175, 177, 184. For 1Q34-34^{bis} see D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 136, 152-55 and John C. Trever, “Completion of the Publication of some Fragments from Qumran Cave I,” *RQ* 5 (1965): 323-45.

4Q509 3 is quoted below from two major editions, DJD 7 and then Elisha Qimron's recent reconstruction; the overlap with 1Q34^{bis} 2+1 is indicated by underlining.

] חַה מוֹעֵד שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ]
] זכר חַה מוֹעֵד שְׁלוֹמֵנוּ]
	כִּיא תִשְׁמַחֲנוּ מִיָּנוּגְנוּ וְאַסְפְּתוּן נִדְחֵינוּ לַמוֹעֵד
	כִּיא תִשְׁמַחֲנוּ מִיָּנוּגְנוּ וְאַסְפְּתוּן נִדְחֵינוּ לַמוֹעֵד
] וְנִפְצוּתֵינוּ יָנוּ {לְתַקְוַת} תְּקִיבִין לְתַקְוַת
] וְנִפְצוּתֵינוּ לְתַקְוַת שְׁנָה

You shall/May you [remember] the appointed time of our peace
 [...for you will make] us [rejoice], removing our grief.
 You will/May you assemble [our banished ones for an appointed time
 of [...]
 and our dispersed ones for the season of [...you will/may you] ga[ther].¹²

Two extant words in parallel stichs, the verb וְאַסְפְּתָה and the noun וְנִפְצוּתֵינוּ, are sufficient to establish this line's literary dependence upon Isa. 11:12: וְנִשָּׂא נֹס לְגוֹיִם וְאַסְפֵּה נִדְחֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְנִפְצוּת יְהוּדָה יִקְבֵּץ מֵאַרְבַּע כְּנָפֹת הָאָרֶץ: "He will hold up a signal to the nations and assemble the banished of Israel, and gather the dispersed of Judah from the four

¹² Baillet, DJD 7, 185–87 and Qimron, "Prayers for the Festivals," 384. The single extant verb, וְאַסְפְּתָה could be taken as a perfect with consecutive *waw* denoting the past, as in Qimron's translation, or as a perfect with conversive *waw* denoting the future, as in Baillet's translation, which accords with his reading of תְּקִיבִין and his identification of the allusion to Isa. 11:12 in ll. 3–4. The future tense is to be favored in light of this allusion and comparison with the similar structure in the next festival prayer where a perfect with *waw* is followed by an imperfect form that expresses the worshippers' promise to praise God: וְנִתְחַה רְשָׁעִים [בְּאִפְרָנוּ וּבְ[וֹנֵי]דַיִם [תַּחֲתֵינוּ] כְּלָה כְּבָל מַעֲנֵינוּ וְאֵנוּ נוֹדָה לְשִׁמְךָ לְעוֹלָם: "You will make the wicked be our [ra]nsom...and we shall praise Your name forever," 1Q34^{bis} 3 I 5–7, see Qimron, "Prayers," 387 and the praise of God's wonders "from generation to generation" in our passage, 4Q509 3 7//1Q34^{bis} 2+1 4). The structure surmised here well suits the pattern of petitionary prayers that conclude with a promise to praise God (e.g., Pss 79, 106 and 4Q504 1–2 vi 15). Note also the opening petitionary formula, "Remember, Lord" in this festival liturgy and in the Words of the Luminaries. Several scholars already recognized a petition for ingathering here; see Lawrence Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (ed. Lee I. Levine; Philadelphia: ASOR, 1987), 42; Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden, Brill, 1994), 102, 106, 109; Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 208 (Falk renders the verbs in the past tense). My translation basically agrees with that of Nitzan; for the jussive see also Schiffman.

corners of the earth.” The formulation of the petition in this way in the Festival Prayers from Qumran is important both for the history of Jewish liturgy and for the issue of Jewish identity under discussion. It brings to light a common ancient liturgical tradition for reciting such petitions by serving as a link, in Hebrew, between similar petitions from the 2nd–1st centuries B.C.E. preserved mainly in Greek¹³ and those in the later Jewish liturgy.

A petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora occurs in several apocryphal prayers from this period with a Judean context. Our primary examples are in the supplications for national redemption in Sir. 36:13, *Ps.Sol.* 8:28 and the second epistle sent from Judaea at the beginning of 2 Maccabees (1:27, 2:18).¹⁴ Typically, these petitions are couched in language that recalls and may draw upon Isa. 11:12 but, there are a few other similarly worded verses that may have been used instead or in addition. In the texts quoted below, 2 Macc. 2:18 clearly alludes to Deut. 30:4 whereas Sir. 36:13 and plausibly 2 Macc. 1:27 seem to use Isa. 49:5–6, perhaps intertextually with Isa. 11:12.¹⁵

¹³ Note also the late biblical petition in Ps 106:47 and its parallel in 1Chr 16:35.

¹⁴ For the epistle’s Palestinian provenance see Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 157–67 and Daniel R. Schwartz, *The Second Book of Maccabees* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004), 78, 85–86 (Hebrew). Schwartz notes that the word ‘Diaspora’ occurs in 2 Maccabees only in 1:27 and that the epistle’s petition for an ingathering is in dissonance with the book’s religious message. See also Agneta Enermalm-Ogawa, *Un langage de prière juif en grec: Les témoignage des deux premiers livres des Maccabées* (CB NTS 17; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987), 75–76.

¹⁵ See also Ps. 147(146):2. For Deut. 30:4 see the discussion below on the Words of the Luminaries. Sir. 36:13 uses the expression “tribes of Jacob” (אֲסוּף כָּל שְׁבֵטֵי יַעֲקֹב) [the Hebrew is extant only in Geniza MS B]), which occurs in the Bible only in Isa. 49:6’s prophecy of return (לְהַקְיִים אֶת שְׁבֵטֵי יַעֲקֹב וּנְצוּרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לְהַשִּׁיב); note that the verb in 49:5a is “gather,” (אִסַּף). 2 Macc. 1:27’s connection with this Isaiah passage is suggested by the additional motif of the despised nation, which it shares with Isa. 49:7 (Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 179). The latter motif is not found in *Ps. Sol.* 8:28, whose petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora is almost identical to that in 2 Macc. 1:27a. The hymn of praise in Sir. 51:12 employs Isa. 56:8 as does the benediction for ingathering in the rabbinic “Eighteen Benedictions” (see below). Although this hymn may be a later addition to Ben Sira since it is not attested in the Greek or ancient Hebrew manuscripts, its thanksgiving for the election of the sons of Zadok as priests suggests an early date (ca. 2nd century B.C.E.; see Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* [AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987], 568–71). For the English translations, I have used the Anchor Bible editions, *Ben Sira* (*idem*, 413) and Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 155–56.

Sir 36:13	Gather all the tribes of Jacob, that they may inherit the land as in days of old.	Συνάγαγε πάσας φυλάς Ιακωβ
<i>Ps.Sol.</i> 8:28	Gather together the dispersed of Israel with mercy and kindness.	Συνάγαγε τὴν διασπορὰν Ἰσραηλ
2Macc. 1:27	Gather together our dispersion. Free those who are enslaved among the nations. Look upon those who have been despised and abominated, and let the nations know that You are our God.	Ἐπισυνάγαγε τὴν διασπορὰν ἡμῶν
2Macc. 2:18	For we hope in God, that He will speedily have mercy upon us and gather us together from the lands under the heavens to His holy Place.	Ἐπισυνάξει ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν

The apocryphal texts cited above have a double significance for our study. First, they indicate that the petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora is a component of Palestinian Jewish identity. Indeed, my preliminary survey has not yet uncovered any explicit *petitions* of this type in Diaspora works from the Second Temple period (see the discussion of Tobit and Baruch below). Second, Ben Sira, the second epistle in 2 Maccabees, and *Ps.Sol.* 8 reflect different Palestinian settings and provide a broad synchronic historical context outside of Qumran in which to view the Festival Prayers unearthed in Caves 1 and 4. This in turn allows us to speak more confidently about a common liturgical practice among some Jewish groups in Palestine during the Second Temple period as well as about a liturgical tradition extending down to the rabbinic petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora in the daily *Amidah* prayer (the “Eighteen Benedictions”) and in the special *Amidah* for holidays. In terms of liturgical practice, the Festival Prayers from Qumran may be seen as a forerunner of the holiday *Amidah*; however, the latter’s petition for ingathering is extant only in late sources dating from the Byzantine period on, and it is phrased differently, with only one word in its mosaic of biblical allusions recalling Isa. 11:12

(נפוצותינו).¹⁶ The closer linguistic parallel with our Second Temple sources occurs in the daily *Amidah*, for which we have Talmudic sources that attest the use of Isa. 11:12 in the body of this petition, the tenth of the “Eighteen Benedictions,” and Isa. 56:8 in its eulogy (cf. the hymn in Ben Sira. 51:12).¹⁷ For our study it is of considerable importance that this daily rabbinic liturgy ultimately derives from a Palestinian milieu in the period after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E.¹⁸ For the earliest evidence of a petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora in a daily liturgy we now turn to the second text from Qumran, the Words of the Luminaries.

¹⁶ וקרֵב פִּזּוּרֵינוּ מִבֵּין הַגּוֹיִם וְנִפְצוּתֵנוּ כִּסּ מִרְכַּתֵי אָרֶץ, “Bring near our scattered among the nations and assemble our dispersed from the ends of the earth.” The last two words clearly draw upon Jer. 31:8; see Ps. 147:2 for “assemble”/כִּסּ; Isa. 11:12 for “our dispersed”/נִפְצוּתֵנוּ; and Joel 4:2 for “our scattered”/פִּזּוּרֵנוּ. The wording of the petition is the same in the Palestinian and Babylonian rites but in the latter it is recited only during the Additional (*Musaf*) service (e.g., *Seder Rab Amram Ga'on* [ed. Daniel S. Goldschmidt; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1971], 126 [Hebrew]) whereas in the former it was recited at every service (see Ezra Fleischer, *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Geniza Documents* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988], 94–97, 156–59 [Hebrew]). In Schiffman’s assessment (“Early History,” 42), “The parallel to the festival *Musaf*... of later rabbinic tradition is so clear that it suggests the prayer for the restoration of the Diaspora to the Land of Israel recited on the festivals... may go back as early as the first century B.C.E.” Daniel K. Falk (*Daily*, 208–9) sees additional evidence in 2 Macc. 1:27 and Bar. 2:13–15 for the recitation of this petition on festivals during the Second Temple period.

¹⁷ Is. 11:12 clearly underlies the petition, וְנִפְצוּתֵנוּ מֵאַרְבַּע תְּקִבָּץ in the abbreviated *Amidah* (see note 40) recorded in *b. Ber.* 29a (Paris MS 671 + כִּנְפוּת); it is less evident in the parallel text given in *y. Ber.* 4:3, 8a: כִּי מִפְּזוּרֵי אֶרֶץ תְּקִבָּץ. In both the Palestinian and Babylonian prayer rites, the petition in the unabridged *Amidah* first cites Isa. 27:13, then Isa. 11:12, and finally, Is. 56:8 in the eulogy. Our earliest sources for this full text are the ninth-century Babylonian *Seder Rab Amram Gaon* (see note 16 above) and numerous manuscripts reflecting the Palestinian rite from the Cairo Genizah. See Solomon Schechter, “Geniza Specimens,” *JQR* [old series] 10 [1898]: 657; Yehezkel Luger, *The Weekday Amidah in the Cairo Genizah* [Jerusalem: Orhot, 2001], 114–18 [Hebrew]). As noted above, the eulogy formulated with Isa. 56:8 is already recorded in the Talmud (*y. Ber.* 2:4, 5a) and finds a close parallel in the hymn in Sir. 51:12, which may be a later addition to that apocryphal work also dating from the Second Temple period (see note 15).

¹⁸ The “Eighteen Benedictions” is attributed to Rabban Gamliel’s leadership at Yabneh (ca. 100 C.E.) in *b. Ber.* 28b; laws governing this liturgy’s recitation are laid down in *tannaitic* texts (e.g., *m. Ber.* 4:3, *t. Ber.* 3:25). See also note 40 below.

*The Words of the Luminaries (4Q504–506)*¹⁹

The Words of the Luminaries (דברי המאורות) is a weekly liturgy comprising six communal supplications for spiritual and physical deliverance, one for each regular weekday; these are followed by a special Sabbath hymn. The weekday prayers share a number of specific formal features in common with the Festival Prayers notably, the system of titling each prayer, the distinctive opening formula, “Remember, Lord,” the structure of historical recollections plus communal petition, and the identical concluding blessing formula. These point to a connection between the two liturgies at the compositional stage and suggest that their authors had access to the same liturgical tradition perhaps via the same channel of transmission and social setting.²⁰

In fact, the Words of the Luminaries surely was composed in a non-sectarian setting; its oldest manuscript (4Q504) predates the settlement at Qumran and the text lacks the sectarian terminology and ideas characteristic of the Qumran community’s own writings.²¹ Like the Festival Prayers, the Words of the Luminaries was copied and transmitted by the Qumran community over the course of two centuries. The reception of these two liturgies at Qumran is an important matter in its own right and will be considered after the discussion of the petitions for Diaspora Jewry in the wider non-sectarian context.

The Friday prayer in the Words of the Luminaries beseeches God to deliver His people from the lands of their dispersion. The table below illustrates how this petition purposely echoes the reworked quotation of Deut. 30:1–3 in the prayer’s historical prologue and has that biblical passage in mind (the biblical parallel is indicated by underlining).

¹⁹ The title is written on the back of the oldest manuscript, 4Q504, which is dated to ca. 150 B.C.E.; 4Q506 is dated to the first century C.E. 4Q505 might be part of the 4Q509 manuscript of the Festival Prayers rather than a third copy of the Words of the Luminaries. See F. García Martínez, “Maurice Baillet, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII. Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)*,” *JSS* 15 (1984): 157–64, especially 161–62 on 4Q505, and now Falk, *Daily*, 59–61.

²⁰ See also Falk, *Daily*, 61n11 and 156–57.

²¹ Esther G. Chazon, “Is *Divrei Ha-me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill), 3–17.

4Q504 1-2 vi 12-14 Friday Petition	4Q504 1-2 v 11-14 Friday Prologue	Deut. 30:1-3 Biblical Source
והצילה את עמכה ישראל Deliver <u>Your people,</u> Isra[el]	ותחון את עמכה ישראל <u>You were gracious to</u> <u>your people, Israel</u>	והשבת אל לבבך you will take them to heart
מכול הארצות הקרובות והרחוקות from all the lands, near and far,	בכול [ה]ארצות in all [the] lands	בכל הגוים amidst all the nations
אשר הדחתם שם. to which [You banished them.] ²²	אשר הדחתם שמה to which You ban- ished them, לחשיב אל לבכם לשוב עודך ולשמוע בקולכה [ככול אשר צויתה ביד מושה עבדכה so that they took it to heart to return to You, and to heed Your voice [just as] You commanded them through Moses Your servant. (You remembered Your covenant in that You took us out in the nations' sight and did not abandon us among the nations. v. 9-11)	אשר הדיחך ה' אלהיך שמה: to which the Lord your God has banished you: ושבת עד ה' אלהיך ושמעת בקלו ככל אשר אנכי מצוך היום: ושב ה' א' את שבותך ורחמך ושב וקבצך מכל העמים אשר הפיצך ה' אלהיך שמה: you will return to the Lord your God, and heed His voice...just as I com- mand you this day:then the Lord your God will return your captivity and have mercy on you. He will gather you together again from all the peoples where the Lord your God has scattered you. (JPS, JPSN)

²² 4Q504 1-2 vi 12-14. The prepositional prefix *mem*, “from,” is reconstructed here on the basis of the concluding benediction that uses the same verb (“who has delivered us from all distress,” vii 3) and the theme of return from exile found in the lines of the historical prologue that are echoed in this petition. The petition continues with another colon, כול הכתוב בספר החיים, “all those written in the book of life,” which evidently runs parallel to “Your people Israel”/ישראל and delineates the Israelites for whom deliverance is requested (cf. Isa. 4:3 for the concept and Dan. 12:2 for the syntax). See Esther G. Chazon, “A Liturgical Document from Qumran and its Implications: ‘Words of the Luminaries’ (4QDibHam)” (diss. Hebrew Univ., 1991), 292-94 (Hebrew).

By couching their petition in the language of the prologue's historical description of the repentance in (v 11–14) and return from the Babylonian exile (v 6–11), the worshippers provide motivation for a positive response to their request. The analogy with the prologue holds up a historical precedent of God's past mercy and deliverance from exile and, at the same time, also holds God to reactivating the covenant promises that he made in Deut. 30:1–3 and Lev. 26:44–45, which are quoted in those very lines.

The Friday prayer's liturgical use of the Deuteronomic covenant passage taps into a well-established liturgical tradition that stretches back to Solomon's prayer in 1 Kings 8:23–53. Several prayers from the Persian and Hellenistic periods justify their supplications for national deliverance by referring to the covenant promise in Deut. 30:1–5 that Israel will repent in exile and be granted divine mercy and a return from the lands to which it was banished. Two of these prayers, those in Neh. 1 and the Palestinian epistle of 2 Maccabees, actually turn this Deuteronomic promise into a petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora by means of a literary process similar to that attested in the Words of the Luminaries:

Be mindful of the promise You gave to Your servant Moses: 'If you are unfaithful, I will scatter you among the peoples (Deut. 30:3); but if you turn back to Me, faithfully keep My commandments (Deut. 30:2); even if your dispersed are at the ends of the heaven, I will gather them from there (Deut. 30:4), and will bring them (Deut. 30:5) to the place where I have chosen to establish My name. (Neh. 1:8–9, NJPS)

For we hope in God, that He will speedily have mercy upon us and gather us together from the lands under the heavens (Deut. 30:4) to His holy Place. (2Macc. 2:18, AB).

Two more prayers that appeal to Deut. 30:1–5 (1Kg. 8:47–50, Bar. 2:27–34) are essentially petitions for salvation *in* exile: "Grant them favor in the sight of their captors that they may be merciful to them (1Kg. 8:50); "deliver us for your own sake and grant us favor with our captors" (Bar. 2:14).²³ In assessing these two petitionary prayers and their bearing on the question of identity, we should also consider the unique case of the hymn in Tobit 13. The quotation of Deut. 30:1–3 in Tob. 13:5–6

²³ I have used the edition, translation and apparatus of scriptural references by Emanuel Tov, *The Book of Baruch* (SBLTT 8, Pseudepigrapha Series 6; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975). For a table of the parallels with Deut. 30 see Chazon, "Liturgical Document," 277–78.

expresses a belief in the future restoration and ingathering but, rather than requesting these, the hymn calls for praising God in the Diaspora and touts the missionary, educational and penitential benefits of such exilic praise (13:3–4, note the Deuteronomic language there, too).²⁴ This perspective is, in Gafni's assessment, typical of Diaspora Jewry²⁵ and, indeed, the Book of Tobit is thought to have been composed in the Diaspora. The provenance of the Book of Baruch is more vigorously debated. Like Tobit, Baruch is set in the Diaspora, calls for praise abroad (3:6–7) and holds up universal recognition of Israel's God as a goal (2:15). It too maintains a belief in the Deuteronomic promise of a future return to the Land (Bar. 2:27–35, cf. Tob. 13:5–6) but, like the exilic prayer in 1 Kg. 8:23–53, it petitions for deliverance *in* captivity and specifically for finding favor with Israel's captors. Baruch's message is submission to foreign rule, and to suit this purpose its allusions to Deut. 30:1–5 are layered over with more numerous quotations from Jeremiah, including that prophet's dictum to serve the Babylonian king (e.g., Jer. 27:9–12, 8:1–2+36:30 in Bar. 2:21–25; both Deut. 30:1–5 and Jer. 24:7, 32:38–40 in Bar. 2:27–35).²⁶ This message of appeasement would well suit a Diaspora attitude and setting but a number of scholars read it as an anti-Hasmonean polemic by a Palestinian party that advocates loyalty to the Seleucid overlords.²⁷

In any event, what emerges from the liturgical use of Deut. 30:1–5 is that the prayers in 1Kg. 8, Bar. 1:15–3:8 and Tob. 3, 13 contrast with the transformation of that Deuteronomic promise into a petition for ingathering in the decidedly Palestinian prayers in Neh. 1, the second epistle of 2 Maccabees, and the Words of the Luminaries. Thus, the

²⁴ In his fine study of this hymn, Steven Weitzman ("Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit," *JBL* 115 [1996], 49–61) argues that its use of Deut. 31–32 drives home the message that the "sojourn is almost over."

²⁵ Gafni, *Land*, 35. Tobit is one of several Diaspora works that takes the more typically Palestinian view of exile as punishment for Israel's sins (*idem*, 24; see Tob. 3:4 and 13:2, 5, where exile is interpreted as an educational scourge). Bar. 1:15–3:8 also exhibits this negative view of exile; for the provenance of Baruch see below.

²⁶ See Rodney A. Werline, *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (SBLEJL 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 93–94, 97–99. Tov (*Baruch*, 14–27) lists many more allusions to Jeremiah but none to Deut. 30; he does have, however, have the covenant curses of Deut. 28–29 in view.

²⁷ For the latter view see Werline, *Penitential Prayer*, 87–88, 106–7 and the sources cited there. A plausible argument for the prayer's Diaspora origin is given by Doron Mendels, "Baruch, Book of," *ABD* (ed. David Noel Freedman; Doubleday: New York, 1992), 1.617–20.

non-sectarian weekly liturgy of the Words of the Luminaries and the non-sectarian Festival Prayers, both on their own and in their larger historical context, indicate that the petition for ingathering is a trait of Palestinian Jewish identity and perhaps one which may help distinguish Palestinian from Diasporic identity.

*The Prayer Concerning King Jonathan in 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer (4Q448)*²⁸

Whereas the Words of the Luminaries and the Festival Prayers share a common liturgical tradition and appear to come from the same milieu, the prayer concerning King Jonathan in 4Q448 presents us with a different perspective on praying for Diaspora Jewry. There is a broad scholarly consensus on the identity of King Jonathan with Alexander Jannaeus and the dating of this text to his reign,²⁹ that is, generations after the composition of the Words of the Luminaries and plausibly later than the Festival Prayers as well. However, the question of whether the first line of this prayer petitions God to “rise up for” or “rise up against” King Jonathan/Janneus is still hotly debated. Scholars on both sides of the debate concur that the next verse is spoken on behalf of Diaspora Jewry: the first group reads the opening verb, “rise up for/guard,” as also governing “and all the congregation of Your people Israel who are in the four winds of heaven;”³⁰ the second group links this nominal clause solely with the subsequent words, “let them all be at peace.”³¹

²⁸ This prayer is more commonly known by the title, “A Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan,” which the editors used in their preliminary publication: Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni, “Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and his Kingdom,” *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229. The official publication by the same editors is “448.4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer,” in *Qumran Cave 4 VI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (ed. Esther Eshel et al.; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 403–25. On the controversy over whether this is a prayer for or against King Jonathan see below.

²⁹ See the paleographical dating of the manuscript and the historical discussion in DJD 11, 404–5 and 410–15.

³⁰ DJD 11, 421; David Flusser, “Some Notes about the Prayer for the King Jonathan,” *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 297–300 (Hebrew); Elisha Qimron, “Concerning the Blessing over King Jonathan,” *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 565–67 (Hebrew); Menahem Kister, “Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 280–90 (the relevant discussion is on page 289); cf. Philip S. Alexander, “A Note on the Syntax of 4Q448,” *ibid.*, 301–2.

³¹ John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, “Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 491–99 (the relevant discussion is on page 498), and Emmanuelle

Clearly, we have here a petition for the security of Diaspora Jewry, figuratively described as “in the four winds of heaven.” As the editors and subsequent exegetes of this text have noticed, the prayer alludes to Zech. 2:10, the only biblical passage that applies this expression to Israel: “Away, away! Flee from the land of the north—says the Lord—though I swept you [there] like the four winds of heaven”³² (cf. Zech. 6:5, Dan. 8:8 and 11:14, regarding the nations’ dispersal). The verse itself and its prophetic context (Zech. 2:5–17) envision the return to an ideal Zion, and this might give us pause to ponder whether our prayer alludes to that larger context and implicitly requests the ingathering of the dispersed people. In a somewhat similar vein, David Flusser observed that here “an echo of the hope for an ingathering of the exiles is heard but indirectly.”³³

Flusser drew attention to the use of the same image of “the four winds of heaven” in two early Christian formulations of the hope for an ingathering, one in Mark 13:27 and the other in *Did.* 10:3. Significantly, the latter is a petition voiced in a liturgical context namely, the grace after the meal in the Eucharist service: “Remember, Lord, thy Church (*ecclesia*, congregation) . . . and gather it together in its holiness from the four winds to thy kingdom.”³⁴ It seems to me that these early Christian texts may well point to still another ancient version of the petition for the ingathering of dispersed Israel, this one formulated with the language of Zech. 2:10. Yet, they also contrast with and serve to highlight our prayer’s choice of words: “in” rather than “from” the four winds and “guard” or “let peace be upon them” rather than “gather” them.³⁵

Main, “For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May 1996* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 113–35.

³² DJD 11, 422 and Main, “For King Jonathan or Against,” 115–18, both of whom note that our prayer is even more similar to the biblical variants that read **בְּאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם**, in the four winds of heaven.” For the biblical text, I have used JPSN.

³³ Flusser, “Some Notes,” 299. Compare Main, “For King Jonathan or Against,” 124, on the appellation “*kahal*, assembly” as expressing “all the assembly of your people, Israel, O God, scattered in the four winds of heaven, is looking forward to its gathering in your Kingdom.”

³⁴ *Didache* in *The Apostolic Fathers* (trans. Kirsopp Lake; LCL 24; Harvard University: Cambridge, MA; 1977), 1.322–25.

³⁵ For the possibility that 4Q448 used a version of Zech. 2:10 that read **בְּאַרְבַּע רוּחוֹת הַשָּׁמַיִם** “in the four winds of heaven” see note 32 above. The contrast with a request for ‘gathering from the four winds’ would still hold (see LXX Zech. 2:10).

Surely had he wanted to, the author of the prayer concerning King Jonathan would have known how to turn Zechariah's prophecy into a petition for ingathering.³⁶ The plain sense of our text, then, seems to be a request for the security of Jews abroad, in the far-flung lands of the Diaspora. This request is coupled here with one for the welfare of the Jews in the Land under King Jonathan, whether God's protection or trouncing of that Hasmonean king is sought. This prayer does appear to stop short of petitioning for an ingathering of Diaspora Jewry to the Land of Israel. One way to understand this phenomenon, which runs counter to our other data from Qumran, is to take up Flusser's suggestion that our prayer, whose *realpolitik* approach is clear from its opening reference to King Jonathan, deals with "the existing situation rather than with the ideal situation."³⁷ Political savvy may well be in evidence here. Although this prayer's sense of responsibility toward Diaspora Jews may be compared, as Flusser does, to that of the epistle to 2 Maccabees, their respective positions on the Diaspora phenomenon differ, with 2 Macc. 1:27, 2:18 representing the more typical Palestinian stance of proactively petitioning for an ingathering.

To date, the case of the prayer concerning King Jonathan is exceptional in the contemporary Palestinian milieu at large as well as for Qumran. It points to some dialectic even within the Qumran community and to a surprisingly high threshold there for two different types of petitions on behalf of Diaspora Jews, one acting for their return and the other supporting their existence abroad. The non-sectarian origin of all three of these petitions suggests that the return of the Jews living abroad was not a burning issue for the Qumran Community and this, in turn, could account for the Community's relatively non-dogmatic reception of the different prayers. At the same time, these three "new" additions to our pool of petitions from Judaea on behalf of Diaspora Jewry enrich our picture of Palestinian Jewish identity in a way that calls for a refinement of our models and methods.

³⁶ This was precisely the process followed for turning the prophecy of Isa. 11:12 into a petition for ingathering in the Festival Prayers from Qumran and other contemporary prayers.

³⁷ Flusser, "Some Notes," 299.

Conclusion

I have isolated two *explicit* petitions for the ingathering of the Diaspora in the Qumran corpus, both in non-sectarian liturgies: one in the annual Festival Prayers and the other in the weekly liturgy of the Words of the Luminaries. These prayers were placed in the wider historical context by tracking similarly worded petitions in Second Temple period works of different genres and social locations: Sir. 36:13, 2 Macc. 1:27, Ps. Sol. 8:28 for the Is. 11:12 formula; Neh. 1:8–9 and 2 Macc. 2:18 for a petition using Deut. 30:1–5. Continuity in both liturgical function and formula with the comparable petition in the rabbinic *Amidah* prayer was also demonstrated. This comparative study suggests that the Qumran liturgical pool basically mirrors the situation in the contemporary Palestinian literature.

The results indicate a tendency toward petitioning for the ingathering of the exiles in numerous Palestinian prayers but not in prayers from the Diaspora. In general, then, this petition can be seen as a feature of Palestinian rather than of Diaspora Jewish identity, and Palestinian rather than Diaspora Jewry would appear to have had a special, vested interest in operatively petitioning for the return of all Jews to the Land of Israel. I would stress that the tendency isolated here is only a *general* trend; indeed, some exceptions have already been detected: the petition for the security of Jews abroad in 4Q448 and in Bar 2:14 *if* Baruch is of Palestinian origin.³⁸ Therefore, methodologically, I would caution against taking this petition as a sole criterion for determining Palestinian over against Diaspora identity and recommend weighing it with other features.³⁹ In principle, I advocate a flexible approach to our models of identity that takes a constellation of features into account and allows for the predilections of individual authors, special groups, particular social locations, and the impact of historical shifts. Clearly, the place of the petition for ingathering within the complex make-up of Jewish identity changed permanently when this petition was institutionalized as part of the statutory liturgy recited by Jews in the Diaspora as well as in Palestine from the second century C.E. until

³⁸ We should also take into account other contemporary Palestinian works such as the Book of Judith, whose prayers lack a petition for the welfare or ingathering of Diaspora Jews.

³⁹ The attitude to a return to the Land is only one of the five components of identity discussed by Hacham in "Exile and Self-Identity." He hints at more parts in the "mosaic" of identity. See also note 7 above.

the modern era.⁴⁰ With the foregoing methodological constraints and caveats in mind, expanding the study of the petition for the ingathering of the Diaspora beyond the Dead Sea Scrolls and the comparative literature examined in this article is a worthwhile endeavor for future research on the contours of Jewish identity.

⁴⁰ The obligation to recite the ‘Eighteen Benedictions’ daily is attributed to Rabban Gamliel in *m. Ber.* 4:1; he is accredited with establishing the text of this prayer at Yabneh (ca. 100 C.E.) in *b. Ber.* 28a, *b. Meg.* 17b. This innovation is generally understood as a substitute for sacrifice following the Temple’s destruction in 70 C.E. (note this prayer’s coordination with the times of sacrifice in *t. Ber.* 3:1; *y. Ber.* 4:1,7b and *b. Ber.* 26b). The earliest recorded text is that of the abbreviated version quoted in the name of Samuel (early 3rd century C.E.; *b. Ber.* 29a, *y. Ber.* 4:3, 8a). In the modern period, the petition for the ingathering to the Land was anathema to the nascent Reform movement and to this day most Reform congregations outside of Israel recite in its stead a petition for liberty “in the four corners of the earth.” See Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (trans. Raymond P. Scheindlin; Philadelphia: New York, 1993; German, 1913/Hebrew 1972), 302–32 and *Gates of Prayer for Weekdays: A Gender Sensitive Prayerbook* (ed. Chaim Stern; New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1993), 27.

SECTARIAN CONSCIOUSNESS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

John J. Collins
Yale University

The terms “sect” and “sectarian” admit of various nuances and are used in various ways not only by biblical scholars and historians of religion but also by sociologists.¹ There is broad agreement, however, that a sect is a group that has separated to some degree from a parent body, and has boundary markers to indicate its separate identity.² Recent studies of sectarianism often posit a continuum in the degree of separation, or alienation.³ The break may be more or less decisive, and the separation more or less extreme. Consequently, whether a particular group is sectarian or not is a matter of where one draws the line. In the context of ancient Judaism, the Dead Sea Scrolls are often thought to provide a paradigm example of sectarianism in an extreme form. The Community Rule and Damascus Document, both of which are found in multiple copies in the Scrolls, describe a community (or communities) in tension with the larger entity of Israel, from which it has separated. There are clear boundary markers, indicated especially in the elaborate admission process in the Community Rule, and claims of unique legitimacy for the group in question. The use of the term “sect” with reference to this group has not been very controversial,

¹ For a helpful overview, see J. M. Jokiranta, “‘Sectarianism’ of the Qumran ‘Sect’: Sociological Notes,” *RevQ* 20 (2001): 223–40. Among many recent treatments, see B. R. Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium. A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples* (London: Heinemann, 1973); idem, *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990); R. Stark and W. S. Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion. Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985); R. Wallis, ed., *Sectarianism. Analyses of Religious and Non-Religious Sects* (London: Owen, 1975); L. L. Dawson, “Creating ‘Cult’ Typologies: Some Strategic Considerations,” *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 12 (1997): 363–81.

² Compare the definition offered by Al Baumgarten: “a voluntary association of protest, which utilizes boundary marking mechanisms—the social means of differentiating between insiders and outsiders—to distinguish between its own members and those otherwise normally regarded as belonging to the same national or religious entity” (*The Flowering of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* [Leiden: Brill, 1997]), 7.

³ Jokiranta, “Sectarianism,” 226–31.

because of its clear separation “from the majority of the people,” in the phrase of 4QMMT.

When we attempt to categorize the literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, the use of the adjective “sectarian” becomes more problematic. In an influential, pioneering, article, Carol Newsom proposed “at least three different things that one might mean by referring to a scroll as sectarian.”⁴ The first, and most common, was that “it had been written by a member of the Qumran community.” A second possibility was that it was used by the Qumran community, regardless of its origin; that it was adopted, so to speak. Finally, the term sectarian might refer to “a rhetorical stance.” The latter category would apply to texts “that speak specifically of the unique structures of the community and the history of its separation from a larger community, and/or that develop its distinctive tenets in a self-consciously polemical fashion.” This last category might not include everything written by members of a sectarian community, only that which is “sectually explicit.”

Throughout this discussion, Newsom was tacitly assuming that “sectarian,” in the context of the Dead Sea Scrolls, implies a relation to “the Qumran community.” This assumption is problematic in several respects. First, the community described in the Scrolls was surely not the only sectarian group in ancient Judaism. Even within the corpus of the Scrolls, it is quite conceivable that some literature derived from a different sect. Moreover, in the time since Newsom wrote her article, the notion of “the Qumran community” has become more problematic. The term *yahad*, which has often been taken as a technical name for that community in the Community Rule, does not refer to a single settlement such as the one at Qumran but is an umbrella term for a network of smaller groups of ten or more members.⁵ Further, the relation between the *yahad* and “the new covenant in the land of Damascus,” described in the Damascus Document, remains controversial.⁶

⁴ C. A. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87. The quotation is from pp. 172–73.

⁵ J. J. Collins, “Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman and W. W. Fields (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97–111.

⁶ C. Hempel, “Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 67–92.

There was evidently some relationship between them, as can be seen from the presence of the 4QD manuscripts at Qumran and from the overlaps between these manuscripts and the copies of the Community Rule from Cave 4.⁷ But if the Damascus Rule and the Community Rule are taken to represent variant forms of the same movement or sect, then this movement must have been somewhat diverse, embracing some people who married and had children, as well as “the men of perfect holiness” who withdrew to the wilderness to walk in perfection of the way. The latter were evidently separated more sharply from the parent society than were their married brethren.

Newsom’s study was seminal insofar as she called for a distinction between texts that can be clearly attributed to the *yahad* and those that can not. Some texts, such as those that refer to the Teacher, can be attributed to the *yahad* with confidence. There remains, however, a huge grey area of texts that seem compatible with the sectarian movement, in some of its forms, but lack unambiguous indicators. Perhaps Newsom’s most interesting contribution was to direct the discussion away from the question of authorship, which is often elusive, to “the rhetorical function of the texts.” Regardless of their provenance, several texts found among the Scrolls contain “some self-conscious reference to separation from the larger religious community.”⁸ It is this phenomenon of separatist self-consciousness that I want to consider here. I will proceed by reviewing the sectarian self-understanding found in the undisputedly sectarian works, the rule books and 4QMMT, and then turn to the more problematic case of a wisdom text, 4QInstruction.

The yahad

For much of the history of scholarship on the scrolls, the understanding of the sectarian character of the underlying community was based on a passage in col. 8 of the Community Rule; “And when these become members of the community in Israel according to all these rules, they shall separate from the habitation of unjust men and shall go into the wilderness to prepare there the way of Him; as it is written: “Prepare

⁷ See S. Metso, “The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule,” in *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery*, ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick, (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85–93.

⁸ Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Language,” 179.

in the wilderness the way of . . . , make straight in the desert a path for our God.” This passage, together with the apparent isolation of the Qumran site, gave rise to the view of a community that was physically isolated from the rest of Judaism and had minimal contact with outsiders. Leaving aside the interpretation of the Qumran site, which is increasingly contested,⁹ this view is problematic even within the context of the Community Rule. The antecedent of “these” who are to go out into the wilderness are the mysterious “twelve men and three priests.” They are said to be set apart as holy in the midst of the council of the community, after they have been confirmed for two years among the perfect of the way. Only then are they to separate themselves and go out into the wilderness. It may be that these were “the first fifteen members of the Qumran community” as E. F. Sutcliffe argued,¹⁰ but they are not the first members of “the council of the community.” They are initially members of a larger group. Their separation from that group is not schismatic. They are trained and tested in “the council of the community,” but are set aside to live a more holy life, and atone for the land. Their atoning role may be taken to imply a criticism of the efficacy of the atonement rituals practiced in the Jerusalem temple. While they may be sectarian in relation to Jewish society as a whole, however, they are not sectarian vis-à-vis their parent community. The group that goes to the wilderness is not all of the *yahad*, but it is part of it. It does not have a separate identity or purpose.¹¹

The larger community, or *yahad*, within which these people are set aside, is also separatist, although to a less extreme degree. They are supposed to “separate themselves from the congregation of the men of injustice, and unite, with respect to the Law and possessions,” under the authority of the sons of Zadok, and/or the multitude of the men

⁹ For a concise bibliography, see J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 18, and her refutation of attempts to see Qumran as a country villa, *ibid.*, 90–104. Prominent dissidents include N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (New York: Scribner, 1995) and Y. Hirschfeld, “Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran,” *JNES* 57 (1998): 161–89; *idem*, “The Architectural Context of Qumran,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 673–83.

¹⁰ E. F. Sutcliffe, S. J., “The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community,” *JSS* 4 (1959): 134–8.

¹¹ See further Collins, “Forms of Community,” 105–6.

of the community.¹² This *yahad* is embodied in clusters of ten or more members, and has a set of regulations governing common life, such as we also find in Hellenistic voluntary associations.¹³ It appears, however, to be a more greedy institution than its Hellenistic counterparts, insofar as it lays greater claims on the lives of its members. It also has an adversarial stance towards the larger society which is atypical of voluntary associations in the Hellenistic world.

The *raison d'être* of the *yahad* in the Community Rule is primarily its distinctive interpretation of the Torah of Moses, which was allegedly revealed to the sons of Zadok and to the multitude of the men of the community. While this interpretation was contested, it did not question the foundational importance of the Torah of Moses. In this sense, both the *yahad* and its elite offshoot in the wilderness are reformist movements. According to 1QS 5, "whoever approaches the Council of the Community shall enter the Covenant of God in the presence of all who have freely pledged themselves. He shall undertake by a binding oath to return with all his heart and soul to every commandment of the Law of Moses" in accordance with the community's interpretation. An elaborate covenant renewal ceremony is prefixed to the rules of the community in 1QS. The community, then, sees itself as fulfilling God's covenant with Israel.¹⁴ The members are "the multitude of Israel who have freely pledged themselves in the Community to return to His covenant" (1QS 5:22). Its priests are "the sons of Aaron." The Community Rule clearly envisions an ongoing process whereby people from "old Israel" can still enter the new covenant. The goal, however, does

¹² 1QS 5:1–3. The reference to the sons of Zadok is not found in some manuscripts of the rule. See S. Metso, "In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 306–15, who regards the shorter text as older; and P. S. Alexander, "The Redaction History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–53, who defends the priority of the longer text.

¹³ M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect. A Comparison with Guilds and religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); M. Klinghardt, "The Manual of Discipline in the Light of Statutes of Hellenistic Associations," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. M. O. Wise et al. (Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 251–70.

¹⁴ See further J. J. Collins, "The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 1. Theory of Israel*, ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner and B. D. Chilton (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 25–42.

not seem to be to reform existing Jewish society from within, but to replace it with an intentional community in which the Torah is observed according to ideal norms. Despite its reformist self-understanding, the *yahad* can reasonably be called a sect, since it is clearly separated from the parent society of Judaism by its distinctive rituals of admission and its avowed intention to separate from the rest of Jewish society.

The Damascus Document differs from the Community Rule insofar as it offers an historical narrative of the origin of its community.¹⁵ The best known passage, in CD col. 1, describes how God visited Israel 390 years after the destruction by Nebuchadnezzar, and caused a plant root to spring from Aaron and Israel “to inherit his land and prosper on the good things of his earth.” The new community, then, is an offshoot, or a remnant, of historic Israel. The association of this community with “Aaron and Israel” is an obvious point of affinity with the Community Rule. The CD passage specifies that the movement was initially penitential in character, and that it only achieved clarity with the advent of the Teacher of Righteousness.

The Damascus Document also speaks of a new covenant. The members of the first covenant sinned and were delivered up to the sword, “but with the remnant which held fast to the commandments of God He made His covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them the hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray” (CD 3:12–13). Here again, the *raison d’être* of the new community is the correct interpretation of the Torah. CD 6 interprets a reference to “the well which the princes dug” in Numbers 21 as follows: “The Well is the Law, and those who dug it were the converts of Israel who went out of the land of Judah to sojourn in the land of Damascus.” The word translated “converts” here, שׁבִי, from שׁוֹב is another point of affinity with the Community Rule, where the members swore to return to the Torah of Moses.¹⁶ The theme of separation is reflected in the statement that they “went out from the land of Judah to sojourn in the land of Damascus.” There has been endless debate as to whether Damascus is a cipher for Qumran,

¹⁵ For a recent review of the accounts of the origin of the sect in the Damascus Document see C. Hempel, “Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship,” in *The Provo International Conference*, ed. Parry and Ulrich, 316–29.

¹⁶ For a summary of the debate about this phrase in the Damascus Document, see C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 57–8.

or whether there actually was a migration to Damascus.¹⁷ We should also reckon with the possibility that the reference is not geographical at all, but that Damascus is a symbol for a state of separation from the religious establishment of Judah. CD 8:16 refers to “the converts of Israel who depart from the way of the people.” Conversely, “the princes of Judah” are criticized because “they have not kept apart from the people.”

There has been a tendency in recent scholarship to emphasize the differences between the Community Rule and the Damascus Document.¹⁸ Most famously, the latter document legislates for people who live in camps according to the order of the land, and who marry and have children. Women and children are conspicuous by their absence in the Community Rule, but that rule book too provides for smaller congregations, which may be analogous to the camps. Other significant differences include the absence of discussion of admission procedures in CD and the failure of the Community Rule to situate its community in the history of Israel. Most significant, perhaps, is the fact that several laws in CD envision life in a Gentile context. These differences, however, must be weighed against the affinities between the two documents. The sectarian consciousness of the two documents seems remarkably similar. The covenant that God made with Israel is not repudiated, but now individuals must decide whether to “enter” this covenant anew. CD refers several times to “the new covenant in the land of Damascus” (CD 6:19; 8:21; 19:33–34). The “new covenant” is an allusion to Jer 31:31. Its continuity with the “old” covenant is not in doubt, but not all Israelites qualify as members. They must join voluntarily, and their children too must be enrolled when they reach the appropriate age (CD 15:5–6).

The community of the new covenant, in CD as in the Community Rule is reformist in the sense that its goal is a return to the Law of Moses, but it is also a separatist, exclusivist, movement that claims to have new revelation about the proper interpretation of that law. As

¹⁷ Hempel, *ibid.*, 58–59. A migration to Damascus is assumed by M. O. Wise, *The First Messiah. Investigating the Savior before Christ* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999), 135–38.

¹⁸ See Hempel, “Community Structures”; P. R. Davies, “The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document,” in *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery*, ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 27–43.

such, it may reasonably be called a sect. Attempts to reconstruct from the laws of CD a movement that was less separatist, and therefore less sectarian than the document in its final form, are very hypothetical.¹⁹

4QMMT, the so-called “Halachic Letter,” also addresses explicitly the separation of a community from the majority of the people. In this case there is no historical perspective, and no indication of the form of the author’s community. The author sets out a series of halachic issues which are the reason for the separation. These issues are matters of scriptural interpretation and allow an appeal to the common ground on which both parties base their beliefs. “We have [written] to you so that you may study the book of Moses and the books of the Prophets and (the writings of) David,” in the hope that such study would confirm the author’s interpretation.²⁰ These scriptures constituted a common basis for the author and the addressee.²¹ The separation of the author’s community was not based on ontological considerations, but on different interpretation, and the authority of different interpreters.

Creation and Election

There is, however, another way in which sectarian consciousness is conceived, whereby the division is located not in the recent history of Israel but at creation.

The idea that some people were chosen at creation and some were rejected is found already in Ben Sira, where the contrast seems to be between Israel and the Canaanites.²² The Damascus Document only hints at such a predestinarian theology in col. 2. Here we are told that

¹⁹ For such an attempt, see C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

²⁰ 4QMMT C 10. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V. Miqs’at Ma’ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 58–59. See however the article of Eugene Ulrich, “The Non-Attestation of a Tri-Partite Canon in 4QMMT,” *CBQ* 65/1 (2003): 202–214, which questions the editors’ reading of this passage.

²¹ Steven Fraade, “To whom it may concern: 4QMMT and Its Adressee(s),” *RevQ* 19 (2000) 507–26, has made an interesting argument that 4QMMT is intended not for external polemic but for internal parenthesis. Even if this is correct, however, the rhetoric of the document attempts to ground the distinctive views of the group in scriptures that are also accepted by outsiders.

²² Sir 33:10–13: “In the fullness of his knowledge he distinguished them and appointed their different ways. Some he blessed and exalted. Some he made holy and

destruction is in store for “those who turn from the way,” for “from the beginning God chose them not. He knew their deeds before ever they were created and He hated their generations.”²³ Those who turn from the way are presumably Jews rather than Gentiles. More specifically, they are those who followed “the Scoffer” rather than the Teacher in CD 1. If these people were predestined for destruction, it seems reasonable to suppose that those who held fast to the commandments were also chosen from the beginning. This theme, however, is not developed in the Damascus Document, which is primarily covenantal in its theology.

The Discourse on the Two Spirits, in 1QS 3–4, also appeals to creation: “From the God of knowledge stems all there is and is to be... He created man (אָנִישׁ) to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation.” For our present purposes, the point to note here is that the division between the elect and their adversaries is not attributed to choices made by human beings in the period after the Babylonian exile but is rooted in creation.

There is no doubt that the dualistic theology of the two spirits is sectarian in Newsom’s second sense, that it was used by sectarian authors to legitimate and lend significance to a social division. The more difficult question is whether a dualistic creation theology is inherently sectarian. Since the dualism of the two spirits was scarcely known in a Jewish context before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, most scholars have assumed that it is “a paradigmatic expression of the sectarian theology.”²⁴ In contrast, Hartmut Stegemann²⁵ and Armin Lange²⁶ have argued that the Discourse on the Two Spirits is an older, pre-sectarian text, that was incorporated into the sectarian rule book. The Damascus Document was influenced by the Discourse, but not

brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low and turned them out of their place.”

²³ CD 2:7–8. On the predestinarian theology of this passage see A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 233–70.

²⁴ So e.g. D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. M. E. Stone (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 483–550, especially 533–38.

²⁵ H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 154. The English translation of this book, however, *The Library of Qumran. On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 108, says that the passage “is surely of Essene origin.”

²⁶ Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 126–8.

profoundly. On this view, the Discourse itself was a sapiential text, that sought to explain the division of the world between good and evil, but was not necessarily the product of a sectarian group. Nonetheless, it appears remarkably congenial to sectarian ideology, and the argument that it is pre-sectarian appears rather counter-intuitive.²⁷

4QInstruction

The sectarian implications of dualism in the Community Rule and Damascus Document are clear enough, because these documents explicitly describe separatist communities. A more difficult case is provided by the recently published wisdom text, 4QInstruction.²⁸ This text says nothing about a *yahad* or community life, and makes no mention of a new covenant.²⁹ It assumes marriage and family life, and discusses financial matters without any suggestion of communal possessions. Nothing in the text suggests the kind of communal structures we find in the Community Rule or the Damascus Document. Moreover, while it alludes the Torah of Moses at several points,³⁰ it does not speak of it explicitly as a source of authority, in marked contrast to the wisdom book of Ben Sira. In the few cases where it reflects halachic interpretation of the Torah, its interpretation does not accord with that of the sectarian texts from Qumran, as Larry Schiffman has shown.³¹ Consequently the editors regard it as an example of “common Israelite

²⁷ See further J. J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 43–45.

²⁸ J. Strugnell, D. Harrington and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

²⁹ The word *yahad* occurs several times in 4QInstruction in an adverbial sense. There is one possible exception in 4Q417 2 i 17 where the editors restore the word *yahad* and translate “then thy surpluses [bring in together/into the community/into thy associate’s possession]”. Even if the restoration (on the basis of a tiny fragment, 4Q199 1, is accepted, it is by no means clear that the reference is to a community. The passage is discussed by C. M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 179.

³⁰ G. J. Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, ed. C. Hempel et al. (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 201–20.

³¹ L. H. Schiffman, “Halachic Elements in the Sapiential Texts from Qumran,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20–22 May, 2001*, ed. J. J. Collins and G. Sterling (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 89–100.

wisdom” addressed “not to any closed community like that at Qumran, nor to any earlier and theologically cognate population, but to a typical junior sage.”³² Eibert Tigchelaar has argued that the addressee could be “anyone in society.”³³ Yet Geza Vermes argues that it is “unquestionably sectarian and displays a terminology akin to the Community Rule, the Damascus Document and the Thanksgiving Hymns”³⁴ and other scholars have also been impressed with its affinities with texts that are accepted as sectarian.

There are indeed numerous points of correspondence between 4Q Instruction and the Hodayot, especially 1QH^a 5, and between the wisdom text and the Discourse on the Two Spirits. The correspondences with the Hodayot include such phrases as “wondrous mysteries,” “eternal visitation,” “eternal glory,” “eternal foundations,” “spirit of flesh” and other phrases.³⁵ These correspondences may be explained by supposing that the hymnist was influenced by the wisdom text, and thus do not necessarily require sectarian provenance for the latter. The correspondences with the Discourse on the Two Spirits are more intriguing. Here again there is a long list of common phrases: “period of peace,” “all periods of eternity,” “God of knowledge,” “children of iniquity,” “sons of heaven,” etc.³⁶ Tigchelaar has observed that these phrases are found primarily in the opening and closing paragraphs of the Discourse (1QS 3:13–18; 4:15–26). The Instruction does not use the terminology of light and darkness, does not speak of Spirits as angels, and does not say that two spirits feud in the human heart. In short, 4QInstruction lacks the most distinctive elements of the Discourse. If the wisdom text were dependent on the Discourse on the Two Spirits, we should have to explain why it only alludes to part of it. It seems more plausible then that the authors or editors of the Discourse drew terminology from 4QInstruction. Moreover, as Lange has noted, the

³² Ibid., 36.

³³ E. J. C. Tigchelaar, “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. D. K. Falk et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 62–75 (quotation from p. 75).

³⁴ G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997), 402.

³⁵ These parallels have been discussed by T. Elgvin, “An Analysis of 4QInstruction,” (Diss. Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1998), 160–61; E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 203–6. The parallels to 1QH^a 5 are concentrated in 4Q417 1.

³⁶ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194–203; Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 127–28.

Discourse has a more developed presentation of dualism and eschatology than the wisdom text, and this too suggests that it is the later of the two.³⁷

The relationship between 4QInstruction and the Discourse is especially interesting, as both texts envisage a division of humanity into two kinds of people. In 4Q417 fragment 1, we are told that God disclosed the vision of Hagu, or book of memorial, which contains the destiny of righteous and wicked, to אֱנוֹשׁ, a spiritual people, but did not give it to “the spirit of flesh,” because it failed to distinguish between good and evil. אֱנוֹשׁ, we are told, is fashioned after the pattern of the holy ones, or angels. The language of the passage alludes to the opening chapters of Genesis.³⁸ אֱנוֹשׁ is most probably not the name of the patriarch Enosh,³⁹ but refers to humanity as originally created. The Instruction on the Two Spirits similarly says that God “created אֱנוֹשׁ to rule the world,” where the reference is clearly to Adam or humanity. The statement that אֱנוֹשׁ and the spiritual people are formed after the pattern of the holy ones is a paraphrase of Gen 1:27, where humanity is created in the image of God. The failure of the spirit of flesh to discern good and evil alludes to the story in Gen 2–3, where Adam and Eve eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil with disastrous results.

There is some debate as to whether the spirit of flesh initially had access to the revelation of Hagu, and lost it by a “fall,” or whether it was inherently incapable of receiving the revelation. The Hebrew reads, וְעוֹד לֹא נָתַן חַנּוּי לְרוּחַ בֶּשֶׂר, which can be translated: “and Hagu was no longer given to the spirit of flesh.”⁴⁰ It is not apparent, however, that the revelation was withdrawn from the spiritual people. Rather, there seem to be two kinds of people from the beginning, and if one kind loses its access to revelation, this is because it had a spirit of flesh.⁴¹

³⁷ Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 130.

³⁸ See J. J. Collins, “In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,” in *The Provo International Conference*, ed. Parry and Ulrich, 595–618.

³⁹ Contra Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 87–88; Brooke, “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” 213.

⁴⁰ So Strugnell and Harrington, in DJD 34, 155. They suggest that “since the days of Enosh the fleshly in spirit have not possessed the power of meditation” (166). If the passage is read in the context of creation, one might suggest that the power of meditation was lost in the “Fall” of Adam.

⁴¹ On the spirit of flesh see J. Frey, “The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, ed. Falk et al.,

It seems reasonable to suppose that 4QInstruction is addressed to “spiritual people” who are capable of grasping revelation. To be sure, the addressees of this text are a matter of some controversy. Tigchelaar has noted that it often addresses hypothetical situations, how to behave if one is poor, or subjected to a beating, or if one enjoys good fortune, etc. But he also notes that “the composition is not merely a collection of instructions for different kinds of addressees.”⁴² The addressee is consistently called a גִּבּוֹר, or “understanding one,” although the understanding may be a matter of aspiration rather than accomplished fact. The understanding in question is not confined to practical wisdom, of the kind familiar from Proverbs and Ben Sira. Throughout the document, the addressee is urged to contemplate “the mystery that is to be,” (רֵז גִּבּוֹרֵהוּ).⁴³ This mystery embraces past, present and future, but it includes the eschatological destiny of righteous and wicked, which is also the subject of the “vision of Hagu.” Presumably the mystery is available to the addressee, and it is either identical with or overlaps with the vision of Hagu, which was given to Enosh and the spiritual people, according to 4Q417 1. The spiritual people, then, were not confined to pre-lapsarian utopia, but were a group to be fostered in the author’s own time. They do not appear to live in community, and they may pursue various professions. They do not appear to be a social elite, since there is extensive discussion of poverty.⁴⁴ They are not just “anyone in society,” however, but are regarded as a spiritual elite.

A further key passage for the question of sectarian consciousness in 4QInstruction is found in 4Q418. In 4Q418 69 ii the addressees are called the “chosen ones of truth,” in contrast to the “foolish of heart” who are doomed to destruction. The passage is fragmentary, but the chosen ones are associated with the pursuit of knowledge. The key passage is found in 4Q418 fragment 81:

[for the utterance of] your lips He has opened up a spring so that you may bless the Holy Ones, and (so that) as (with) an everlasting fountain you may praise His n[ame]. The]n has He separated you from every fleshly

197–226; “Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, ed. Hempel, 367–404.

⁴² Tigchelaar, “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” 73.

⁴³ For a thorough recent discussion see M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), chapter 2.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, chapter 4.

spirit, so that you may be separated from everything that He hates, and may hold yourself aloof from all that His soul abominates. For He has made everyone and has made them to inherit each his own inheritance; but he is your portion and your inheritance among the children of mankind...just as He has appointed you as a Holy of Holies [over all the] earth, And (just as) among all the [Go]dly [ones] has He cast your lot. And He has magnified your glory greatly. He has appointed you for himself as a first-born among...

This passage alludes to the promise to Aaron in Num 18:20: "I am your inheritance and your lot among all the sons of Israel." In Num 8:14 and 16:9 the same verb "to separate" that is used here occurs with reference to the Levites, who are set aside from the midst of the Israelites.⁴⁵ The significance of this passage in the context of 4QInstruction is much disputed. Fletcher Louis has argued that the addressee is a priest,⁴⁶ and his argument may seem to lend support to Lange's thesis that 4QInstruction derives from a priestly milieu.⁴⁷ There is, however, remarkably little evidence of priestly concerns in the work as a whole.⁴⁸ Tigchelaar, in line with his argument that people of various professions are addressed, suggests that the addressees are priests in this passage, but not in others.⁴⁹ Elgvin, at the other end of the spectrum, notes that the passage includes royal motifs as well as priestly, especially in the reference to the first-born son.⁵⁰ He argues that both priestly and royal motifs are applied symbolically to the elect addressee.

The nature of the allusions to the priestly passages in Numbers tells in favor of Elgvin's position. Whereas the Lord is the inheritance of Aaron "among all the sons of Israel," He is the inheritance of the addressee "among the children of humankind." Again, the addressee is not separated from Israel, but from "the spirit of flesh." In light of

⁴⁵ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 232.

⁴⁶ C. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 176–87.

⁴⁷ A. Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*, ed. A. Schoors (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–59.

⁴⁸ See the thorough analysis of this issue by T. Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20–22 May, 2001*, ed. J. J. Collins and G. Sterling (Leiden: Brill, 2004). Compare Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 235–36.

⁴⁹ Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 231–6.

⁵⁰ Elgvin, "Priestly Sages." See also his discussion of this passage in "An Analysis," 125–38.

what we have seen of the spirit of flesh in 4Q417, we should conclude that the addressee is being included in the spiritual people, and that this requires separation, in some sense, from the mass of humankind. This is not just the separation of priest from people, but the separation of the elect from “everything He hates.”

Two other aspects of this passage are significant. First, while the end of line 4 is fragmentary, it most probably says that God has cast the lot of the addressee with the holy ones. This language is applicable to priests, to be sure, but it also recalls the familiar motif of fellowship with the angels in the sectarian scrolls. It is also in accordance, however, with the statement in 4Q417 that the spiritual people are created after the pattern of the holy ones. Second, the statement that “He has appointed you as a Holy of Holies [over all the] earth” is reminiscent of 1QS 8, where the community becomes a holy of holies to atone for the land.⁵¹ In the rule book, it is generally assumed that a criticism of the temple cult is implied. The same may be true in 4QInstruction, but the passage is too oblique to prove that the addressees are in schism with the temple.

Elgvin has argued strongly that this passage does not reflect a single wisdom teacher speaking to his disciple, but rather that “teacher and addressee belong to circles with a distinct identity, some kind of ‘remnant’ community.”⁵² In part, his argument rests on a reference in 4Q418 81, line 13, to an “everlasting plantation,” language similar to that used to describe the elect community in the Apocalypse of Weeks. Unfortunately, the context in 4QInstruction is fragmentary, and the reference of the “everlasting plantation” is not clear. The passage is indeed reminiscent of the community in 1QS 8, but it does not make any explicit reference to a community, or describe any communal structures. We have, in short, a text that exhibits sectarian consciousness, insofar as it envisions a class of people who are separated from the “spirit of flesh,” but lacks any reference to communal organization, and does not articulate its distinctive consciousness in terms of the covenant and the law, in the manner of the sectarian rule books from Qumran.

Charlotte Hempel has suggested that the peculiar character of 4QInstruction might be explained by redaction criticism. She suggests

⁵¹ In 1QS 8, the community is called בְּחֵירֵי רֵצוֹן (chosen ones of favor). 4Q418 81 line 10 says “it is in your power to turn away anger from the men of favor.”

⁵² Elgvin, “An Analysis,” 138.

that 4QInstruction is a composite work, parts of which are traditional wisdom, while other parts originated in “a particular strand in Second Temple Judaism, though not the *yahad*, but perhaps its forerunners.”⁵³ The quasi-sectarian character of 4QInstruction, however, does not derive only from a few passages such as 4Q418 81, but depends largely on the appeal to a mystery, the *raz nihyeh*, to which some people have access while others do not. Appeals to this mystery are ubiquitous in the text, and cannot be removed by redaction-critical surgery.

Hempel may, however, be on the right track when she suggests that the authors of 4QInstruction were in some sense fore-runners of the *yahad*. Al Baumgarten has suggested that one can divide “the course of a successful idea or institution into vague antecedents, forerunners, maturity, and after-effects. What separates any one stage from the others is the extent to which the idea or institution served as a basis for social cohesion and action. This determination is only possible with the benefit of hindsight: a historian must first know when full maturity was reached, and only then can the story be organized in a meaningful way.”⁵⁴ The account of the development of a sectarian community in CD 1 is an example of this kind of retrospective assessment. Before the arrival of the Teacher, the penitents were like blind men groping for the way. They did not necessarily see themselves that way at the time. We do not know whether 4QInstruction was a product of these “blind men” of the Damascus Document. There were several proto-sectarian groups in Judea in the third and second centuries B.C.E., as can be seen from the Enoch literature and other pseudepigrapha. It does appear, however, that 4QInstruction reflects a stage of spiritual separatism that was not yet embodied in social action. The “spiritual people” were aware of their need to separate from “the spirit of flesh,” but they had not yet found their Teacher. They had not yet developed the kind of systematic focus on Torah interpretation that we find in the “mature” sectarian scrolls from Qumran, and they had not yet set up the social structures that would enable them to separate themselves from the multitude of the people.

⁵³ C. Hempel, “The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, ed. Hempel et al., 282. The idea of editorial strata in 4QInstruction has been argued especially by T. Elgvin, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century B.C.E.: The Evidence of 4QInstruction,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*, ed. Schiffman et al., 226–47. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, argues strongly against separating the different kinds of material.

⁵⁴ Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects*, 24.

BETWEEN MOTHERLAND AND FATHERLAND:
DIASPORA, PILGRIMAGE AND THE SPIRITUALIZATION
OF SACRIFICE IN PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA¹

Andrea Lieber
Dickinson College

The concept of “diaspora” is used so frequently in the discourse of Jewish studies that to invoke it seems nearly cliché. Scholars of Jewish history have long been occupied with the project of unpacking the complexity of Jewish diasporic identity. And yet this very feature of Jewish experience that has for decades been taken for granted as a basic fact in the study of Judaism and Jewish culture, has of late received a good deal of attention in scholarly circles outside Jewish studies.² “Diaspora” has emerged as a category of critical analysis that is embraced and applied not just to the case of the Jews, but to other dispersed populations as well. In the inaugural issue of the journal *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, its editor Khachig Tölölyan wrote in 1991 that “diasporas are the exemplary communities of the transnational movement” and noted that *diaspora* now can be used to talk about a whole host of border-crossing identities: immigrant, expatriate, refugee, guest-worker, exile community, overseas community, ethnic community.³ In that same volume, William Safran noted that

¹ Betsy Halpern-Amaru was my teacher and mentor at Vassar College. I learned my first words of Hebrew in her courses, where she also introduced me to the work of Philo and the rich world of Jewish antiquity. It is with great admiration and profound gratitude that I dedicate this essay to her.

² Within Jewish studies, there are a few scholars whose work is concerned with bridging contemporary diaspora studies and Jewish studies. Some notable examples are Henry Goldschmidt, “Crown Heights is the Center of the World”: Reterritorializing a Jewish Diaspora,” *Diaspora* 9:1 (2000): 83–106; Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin, *Powers of Diaspora: Two Essays on the Relevance of Jewish Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002); Alanna Cooper, “Conceptualizing Diaspora: Tales of Jewish Travelers in search of the Lost Tribes,” *AJS Review* 30:1 (2006): 95–117; *ibid.*, “Reconsidering the Tale of Rabbi Yosef Maman and the Bukharan Jewish Diaspora,” *Jewish Social Studies* 10:2 (2004): 80–115. Particularly relevant to the present study is John M. G. Barclay, *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004).

³ Khachig Tölölyan, “The Nation State and its Others: In Lieu of a Preface,” *Diaspora* 1(1): 3.

diaspora is used as a metaphoric designation in much the same way that “ghetto” has come to designate all kinds of crowded, constricted and disprivileged urban environments and “holocaust” has come to be applied to all kinds of mass murder.⁴

It is fascinating that the Jews, in many respects the paradigmatic “other,” have of late become so definitive of global cultural experience. Jonathan Boyarin and Daniel Boyarin, in their recent book, *Powers of Diaspora*, refer to this phenomenon when they suggest that a critical privileging of the term “diaspora” means understanding diaspora as a “normal” situation rather than a negative symptom of disorder. The permeability of boundaries and the “decenteredness” that typifies contemporary transnational reality has ironically come to resemble the worlds in which Jews have lived for centuries, and the very feature of Jewish society that once marked Jewish difference is now normative. Indeed, the way in which contemporary diasporas (and diaspora theorists) have come to challenge the viability of the modern nation-state echoes, in many respects, the very discourse employed by those enlightenment writers concerned with the Jews’ place in the emerging modern European state.

Applying contemporary diaspora theory to the study of Jewish antiquity is problematic because so much of that discourse is couched in post-colonialism and a liberal critique of the nation-state. Can the insights of an interdisciplinary diaspora studies be applied to the study of Jewish communities that antedate the birth of the modern nationalism? Although contemporary diaspora studies often look to ancient Jewish civilization as an exemplary case, the most notable example being James Clifford’s use of Goitein’s “Geniza World,”⁵ depicted in his master work *A Mediterranean Society*,⁶ scholars are just beginning to read ancient diasporas through the lens of contemporary diasporas. As noted by John Barclay in his introduction to *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*, a recent volume which uses contemporary “diaspora” theory as a starting point for thinking about Jews in the Roman world, certain motifs central to post-colonial and diaspora studies, such as ‘cultural hybridity’ and ‘double identities’ are

⁴ William Safran, “Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return,” *Diaspora* 1(1): 83–99.

⁵ James Clifford, “Diasporas,” *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (1994): 302–308.

⁶ S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Cairo Geniza* (6 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).

very helpful concepts in analyzing Jewish life in the Greco-Roman era. In what follows, I suggest that reading antiquity through the lens of contemporary diasporas can reveal a more nuanced appreciation for the complexity of ancient diasporic existence.

Philo's Diasporic Consciousness

Philo is the quintessential voice of the Jewish diaspora in antiquity. Born approximately 20 C.E. to a prominent family in Alexandria (which was home to a diaspora Jewish community that was already centuries old), Philo is often depicted as a thinker who consciously sought to wed the divergent traditions of Hellenism on the one hand and Judaism on the other. Whether Philo's syncretism reflects a conscious process of self-definition or a more organically blended synthesis,⁷ his work provides the classic paradigm of Hellenistic-Jewish intellectual life.

Did Philo understand "diaspora" as a condition of oppression or disempowerment? A close reading of several key texts suggests that Philo did not. In fact, in what follows, I contend that Philo consistently attaches a positive valence to the Jewish dispersion, and in this respect develops a theology of diaspora that actually legitimates Jewish settlement in diverse locations. This is accomplished on the one hand by the use of Greek colonial language to refer to the Jewish dispersion, and on the other hand by his reading the religious acts of pilgrimage and sacrifice as rituals that are performed on a higher level in foreign lands. In this way, Philo affirms a diasporic consciousness that sees the Jews' dispersion as a mark of moral and spiritual superiority.

While some Jewish Hellenistic, and even earlier Persian sources, such as the canonical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, have a clearly developed theology about land and loss of land (we lost the homeland because of sin, which led to our exile, and through repentance we will be returned to the homeland), Philo's writing presents a distinct departure from that theological worldview. In fact, although Philo often idealizes Jerusalem,

⁷ On this issue see Betsy Halpern-Amaru, *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994); Isaiah Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*, (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria" in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (ed. Michael Stone; CRINT 2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 233–282.

he also frequently provides what appear to be rationalizations to account for and justify the Jews' diasporic condition.⁸

One of the most striking of Philo's strategies in this regard is his casting the relationship between Jerusalem and diaspora cities such as Alexandria in the language of Greek colonization.⁹ Twice in his extant writings, Philo states that the Jews consider Jerusalem to be their "Mother-city" or μητρόπολις.¹⁰ In *Flaccus* 46, the Jews are depicted as "too large" a people to be contained by one land:

For so populous are the Jews that no one country can hold them, and therefore they settle in very many of the most prosperous countries in Europe and Asia both in the islands and on the mainland, and while they hold the Holy City where stands the sacred Temple of the most high God to be their mother city (μητρόπολις), yet those which are theirs by inheritance from their fathers, grandfathers, and ancestors even farther back, are in each case accounted by them to be their fatherland (πατριδάς) in which they were born and reared, while to some of them they have come at the time of their foundation as immigrants to the satisfaction of the founders.¹¹

Philo's use of colonial language fully turns the Jewish diaspora on its head. Instead of the result of foreign domination or disempowerment, the language of colonization suggests that Jewish settlement outside of Palestine is intentional and a mark of strength. Philo's claim is that the Jews are too numerous to be contained by one country, completely erasing the experience of forced expulsion from his history.

⁸ A great deal has been written on Philo's relationship to Jerusalem. Of specific relevance to this study are Y. Amir, "Philo's Version of Pilgrimage to Jerusalem," in *Die Hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandria* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), 52–64; Betsy Halpern-Amaru, "Land Theology in Philo and Josephus," in *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives* (ed. L. A. Hoffman; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986), 65–93; I. Heinemann, "The Relationship between the Jewish People and their Land in Hellenistic Jewish Literature," *Zion* 13–14 (1948–49): 1–9 (Hebrew); H. J. Klauck, "Die Heilige Stadt. Jerusalem bei Philo und Lukas," *Kairos* 28 (1986): 129–136; W. C. van Unnik, *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistischen-römischen Zeit* (AGJU 17; Leiden: Brill, 1993).

⁹ John Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (2nd ed.; Chicago: Ares, 1983); Irad Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (Leiden: Brill, 1987).

¹⁰ Philo's use of this term has received a great deal of scholarly attention. See van Unnik, 136; Amir, 53–55; Borgen, 269; A. Kasher, "Jerusalem as a 'Metropolis' in Philo's National Consciousness," *Cathedra* 11 (1979): 45–56; M. Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2001), 17–44. See also the recent study by Sarah Pearce, "Jerusalem as Mother City in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria," in *Negotiating Diaspora* (ed. J. Barclay; T&T Clark/Continuum, 2004), 19–36.

¹¹ All translations excerpted from Colson, et al. *Philo*, (10 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990).

In formulating his “double identity” Philo chooses the genealogical metaphors of “motherland and fatherland” to articulate dual parentage. In a similar passage from the *Legatio ad Gaium*, Philo writes:

While [the holy city] is my native city (πατρίς) she is also the mother city (μητρόπολις) not of one country Judaea but of most of the others in virtue of the colonies (ἀποικίαι) sent out at divers [sic] times to the neighboring lands. . . . And not only are the mainlands full of Jewish colonies (ἀποικίαι) but also the most highly esteemed of the islands, Euboea, Cyprus and Crete.¹²

Although Philo refers here to Jerusalem as both πατρίς and μητρόπολις, he refers to Jewish settlements abroad as colonies ἀποικίαι. Philo boasts of the fine cities and islands where Jews dwell. Although it is not a text that employs explicit colonial language, Philo’s discussion of offering first fruits in Spec. 1:77–78 expresses similar pride in the esteemed places Jews have settled:

As the nation is very populous, the offerings of first-fruits are naturally very abundant. In fact, practically in every city there are banking places for the holy money where people regularly come and give their offerings. And at stated times there are appointed to carry the sacred tribute envoys selected on their merits, from every city those of highest repute, under whose conduct the hopes of each and all will travel safely.

In a recent analysis of this motif, Sarah Pearce suggests (in opposition to the majority of earlier scholarship on this theme) that Philo’s use of colonial language reflects his attempt to assert the importance of the diaspora cities to Jewish identity. While earlier scholars have read Philo’s language as a means of emphasizing the centrality of Jerusalem or defending the Jews’ continued allegiance to the Temple there, Pearce argues that in calling diaspora cities “colonies” Philo is actually drawing on a tradition already evidenced in the Septuagint in which Zion is called μητρόπολις (Is. 1.26), and the Hebrew terms for diaspora communities (*galut*, *golah*) are typically translated with the Greek word used to refer to a colony (ἀποικία).¹³ Pearce concludes that, for Philo, “there is no tension between the notion of Jerusalem as mother-city and Alexandria as home.”¹⁴

¹² *Legatio* 281–2.

¹³ Pearce, 32–35.

¹⁴ Pearce, 36.

Building on Pearce's thorough analysis of this motif in Philo's work, I am interested in probing the gendered dimension of the colonial language employed by Philo. In theorizing the Jewish diaspora Daniel Boyarin has argued that the diasporic condition is a feminized condition, one that challenges and subverts the phallic construction of nationalism. In the texts cited above, Philo also genders the Jewish diaspora through a genealogical metaphor, with homeland identified as "Mother" city and diasporic identity affiliated with the patriline—the fatherland.¹⁵ Rather than viewing diaspora as a result of domination and disempowerment, the Jews according to Philo are "too large" to be contained in one land—which is also perhaps an image of masculinity. Rather than a mark of weakness, the fact that Jews live spread out among distant lands is a sign of their virility. Philo thus casts the Jews' dispersion in terms of strength—perhaps as a rhetorical move to suggest that the Jewish diaspora, rather than an outcome of political disempowerment, is actually analogous to the conscious expansionist process of colonization.

Pilgrimage

In addition to Jewish migration from Jerusalem, Philo was also interested in Jewish movement toward Jerusalem in the practice of ritual pilgrimage. The complexity of Philo's diasporic consciousness is further expressed in his ambivalent attitude toward this rite.¹⁶ As an Alexandrian Jew, Philo's daily experience of Judaism and Jewish worship was necessarily removed from the daily mechanics of the Temple cult in Jerusalem. Diaspora Jews participated in sacrificial rites vicariously through their contribution to a temple tax, used to purchase the public sacrifice, but also through pilgrimage to the revered city on the occasion of annual holidays.¹⁷ Philo's description of pilgrimage emphasizes the phenomenon

¹⁵ Compare *Conf.* 77–78: For surely, when men found a colony (ἀποικίαν), the land which receives them becomes their fatherland (πατρίς) instead of the mother-city (μητρόπολις), but to the traveler abroad the land which sent him forth is the mother to whom he yearns to return.

¹⁶ See Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), 2:242–48.

¹⁷ *Provid.* 2.64 (Aucher 2. 107); See Wolfson, *Philo*, 241; E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935); Emile Schürer, *The History of the*

as an out-of-the-ordinary event; while presenting extreme hardship, it is one that reaps great benefits. Indeed, the willingness to endure pilgrimage is testimony to one's spiritual authenticity, and the cultivation of such discipline is understood by Philo as one of the purposes of the centralized Jerusalem cult:

[Moses] provided that there should not be temples built either in many places or many in the same place, for he judged that since God is one, there should be also only one temple. Further, he does not consent to those who wish to perform the rites in their houses, but bids them rise up from the ends of the earth and come to this temple. In this way he also applies the severest test to their dispositions. For one who is not going to sacrifice in a religious spirit would never bring himself to leave his country and his friends and kinsfolk and sojourn in a strange land, but clearly it must be the stronger attraction of piety which leads him to endure separation from his most familiar and dearest friends who form as it were a single whole with himself.¹⁸

Rather than worship at local shrines, God requires individuals to "rise up from the ends of the earth and come to the temple" to worship God as one people. Thus, the centralization of Jewish temple worship reflects the unity of God, and even foreshadows the unity of the exiled Jewish people.

The existence of a singular temple, and the necessity of pilgrimage to it, also nurtures proper spiritual discipline and checks the private will. According to this view, one must have genuine faith to journey from Alexandria to Jerusalem. Indeed, Philo emphasizes the difficulty of pilgrimage over the ease of local worship. The passage from Philo cited above reveals the perception of a sharp distance between Alexandrian Jewry and their kin living in the land of Israel. To embark on a pilgrimage in order to sacrifice entails a departure from "friends and kinsfolk" and a sojourning in a "strange land." Philo is rather dramatic in his phrasing in an effort to show what a great trial the pilgrimage presents. Kinsfolk are those who "form a single whole" and leaving to sacrifice is an extreme challenge. But according to Philo, there is a spiritual payoff. Upon arriving at the Jerusalem Temple, another type of communal unity is achieved among those who have journeyed from "the ends of the earth":

Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (rev. and ed. by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973), III.1:586.

¹⁸ *Spec. Leg.* 1.67.

Countless multitudes from countless cities come, some over land, others by sea, from east and west and north and south at every feast. They take the temple for their port as a general haven and safe refuge from the bustle and great turmoil of life, and there they seek to find calm weather, and, released from the cares whose yoke has been heavy upon them from their earliest years, to enjoy a brief breathing space in scenes of genial cheerfulness. Thus filled with comfortable hopes they devote the leisure, as is their bounded duty, to holiness and the honoring of God. Friendships are formed between those who hitherto knew not each other, and the sacrifices and libations are the occasion of reciprocity of feeling and constitute the surest pledge that all are of one mind.¹⁹

The scene described in the above passage is remarkable in its resemblance to an eschatological scene. Pilgrimage to the temple of Jerusalem created unity among Jews from diverse locales. In the service of God, they affirmed their like-mindedness and shared sacrificial food and drink. It appears that Philo imagines this phenomenon as a preview of Israel's future, when all Jews would be united to sacrifice again in Jerusalem.²⁰ The ingathering of the exiles was one of the signal features of the messianic age according to Philo,²¹ whose ideas on the subject seem to rely on exegetical interpretations of Isaiah 2 or Micah 4. Philo seems to be hinting that pilgrimage is in fact a model for his eschatological vision. In Philo's description of pilgrimage, the exiles gather, worship God with sacrifices and celebrate their unity as a people in the service of God by sharing food and drink.

In advocating sacrificial worship at a centralized shrine, Philo's work reflects the perspective of the biblical writers of Deuteronomy and Chronicles. Yet his insistence upon centralized sacrifice may also be influenced by Greek thought. Book X of Plato's *Laws* deals with hypothetical motives for impious behavior among citizens of an ideal *polis*. One source of impiety presented by Plato is the belief that the gods might be won over by "the cajoling of offerings and prayers."²²

¹⁹ *Spec. Leg.* 1.70.

²⁰ Ellen B. Birnbaum, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), see especially Chapter 3, "Israel and the Ones Who Can See."

²¹ Wolfson, *Philo*, 408. Ingathering of the exiles, national prosperity in the Jewish homeland and peace among all human beings and between human and animal life were the three features of the messianic age in Philo. See *Praem* 29, 165, 168.

²² Plato *Laws* 10. 882b. Text from *The Laws*, trans., A. E. Taylor in *Plato: The Collected Dialogues* (ed. E. Hamilton and H. Cairnes; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 1225–1513. The other two forms of impiety were 1) outright rejection of the belief that Gods exist at all, and 2) the belief that Gods do exist, but are indifferent to the plight of humanity.

The interlocutors of this dialogue seek to refute those who believe in divine venality, and in the end, set up legislation designed to curb such impiety:

We must frame a law applicable to all these offenders alike, and designed to alleviate the sin of most of them against religion in word or act—to say nothing of the folly of the sinners—by the prohibition of illegal ceremonial. In fact the following law should be enacted for all cases without exception. No man shall possess a shrine in his private house; when a man feels himself moved to offer sacrifice, he shall go to the public temples for that purpose and deliver his offerings to the priests of either sex whose business it is to consecrate them. He may join with himself in the prayers any person whose company he may desire.²³

No individual is permitted to have a private altar, and if moved to offer sacrifice, must go to the public temple and make the offering via the priest. Plato explains that the law is necessary because people, particularly women and the sick, are often prompted by fear into making sacrificial offerings. In addition, those seeking visions or advice are prone to sacrifice according to their own will, whenever and wherever they want. Plato's ban on private altars would, he believed, promote authenticity among worshippers. The discussion continues as follows:

[The Law] prevents fraud in this matter itself, from setting up shrines and altars in their own houses, under the delusion that they are winning the privy favor of heaven by offerings and prayers, thus indefinitely aggravating their criminality and bringing guilt before God on themselves and the better men who tolerate their conduct, until the whole community reaps the harvest of their impiety—as in a sense it deserves... the enactment [of the legislator] shall run thus: No citizen is to possess a shrine in his private dwelling house;... Any person proved guilty of a sin against piety... whether by dedicating a shrine on private ground or by doing sacrifice to any gods whatsoever in public, shall suffer death for doing sacrifice in a state of defilement.²⁴

The private impiety of an individual who sacrifices at a private shrine has the potential to undermine the piety of the community at large. As such, private altars are not merely discouraged, but banned, lest the whole city be brought to sin.

²³ *Laws*, 10. 909d–910b.

²⁴ *Laws*, 10. 910c–d.

Sacrifice

Philo's writing reveals a great deal of ambivalence about sacrifice; the majority of his references to the subject involve an extreme "spiritualization" of the rite. In fact, in most places where Philo interprets texts dealing with the cult, he allegorizes to the extent that the literal components of sacrificial practice are actually devalued in favor of the quality of intention that underlies them. Indeed, it is the inward condition of the soul for Philo that constitutes the true sacrifice.

Valentin Nikiprowetzky has argued that Philo, in his spiritualization of the cult, must be understood as a thinker situated at the crossroads of the biblical and Greek philosophical doctrines of sacrifice. As a Jew ensconced in the Hellenistic world, Philo was heir to polemic against the practice of sacrifice from both traditional Jewish and classical Greek perspectives. We saw above his resonance with Greek and Deuteronomic thought in Philo's advocating of a centralized cult. But in his deeper reflection on the meaning of sacrifice, Philo presents a perspective that lies rather someplace between the radical prophetic polemic against sacrifice attested in the Bible²⁵ and the stance against blood-rites advocated by the Pythagorean and Neo-Pythagorean philosophical schools.²⁶ The biblical polemic presented contemporary temple-sacrifice as corrupt, and looked toward the "messianic" future for the practice of undefiled and true sacrifice.²⁷ The Pythagoreans abhorred blood sacrifice on the grounds that it was wrong to slaughter ritually an animal victim. Pythagoras' condemnation of animal sacrifice was rooted in the belief that human and animal lives are intimately connected. Among the

²⁵ Valentin Nikiprowetzky, "Spiritualisation et Culte Sacrificiel chez philon d'Alexandrie," *Semítica* 16 (1967): 97–116: "L'enseignement de Philon est situé au carrefour, on l'a dit, de la doctrine scripturaire et de la doctrine philosophique des sacrifices. L'une et l'autre se reflètent donc dans ceux de ses textes qui concernent ce point particulier de théologie" (99).

²⁶ Richard D. McKirahan, Jr., *Philosophy Before Socrates* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994), 88–89. The Pythagoreans viewed killing anything as a great offense. All living things are related, according to the Pythagorean system, thus any killing is the equivalent of murder.

²⁷ "O LORD open my lips, and let my mouth declare your praise. You do not want me to bring sacrifices; you do not desire burnt offerings; true sacrifice to God is a contrite spirit; God you will not despise a contrite and crushed heart. May it please you to make Zion prosper; rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. Then you will want sacrifices offered in righteousness, burnt and whole offerings; then bulls will be offered on your altar." Ps. 51:17–21.

Pythagoreans, the belief in metempsychosis, the passing of a human soul into another human or animal life, fostered a belief that the taking of animal life for blood sacrifice was morally wrong.²⁸

Philo's view is not as extreme as that of the biblical prophets in condemning contemporary sacrifice as corrupt, nor did he advocate the cessation of blood sacrifice as did the Pythagoreans. Rather, he accepts sacrifice and pilgrimage as legitimate forms of worship which have their own merit yet, nonetheless, devalues such practice in relation to the allegorical significance he attaches to the sacrificial cult. Thus, Philo reads the prescriptions of Leviticus concerning the cult in a "spiritualized" manner: "...what is precious in the sight of God is not the number of victims immolated but the true purity of a rational spirit in him who makes the sacrifice."²⁹ A few lines later in the same text we read, "...He who intends to sacrifice must consider not whether the victim is unblemished but whether his own mind stands free from defect and imperfection."³⁰ His interpretation focuses on the interior disposition of the person presenting the offering and in many cases the interior aspect becomes the whole of the rite; the *halakhic* particularities of the cult are irrelevant. Philo turns his attention to the quality of the soul in the performance of sacrifice, and even goes so far as to associate explicitly the soul who brings the sacrificial offering with the sacrificial victim itself. Thus every aspect of the actual rite of sacrifice takes on a deepened, philosophical meaning which is presented as embodying the ritual's true, if hidden, significance. Indeed, the material offering is only the exterior expression of an internal condition.³¹ Philo emphasizes the need for purity of the "heart" rather than the technical purity of sacrificial offerings.³²

While the Jerusalem Temple occupies an important place in Philo's understanding of Judaism and the Jewish people, his radical spiritualization of the cult has been read as an effort to find daily moral and spiritual meaning in the prescriptions surrounding the cult. Israel, which for Philo is the nation who "sees God," is also a nation of priests. But what is the meaning of a national priesthood that lives apart from the

²⁸ Nikiprowetzky, "Spiritualization," 13.

²⁹ *Spec. Leg.* 1.277.

³⁰ *Spec. Leg.* 1.277. See Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: JTSA, 1962), 153–163.

³¹ Nikiprowetzky, "Spiritualization," 101.

³² Cf. Hosea 6.6: "For I desire goodness, not sacrifice; obedience to God, rather than burnt offerings."

national temple? Philo's spiritualization of the cult allows for the priesthood itself to become spiritualized and removed from the apparatus of temple sacrifice. Priestly status becomes a disciplined, moral and spiritual ideal attainable by all Israel. In this respect, Philo's re-reading of sacrifice along with his insistence upon a centralized shrine, enables a truer form of cultic worship to be practiced in a diaspora setting.

Interpreting the numerous prescriptions in the Septuagint³³ text, Philo attaches symbolic significance to the multiple components of the sacrificial rite.³⁴ Every detail of the cult is spiritualized as Philo transforms sacrifice into a contemplative journey. His references to sacrifice and the temple are scattered throughout his works, but the most extensive and detailed treatments are in *Questions and Answer on Exodus*,³⁵ where he describes point-by-point the features of the tabernacle, and in *On the Special Laws*, where he gives lengthy exegetical commentary on Leviticus. The entire geography of the Temple, as described in the biblical text, is fully allegorized. The temple itself symbolizes the cosmic meeting place of the sensible and intelligible worlds, and sacrifice becomes a contemplative activity by means of which these two aspects of reality are neatly bridged. The ark is a symbol of the incorporeal world,³⁶ and the table adjacent to it symbolizes the sense-perceptible world.³⁷

³³ It is important to note that the Septuagint itself allegorizes somewhat in its translation of some of the technical cultic apparatus. For example, the *urim and thummim*, are translated as *deylosis kai aleytheia* ("manifestation" and "truth") or *sapheyneia* (distinctness, perspicuity) *kai aleytheia* (Philo: *Spec. Leg.* 3.132,140; IV.69; *Mos.* 2.113, 128–29). Thus, it is possible that Philo's own allegories were based upon similar ideas already circulating in Greek-Jewish culture.

³⁴ Philo employs allegory to "spiritualize" Jewish law as it is reflected in the text of the Septuagint. I use the term "spiritualize" to describe Philo's tendency to provide moral, ethical and philosophical explanations which constitute the deeper meaning of particular Biblical commandments, over and above his literal interpretation of those same texts. Philo reads the Bible on two levels: he reads contextually to provide a literal understanding of a text, but also reads symbolically, abstracting the message of a biblical passage beyond its context to arrive at its homiletical or moral significance. Philo frequently calls these two components of scripture the "body" and "soul" of a text.

³⁵ *QE* is extant only in Armenian and Latin translations from the Greek. There are numerous Greek fragments, and I have provided relevant Greek text where it is available, but lack of an *Urtext* makes careful scrutiny of Philo's language in this document rather difficult. All texts cited in this chapter are from Ralph Marcus, *Philo Supplements* (2 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953). I have noted manuscript variants where relevant.

³⁶ *QE* 2.59.

³⁷ *QE* 2.69. Philo also attaches cosmic significance to many other pieces of the tabernacle's furnishings. The bowls on the branches of the menorah stand for zodiacal signs (*QE* 2.76); the mixing-bowls on the lampstand represent the seasons of the year (*QE* 2.77). The lampstand in general seems to be associated with heavenly luminaries. See *QE* 2.78–80.

The four rings that are fit onto the ark, two on each side, symbolize the division of the world into the sense-perceptible and the intelligible sides;³⁸ the *cherubim* are situated on two sides of the altar to indicate that the “bounds of the whole heaven and the world are fortified by the two highest guards,” God’s creative potency and God’s ruling potency.³⁹ The temple is the sacred *topos* where divine and human, intelligible and sensible worlds meet.

Philo holds that the Tabernacle (and by implication, the Temple) was constructed according to a heavenly archetype that was revealed to Moses when he ascended Sinai. Indeed, during this ascent, Moses was shown the pattern according to which the whole universe was made.⁴⁰ The temple, which encases the boundary between the sensible and intelligible worlds, is a microcosm of the universe, but also a macrocosm of the individual soul. In Philo’s words: “What is the meaning of the words, ‘Thou shalt make (them) according to the pattern which has been shown to thee on the mountain’?”⁴¹ Through the ‘pattern’ He again indicates the incorporeal heaven, the archetype of the sense-perceptible, for it is a visible pattern and impression and measure.⁴² The tabernacle is built on the model of the heavens. Indeed, the whole heaven is itself a temple of God. The true temple is the universe; the one crafted by human hands is a replica:

The highest, and in the truest sense the holy temple of God is, as we must believe, the whole universe, having for its sanctuary the most sacred part of all existence, even heaven, for its votive ornaments the stars, for its priests the angels who are servitors to his powers, unbodied souls, not compounds of rational and irrational nature, as ours are, but with the irrational eliminated, all mind through and through, pure intelligence’s, in the likeness of the monad. There is also the temple made by hands; for it was right that no check should be given to the forwardness of those who pay their tribute to piety and desire by means of sacrifices either to give thanks for the blessings that befall them or to ask for pardon and forgiveness of their sins.⁴³

³⁸ *QE* 2.56.

³⁹ *QE* 2.64.

⁴⁰ *QE* 2. 52: “For indeed it was indeed proper and fitting to reveal to an intelligent man the forms of intelligible things and the measures of all things in accordance with which the world was made.

⁴¹ See *Leg. All* 3.102, where Philo uses this same verse to contrast Moses, the artificer of archetypes, with Bezalel, artificer of the objects made in accordance with the archetype.

⁴² *QE* 2.82.

⁴³ Compare Hebrews 5–9, where the tabernacle represents a sketch or replica of the heavens, which is depicted as the true temple. Both Philo and the author of Hebrews

Consequently, the heavenly temple is administered by the unbodied angels, and the material temple is administered by priests. Just as the temple is a microcosm of the universe, so it is a macrocosm of the human soul. The high priest dons the tunic, which represents heaven. He literally “puts on” the cosmos to represent the unity of humanity with the whole heaven:

For there are, as is evident, two temples of God: one of them this universe in which there is also as High Priest his first born, the divine word, and the other rational soul, whose priest is the real Man; the outward and visible image of whom is he who offers the prayers and sacrifices handed down from our fathers, to whom it has been committed to wear the aforesaid tunic, which is a copy and replica of the whole heaven, the intention of this being that the universe may join with man in the holy rites and man with the universe.⁴⁴

The temple itself is a mediator between human and divine reality, and the priest through sacrifice, enacts this drama of mediation.

But the attire of the high priest during temple service is more than symbolic. According to Philo, the priest, upon entering the holy of holies undergoes a profound ontological transformation: his body and soul detach from one another as he mediates between heaven and earth:

...according to Moses, the priest when he goes into the holy of holies ‘will not be a man until he comes out’ (Lev 16.17);⁴⁵ no man, that is, in the movements of his soul though in the bodily sense he is still a man. For when the mind is ministering to God in purity, it is not human, but divine. But when it ministers to ought that is human, it turns its course and descending from heaven, or rather falling to earth, comes forth, even though his body still remains within. Most rightly then is it said, ‘He led him outside,’ outside of the prison houses of the body, of the lairs where the senses lurk, of the sophistries of deceitful word and thought; above all He led him out of himself...⁴⁶

The temple is the sacred locus for the intersection of God and humanity, or to use Philo’s terminology, it is where the intelligible and sensible

credit Moses with the building of the tabernacle according to a heavenly paradigm, revealed to him by God. S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Zurich: Müller, 1965).

⁴⁴ *De Somn.* 1. 215.

⁴⁵ The biblical passage, of course, refers to the fact that no other man will enter the holy of holies until the priest comes out. “When he goes in to make expiation in the shrine, nobody else shall be in the tent of meeting until he comes out” (Lev. 16:17).

⁴⁶ *Heir.* 84–85.

realms meet. Traversing the threshold between the divine and human realms, the priest exists in a liminal state as his soul is “led outside” of its sensible body. The high priest, who navigates this precarious boundary, is frequently described in such “mystical” terms as a semi-divine figure.⁴⁷ Indeed, his journey into the inner sanctum of the temple is a journey to another place, one that transcends physical reality. The efficacy of his sacrificial offerings is dependent upon his openness to the psychic transformation he must undergo when he enters the inner sanctum of the temple, which for Philo, symbolizes the unchanging realm of pure intellect. The priestly robe is just one symbol of his mystical significance. Describing in detail the vestment of the high priest, Philo writes of the garment:

Such is the form in which the sacred vesture was designed, a copy of the universe, a piece of work of marvelous beauty to the eye and the mind. To the eye it presents a most amazing appearance transcending any woven work that we possess in variety and costliness, to the mind the philosophical conceptions which its parts suggest. For it expresses the wish first that the high priest should have in evidence upon him an image of the All, that so by constantly contemplating it he should render his own life worthy of the sum of things, secondly that in performing his holy office he should have the whole universe as his fellow ministrant.⁴⁸

Wearing the mystical robe, the priest bears the image of “the All.” The image is a reminder that he serves God as a representative of the whole universe.⁴⁹ The robe is a garment of mediation and in wearing it, the Priest is equivalent to the whole nation. A symbol of the transformation experienced by the priest at the culmination of the sacrificial rite is his change of garment as he enters the inner sanctum of the temple. He removes the luminous garment that symbolized the universe and instead puts on pure, white linen, “a figure of strong fiber, imperishableness, most radiant light: for fine linen is hard to tear, and is made from no

⁴⁷ The relationship between priestly or anti-priestly polemic and the origin of messianic and mystical traditions has been treated by a number of scholars. See L. Baeck, *The Pharisees and Other Essays* (New York: Schocken Books, 1966); R. Elior, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism* (Oxford: Littman Library, 2004); Gruenwald, “From Priesthood to Messianism: The Anti-Priestly Polemic and the Messianic Factor,” in Fishbane, ed., *Messiah and Christos. On the mystical garment*, see G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (2nd ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965), 56–64.

⁴⁸ *Spec. Leg.* 1. 95.

⁴⁹ It is interesting to note Philo’s universalizing spirit here. Sacrifice accomplishes redemption for all humanity, not just Jews.

mortal creature, and moreover when carefully cleaned has a very brilliant luminous color.”⁵⁰ That the priest’s garment is not made from animal skins is significant. Again, we are reminded of the Pythagorean distaste for blood sacrifice. The priest’s own identity is bound up with that of the sacrificial offering.⁵¹

Philo is preoccupied with the soul of the priest and its proper condition for performing the sacrificial rites. The soul, in fact, becomes the central focus of his spiritualized cult. As the soul of the priest is viewed as a paradigm for the individual soul, Philo is able to transform sacrifice from a rite of the spiritual and political elite into a personal model for psychic discipline.⁵² Philo’s spiritualization completely removes sacrifice from the actual cultic apparatus of the Jerusalem Temple. Indeed, it becomes a rite of the soul.

Philo describes the soul itself as the one true altar:

The true altar of God is the thankful soul of the Sage, compacted of perfect virtues unsevered and undivided, for no part of virtue is useless. On this soul-altar (lit.: on it) the sacred light is ever burning and carefully kept unextinguished, and the light of the mind is wisdom, just as the darkness of the soul is folly.⁵³

The actual temple altar is not the true altar. Rather, the wise soul focused on divine knowledge is the shrine and the cultivation of wisdom within the soul is the truest offering:

What is the meaning of the words, ‘Thou shalt make for me a sanctuary, and I shall appear among you’? . . . If however, thou art worthily initiated and canst become an animate shrine of the Father, then instead of having closed eyes, thou wilt see the First Cause [var. First things] and in wakefulness thou wilt cease from the deep sleep in which thou has been held. Then will appear to thee that manifest one (ὁ ἐπιφάνης) . . . For the

⁵⁰ *De Somn.* 1. 216–217.

⁵¹ The concept of “bloodless sacrifice” is a major theme in the Gospel to the Hebrews. Philo’s allegorizing of sacrifice is believed to have exerted strong influence upon the early fathers of the church. See Jean Laporte, “Sacrifice in Origen in Light of Philonic Models,” in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy* (ed. C. Kannengiesser and W. Peterson; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), 250ff.

⁵² Steven D. Fraade, “Ascetical Aspects of Ancient Judaism,” in *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible Through the Middle Ages* (ed. Arthur Green; New York: Crossroad, 1987), 253–288; James Montgomery, “Ascetic Strains in Early Judaism,” *JBL* 51 (1932):183–213; Vincent Wimbush, *Renunciation Towards Social Engineering (An Apologia for the Study of Asceticism in Greco-Roman Antiquity)* (OPIAC 8; Claremont: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, n.d.).

⁵³ *Spec. Leg.* 1.287–88.

beginning and end of happiness is to be able to see God. But this cannot happen to him who has not made his soul, as I said before, a sanctuary and altogether a shrine of God.⁵⁴

Every individual becomes a sanctuary, add altar and a priest. Philo's understanding endows those who contemplate noetic reality with a type of priestly ability. One whose soul is like an altar can see God and the secrets of creation. This text provides a vivid example of one of Philo's most extreme allegories of the cult. Philo spiritualizes the sacrificial process to such an extent here that he seems to describe a process that is almost entirely interior. Is Philo perhaps suggesting that true sacrifice is a contemplative experience that can be accessed without the temple and priestly apparatus? In this sense, Philo's allegory accomplishes a true democratization of the priesthood.⁵⁵

Conclusion

Many scholars have assumed that it was lack of access to the temple, a result of persecutions expressed in texts such as Daniel or Ezekiel, that inspired tales of ascent to a heavenly temple and visions of a third, restored temple in the eschatological future. In Philo's time, however, the temple still stood, and remained an institution of symbolic importance in Philo's work. Thus, Philo's consistent allegorizing of the temple cult is curious, as the cult continued to function as a central religious institution in his day, and as discussed above, he continued to value pilgrimage as an important form of religious observance and communal solidarity.

Though the temple still functioned in Jerusalem, Philo chose to engage sacrifice through allegory, and thus transformed it into an interior-focused, contemplative rite. While Jerusalem might still have been the *axis mundi*, the place where heaven and earth meet, the place where the Jewish people will be restored to its unity, it was also, for Philo, not a place at all. Indeed, Philo's "Jerusalem" was a spiritual condition of psychic balance, a state of mind that was attainable in a unique way in diaspora. If we read Philo's allegorizing as an active attempt to affirm the "powers of diaspora"—to craft a diasporic identity founded

⁵⁴ *QE* 2.51.

⁵⁵ Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford, 1993).

on national virility as well as superior moral virtue, then the theology of diaspora that emerges in Philo's writing is one that accords divine purpose to the status of exile. This divine purpose is not played out through the drama of sin and punishment, but rather in highlighting the ways in which the dispersion of the Jews conforms to, and perhaps even anticipates, the very ideals of ancient Greek colonization. This scenario bears a striking resemblance to Judaism's ironic history in the post-modern era—that after centuries of marginalization and difference, Judaism's transnational existence is now representative of the global norm.

PART III

REWRITING TRADITION

THE CASE OF THE BLASPHEMER (LEV. 24:10–16)
ACCORDING TO PHILO AND JOSEPHUS

Louis H. Feldman
Yeshiva University

Introduction: Significant Questions

The brief incident of the blasphemer (Lev. 24:10–16) confronts us with a number of significant questions. Why does the Pentateuch suddenly interrupt its account in Leviticus, dealing primarily with the rules pertaining to the priests and the sacrifices, the laws pertaining to *kashrut*, and the ritual laws of purity concerning *tzaraas* (which is usually, erroneously, translated as leprosy)? Only at the end of the book are there discussions of male and female discharges, the laws concerning forbidden sexual relationships, laws concerning gifts to the poor, the requirement of honest dealings with others, the listing of the various festivals, the laws concerning the sabbatical and jubilee year, and the listing of punishments for not observing these laws. The only narrative interruptions are the very brief account of the deaths of Nadab and Abihu (Lev. 10:1–7) and the account of the blasphemer (Lev. 24:10–16), but since Nadab and Abihu were priests there is, in that case, certainly a point of connection with the rest of the book of Leviticus. Hence we are left with the account of the blasphemer as the only narrative that seemingly has no direct connection with those ritual rules of procedure.¹

Philo repeats the biblical statement that what prompted the blasphemer to curse was a fight with an Israelite, but he does not tell us what prompted the fight and what was at issue in the fight. Presumably, he is interested in stressing that the Jews, who had been accused of fomenting a struggle in Alexandria, are actually peaceful and reasonable.

¹ On the problems connected with the structure and digressions in Lev. 24 see Rodney R. Hutton, "Narrative in Leviticus: The Case of the Blaspheming Son (Lev 24: 10–23)," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 3 (1997): 145–63; and John R. Master, "The Place of Chapter 24 in the Structure of the Book of Leviticus," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 159 (2002): 415–24.

Why does Philo so greatly expand the story of the blasphemer, whereas Josephus omits it completely? We may note that Josephus, despite his promise (*Ant.* 1.17) that in his paraphrase of the Pentateuch he would not add to the biblical narrative nor omit anything, similarly omits a number of apparently incriminating details, such as Jacob's deception of his father in order to obtain the blessing (Gen. 27:1–29), the cunning of Jacob in connection with Laban's flock (Gen. 30:37–38), the Judah-Tamar episode (Gen. 38), Moses' slaying of the Egyptian (Exod. 2:12), the building of the golden calf (Exod. 32), the grumbling and doubting before the second miraculous feast of quails (Num. 11:11–23), Miriam's *tzaraas* (Num. 12:10), the story of Moses' striking the rock to bring forth water that speaks of Moses' disgrace (Num. 20:10–12), and the story of the brazen serpent (Num. 21:4–9) whereby Moses cured those who had been bitten by the fiery serpents.² We may note that in the omission of both the narrative of Moses' slaying of the Egyptian and of the story of the fight between the blasphemer and the Israelite Josephus may have had apologetic motives,³ and hence that he omits both, since he was eager not to portray the Jews as a quarrelsome people. Philo does not omit either despite the fact, as we shall see, that they present particular problems for him, inasmuch as in *De Vita Mosis* 1.2 he is answering those non-Jewish critics who belittle Moses and inasmuch as in the case of Moses' slaying of the Egyptian Moses is guilty of bypassing the judicial system and since, as in the case of the blasphemer, Moses is ignorant of what law to apply, whereas a great leader must not be ignorant of the law, especially after he has apparently just received the whole system of law from G-d Himself. Philo gives reasons to explain Moses' action in both cases.

As to the judgment in this case, Josephus does not refer to this incident at all; and when (*Ant.* 4.202) he refers to the crime of blasphemy, he says, "Let one who blasphememes (βλασφημήσας) G-d be stoned," but he does not explain what he means by "blasphemy." If Josephus

² See my *Flavius Josephus: Judean Antiquities 1–4* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 7 n. 22. One may note, moreover, that Josephus omits all the passages that Ibn Ezra lists in his commentary at the beginning of Deuteronomy and about which he says, "Hamevein yavin," "the one who understands will understand." These passages raise questions as to the divine origin of the Torah and seem to imply a human origin.

³ Alternatively, in the case of the omission of the case of the blasphemer, Josephus may have believed that the case of the blasphemer in the Bible was a unique occurrence and that there had been no later occurrences of blasphemers according to this model.

(*Ant.* 3.209–11) does retain the sole other narrative portion in Leviticus, the story of Nadab and Abihu, it is because he, as a priest, felt strongly that in bringing to the altar not the kinds of incense that Moses had prescribed they had committed an egregious sin and, in the interest of protecting the priestly code of behavior, it was important to stress the nature of this violation. On the other hand, he omits the account of the Golden Calf incident because it casts aspersions on the role of Aaron, whose role as the initial high priest, Josephus, who was himself a priest, felt constrained to keep free of such behavior.

The Terminology of Blaspheming

The biblical text is careful to point out that the blasphemer, whose name is not given, was the son of an Israelite mother (identified by name as Shelomit the daughter of Diveri of the tribe of Dan, but who is mentioned nowhere else in the Bible) and an Egyptian father and notes that he fought with a full-fledged Jew, who is not otherwise identified and who is mentioned nowhere else in the Bible.⁴ Then follows the key sentence that he engaged in what would appear to be two separate activities, *vayiqqov* and *vayeqallel* (Lev. 24:11). The Septuagint renders *vayiqqov* as ἐπονομάσας . . . τὸ ὄνομα “naming the name,” and *veqallel* as κατηρώσατο “called down curses upon.” Philo, who expands (*De Vita Mosis* 2.193–208) the narrative of the blasphemer from seven verses to sixteen paragraphs, does not refer to two separate activities but rather says merely that he cursed G-d (*De Vita Mosis* 2.199) and that he thus uttered a sacrilege (ἀσέβημα φθεγξάμενου) That, however, two separate

⁴ H. Mittwoch, “The Story of the Blasphemer Seen in a Wider Context,” *VT* 15 (1965): 386–89, very fancifully reconstructs a scenario connecting the scene of the blasphemer here with the incident in which Moses smote an Egyptian who had been striking a Hebrew (Exod. 2:11–12). Mittwoch imagines, in connection with the latter episode, a meeting of the elders of the Israelites in which the elders deliberated how to counter the presumed threat to Moses and his family. According to this imaginative reconstruction, a man named Diveri rose and offered to give his daughter in marriage to the son of the slain Egyptian. This, Mittwoch postulates, is the Shelomit of our narrative. Their son joined the mixed multitude when the Israelites left Egypt, and he is the Egyptian in our episode. But when he resisted giving evidence against Moses, the son of the Israelite woman blasphemed the name of G-d and uttered curses. All this, we may remark, is possible, but there is no actual evidence to support the details. One of the key words in the pericope is that the blasphemer learned from the episode that the shoemaker, in atonement for his act assumed responsibility for it and attempted to atone for it. But there is no such assumption in my version.

acts involved seems clear from the fact that when Moses, who is unsure how to punish the blasphemer, turns to G-d, he is told four verses later (Lev. 24:15–16): “And say to the people of Israel, ‘Whoever curses (יִקְלֹל) his G-d shall bear his sin. And he who blasphemes (וַיִּקְבֹּב) the name of G-d shall be put to death.’” As Weingreen⁵ has noted, the verb יִקְבֹּב may be either the Qal imperfect of the double ‘ayin root קִבַּב, “cursed,” “invoked evil upon,” or the Pe Nun verb וַיִּקְבֹּב, “named,” “mentioned by name.” That the meaning here is the latter is clear from the divine law (Lev. 24:16): “He who blasphemes (וַיִּקְבֹּב) the *name* of G-d shall be put to death.” That this is the meaning of וַיִּקְבֹּב as understood by the rabbis is clear from the Mishnah in *Sanhedrin* 7:5: “The blasphemer (הַמְגַדֵּף) is not culpable until he has expressly pronounced (שִׁפְרַשׁ) the Name (הַשֵּׁם).” The Targum Onqelos, reflecting this rabbinic understanding of the word וַיִּקְבֹּב, renders it as וַיִּדְפִּישׁ, “clearly pronounced.” The Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 56a) clearly, citing the conclusion of the Rabbis, indicates that the name of G-d must be explicitly mentioned in the curse (וַיִּקְבֹּב), in contrast to the view of Rabbi Meir, who regards a person as culpable even without explicit mention of the name of G-d. Significantly, the Septuagint (Lev. 24:15) reads, “Whoever curses G-d (Greek θεόν) shall bear a sin,” whereas the Hebrew reads, “A man who curses his G-d (אֱלֹהָיו) shall bear his sin.” The Septuagint, by not saying “his” G-d implies that he curses the Hebrew G-d, though not the Tetragrammaton. The Septuagint for Lev. 24:16 reads, “One who names the name of the L-rd (Κυρίου) let him die by death,” whereas the Hebrew reads: “וַיִּקְבֹּב שֵׁם ה’.” Here, by using the Greek word Κυρίου, the Septuagint indicates that the prohibition is in the use of the Tetragrammaton, since that is the Septuagint’s way of translating the Tetragrammaton. Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.204) clearly differentiates between cursing G-d generally and explicitly cursing the Tetragrammaton by name, which, he says, is worse than cursing.⁶ Philo’s point is that the key is not in the verb “curse” or “name” but in the verb’s object, הַשֵּׁם, which is the way he translates אֱלֹהִים vs. the object of the verb “name,” which is the Tetragrammaton. What is confusing is that Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.198) says that reviling is a lesser sin compared with cursing, but here he uses

⁵ J. Weingreen, “The Case of the Blasphemer (Leviticus XXIV 10ff.),” *VT* 22 (1972): 118–23.

⁶ This distinction is not found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Rather, as we find in the Dead Sea *Community Rule* 6:27, the punishment for the mere mention of the name of G-d is to be excluded from the community, never to return.

the verb “cursing” in connection with the lesser sin of disparaging the pagan gods. Apparently, there are two levels of cursing: disparaging the pagan gods, which is certainly prohibited, and actually naming the Tetragrammaton, which deserves the death penalty.⁷ The blasphemer is, in some way, thus violating the prohibition in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:7, Deut. 5:11). In doing so he has degraded or dishonored G-d.

The Significance of the Fact that the Blasphemer is an Egyptian

As to why Philo expands so considerably the account of the blasphemer, the main point is that the blasphemer is an Egyptian, for if the story is presented merely to give us the punishment to be inflicted upon a blasphemer, why does it not omit the narrative details and merely give us the nature of the crime and the punishment to be inflicted upon the offender? The answer seems to be that it is important to identify the offender as an Egyptian. Moreover, the fact that, in a book that centers on halakhic matters, the narrative goes out of its way to identify the mother of the blasphemer as a Jewess intends to give us halakhic data as to what constitutes a Jew, namely, one who has a mother who is Jewish. It is perhaps also intended to give us halakhic evidence as to how one is permitted or not permitted to refer to pagan gods. Furthermore, the incident implies, in agreement with the rabbis (*Sanhedrin* 56a), that a Noahide, that is, a non-Jew, since the blasphemer, as the son of a non-Jewish mother, is halakhically not Jewish, is punished only if he curses G-d by referring to Him by the name of the Tetragrammaton. We note that immediately after the incident of the blasphemer and the punishment inflicted upon him we are given (Lev. 24.17–22) the details of the punishment to be inflicted if one strikes a human or an animal and the fact there should be one law for the proselyte and the native-born Israelite. The fact that this statement follows immediately after the story of the blasphemer and the punishment inflicted upon him would seem to stress that there is a difference in the case where one is not a proselyte, as was true in the instance of the blasphemer, namely that he is punished only where he utters the Tetragrammaton.

Philo, who as a leader of the Jewish community in Alexandria in Egypt, must have been aware of the attraction that the Egyptian way

⁷ Rodney R. Hutton, “The Case of the Blasphemer Revisited (Lev. XXIV 10–23),” *VT* 49 (1999): 532–41.

of life had for some of the Jews of his own day. The fact that the blasphemer was the product of a mixed marriage between a Jew and an Egyptian must have recalled for him such products of mixed marriages with Egyptians who accompanied the Israelites in the Exodus from Egypt (Exod. 12:38). He uses extremely strong condemnatory language in describing (*De Vita Mosis* 1.147) these products of mixed marriages as “a promiscuous, nondescript and menial crowd, a bastard (νόθον) host, so to speak, associated with the true-born.” He likewise describes the blasphemer as a bastard (νόθος, *De Vita Mosis* 2.193). Though intermarriage was most likely not frequent in Philo’s own society,⁸ Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 3.29) does mention the consequences in the future, “lest some day, conquered by the forces of opposing customs, you surrender and stray unawares from the path that leads to piety and turn aside into a pathless wild.”

Philo, significantly, uses the same language with regard to the rebellious son (*De Ebrietate* 95) that he uses with regard to the worshippers of the Golden Calf, namely that he has made a god of the body, that this god is a god of the vanity most honored among the Egyptians, and that its symbol is the image of the golden bull. Just as the rebellious son in the Bible (Deut. 21:18–21) merits the death penalty, so do the worshippers of the Golden Calf. Significantly, Pseudo-Philo (12.3), who apparently does not have the association with Egypt that Philo has, refers to the animal that the Israelites worship as a calf (*vitulus*) rather than as a bull.

Similarly, in a strong condemnatory tone, Philo makes a point (*De Vita Mosis* 2.162) of noting that the golden calf (which he terms a bull, ταῦρος) was in imitation of the animal, Apis, which, he notes, is the one held most sacred in Egypt.⁹ In effect, Philo is saying that

⁸ See my *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 78–79. Philo, significantly, uses the same language with regard to the rebellious son (*De Ebrietate* 95) that he uses with regard to the worshippers of the Golden Calf, namely that he has made a god of the body, that this god is a god of the vanity most honored among the Egyptians, and that its symbol is the image of the golden bull. Just as the rebellious son in the Bible (Deut. 21:18–21) merits the death penalty, so do the worshippers of the Golden Calf. Significantly, Pseudo-Philo (12.3), who apparently does not have the association with Egypt that Philo has, refers to the animal that the Israelites worship as a calf (*vitulus*) rather than as a bull.

⁹ Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1928), 6:52, n. 271, who is unaware that the identification of the bull with Apis comes from Philo, notes that this identification is frequently mentioned by early Christian writers, notably *Apostolic Constitutions* 6.20 and Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones* 4.10, but is unknown in early rabbinic literature.

the very people who were delivered from Egypt have succumbed to the worship of the god that the Egyptians worship. We may also suggest that since from the embalmed bull, which was called Osiris-Apis (Diodorus 1.85.4), the cult of Sarapis, which was so popular especially in Alexandria,¹⁰ was developed during the Hellenistic period, Philo's revulsion may reflect his reaction to the attraction that the Sarapis cult had in his own day. Whereas the biblical narrative gives no reason as to why the Israelites chose to fashion their god in the form of a calf, Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.161), on a number of occasions in referring to the incident, says that the calf was in imitation of Egyptian animal worship (*De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 130; *De Posteritate Caini* 158, 165). As Niehoff¹¹ has most appositely noted, the Egyptians are the only ethnic group that Philo places in diametrical opposition to the Jews. They are viewed (*De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 130) as the personification of body and as the enemies of the Israelites. He refers to the defection as a change of habits (ἐκδιώτησις), a veritable reversal of life style. The Israelites are no longer mere sinners but utter apostates who have deserted to another way of life. Perhaps Philo is thinking of his nephew, Tiberius Julius Alexander, who, as Josephus (*Ant.* 20.100) puts it, "did not stand by the practices of his people," and of others like him in Alexandria. Though the Septuagint refers (Exod. 32:4, 8, 19, 20, 24, 35) to the animal worshipped by the Israelites as a golden calf (μόσχος) and though elsewhere (*De Posteritate Caini* 158, 162, 163, 166; *De Ebrietate* 96, 124; and *De Fuga et Inventione* 90) Philo sometimes refers to the animal as a calf, in what is, in effect, the official biography of Moses, *De Vita Mosis* 2.162 and 2.270, he never speaks of it as a calf but only as a bull (ταῦρος). Indeed, he speaks of the bull as the symbol of the Egyptians (*De Ebrietate* 95).

It is important to note that Philo does not treat all forms of polytheism in the same fashion. Thus, as Mendelson¹² indicates, in connection with worship there is a hierarchy (*De Decalogo* 52–81) descending from the more sublime to the ridiculous—astral worship, pantheism, deification of certain elements, idol worship, worship of domesticated

¹⁰ See J. E. Stambaugh, *Sarapis under the early Ptolemies* (Leiden: Brill, 1972); and Richard L. Gordon, "Sarapis," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (3rd ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 1355–56.

¹¹ Mareb R. Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 46.

¹² Alan Mendelson, *Philo's Jewish Identity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 34–38.

animals, and worship of savage animals. On a purely theoretical level, Philo (*De Animalibus* 77–100), in his debate with his nephew Tiberius Julius Alexander, argues that since animals are not rational, they do not act rationally; hence, he concludes, “to elevate animals to the level of the human race, and to grant equality to unequals is the height of injustice.”¹³ By this criterion the Egyptians, whom Philo identifies with the gods whom they worshipped,¹⁴ are the most debased. Indeed, Philo reduces to absurdity (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1.79) the foolish attachment of the Egyptians to irrational animals, and especially to bulls, and of the Israelites’ construction of a golden bull in imitation of Egyptian vanity (τῦφος), “delusion,” “nonsense,” “humbug” attached to irrational animals (ἐπ’ ἀλόγοις ζώοις) (*De Specialibus Legibus* 3.125). He has a particularly strong attack on the Egyptian worship of animals, which he reduces to absurdity, in fact lowering the worshippers to sub-human status (*De Decalogo* 79–80): “Indeed, strangers on their first arrival in Egypt before the vanity of the land has gained a lodgement in their minds, are likely to die with laughing at it, while anyone who knows the flavor of right instruction, horrified at this veneration of things so much the reverse of venerable, pities those who render it and regards them with good reason as more miserable than the creatures they honor, as men with souls transformed into the nature of those creatures, so that as they pass before him, they seem beasts in human shape.”¹⁵ It is hardly decent, says Philo (*De Vita Contemplativa* 8), even to mention the gods of the Egyptians, since they “have promoted to divine honors irrational animals, not only of the tame sort but also beasts of the utmost savagery. . . . They render worship to them, they the civilized to the uncivilized and untamed, the reasonable to the irrational, the kinsfolk of the G-dhead to ugliness unmatched even by a Thersites [*Iliad* 2.216–19], the rulers and masters to the naturally subservient and slavish.”¹⁶ Philo is here, in effect, refuting the claim made by Artapanus

¹³ Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria, an Exegete for His Time* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 231, asserts that Philo draws his arguments here from Stoic philosophers from Chrysippus to Poseidonius.

¹⁴ See Borgen (above, n. 13), 211.

¹⁵ On this ridiculing of the Egyptian zoolatry, see Niehoff (above, n. 11), 45–74.

¹⁶ For further denunciation of Egyptian worship of animals, see Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 139, 163–66; also Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.224–25; 2.66, 81, 86–88, 139. For pagan critiques of Egyptian animal-worship see Cicero, *De Natura Deorum* 1.36.101; Strabo 16.2.35; Plutarch, *Isis and Osiris* 71; Juvenal 15.1–13; Athenaeus 7.299–300; Lucian, *Deorum Concilium* 10.11, *Imagines* 11, *Jupiter Confutatus* 42, cited by Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. 1: *Historians* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 234, n. 51.

(*ap.* Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.27.4) that Moses assigned as gods to the Egyptians cats, dogs, and ibises. Elsewhere, to be sure, Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 1.23) states that when Moses was young, learned Egyptians instructed him in the regard paid to animals, to which they even paid divine honors; but he quickly adds (*De Vita Mosis* 1.24) that Moses sought only for truth, since his mind was incapable of accepting any falsehood.

Moreover, the Egyptians, in Philo's view, in revering the earth and its river (*De Vita Mosis* 2.194–95), have turned the idea of religiosity upside down. Their religion is a complete non-religion. According to Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1.53), Moses counsels proselytes that “they must not, presuming on the equal privilege and equal rank that he grants them because they have denounced the vain imaginings of their fathers and ancestors, deal in idle talk or revile with an unbridled tongue the gods whom others acknowledge, lest they on their part be moved to utter profane words against Him Who truly is.” The statement that one is not permitted to speak slightly of other people's religions—his interpretation of the Septuagint of Exod. 22:27—apparently does not apply to the Egyptian religion, since the Egyptians were downright atheists (*De Vita Mosis* 2.194 and especially *De Fuga et Inventione* 180). If we ask how Philo could be so extremely negative in his view of the Egyptians when in Josephus Joseph, as Egyptian viceroy, is so considerate of the Egyptians, the answer would seem to be that the latter reflects the behavior of the Egyptians many years before the Exodus, at which time, significantly (Exod. 1:8) there arose a new king, that is, a new dynasty, and apparently a new attitude, among the Egyptians, notably toward foreigners.

The Seriousness of the Case of the Blasphemer

Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1.53) is particularly concerned about the danger of blasphemy because of the deleterious influence that blasphemy has on proselytes, since blasphemy gives a license to unbridled tongues, blaspheming gods. Earlier in Book 2 of *De Vita Mosis* (2.25–44) there is a long digression dealing with the story of the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek at the behest of King Ptolemy Philadelphus. This has nothing to do with Moses directly, but it makes the point that non-Jews were invited to share in the annual celebration of the completion of the translation. It expresses the hope and confidence that non-Jews will abandon their peculiar ways and will turn to honoring G-d and

His laws. If such talk insulting to G-d would be permitted, says Philo, this would give a license to proselytes to utter impious language against the true and holy G-d. Hence, the incident of the blasphemer belongs not in Book 2, which deals with Moses' role as king, lawgiver, and high priest, but rather in Book 1, dealing with Moses' role as prophet and agent of G-d.

Another reason why Philo felt so strongly about the sin of the blasphemer was that he perceived (*De Vita Mosis* 2. 198) that the blasphemer's refusal to reverence G-d implied refusal to honor parents and country and benefactors. Parents, he says (*De Specialibus Legibus* 2.229–30), are truly benefactors, inasmuch as they brought children out of non-existence and nurtured and educated them; indeed, Philo (*De Ebrietate* 13–98) has an extraordinarily long discussion justifying the penalty to be meted out to the rebellious son, where he equates the father of such a son with G-d and the mother with G-d's Wisdom.

Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.202) deems the blasphemer's punishment appropriate, as "stoning was the fitting punishment for a man of a hard and stony soul, and also desiring that the work of vengeance should be shared by all the people, who, as He [G-d] knew, were deeply indignant and desired the death of the offender. And execution by missiles appeared to be the only mode in which so many thousands could take part." Thus Philo applied the principle of the *lex talionis*, which he understood literally (*De Specialibus Legibus* 3.195), to the case of the blasphemer.

The Problem of Moses' Reaction toward the Case of the Blasphemer

The account of Moses' reaction to the case of the blasphemer presented Philo with a real problem. How could the great lawgiver be ignorant of the law in this case when he had received the law not long before this? Lest the reader suspect that Moses had forgotten the law, Philo hastens to explain (*De Vita Mosis* 2.197) that Moses was indeed astonished at the blasphemer's madness and his sheer audacity, and that, in fact, he was strongly indignant and would have cut him off with his own hand but that he feared that he might exact too light a penalty for such extraordinary impiety.

We may well ask why Philo, like Josephus, did not omit the story of the blasphemer, since Moses does not apparently appear in a good light, inasmuch as he, the great lawgiver, does not know how to punish

this lawbreaker (Lev. 24:11–12). Moreover, Philo himself says at the beginning of the treatise (*De Vita Mosis* 1.2–3) that Greek men of letters have refused to treat him as worthy of memory because in many cases the ordinances of the legislators of other states are opposed to his. And if he did include the episode why did he not place it in Book 1 of *De Vita Mosis*? The answer would appear to be that Philo himself (*De Vita Mosis* 2.187) asserts that in Book 1 he had discussed the qualities of Moses as king, lawgiver, and high priest, and that he had left for Book 2 Moses' quality as a prophet of the highest quality. Indeed, Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.192) cites four instances in the Torah where a divine voice laid down the law in the form of question and answer: the case here of the blasphemer, the individual who gathered wood on the Sabbath (Num. 15:32–36; Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 213–220), the second offering of the Paschal sacrifice (Num. 9:1–4; Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 222–32), and the daughters of Zelophehad (Num. 27:1–11; Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2.234–45). One might think that the fact that in these four cases Moses, the great lawgiver, was apparently at a loss as to how to deal with them would seem to damage Moses' reputation as a lawgiver and leader; but Philo makes clear that there was no precedent in these four cases and hence that Moses had to communicate again directly with G-d. The prophet, says Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.190), asks questions of G-d about matters on which he has been seeking knowledge, and G-d replies and instructs him. This is precisely what happens in the case of the blasphemer and in the other three cases as well. Moses had to seek out G-d, and in return G-d bestowed upon him a prophecy with a divine ordinance. As Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.203) says, in a remarkable statement, a new ordinance had to be drawn up because there was no precedent, and “unexpected disorders” required divine intervention and the promulgation of a new law. The offense of the blasphemer is a theological offense, in questioning G-d's very existence. Hence Moses had to use his prophetic faculty in order to be informed by G-d directly.

The Attitude of Philo and Josephus toward the Gods of Others

Both Philo and Josephus stress the importance of respect for their non-Jewish neighbors. This is particularly apparent in their view of their sin of blasphemy, especially in view of the close connection of religion and state. Both Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.205, *De Specialibus Legibus*

1.53, *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2.5) and Josephus (*Against Apion* 2.237) follow the Septuagint (Exod. 22:27) in reading “Thou shalt not revile gods” and deduce therefrom that Moses forbade the Jews to deride or blaspheme the gods recognized by others, out of respect for the very word “G-d.” In emphasizing that one is not permitted to blaspheme pagan gods, Philo and Josephus may well be answering the charge of people such as is cited by Pliny the Elder (*Historia Naturalis* 13.46), that Jews are remarkable for their contempt for divine powers generally. He is also refuting such people as Tacitus (*Histories* 5.5.2), who assert that the first thing that Jews teach proselytes is to despise the gods. Philo, however, noting (*De Vita Mosis* 2.203) that the biblical passage speaks of two acts of the blasphemer, cursing and naming G-d, explains, in accordance with the Septuagint of Exod. 22:27, that one is not permitted to blaspheme (לְקַלֵּל) the *gods* of others, but that to name the name of the Hebrew G-d, Who is utterly unique, is a much more serious crime (*De Vita Mosis* 2.204–6) and is punishable by death. In rendering the word אֱלֹהִים as a plural θεοὺς, “gods,” the Septuagint, followed by Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2.205, *De Specialibus Legibus* 1.53, and *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2.5) and Josephus (*Ant.* 4.207, *Against Apion* 2.237) understands the prohibition as applying to one who blasphemes “his G-d.” Hence this would appear to refer to a pagan god as well.¹⁷ Only such a person must “bear” his sin (Lev. 24:15), whereas one who actually names G-d, referring to the Tetragrammaton, is to be stoned to death. In drawing this distinction between blaspheming and naming, as we have noted, Philo is in accord with the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin* 7:5), which explains that the blasphemer is to be put to death only if he has fully pronounced the name of G-d (i.e., the Tetragrammaton). This would also appear to explain the prohibition in the Decalogue (Exod. 20:7 and Deut. 5:11) of misuse of G-d’s name without due reason.¹⁸ The Name is thus equivalent to the Tetragrammaton, as we see in Deut. 28:58.¹⁹ According to the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 56a), a non-Jew is forbidden to blaspheme generic G-d by the “laws of Noah.”

Josephus may not have included the story of the blasphemer, but he does state the Law (*Ant.* 4.207) that forbids blaspheming the gods that other cities revere or robbing foreign temples or taking treasures

¹⁷ Targum Onqelos on Exod. 22:27 renders אֱלֹהִים by the Aramaic אַדְרָג, “judge,” as do the rabbis.

¹⁸ See Weingreen (above, n. 5), 122.

¹⁹ See Weingreen (above, n. 5), 122.

that have been dedicated in the name of any god. This would seem to be Josephus' answer (*Ant.* 4.207) to Manetho's objection (*Against Apion* 1.249, 264, 309) that Moses ordered his people to overthrow temples and altars; doing so would seem to be less than tolerant. Indeed, we may note that Josephus, in his paraphrase of the Bible in the *Antiquities*, significantly omits the passage (Deut. 12:2–3) in which G-d instructs Moses that the Israelites, when entering Canaan, should destroy all statues and devastate all high places, since this would seem to indicate lack of respect for other peoples' religions. In addition, Josephus (*Ant.* 2.304) has discreetly omitted any reference to the passage (Exod. 8:21–23) in which Moses seems to show intolerance by declaring that the Israelites sacrifice to G-d what is untouchable to the Egyptians. Furthermore, whereas the Bible (Lev. 24:15–16) declares that anyone, whether Israelite or foreigner, who curses G-d is subject to the death penalty, Josephus (*Ant.* 4.202), sensitive to the feelings of non-Jews, in paraphrasing the passage, omits mention of the applicability of this penalty also to foreigners.²⁰

Summary

Philo, in agreement with rabbinic tradition, draws a distinction between cursing G-d in general and actually cursing G-d by referring to His name, the Tetragrammaton. Philo, as a leader of the Jewish community in Alexandria, elaborates greatly in recounting the incident mentioned in the Bible, emphasizing in particular the identity of the blasphemer as an Egyptian. We see how negatively Philo felt about the Egyptians in the fact that he refers, in his official biography of Moses, *De Vita Mosis*, to the golden calf not as a calf but as a bull, thus bringing to mind the Egyptian worship of a bull in the popular cult of Sarapis. Thus he refers to the Egyptian religion as a complete non-religion. Perhaps Philo is seeking to counter the attraction of the cult to Jews. In particular, he is concerned about the danger of blasphemy because of its influence on proselytes. The danger is particularly serious because Philo sees in the refusal of the blasphemer to reverence G-d an implied refusal to honor parents and country and benefactors. Because he notes that Greek men of letters had refused to treat Moses as worthy

²⁰ I should like to express my gratitude to my colleague, professor Hayim Tawil for aid in interpretation of the biblical terms for "blasphemy."

of memory, Philo is especially concerned with Moses' initial ignorance of what penalty to inflict upon the blasphemer. Philo's reply, in this as in three other instances where Moses did not know what to decide, is that there was in these no precedent and hence that Moses had to communicate directly with G-d.

Josephus avoids the whole problem by not mentioning the incident at all. On other hand, both Philo and Josephus stress the importance of respect for all religions.

CHASTE BETRAYALS: WOMEN AND MEN IN THE APOCRYPHAL NOVELS

Adele Reinhartz
University of Ottawa

In the aftermath of the Bill and Monica saga, the bookstores were filled with self-help books on saving one's marriage. One of these, entitled *Emotional Infidelity: How to Affair-Proof Your Marriage and 10 Other Secrets to a Great Relationship*, argued that the major threat to marriage today is not sexual infidelity but rather "emotional infidelity," the sharing of emotional intimacy with someone outside the marital relationship. Those who would avoid infidelity are urged to avoid personal conversation with friends and co-workers over lunch or on e-mail, and, of course, to spend more "quality time" with one's partner.¹

Whether the distinction between sexual and emotional infidelity condemns or exonerates Clinton I do not know. But the book raised some interesting questions about a group of women with whom I have spent many enjoyable hours: Esther, Susanna, Sarah, and Judith. These women are not personal friends or co-workers, nor do we do lunch or exchange e-mails. Nevertheless, as leading ladies in one or another of the books of the apocrypha, they are more absorbing, to me at least, than Monica, Hilary, and Bill. All four of these apocryphal women are pious, chaste, beautiful, and unavailable. Susanna, Sarah and Esther are married; Judith is widowed and determined to stay that way. Despite their piety and chastity, however, all of these women have significant, perhaps even emotionally intimate, relationships with men other than their husbands: Esther with her kinsman Mordecai, Susanna with the young prophet Daniel, Sarah with their father-in-law Tobit, and the beautiful widow Judith with the Assyrian general Holofernes. If Neuman's book is correct, such relationships are a form of infidelity, a threat to marriage, and therefore should have been studiously avoided by these Hellenistic Jewish poster girls. Yet in the apocryphal texts

¹ M. Gary Neuman, *Emotional Infidelity: How to Affair-Proof Your Marriage and 10 Other Secrets to a Great Relationship* (Three Rivers, Michigan: Three Rivers Press, 2002).

known as Greek Esther, Susanna, Tobit and Judith, these liaisons are not only tolerated but actively encouraged and lavishly praised. How are we to understand this paradox?

Apocrypha and Diaspora

The apocrypha are fascinating not only for their role in the vagaries and controversies that surround the lengthy canonization processes within Jewish and Christian communities but also for the insight they provide into the travails, concerns, and beliefs of second temple Jews as they considered their place in the culture, politics and religious systems of the Hellenistic world.²

The apocryphal texts demonstrate an acute awareness of the Babylonian conquest which left a sizeable Jewish population living outside the land of Israel. Tobit, for example, instructs his son Tobias to take his children to Media, for “all of our kindred, inhabitants of the land of Israel, will be scattered and taken as captives from the good land; and the whole land of Israel will be desolate, even Samaria and Jerusalem will be desolate. And the temple of God in it will be burned to the ground and it will be desolate for a while” (14:3–4). The Letter of Jeremiah warns the exiles in Babylonia “...to beware of becoming at all like the foreigners or of letting fear for the[ir] gods possess you when you see the multitude before and behind them worshipping them.” (5–6).

The apocrypha provide a blueprint for how to maintain Jewish identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora. Like Esther (14:15, Addition C) and Judith (10:5, 12:19), Diaspora Jews should maintain the dietary laws even under the most adverse circumstances; they should observe the holidays of Purim (Greek Esther) and Hanukkah (2 Maccabees 2:16–10), which commemorate victories of Israel against foreign political, military and spiritual forces. Sabbath observance was essential, of course, but could be compromised in times of war, for, as the Maccabean leader Mattathias noted, “If we all...refuse to fight with the Gentiles for our lives and for our ordinances, they will quickly destroy

² Cf. Charles D. Harvey, *Finding Morality in the Diaspora? Moral Ambiguity and Transformed Morality in the Books of Esther*, *Beihfte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*; Bd. 328. (New York; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003).

us from the earth” (1 Maccabees 2:40–41). Most crucial, however, was endogamy, “marrying in.” Tobit emphatically instructs his son Tobias to “marry a woman from among the descendants of your ancestors; do not marry a foreign woman, who is not of your father’s tribe; for we are the descendents of the prophets” (4:12).

The apocryphal books of Susanna, Tobit, Judith and Greek Esther illustrate the various precepts and values that were dear to the hearts of Diaspora Jews. Though not quite pot-boilers or Harlequin romances, these books, like modern novels, were intended to entertain as well as to convey a moralistic or didactic message.³ Judging by the number of manuscripts and versions still extant, these novels may well have been read by more Jews than any other type of literature except the Torah itself.⁴

Apocryphal Women

A striking feature of these novels is the predominance of women characters around whom revolve the emotional issues of the drama.⁵ More often than not, these emotional issues are directly related to marriage and the marital relationship, as they pertain to a heroine who is Jewishly knowledgeable, pious, and, of course, chaste.

This description fits Susanna perfectly. Her story is one of three apocryphal additions to the biblical Book of Daniel, and was likely written in Greek in the early first century B.C.E.⁶ Susanna is “a very beautiful woman and one who feared the Lord” (2); She has been taught according to the Law of Moses by her parents, who are also righteous (3). Her husband Joakim is very wealthy and much honoured. His house in Babylon serves as the court of law, and has a fine garden (4). One hot day Susanna prepares in the garden for a refreshing bath. There she is entrapped by two wicked and lustful elders, judges in the court, who have been eyeing her for some time. The elders offer her an unsavoury ultimatum: either she lies with them or they report that

³ Lawrence M. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World, Myth and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995), 5.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ On the dating, provenance and other introductory information about the apocrypha, see Michael David Coogan et al., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: With the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books* (3rd ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), ad loc.

she had a rendezvous with a young man. She refuses, is duly accused, tried, and would have been executed for adultery but for the young Daniel who exposes the duplicity of the elders, saves Susanna's life, and restores her intact to her parents, husband and family (63).

So where is the infidelity in this ancient court drama? Certainly not in the encounter between Susanna and the elders, much as the two men might have desired it. Apparently not between Susanna and Daniel, who do not meet directly at all. But this latter possibility bears a closer look. Although Susanna and Daniel never so much as speak to one another, the reader of this story cannot help but draw a line of connection between them. First, Daniel is Susanna's counterpart in youth and piety. Second, Daniel's presence in the story contrasts starkly with Joakim's absence. Although Susanna is very much the married woman, the narrative disconnects her from her husband while linking her with Daniel. Joakim does not appear as a speaking character but only as a backdrop to the main action. Indeed, his sole role seems to be to establish Susanna's class and marital status, facts that are essential to the plot of the novel. Most important, Joakim is absent from the court proceedings except, presumably, as a spectator. He is silent in the face of the challenge to his wife's virtue and reputation; he is passive as the case is tried and verdict pronounced. Daniel, on the other hand, defends Susanna's piety and chastity as her husband should have done; he is passionately convinced of her innocence, as her husband should have been. Daniel takes on the role of judge and arbiter that Joakim should have held as the most honoured man in the community. Daniel is quite literally the answer to Susanna's prayers (22, 44), for when she turns to God for help, God chooses Daniel as the agent through whom to aid her. Without Daniel, she is nothing, in fact, she is dead.

If the story of Susanna were a modern-day romance, Susanna would wake up to the superficiality and emotional bankruptcy of her relationship with husband Joakim and run off with the young and passionate Daniel, thereby cementing physically and emotionally the spiritual connection between them. Indeed, the reader might be forgiven for thinking that in the young man Daniel the lad of the elders' fabricated tale has somehow materialized in the flesh. (It would have helped my theory immensely if the word for "young lad" in the elders' story, *νεανίσκος* [*neaniskos*] and the word as applied to Daniel *παιδέριον νεότερον* [*paidērion neoteron*] were the same in Greek, but alas this is not the case.) But this being a first century Jewish novel in which passion plays second fiddle to propriety, Daniel's intervention does not

merely save Susanna's life but returns her to her husband, who, now that she has been vindicated—no thanks to him—praises God for her (63). The romance of Susanna and Daniel remains a titillating possibility, no more.

More graphic, and daring, are the exploits of Judith. Her story was probably composed in Hebrew during the latter part of the second century B.C.E., and transmitted in several versions and translations. The book is set during the fictional siege of the Jewish town of Bethulia at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar's Assyrian army and his general Holofernes. Judith, a beautiful, pious, and wealthy widow, saves Bethulia when she develops and successfully carries out a risky and cold-blooded plan for Holofernes.

If Susanna's attraction lay in her innocence, Judith's power lies in her piety, decisiveness, and guts.⁷ Like Susanna, Judith is an upper class woman. She too has been properly married, though by the time we meet her she has been widowed for some time. Though she eschews the comforts of her late husband Manasseh's home, Judith ably manages the estate, and carries a position of authority in the community. But in her personal life she has not moved on. Indeed, Judith has adopted a lifestyle of permanent mourning. She lives in a tent on the roof of the home, dresses in sackcloth, and fasts, except on Sabbath and feast days.⁸ Judith's extreme piety and ongoing devotion to her husband, or at least, her fidelity to the widow's role are admirable, from the point of view of the Hellenistic Jewish diaspora.

Not that Judith lacks potential suitors. One such man in her life is Uzziah, the Bethulian Jewish leader who is clearly smitten with Judith and will gladly go along with whatever plan of action, political or otherwise, that she might suggest. Then there is Achior, the righteous Ammonite whose words and deeds parallel Judith's and who ends by converting to Judaism. But neither of these men is a match for Judith. She is hunting bigger game: the Assyrian general Holofernes himself.

⁷ Linda Day, however, has argued that Judith's piety is a tad deceiving; in Day's view, Judith is a morally ambiguous character. See Linda Day, "Faith, Character and Perspective in Judith," *JSTOT* 95 (2001): 71–93.

⁸ For a study of the role of domestic space in the books of Judith and Susanna, see Adele Reinhartz, "Better Homes and Gardens: Women and Domestic Space in the Books of Judith and Susanna," in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson* (ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins; *Studies in Christianity and Judaism/Études Sur Le Christianisme Et Le Judaïsme*; Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000), 325–39.

True, this hunt is fuelled by the passion of patriotism rather than love, but it is sexuality that pervades the preparations for and execution of their climactic encounter.

Judith engages in extensive and detailed beauty preparations. According to the narrator:

She removed the sackcloth she had been wearing, took off her widow's garments, bathed her body with water, and anointed herself with precious ointment. She combed her hair, put on a tiara, and dressed herself in the festive attire that she used to wear while her husband Manasseh was living. She put sandals on her feet and put on her anklets, bracelets, rings, earring, and all her other jewelry. Thus she made herself very beautiful, to entice the eyes of all the men who might see her (10.3-4)

Indeed, she dazzles Uzziah, the elders, and all the men of the town as she departs Bethulia, she captivates the Assyrian patrol that arrests her and takes her off to Holofernes, and she enchants the great man himself.

The seduction of Holofernes is meticulously planned and almost lovingly carried out. The irony is exquisite. Whereas Holofernes believes that he is seducing Judith, preparing her slowly for an intimate encounter, we readers know that the reverse is true. With every sweet word that she utters, Judith winks knowingly at her narrative audience. When Judith declares that this, the day that she is finally alone with him in his tent, is the greatest day in her whole life (12:18), we know it is not Holofernes' sexual technique that she is anticipating. Standing beside Holofernes' bed, where he has collapsed in a drunken stupor, Judith prays for God's help. She then reaches up to the bedpost, takes down Holofernes' sword, prays again, and strikes his neck twice with all her might. She cuts off his head, rolls his body off the bed and pulls down the canopy. She calmly leaves the tent and hands the head to her maid, who places it in the food bag. The two of them stroll back to Bethulia.

It may be argued that decapitation is a symbolic castration, and that in penetrating Holofernes' tent Judith has reversed the gendered hierarchies of active and passive, penetrator and the penetrated. She is the seducer and he the seduced, she the manipulator and he the putty in her hands.⁹ Clearly, Holofernes is no Daniel, and his relationship

⁹ Mieke Bal, "Head Hunting: 'Judith' on the Cutting Edge of Knowledge," *JSTOT* 63 (1994): 3-34.

with Judith is fraught with manipulated misunderstanding and not spiritual intimacy.

Yet it is Holofernes, and not the more acceptable men such as Uzziah and Achior, who is marked as the dead Manasseh's counterpart in his widow Judith's life. It is for Holofernes that Judith now bathes, anoints, and dresses herself, "in the festive attire that she used to wear when her husband Manasseh was living" (10:3–4). Holofernes' death by decapitation is not unlike that of Manasseh, who died on his bed after feeling a burning heat on his head (a similarity that is often masked by a less awkward, and less literal English translation such as "he was overcome by the burning heat: 8:3).

We readers know that Judith spoke to Holofernes with forked tongue, but imagine how she must have watched his every move, gauged his response, learned his body language and his drinking habits, for without such intimate knowledge, she would surely have been unable to carry out her daring act. After such a peak experience, how could she settle for marriage with the adoring Uzziah or the newly-converted Achior? No, she herself must remain a widow, though many desire to marry her (16:22).

Where Susanna shies away from seduction and sexuality, Judith pushes chastity to the brink, committing an act which remains chaste in a technical sense only. Yet both are ultimately restored to the status quo, and do not disrupt it again. Susanna returns to her husband alive and unsullied, and Judith returns to her estate and her widowhood. In both cases sexuality is contained despite the intense and life-changing encounter with another man.¹⁰

Although both Susanna and Judith were in endogamous marriages, endogamy itself is not a major theme in either book. Contrast the book of Tobit, in which endogamy is all. Tobit is generally dated to the second century B.C.E.; fragments found at Qumran, four in Aramaic and one in Hebrew, suggest a Hebrew or Aramaic original. The hero, Tobit, is a pious Diaspora Jew who becomes blinded by bird dung after providing proper burial for a fellow Jew. Believing, indeed, in his despair, hoping, that he will soon die, he sends his son Tobias to redeem a sum of money in a distant land. Tobias, accompanied by the angel Raphael, returns not only with the money, but with a remedy for his

¹⁰ Cf. Amy-Jill Levine, "Sacrifice and Salvation: Otherness and Domestication in the Book of Judith," in *"No One Spoke Ill of Her": Essays on Judith* (ed. James C. VanderKam; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 17–30.

father's blindness and with a fitting bride. As a reward, Tobias prepares to give Raphael half of the estate which he had redeemed.¹¹

Our interest is in Tobias' bride Sarah. Like Susanna and Judith, Sarah belongs to the upper crust. The family has a large house, herds, and servants, one of whom complains that Sarah beats her (3:9). Sarah, like Tobit, suffers from a malady for which no cure has been found: each of her seven bridegrooms has died in the marriage bed at the hands of the demon Asmodeus. Sarah's affliction is cured when Tobias, coached by the angel Raphael, put a fish's liver and heart on the embers of incense. The resulting odor so repels the demon that he flees to the remotest parts of Egypt (8:3). Sarah's marriage to Tobias answers the dreams of both sets of parents, who want only that their children marry within the family (7:10).

The marriage of Sarah and Tobias is arranged quickly and without much fanfare. Tobias declares that he will neither eat nor drink till matters are settled. Sarah's father, Raguel immediately pronounces the marriage formula (7:11), the wedding chamber is prepared, and Sarah awaits Tobias while he feasts. At bedtime, he enters the chamber, vanquishes the demon, and then arises from bed, ordering Sarah to do the same. They pray for safety and mercy (8:4). Tobias declares that he is taking this kinswoman "not because of lust, but with sincerity." (8:7). Sure enough, no sooner do they say "Amen, Amen" than they go to sleep for the night. While we may presume that consummation occurs, perhaps at the moment of the demon's defeat, the narrator draws the curtain and protects their modesty.

Thus far chastity, sincerity, and of course endogamy rule the story. Sarah may be so delighted to be out of the vicious and traumatic cycle of wedding-night deaths that she would not look at another man. And indeed she does not. But even this narrator, much less bold than the one who tells Judith's tale, links the chaste woman with a man who is not her husband. In this case, the man is her father-in-law Tobit. The narrator associates them long before they meet, through specific comments as well as the narrative structure of particular chapters. Tobit's lengthy prayer for death—occasioned by his incurable blindness—in chapter

¹¹ Tobit is often taken to be a humorous work, due to its frequent use of exaggeration, and the very notion of a man being blinded by bird dung. See, for example, Anatheia Portier-Young, "Alleviation of Suffering in the Book of Tobit: Comedy, Community, and Happy Endings," *CBQ* 63, no. 1 (2004): 35–54. For a contrary view, see J. R. C. Cousland, "Tobit: A Comedy in Error?", *CBQ* 65, no. 4 (2004): 535–553.

3 is followed immediately by Sarah's prayer for death, occasioned by the taunting she receives for the deaths of her seven bridegrooms. God too links Tobit and Sarah. As the narrator states, "the prayers of both of them were heard in the glorious presence of God. So Raphael was sent to heal both of them: Tobit, by removing the white films from his eyes, so that he might see God's light with his eye; and Sarah, daughter of Raguel, by giving her in marriage to Tobias son of Tobit, and by setting her free from the wicked demon Asmodeus." (3:16–17). At the end of the story, the angel Raphael repeats this motif when he reveals his identity to Tobit and Tobias: "So now, when you and Sarah prayed it was I who brought and read the record of your prayer before the glory of the Lord...at the same time God sent me to heal you and Sarah your daughter-in-law." (12:12–14). Indeed, Tobit's full vigour is restored only after he meets Sarah (11:16).

In contrast to the books of Susanna and Judith, the book of Tobit does not contain even the remotest hint of sexual impropriety in this non-marital relationship. Sarah goes on to beget seven sons, and Tobit dies a contented old man. The relationship between them, far from disrupting marital patterns, is but the confirmation that Tobias and Sarah were indeed meant for each other from the beginning of the world, as the angel Raphael had told Tobias (6:18).

Why then the link between Tobit and Sarah? Allow me to suggest that Tobias is a mere stand-in for his father, who is already married and cannot be unmarried due to the social mores implicit within the book. This possibility does not stem directly from the story itself but emerges from the folk tale which, according to many scholars, is at the heart of this book. This folk tale is known as the Grateful Dead (a phrase that has very different associations to our own contemporary ears).¹² It is attested in many different cultures, and it runs like this: A wandering hero meets a group of creditors who refuse to bury a corpse until the debts of the dead man are paid. The hero ransoms the dead man's body and secures its burial. At some later point, a mysterious personage joins the hero's company and agrees to aid him on his journey. This mystery figure is the Grateful Dead Man, apparently restored to life. The aid is provisional, however, on the condition that the hero's gains

¹² Carey A. Moore, *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (1st ed.; New York/Toronto: Doubleday, 1996), 11–12. Another folk motif in this work is the Monster in the Bridal Chamber; cf. Wills, *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*, 73.

be shared equally with the Grateful Dead Man. The two then embark on a series of adventures that culminate in the bridal chamber of a princess whose many bridegrooms have perished in the jaws of a dragon in the wedding bed. On the advice and with the help of the Grateful Dead Man, the hero slays the dragon and marries the princess. The Grateful Dead Man then receives half of the hero's gains.

The parallels to the story of Tobit are obvious. In Tobit, however, the figure of the hero is split between the father, who buries the dead man, and the son, who saves and marries the princess. Sarah's marriage to Tobias is the fulfillment of Tobit's dream, and her arrival into his household essential to his complete recovery. Tobias, like Raphael, is merely the agent who brings Sarah and Tobit together.

Finally, we turn to Esther, not as she appears in the Hebrew story that is read annually at the feast of Purim, but in her Greek guise in the Septuagint. The Greek book of Esther differs from Hebrew Esther in two principal ways. First, it contains six lengthy additions which add narrative content as well as amplify aspects of the Hebrew story, and second, it adds approximately fifty references to God to the Hebrew story in which God is not mentioned in any explicit way. A colophon attributes the Greek text to one Lysimachus, an Alexandrian Jew who lived in Jerusalem, though scholarly opinions are divided as to the historicity of this attribution. Two of the six additions, ostensibly the texts of Persian edicts, were composed in Greek; the others may have had a Hebrew source. The latest possible date is the late first century C.E., when the additions were used by the Jewish historian Josephus in his paraphrase of the Esther story.

Like its Hebrew counterpart, the Greek book of Esther tells of the Jewish queen of the Persian king Artaxerxes. Within the context of second temple Jewish literature, this Esther stands out among her fellow women heroes: she alone has broken the cardinal rule of endogamy by marrying King Artaxerxes. Not only does she marry him, but, in a manner reminiscent of Judith's preparations, she deliberately sets out to ensnare him by participating in the rigorous year-long beauty regimen and beauty contest, or perhaps sex contest, by which Artaxerxes seeks to replace the disobedient Queen Vashti.

The main plot of this story, like that of Judith, revolves around a threat to the survival of the Jewish people that is perpetrated by a powerful enemy, in this case, Haman, King Artaxerxes' right hand man. Haman manipulates the king into promulgating a decree authorizing the destruction of all Jews on the fourteenth day of the month

of Adar. Esther, like Judith, must act decisively and daringly to save her people.

Perhaps, then, it is Haman the enemy who constitutes Esther's intimate other, just as Holofernes did for Judith. Some basis for this interpretation can be found in the climactic scene in which Esther reveals her identity and her people's plight to the king and exposes Haman as the evil perpetrator (7:6). Upon hearing of Haman's dastardly deed, the king leaves the room and Haman begs the queen for his life, for, as the narrator explains, "he saw that he was in serious trouble" (7:7). The king re-enters the room just as Haman throws himself upon Esther beseechingly. Artaxerxes jumps to the most alarming interpretation of the scene: "Will he dare even assault my wife in my own house?" (7:8).

But though she is instrumental in Haman's downfall, Esther is much less occupied with Haman than Judith is with Holofernes. Esther's primary relationship throughout the entire book is neither with her husband, nor with Haman, but with her kinsman Mordecai. It was Mordecai who had raised her after she was orphaned, who had primed her for the beauty contest, and who continued to keep an eye on her from his vantage point in the king's court. From the beginning of Addition A, it is clear that Mordecai, as Esther's elder, and a man, dominates this relationship, a position that is reinforced by his role as her guardian and mentor (2:10) both before and after her marriage to the king (2:11).

Esther's rise to queendom is a potential threat to Mordecai's dominant position in their relationship. The threat is defused to some degree by the narrator who goes beyond the Hebrew version in emphasizing that Esther continued to obey Mordecai's word in all matters pertaining to faith and lifestyle: she feared God and kept his laws, "just as she had done when she was with [Mordecai]" (2:20). From the narrator's perspective, the essential structure of their relationship therefore remained unchanged even though her worldly status now surpassed his. That this is true also from the divine perspective is indicated by their twin prayers, which are the substance of Addition C. As in Tobit, which paired the supplications of Tobit and Sarah, the family that prays together stays together.

If Mordecai is Esther's superior in the Jewish world, it is Esther, Artaxerxes' queen, who is "one-up" on him in the external world of Persian society and politics. The narrator, however, takes pains to remedy this discrepancy by elevating Mordecai's status to match Esther's. First, the

narrator lavishes attention on Mordecai in the additions which act as preface and prologue to the book proper. In this frame, Mordecai has a prophetic dream in which the events of the main plot are set out in symbolic terms as a conflict between two great dragons—Mordecai and Haman—mediated by a tiny spring that became a river, namely Esther. Second, within the book itself, the narrator embroils Mordecai in a subplot all his own. As in the main plot, and in keeping with Mordecai's dream, the villain of the piece is Haman. According to Addition A, Mordecai exposes a plot to assassinate the king, and thereby incurs the hatred of Haman. In the body of the book, as in the Hebrew version, Haman's enmity stems from Mordecai's refusal to bow down to him. Mordecai gets the better of Haman when Artaxerxes reads of Mordecai's role in averting his assassination and engages Haman to carry out the public honours that Haman had expected for himself.

Third, the narrator carefully plots out Mordecai's rise in political power to the point where he is no longer subordinate to Esther in this regard. When Haman's plot is first announced, Mordecai can only influence matters indirectly, by persuading Esther that she must seek an audience with the king. He takes this opportunity to remind Esther of "the days when you were an ordinary person, being brought up under my care," an admonition intended to give greater force to his command to "Call upon the Lord; then speak to the king in our behalf, and save us from death" (4:8). This speech serves both to maintain the "proper" hierarchy of relationship between Mordecai and Esther and to emphasize that an appeal to God through prayer is essential if tragedy is to be averted. Esther finally agrees, asking only that the Jews in Susa gather and fast for three days and nights, as will Esther and her maids (4:16).

Haman's exposure as villain marks Mordecai's formal ascent to power. The king gives Mordecai Haman's ring and his position as the king's right hand man, and Esther gives him authority over Haman's estate (8:2). The king then authorizes Esther to write a decree replacing the one dictated by Haman (7:7–10, 8:1–12), but the context makes it clear that the letter was written by her and Mordecai together in the king's name (8:8). The description, institution, and validation of the annual festival, celebrated by merrymaking, and the giving of gifts to friends and to the poor, are associated with both Mordecai and Esther.

Then Queen Esther daughter of Aminadab along with Mordecai the Jew wrote down what they had done, and gave full authority of the letter about Purim [which was to be celebrated throughout the land]. And Mordecai

and Queen Esther established this decision on their own responsibility, pledging their own well-being to the plan. Esther established it by a decree forever, and it was written for a memorial. (9:29–32)

Mordecai, meanwhile, “acted with authority on behalf of King Artaxerxes and was great in the kingdom as well as honored by the Jews.” (10:3) Mordecai has not only replaced Haman as the king’s right hand man, thereby achieving an influential and formal role in the government that paralleled Esther’s, but he also acted in concert with Esther as leaders of Persian Jewry.

That Mordecai is the most significant person in Esther’s life is obvious. Their intimacy is explicitly based on familial ties, sharing a household, and ongoing communication even when separated by status and the harem walls. The intensity of the relationship far surpasses that of Esther’s marriage to a Gentile king to whom she can speak only when formally summoned, whose bed she despises, and whose royal crown she likens to a “filthy rag” (literally: menstrual rag). These innermost feelings, revealed by Esther in prayer to God alone, and Mordecai’s expressed conviction that Esther’s marriage was divinely ordained for the purpose of saving the Jewish people, redeem Esther’s exogamy of which the narrator, and no doubt his Hellenistic Jewish audience, must have disapproved.

The intimacy between Mordecai and Esther can easily be explained as an expression of the love between adoptive father and daughter, or mentor and pupil. But there is one, albeit very small, hint that something more may be at stake. Scholars have long been puzzled by a discrepancy between the Greek and Hebrew versions of Esther in their opening descriptions of the relationship between Mordecai and Esther. Whereas the Hebrew unequivocally states that Esther was as a daughter [bat] to him, the Greek indicates that Mordecai brought her up as a wife for himself [epaideusen autein eauto eis gunaika] and then comments on her beauty (2:7). The Hebrew version strikes many commentators as correct in light of the narrative context in which Esther goes on to marry Artaxerxes. Carey Moore, for example, suggests that the Greek translator misread the Hebrew consonants (bt), which are the same for “daughter” and for “house” (1977, 186), and hence substituted “wife” for “daughter” in complete disregard for the rest of the narrative. But if we allow the Greek to stand, we have a rather different subtext to the relationship between Mordecai and Esther, and of plans that had to be postponed, perhaps, but not necessarily dismantled. Our Hellenistic Jewish narrator may be too prudish to suggest any sexual

dimension to the relationship between Esther and Mordecai, but it is not too farfetched to suggest that Mordecai functions as her husband in all but name.

Conclusions

Speculate as one might about less chaste outcomes of the male-female relationships depicted in these books, we must face the fact that the narrators studiously avoid such options and did not allow extra-marital relationships to disrupt prior marital bonds. Even King Artaxerxes, unsuitable match that he is for a nice Jewish girl, is not erased from the picture by the more acceptable Mordecai.

Nevertheless, the links between Susanna, Judith, Sarah, and Esther, and their “other” men are far from peripheral in the literary structures and plots of their books, and in the depictions of the women themselves. The literary connections between Tobit and Sarah, for example, are suggested by the juxtaposition of their respective prayers within a single chapter, and the assertion that Raphael is the instrument through which God aimed to help them both. Similarly in Esther, the prayers of Mordecai and Esther occupy Addition C.

As elements in the plot, these extra-marital relationships are crucial to the successful outcomes of the stories; the “other men” avert tragedy in every case. Without Daniel, Susanna’s life ends in unjust execution. Without Holofernes (or, to be precise, without his death), Bethulia is besieged and destroyed. Without Mordecai, Esther is too meek to approach the king and hence the Jews in Persia are destroyed. Without Tobit, Sarah is doomed to suffer the deaths of more bridegrooms, since it is Tobit who initiates the quest of Tobias during which Sarah is liberated from her sorry state.

Nor do the women themselves remain unchanged, even if their marital status stays the same. Susanna has Daniel to thank for her life. Though Judith returns to her house and her widowhood after beheading Holofernes, she is no longer a recluse. After she heeds Mordecai’s counsel and approaches the king, Esther becomes more assertive and expands her royal role to include decisionmaking and influence. Were it not for Tobit and the quest that he imposed upon his son, Sarah would have remained sadly unfulfilled in her parents’ distant household.

Final evidence for the necessity of these relationships is the fact that they all, in one way or another, demonstrate God’s providence and his

personal interest in these women and their situations. Daniel is God's way of answering Susanna's prayer for justice; Holofernes' seduction and death are sanctioned by God in answer to Judith's prayer that she might help her people. Tobit's prayers, along with Sarah's, are answered by God through Raphael; Mordecai raised Esther to be pious and continued to be her mentor in all things including prayer.

Therefore the "other man" is in one way or another an instrument of God, through which God effects a positive outcome. This positive outcome often involves the restoration of a prior positive situation now threatened by an enemy. In Esther and Judith, the emphasis is on a communal crisis: the safety and very existence of the Jewish community are threatened by an enemy whom only these women can vanquish. But even for Susanna and Sarah, whose distress seems purely personal, there is an element of communal concern, namely, the maintenance of purity and fidelity in the exiled community in Babylon, and the need for endogamous marriage in the face of the imminent exile feared by Tobit.

The general pattern of disruption and restoration, the communal and personal contexts, and the role of God, suggests that the broader conceptual context of these books may well be the covenantal relationship between God and Israel and specifically the Jewish understanding of exile and the hope for restoration. Just as the apocryphal texts interpret exile as God's just punishment for Israel's sins, so do they also anticipate a future restoration of Israel to the land. In the words of Tobit to his son Tobias, "God will again have mercy on them and God will bring them back . . . so now, my children, serve God faithfully and do what is pleasing in his sight." (14:5, 9; cf. Wisdom 19:22).

This is not to say that these stories should be read as allegories in which the female characters represent Israel, who sins and repents, and the men to whom they are *not* married represent God who punishes and then relents. These descriptions do not suit the women, who are invariably pure and free from sin, nor the men, who are not all God's representatives even if they are instrumental in working out the divine plan. The stories simply do not conform to this pattern. But in portraying women who suffer disruption and whose restoration is aided by God through the agency of a man that is not their husband, the novels may be holding out the hope of God-given restoration to the Jewish readers in exile from their land.

Finally, apocryphal literature has all the elements of romantic novels: nuances of romance, intimacy, and sexuality in the lives of women who

remain prim, proper, and faithful. Though none of these women runs off with her “other man,” it may not be too far-fetched to suggest that Jewish audiences of two thousand years ago were entertained by tales of love, sex, and intrigue, much as we are today. After all, think of the Bible stories of Joseph and Potiphar’s wife, or David and Bathsheba, or the erotic Greek novels such as *Daphnis and Chloe*, in comparison with which tales of modern politicians and their dalliances seem rather tame. But while Hellenistic Jews may have enjoyed such entertainment, they, like many of us, also wanted their leaders and heroes to be upright, pious, and morally unobjectionable.

THE DAMASCUS DOCUMENT'S "THREE NETS OF BELIAL:"
A REFERENCE TO THE ARAMAIC LEVI DOCUMENT?

Hanan Eshel*
Bar-Ilan University

Two exceptions to the rarity of allusions to, or quotations from, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical works in the Dead Sea Scrolls are found in the *Damascus Document*. CD 16:3–4 makes reference to the book of *Jubilees*, and CD 4:15 quotes the words of Levi, the son of Jacob, attributed by most scholars to a pseudepigraphical Levi composition.¹ The existence of these allusions in CD has significant bearing on the question of the dating of *Jubilees* and of the composition from which the Levi quote derived. The first part of this article attempts to identify the source for, and to explain how CD's author interpreted the aphorism attributed to Levi; its second part suggests that the Levi citation in CD was understood as reflecting the reasons for the Qumranites' split from Jerusalem.

The Three Nets of Belial

CD's peshar to Is. 24:17–18 contains a statement attributed to Levi ben Jacob:

12. ובכל השנים האלה יהיה
13. בליעל משולה בישראל באשר דבר אל ביד ישעיה הנביא בן

* I thank my friend Professor Menahem Kister for his pertinent comments. This article was translated by Dena Ordan, who is delighted to have this small part in her friend Betsy's *Festschrift*.

¹ Apart from the references in CD treated here, only three other Qumran scrolls (4Q228, 4Q166, and 4Q390) appear to quote *Jubilees*. See J. C. VanderKam, "228. Text with a Citation of *Jubilees*," *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part I* (ed. H. Attridge et al., DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 177–85. M. Kister ("Two Formulae in the Book of Jubilees," *Tarbiz* 70 [2001]: 297 n. 44 [Hebrew]) is not convinced that the quotes in 4Q228 are from *Jubilees*; similarly, he doubts that the quote in CD refers to *Jubilees*. In a personal communication he commented that this reservation holds for 4Q228 as well. Evidently, Peshar Hosea^a (4Q166=4QHos^a)'s interpretation of Hosea 2:13 cites *Jub.* 6:34–38, and 4Q390 (cols. 1:8, 2:10) twice cites the same verses from *Jubilees*. See M. J. Bernstein, "Walking in the Festivals of the Gentiles: 4QpHosea^a 2.15–17 and *Jubilees* 6.34–38," *JSP* 9 (1991): 21–34. For the view that

14. אמוץ לאמר פחד ופחת ופח עליך יושב הארץ פשרו
 15. שלושת מצודות בליעל אשר אמר עליהם לוי בן יעקב
 16. אשר הוא תפש בהם בישראל ויתנם פניהם לשלושת מיני
 17. הצדק הראשונה היא הזנות השניה ההון השלישית
 18. טמא המקדש העולה מזה יתפש בזה וניצל מזה יתפש
 19. בזה³

12. ... But during all those years,
 13. Belial will run unbridled amidst Israel, as God spoke through the hand of the prophet Isaiah, son of
 14. Amoz, saying, "Fear and a pit and a snare are upon you, O inhabitant(s) of the land." This refers
 15. to the three nets of Belial, of which Levi, the son of Jacob, said
 16. that he (Belial) entrapped Israel with them, making them seem as if they were three types of
 17. righteousness. The first is *fornication*, the second *avarice*, and the third
 18. *defilement of the sanctuary*. He who escapes from this is caught by that and he who is saved from that is caught
 19. by this...³

I interpret lines 16–18 as follows: Belial has placed before Israel three nets of [un]righteousness: the first is fornication, the second avarice, and third is defilement of the Temple. In what follows, CD goes on to detail some of the laws relating to fornication and defilement of the Temple (4:19–5:21).⁴

In suggesting this pesher, its author seems to have not only Isa. 24:17 but also Jer. 48:43–44 in mind: "Terror, and pit, and trap upon you who dwell in Moab!—declares the Lord. He who flees from the terror shall fall into the pit; and he who climbs out of the pit shall be caught in the trap" (NJPS). Based on Jeremiah, this in turn led the author to conclude the pesher by stating: "He who escapes from this is caught by that and he who is saved from that is caught by this."

I am by no means the first to attempt to identify the source of the Levi quote. Upon his publication of the two Geniza manuscripts of

CD 16:3–4 does not quote *Jubilees*, see D. Dimant, "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The so called *Book of Noah* and the Alleged Quotation of *Jubilees* in CD 16:3–4," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint* (eds. P. W. Flint, J.C. VanderKam and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2006): 230–49.

² M. Broshi, ed., *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), col. 4, 16–17; emphases here and in succeeding quotes are mine.

³ J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2: *The Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 1995), 19; slightly revised.

⁴ A small fragment of this section was preserved in 4QD^a (4Q266) frg. 3i. See J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 40.

CD, Solomon Schechter proposed that the reference in question was to the Greek *Testament of Levi*, part of the *Testaments of the Twelve Tribes*.⁵ This hypothesis was accepted by R. H. Charles. However, because the *Testament of Levi* contains no verses specifically identifiable as the source for the quote in CD,⁶ Charles simply noted a number of verses in the Greek *Testament of Levi* in which Levi warns his children not to sin by fornication, avarice, and desecration of the Temple.⁷ For example, T. Levi 14:5–6 cites cultic sins, sexual licentiousness, and avarice alongside conjoining with Gentile women.⁸ If we view the latter as a form of fornication, then these verses contain sins similar to the ones found in CD. Nonetheless, it is extremely unlikely that Greek *Testament of Levi* predates CD;⁹ thus it could not have served as the source for the Levi quote.

Jonas Greenfield's 1988 suggestion that the citation attributed to Levi in CD comes not from Greek *Testament of Levi* but from an early work today known as the *Aramaic Levi Document*, one of the sources for the Greek *Testament*, seems more likely.¹⁰ Greenfield submitted that the reference in CD relates to the words of Isaac to his grandson Levi, found in *Aramaic Levi* 6:1–3. The advantage of this suggestion is that, like CD, the verse in question names three sins.¹¹

⁵ S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. 1: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910), xxxv n. 17.

⁶ This point was noted by C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Document* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 16, and by H. Kosmala, "The Three Nets of Belial," *Studies, Essays and Reviews*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1978), II:115–37, esp. 115.

⁷ See R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), II: 790. Charles suggested a link between the citation and Greek *Testament of Levi* 9:9, 14:5–6, and 16:1.

⁸ *Testament Levi* 14:5–6 reads as follows: "You will rob the offerings of the Lord and steal from his portions and before sacrificing to the Lord take the choice things, eating contemptuously with harlots; you will teach the commandments of the Lord out of covetousness, pollute married women, be joined with harlots and adulteresses, take to wives daughters of Gentiles, purifying them with an unlawful purification, and your union will be like Sodom and Gomorrah in ungodliness" (H. W. Hollander and M. De Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary* [SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985]).

⁹ See M. de Jonge, "The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and Related Qumran Fragments," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity* (eds. R. A. Argall, B. A. Bow, and R. A. Werline; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 63–77.

¹⁰ J. C. Greenfield, "The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV, 15–19," in *RevQ* 13 (1988): 319–22. Before Greenfield's article appeared, J. T. Milik ("Écrits préesséniens de Qumran: d'Hénoch à Amram" in *Qumran: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* [ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978], 95) noted that the statement found in CD is not attested in *Aramaic Levi*.

¹¹ This conclusion has important implications for the dating of *Aramaic Levi*. See J. C.

1. ואמר לי לוי אזדהר לך ברי מן כל טומאה ומן כל חטא דינך רב הוא מן כל בשרא
 2. וכען ברי דין קושטא אחזינך ולא אטמר מינך כל פחנם לאלפותך דין כהנותא
 3. לקדמין הי>זדהר לך ברי מן כל פחזו וטמאה ומן כל זנות

1. And he said to me, Levi my son, | beware of all uncleanness and | of all sin, your judgment is greater than that of all | flesh.
2. And now, my son, I will show | you the true law and I will not hide | anything from you, to teach you the law | of the priesthood.
3. First of all, be<wa>re | my son of all *fornication* and *impurity* and of all *harlotry*.¹²

Comparison of the lists from *Aramaic Levi* and CD shows that *Aramaic Levi* 6:3 has פחזו and טומאה, זנות as opposed to CD's הזנות, ההון, and טמא המקדש.¹³ Thus both lists have in common זנות (fornication) and impurity: the טומאה in *Aramaic Levi* can be seen as parallel to CD's המקדש. Yet, any attempt to accept Greenfield's proposal to link the Levi reference in CD to *Aramaic Levi* must, however, establish and explain the connection between פחזו and הון. Greenfield solved this difficulty by attributing the replacement of פחזו by הון to a scribal mistake,¹⁴ arguing that the

Greenfield, M. E. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 19–22.

¹² *Ibid.*, 74–5.

¹³ According to this proposal, the citation in CD is not an exact Hebrew translation of *Aramaic Levi*, but rather a paraphrase of the verse. Moreover, CD's author does not cite *Jubilees* precisely either, even though *Jubilees* was written in Hebrew: "And the explication of their times, when Israel was blind to all these; behold it is specified in the Book of the Divisions of the Times in their Jubilees and in their Weeks" (16:2–4). Most scholars assume that the reference to *Jubilees* addresses the expression "explication of their times" (ויפרוש קציהם), namely, the historical division into periods. However, this topic does not appear in *Jubilees*. For other suggestions, see B. Z. Wacholder, "The Date of the Eschaton in the Book of Jubilees: A Commentary on Jub 49:22–50:5, CD 1:1–10 and 16:2–3," *HUCA* 56 (1985): 87–101 and the bibliography cited in n. 1 there. Other scholars contend that CD's author meant some work other than *Jubilees*. See, for example, R. T. Beckwith, "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 173, and Kister, "Two Formulae," 297 n. 44. Still other scholars submit that the description in CD is a paraphrase based on *Jub* 23:11, which states regarding the generations after Abraham: "[they] will grow old quickly. . . . It will be their knowledge that will leave them. . . ; all of their knowledge will depart." These scholars attribute the reference to *Jubilees* to the phrase "when Israel was blind" (עורון ישראל); see, for example, Charles, *Apocrypha*, 790. If indeed CD's author was alluding to a verse in *Jubilees*, taken in conjunction with the verse attributed to Levi, this provides evidence that in citations from nonbiblical works, he did not quote exactly but rather paraphrased.

¹⁴ Greenfield, "Words of Levi," 332.

ninth-century scribe who copied CD from a Qumran manuscript had difficulty deciphering Second Temple period handwriting.¹⁵

The absence of any physical resemblance between these words makes Greenfield's proposal difficult to accept, particularly because the concept $\eta\eta$ appears elsewhere in CD, with a negative connotation, as in the passage under consideration.¹⁶ As a disciple of the Teacher of Righteousness, CD's author was an adherent of the worldview that rejects private property, detailed in the *Rule of the Community's* regulations governing communal property. These circles viewed avarice as a focal sin, and accordingly their members held no private property. This makes attributing CD's enumeration of $\eta\eta$ as one of the nets of Belial to a ninth-century scribal error problematic and led to the rejection of Greenfield's proposal.¹⁷ The denial of any connection between the verses in the two documents impacts on the dating of *Aramaic Levi*.¹⁸

Yet Greenfield's proposal is not entirely without merit. I tentatively suggest that, rather than seeking a linguistic link between CD's $\eta\eta$ and *Aramaic Levi's* $\eta\eta$, we direct our attention to the conceptual relationship between the two. Crucial to this argument is the assumption that the authors of CD and other sectarian works found at Qumran (the pesharim in particular) were learned men, fully conversant with the Bible, which they evidently knew by heart. They certainly assumed a

¹⁵ On the discovery of the *Damascus Document* at Qumran in the early Middle Ages, and on the two later copies that found their way to the Cairo Geniza, see the summation by C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2000), 15–18.

¹⁶ For further examples of CD's negative attitude toward avarice, see CD 6:15–16, 8:5–8, 10:18, 12:7; 19:17–19.

¹⁷ See, for example, J. Kugel, "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 55–8, esp. n. 52; M. Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 348 n. 141 (Hebrew). Joseph Baumgarten and Daniel Schwartz ("Damascus Document," in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* [ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 1995], 19 n. 38) stress that the passage in CD is followed only by laws relating to fornication and defilement of the Temple, and makes no reference to avarice ($\eta\eta$ or $\eta\eta$). Henry Drawnel (*An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran* [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 19–20), who dates *Aramaic Levi* very early, agrees that the passage in CD "echoes the language of *A.L.D.* 16"; nonetheless, he rejects Greenfield's proposal and argues "it cannot be recognized as a citation of the Aramaic work." R. A. Kugler (*From Patriarch to Priest* [Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1996], 99) simply notes Greenfield's proposal but does not express an opinion as to whether or not it should be accepted.

¹⁸ Kugel ("Levi's Elevation," 54–64) dates *Jubilees* earlier than *Aramaic Levi*. Cana Werman ("Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period," *DSD* 4 [1997]: 211–25) critiques Kugel's view and defends the accepted approach that dates *Aramaic Levi* earlier than *Jubilees*.

high level of familiarity with Scripture by their audience, an understanding germane to my explanation of how CD's author linked *Aramaic Levi's* term with הוֹן.¹⁹

The noun פְּהוּ is attested twice in Scripture: in Gen. 49:4 and Jer. 23:32, and the adjective פְּהוּוֹ, usually interpreted as reckless or foolhardy, also appears twice, in Judg. 9:4 and Zeph. 3:4. Most attempts to arrive at the meaning of פְּהוּ rely on the better known verse from Jacob's blessing to Reuven: "Unstable (פְּהוּוֹ) as water, you shall excel no longer; For when you mounted your father's bed, you brought disgrace—my couch he mounted!" (NJPS). This verse's allusion to a connection between פְּהוּ and fornication underlies the use of this word to denote sexual licentiousness in Second Temple Hebrew and Aramaic,²⁰ a meaning reflected in a Cave 4 document describing the dangers of a wicked woman (4Q184—Wiles of the Wicked Woman):

13. ...ענייה הנה והנה ישכילו ועפעפיה בפהו תרים לראו[ת] לא[י]ש
 14. צדיק ותשיגהו ואיש[ן] [ע]צום ותשכילוהו ישרים להטות דרך ולבחורי צדק
 15. מנצור מצוה סמוכי [] להביל בפהו והולכי ישר להטות ה[ו]ק...

13. Her eyes glance keenly hither and thither, and she *wantonly* raises her eyelids to seek out
14. a righteous man and lead him astray, and a perfect man to make him stumble; upright men to divert (their) path, and those chosen for righteousness
15. from keeping the commandment; those sustained with [...] to lead along with *wantonness*, and those who walk uprightly to change the st[atute].²¹

¹⁹ For an illustration of the view that the Qumran authors knew Scripture by heart, and alluded to certain verses by using phrases that appear in them, see H. Eshel, "The Historical Background of the Peshet Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 409–20, esp. 415–19.

²⁰ See J.C. Greenfield, "The Meaning of פְּהוּ," in *Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (ed. S. M. Paul, M. E. Stone, and A. Pinnick; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 2001), 2:725–30; M. Kister, "A Contribution to the Interpretation of Ben Sira," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989–90): 328–30 (Hebrew). The primary early meaning of this root is most likely 'to jump up with excitement', or 'to act in excitement' as documented in 4QSam^b 6:7 at 1 Sam. 20:34: ויפּהוּ יונתן מעל השלחן בהרי אף ("and Jonathan sprang up excitedly from the table"), as well as in 4QSam^a 32:7 at 1 Sam. 25:9: ויפּהוּ נבל ("jumped up with excitement"). See *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: 1–2 Samuel* (ed. F. M. Cross et al.; DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 87, 233. On the importance of the Samuel scrolls from Cave 4 for the understanding of פְּהוּ see A. Lange, "Die Wurzel *phz* und ihre konnotationen," *VT* 51 (2001): 497–510.

²¹ J. M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 82–84 (slightly revised). This work also attests to the combination פְּהוּוֹ אִישׁוֹנֵי ("wanton eyes"—fig. 3:5) and the verb derived from the concept פְּהוּ as found in the sentence: לבה יכין פְּהוּוֹ ("Her heart's perversion prepares wantonness"—fig. 1:2).

I submit, however, that CD bases its interpretation of this term not on Gen. 49:4's meaning of licentiousness, but rather upon Jeremiah and Zephaniah's descriptions of the false prophets, whose avariciousness was a watchword. Jeremiah 23:32 reads: "Behold, I am against them that prophesy lying dreams, saith the Lord, and do tell them, and cause My people to err by their lies, and by their wantonness [וּבְפִדְוֹתָם]; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them [1917 JPS]. Zephaniah 3:4 states: "Her prophets are wanton [פְּדוּיִם] and treacherous persons; Her priests have profaned that which is holy, They have done violence to the law" [1917 JPS]. I propose that the author of CD understood פְּדוּ in these verses, with reference to the actions of the false prophets, as avarice, an interpretation undoubtedly influenced by the well-known accusatory verses from Micah 3:9–11: "Hear this, you rulers of the House of Jacob, You chiefs of the House of Israel, Who detest justice And make crooked all that is straight, Who build Zion with crime, Jerusalem with iniquity! Her rulers judge for gifts, Her priests give rulings for a fee, And her prophets divine for pay; Yet they rely upon the Lord, saying, 'The Lord is in our midst; No calamity shall overtake us'" (NJPS). That these verses from Micah attacking the eighth-century BCE Jerusalem establishment were well known in the late biblical period emerges from Jer. 26:17–19. I imagine that the Qumranites identified with these verses, viewing the Jerusalem establishment of their day as tainted with the same kind of corruption and greed described by Micah. Moreover, that the false prophets delivered comforting prophecies in order to receive monetary favors is a recurring theme in Scripture.²² I submit that CD understood Jer. 23:32, Zeph. 3:4, and Micah 3:11 to admit an interpretation of פְּדוּ as referring to avarice.

Having explained how CD's author could have made a conceptual connection between פְּדוּ and דָּוָן, I suggest that the triple combination of פְּדוּ, פְּדוּת, and פְּדוּ found in Isa. 24:17 and Jer. 48:43 sparked an association with פְּדוּ, which appears in *Aramaic Levi*. The difficult reading "three types of righteousness" in CD, explained here as three types of

²² See 1 Kgs 22:10–13; Amos 7:12–17; Jer. 14:13–18, 20:1–6, 23:9–40; 28:1–17; 29:21–29, 37:19; and Ezek. 13:1–19. At the end of his article ("The Meaning of פְּדוּ"), Greenfield suggests interpreting Jer. 23:32's וּפִדְוֹתָם and Zeph. 3:4's פְּדוּיִם according to the late meaning, namely, as denoting sexual licentiousness, linking these verses with Jer. 29:21–23, which relates how the false prophets Ahab ben Kolaiah and Zedekiah ben Maaseiah commit "adultery with the wives of their fellows" (v. 23). See Greenfield, "The Meaning of פְּדוּ," 730 n. 15. I find the association of the false prophets with avarice to be more prominent.

unrighteousness,²³ can perhaps be linked to Levi's remarks immediately preceding the detailing of the sins, in which he notes his desire to teach his sons **דִּין קוֹשָׁט**,²⁴ namely, the true or just law.

If my understanding of CD's author's mindset as one of the disciples of the Teacher of Righteousness—who sharply opposed the avarice of the Jerusalem establishment and favored communal property—is correct, by relying on Jeremiah 23, Zephaniah 3, and Micah 3, he apparently sought, and found, a way to link one of the accusations in *Aramaic Levi* with avarice. Note that this sheds no light on how the author of *Aramaic Levi* interpreted **פְּהוּ**, and there is no reason to assume that he understood it as avarice.²⁵ The different order of the sins found in CD—fornication, avarice, and defilement of the Temple—as opposed to *Aramaic Levi* may reflect how CD's author ranked their importance.

This triad of sins appears not only in *Aramaic Levi* but also in *Jub.* 7:20–21, which relates that Noah commanded his sons “to keep themselves from fornication, uncleanness, and from all injustice, For it was on account of these three things that the flood was on the earth. . . .”²⁶ Because CD attributes the quote to Levi and not to Noah, this indicates either that *Aramaic Levi* was written before *Jubilees* and that CD's author preferred to quote it and not *Jubilees*, or that CD's author felt that attribution to Levi rather than to Noah would impact more strongly on his audience. A third possibility is that CD's author preferred to quote *Aramaic Levi* because of its use of **פְּהוּ**, as in Isa. 24:17 and Jer. 48:43–44, as opposed to *Jubilees'* injustice (**הַמָּס**).²⁷

²³ Negative expressions containing the word **צַדִּיק**, to which the brief phrase **מִיֵּי צַדִּיק** found in CD refers, appear in the *Temple Scroll*, for example: “for the bribe perverts justice, and subverts the cause of the righteous” (51:13); “perverts righteous judgement” (51:17), and in the *Apostrophe to Zion*: “Who has ever perished (in) righteousness, or who has ever survived in his iniquity?” (11QPs^a 22:9). For the importance of the latter verse, see H. Eshel and J. Strugnell, “Alphabetical Acrostics in Pre-Tannaitic Hebrew,” *CBQ* 62 (2000): 449–53.

²⁴ *Aramaic Levi*, 6:2.

²⁵ Note that Levi's prayer in *Aramaic Levi* mentions three similar sins: **אֲרִיזָה** [מִנֵּי מַרִּי] **וְהַמָּס** **וְהַמָּס** **וְהַמָּס** [בְּאִשָּׁה וְהַמָּס] **וְהַמָּס** **וְהַמָּס** (“Make far [from me, my Lord, the unrighteous spirit, and evil thought] and fornication”—3:5; reconstructed according to the Greek text; see Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel, *Aramaic Levi Document*, 60–1). Perhaps this request to keep distant from unrighteousness, evil thought, and fornication is linked to what Levi heard from his grandfather Isaac, found in *Aramaic Levi* 6:3.

²⁶ Kosmala (“Three Nets of Belial,” 132) notes the similarity between these verses and the description found in CD.

²⁷ *Jub.* 7:21–22 were not preserved in the copies found at Qumran and are found only in the Ethiopic manuscripts: thus, it is difficult to determine whether the original Hebrew read **הַמָּס** or **פְּהוּ**. Note that the editions of both Abraham Cahana (*Ha-Sefarim*

These same three sins are also mentioned twice in the NT. Ephesians 4:19 notes how the rest of the gentiles have abandoned themselves to licentiousness, to the practice of every kind of immorality, and to greediness. Ephesians 5:1–3 turns to its audience with the following request: "Therefore be imitators of God, as beloved children, and live in love, as Christ loved us and gave himself up for us, a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God. But *fornication* and *impurity* of any kind, or *greed*, must not even be mentioned among you" (NRSV).²⁸ The double mention of "greed" suggests that the epistle's author adopted the tradition reflected in CD, which, as we saw, understands פְּדוּת as avarice. The author of the Epistle to the Ephesians undoubtedly drew these cardinal sins from sectarian writings, as Hans Kosmala notes.²⁹ As we shall see, these three cardinal sins have broader significance in the Qumran context.

The Reasons For the Sectarian Departure for the Desert

Thus far, I have attempted to establish that CD's author linked *Aramaic Levi's* פְּדוּת with avarice. Indeed, the greed of the Jerusalem priestly establishment is one of three main factors identified by scholars for the separation of the Qumran sectarians from the people.³⁰ I propose that CD's author understood the three concepts of sin mentioned in *Aramaic Levi* as alluding to the reasons that prompted his group to leave Jerusalem.³¹ Apparently, CD's interpretation of the verse from *Aramaic*

ha-Hizonim [Tel Aviv: Mekorot, 1937] 1:238) and E. S. Artom (*Ha-Sefarim ha-Hizonim: Sippurei Aggadah* [Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1965], 2:36) translate the three sins as: נְהוּרָה שְׂמֵחָה וְדוּמָס.

²⁸ On the relatively late date of the Epistle (c. 100 C.E.) and the likelihood that its author was familiar with some of the works found at Qumran, see H. Koester, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 2: 267–72. Koester cites Ephesians 5:3 as one of the verses that demonstrates Qumran influence.

²⁹ See Kosmala, "Three Nets of Belial," 132–3. This scholar's other attempts to find echoes of this passage in CD in other NT passages are less convincing.

³⁰ See C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (London: Oxford University Press, 1957), 53–70; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Critique of the Princes of Judah," *RB* 79 (1972): 200–16; E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM Press, 1977), 240–57; D. R. Schwartz, "On Two Aspects of a Priestly View of Descent at Qumran," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 163–5; D. Flusser, "The Social Message from Qumran," in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 193–201.

³¹ B. Z. Wacholder (*The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* [HUCM 8; Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1983], 119–29) similarly suggested that the three nets of Belial in CD constituted the factors prompting the relocation of the sect in the desert.

Levi created parity between the sins of the Jerusalem priests during the Hasmonean period and the behaviors from which Levi, the son of Jacob, asks his sons the priests to refrain in preparation for learning the laws of the priesthood.³²

Qumran scholars attribute the decision of the disciples of the Teacher of Righteousness to separate from the multitude of the people³³ and to live in the desert to three main factors: (1) their criticism of the moral and financial corruption which had in their opinion spread among the Jerusalem priesthood;³⁴ (2) the dispute over which calendar to observe in the Temple;³⁵ and (3) their stringent halakhic method which was not accepted by the ruling establishment in Jerusalem. The details of these halakhic disputes are found in the halakhic letter known as *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (4QMMT).³⁶

Menahem Kister suggests a connection between MMT and CD's "three nets of Belial." He divides MMT into three sections: one part treats defilement of the Temple (most of the letter), another fornication (2:75–82), and still another avarice (3:5–7).³⁷ Accordingly, these are the three underlying factors for the Qumranite separation from the majority and, from the Qumran perspective, the *halakhot* detailed in MMT reflect their opposition to what they viewed as defilement of the Temple and fornication.³⁸ It makes sense to assign the calendrical

³² *Aramaic Levi* 6:2.

³³ The description העם הרוב ("we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people") is attested in MMT. On the importance of this statement, see H. Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (eds. J. Kampen and M. S. Bernstein; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1996), 59–61.

³⁴ See the studies in n. 30 above.

³⁵ See S. Talmon, "The Calendar of the Judean Covenanters of the Judean Desert," in *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989), 147–85.

³⁶ On its halakhic method, see Y. Sussman, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (eds. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell; DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 179–200. For the views of scholars who attribute the splitting off of the Qumranites to halakhic disputes, see the comprehensive bibliography in A. I. Baumgarten, "But Touch the Law and the Sect Will Split: Legal Dispute as the Cause of Sectarian Schism," *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 5 (2002): 301–15.

³⁷ See Kister, "Studies in 4QMiḳṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah," 348.

³⁸ For the *halakhot* dealing with incest and accusing the people and the priests of fornication, found at the end of MMT, see Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, 54–7. These *halakhot* must be linked to the ones appearing in CD immediately after the passage citing the three nets of Belial (4:20–5:13).

dispute to the rubric of defilement of the Temple, because adherence to the lunar calendar would, according to the Qumranites, make the Temple rites unhalakhic.³⁹

Not only were the Qumranites aware of the three reasons for their self-imposed exile,⁴⁰ as emerges from the criticism heaped upon their opponents in CD, the pesharim, and MMT, but they also mention them explicitly in their works. There may then be confluence between the reasons that brought the sect to the desert—financial corruption, the dispute over the proper way to observe the Temple cult (the calendrical dispute and other laws discussed in MMT), and the laws relating to fornication detailed in the halakhic letter and in CD—and the three nets of Belial. I further suggest that the “three nets of Belial,”⁴¹ or the three reasons for the Qumranite split from the majority, are referred to in the third and final part of MMT, where the letter writer notes in his summation:

- .8 ...ואתם י[ודעים שלוא]
- .9 [?]מצא בידנו מעל שקר ורעה כי על [אלה] נהנו נותנים א[ת] לבנו...
8. ...And you [know that no]
9. *treachery* or *deceit* or *evil* can be found in our hand (i.e. in us), for we have given [some thought (?) to [these issues].⁴²

In my opinion, the word מעל, with which the list of three cardinal sins opens in MMT, should be interpreted in accord with Lev. 5:15–16: “When a person commits a trespass, being unwittingly remiss about any of the Lord’s sacred things, he shall bring as his penalty to the Lord... He shall make restitution for that wherein he was remiss about the sacred things, and he shall add a fifth part to it” (NJPS). Seen in

³⁹ See J. C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time* (London: Routledge, 1998), 44–51, 110–12.

⁴⁰ The concept of *בית גלוהו*, ‘his house of exile,’ with reference to the Teacher of Righteousness appears in Peshar Habakkuk 11:6. See M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Möhr Siebeck, 2002), 6B: 180–1.

⁴¹ See the important discussion by Kister (“Studies in 4QMiḡṣat Ma‘aše Ha-Torah,” 348 n. 141) where he shows that each of the groups with which the Qumran sect debated—Ephraim, the Wicked Priest, and the Princes of Judah—was accused of failing with regard to two of the three nets of Belial. This insight supports CD’s description, “He who escapes from this is caught by that and he who is saved from this is caught by this.”

⁴² Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miḡṣat Ma‘aše ha-Torah*, 58–59 (col. 8–9); slightly revised.

this light, *מעל* was interpreted in MMT, and in another Qumran scroll that sharply criticizes the Second Temple priests (4Q390) for enriching themselves “by ill-gotten wealth and illegal profit and injustice,”⁴³ as unlawful enjoyment of property donated to the Temple, also the subject of Mishnah *Me’ilah*.⁴⁴ This accusation, which must be linked to avarice, was certainly applied by the Qumranites to the priests running the Jerusalem temple. In their eyes, these priests dipped their fingers into the public treasury, making use of money donated to the Temple to forward their personal interests and status.⁴⁵

Intriguingly, in MMT as well we find a three-sin pattern, which to my mind reflects the same sins as the ones found in the lists in *Aramaic Levi* and CD, even preserving the order of *Aramaic Levi*. If so, MMT’s שִׁקְרָה is equivalent to *Aramaic Levi*’s impurity and CD’s defilement of the Temple, and its רְעָה corresponds to the fornication found in the other two lists.

The following table summarizes this hypothesis that the lists of three sins in CD and in MMT exemplify how the Qumranites applied *Aramaic Levi* 6:3 to the reasons for their schism with the rest of the people.

⁴³ In 4Q390 we find the priests accused: “and they shall not know nor understand that I was angry with them for their unfaithfulness [בַּמְעַלִּים]. [...] They shall forsake Me and do evil before Me. In that which I do not desire, they have chosen to enrich themselves by ill-gotten wealth and illegal profit and [injustice]” (col. 2:7–9). For a discussion of 4Q390, see H. Eshel, “4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period,” in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids, Mich., 2005), 102–10.

⁴⁴ For this explanation of the term *מעל*, see B. M. Bokser, “*Ma’al* and Blessings Over Food: Rabbinic Transformation of Cultic Terminology and Alternative Modes of Piety,” *JBL* 100 (1981): 561–2; D.R. Schwartz, “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” *Reading 4QMMT*, 76. Menahem Kister has reservations regarding this explanation; see his “Studies in 4QMiqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah,” 320–1, esp. n. 9. I do not find his arguments convincing, because *מעל* could certainly refer at times to a general notion of religious sin, and at others, specifically denote stealing from property dedicated to the Temple. Indeed, Kister’s proposition that MMT reflects the three nets of Belial supports the suggestion that the *מעל* mentioned in MMT should be connected with avarice; for if not, then MMT contains almost no references to sins related to the pursuit of wealth.

⁴⁵ The hellenizing priests who were active in Jerusalem in the seventies and sixties of the second century B.C.E. embezzled Temple funds. Sometimes these Temple funds were sent to the Seleucid kings in order to entrench their political status; at other times, the priests took funds for personal needs. For descriptions of such instances, see 2 Macc. 3:4–6; 4:1, 7–9, 32, 39–42; 5:15–21; 11:3, and 1 Macc. 1:21–24; 6:12.

<i>Aramaic Levi</i>	CD	MMT	Reasons for Split
1. פהז	2. הון	1. מעל	Financial corruption of the priestly establishment
2. טומאה	3. ממא המקדש	2. שקר	Different Temple laws
3. זנות	1. זנות	3. רעה	Laws relating to fornication

If I am correct, the triad of fornication, avarice, and defilement of the Temple found in CD derived from the *Aramaic Levi Document* and was reflected in other Qumran works and continued in the New Testament. In the Qumran context, this list of sins also mirrors the sect's rationale for its separation from the majority, alluded to in MMT. Apart from the insight into the conceptual basis for the link between CD and *Aramaic Levi* that I have tried to establish, these conclusions have broader significance because they support an early date for *Aramaic Levi*—late third or early second century B.C.E.—if CD, composed in the latter half of the second century B.C.E.,⁴⁶ indeed quotes the *Aramaic Levi Document*.

⁴⁶ The *Damascus Document* is usually dated to the latter half of the second century B.C.E. See J. M. Baumgarten, "Damascus Document," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 169.

WHY DID ANTIOCHUS HAVE TO FALL (II MACCABEES 9:7)?

Daniel R. Schwartz
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Although Proverbs 24:17, and Samuel the Little (who quotes that verse in *m.Abot* 4.24) admonish us “Do not rejoice when your enemy falls, and let not your heart be glad when he stumbles,” most of us do. In fact, we are even happy to rejoice and be glad when they don’t actually fall but instead suffer some other misfortune or catastrophe; ancient *de mortibus persecutorum* literature shows great variety and ingenuity in this regard.¹ Thus, although the standard tradition saw no need to report that Antiochus IV, who was an enemy of many, died of a fall, there was widespread interest and glee about his death.² According to the vulgate tradition of Greek and Latin literature this Seleucid king, following a failed attempt to plunder a temple in the course of his eastern campaign, died instead of some terrible *disease*.³ Thus Polybius (31.9) reports that “some say” the king went mad;⁴ Diodorus Siculus (31.18a), as cited by Jerome from Porphyrius, reported (probably dependent upon

¹ On Graeco-Roman, Jewish and Christian varieties of such literature see, in general, Lactantius, *De mortibus persecutorum* (ed. J. L. Creed; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), xxxv–xli. For the sufferings ancient literature loved to impose upon persecutors, see e.g. D. J. Ladouceur, “The Death of Herod the Great,” *Classical Philology* 76 (1981): 25–27, which, as many other studies, uses W. Nestle, “Legenden vom Tod der Gottesverächter,” *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 33 (1936): 246–269 = *idem*, *Griechische Studien* (Stuttgart: Hannmann, 1948), 567–596. The summary table in the concluding section of Nestle’s article has no reference to falling—from chariots or anything else.

² On the ancient reports see, in general, M. Holleaux, “La mort d’Antiochos IV Épiphane,” *Revue des études anciennes* 18 (1916): 77–102. Holleaux focuses on establishing that they indeed apply to this Antiochus and not to his father. I cite this study according to the minimally revised version in Holleaux’s *Études d’épigraphie et d’histoire grecques*, III (Paris: de Boccard, 1942), 255–279.

³ On the geographical discrepancies, which will not concern us, see F. W. Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, III (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979), 473–474, also T. Drew-Bear, “Où mourut Antiochos IV?,” *Revue des études anciennes* 82 (1980), 155–157. In general, on Antiochus’ final campaign and death, late in 164 B.C.E., see also O. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (København: Gyldendal & Nordisk, 1966), 170–171. But he has no interest in the precise aetiology of his death.

⁴ δαμονήσας; see Holleaux, *Études*, 262–263, n. 5; A. Mauersberger, *Polybios-Lexikon*, I/2 (Berlin: Akademie, 1961), col. 409, s.v. (“den Verstand verlieren, verrückt werden”), citing 12.12b.1 and our 31.9.

Polybius) that the king went mad and eventually died of an unspecified disease,⁵ while Porphyry himself says Antiochus “mortuus est maerore consumptus” (died of grief? consumption?),⁶ Appian (*Syriaké* 11, §66) reports that he died “wasting away” (of consumption or tuberculosis?);⁷ and Granius Licinianus says he died of some nocturnal “terror,” whatever that may mean and whatever his source.⁸ Similarly, if we turn to Jewish tradition, I Macc 6, followed by Josephus in *Antiquities* 12.357, has him die of some unspecified disease in the wake of his failure in Elymais and the concomitant arrival of bad news from Judaea.

None of these pagan or Jewish writers mentions Antiochus falling, only his illness (or “terror”). The closest we get to falling is in I Macc 6:8, where in the wake of his taking ill Antiochus “fell into bed and fell into sickness due to grief” (ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην καὶ ἐνέπεσεν εἰς ἀρρωστίαν ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης). But this is only the biblical phrase **נפל למשכב** (Exod 21:18), as we see both from the identical usage in I Macc 1:5, of Alexander, and from Josephus’ paraphrase of I Macc 6:8, where we read that Antiochus εἰς νόσον κατέπεσεν (*Ant.* 12.357). Although after we’ve seen the material we shall next review we might suspect that something of it is reflected in I Maccabees’ diction here, taken by itself no one would suspect any reference to any separate fall.⁹

⁵ “versum in amentiam ac postremum morbo interiisse;” *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentariorum in Daniele Libri III (IV)* (ed. F. Glorie; Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 75a; Turnholt: Brepols, 1964), 925–926 (on Daniel 11:36) = F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, IIB (Berlin: Weidmann, 1929), 1227, no. 260 F 53 = M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, II (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1980), no. 464r.

⁶ Porphyry apud Jerome on Daniel 11:44–45 (in the editions mentioned in n. 5: Glorie, 932; Jacoby, 1228 [260 F 56] and Stern, no. 464s).

⁷ For some discussion of the meaning of the last two texts, see G. W. Lorein, “Some Aspects of the Life and Death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes: A New Presentation of Old Viewpoints,” *Ancient Society* 31 (2001): 169–171.

⁸ “terrore perit nocturno;” *Grani Liciniani Reliquiae* (ed. N. Criniti; Leipzig: Teubner, 1981), Bk. 28, p. 5. It has been suspected that this tradition, which includes the body of the dead Antiochus falling from the carriage that was transporting it for burial, was influenced by the tradition of II Maccabees to be discussed below. See Holleaux, *Études*, 258, n. 1, and D. Flusser, “The Dedication of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus: Story and History,” in: *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (ed. I. M. Gafni, A. Oppenheimer & D. R. Schwartz; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center & Historical Society of Israel, 1996), 62–63, n. 29 (Hebrew).

⁹ Similarly, when a scholion to *Megillat Ta’anit* says that Antiochus **נפל במקומו**, it is not clear whether it means that he died of a fall or, rather, simply that he died. In any case, it seems that the Antiochus meant—who is said to have “fallen” after leaving Jerusalem—is not our IV Epiphanes, but, rather, V Eupator or VII Sidetes. See V. Noam, *Megillat Ta’anit* (Jerusalem: Yad ben-Zvi, 2003), 291–292 (Hebrew).

In contrast, among the lines of a penitential prayer (*seliḥa*) composed—as is shown by the concluding acrostic—by the eleventh-century rabbinic authority, Gershom ben Jehudah of Mainz (known as Rabbenu Gershom Meor HaGolah, henceforth RGMH), we find the following:¹⁰

פּשׁ יוֹנִי הוּא וּמִשְׁרָתוֹ רָשָׁעִים / לְהִשְׁכִּיחַ מֵעַמְךָ שִׁמְךָ הַנְּעִים
 יַעַץ לְהַדְרִיחַ יְלִדֵי שְׁעִשׂוּעִים / נָפַל וְנִשְׁבַּר וּמָת בְּתַחֲלוּזָאִים רָעִים

The Greek and his wicked servants stupidly tried
 To cause Your people to forget Your pleasant name
 When he connived to lead the darling children astray
 He fell and broke and died of severe illnesses.

Here, the linkage of falling to breaking indicates a separate fall is meant. But this reference to a failed persecution by a “Greek,” which comes after stanzas that report that God similarly rescued Abraham and the heroes of Daniel 3 and 6 from their respective persecutors, clearly refers to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. This is indicated not only by that chronological sequence, but also by the fact that elsewhere in the Jewish liturgical tradition, most notably in the *Al hanissim* prayer said several times daily on Hanukah, “Greek” is used to refer to the Seleucid kingdom and in connection with this Antiochus’ decrees against Judaism, which, as here, are summarized as an attempt to cause the Jews to forget (להשכיח).¹¹ Similarly, the use of להדריח in connection with those decrees is quite apposite, given the obvious allusion to Deut 13:14 where it refers to those who would “lead astray” to the worship of other gods.¹²

Each line of this stanza is based upon a biblical phrase: “wicked servants” comes from Proverbs 29:12, “Your pleasant name” from Psalms 135:3, “darling children” from Jeremiah 31:19, and “broke and died” from Exodus 22 (v. 13: וְנִשְׁבַּר אִוֵּן מוֹת). However, while the first three lines seem to pose no problems, the fourth, which alludes to a verse that regulates what happens when borrowed property is damaged, is a

¹⁰ Text according to Rabbenu Gershom Meor HaGolah, *Seliḥot uPhizmonim* (ed. A. M. Haberman; Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1953/54), 21; my translation. For a reproduction of a fourteenth-century Hamburg manuscript, see my *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004), 195 (Hebrew).

¹¹ Although in that prayer the object of “to forget” is the Torah, not God’s name. For the prayer, see J. H. Hertz (ed.), *Authorised Daily Prayer Book* (revised ed.; New York: Bloch, 1948), 152–153.

¹² Just as Deut 13:14 is alluded to in I Macc. 1:11, in basically the same context.

different matter. For, first of all, Exod 22:13 does not mention falling; RGMH added it himself. Moreover, while falling goes well together with “broke,” falling does not usually cause “severe illnesses.” RGMH must have had a good reason to add something that is both absent from the biblical text he is using and inconsistent with the rest of his story. Thus, it appears that this stanza mixes two motifs: one has Antiochus dying of a fall, the other—of a disease. True, the Hebrew for “severe illnesses” is taken straight out of II Chr. 21:19, where, just as in RGMH’s poem, it describes the death of a wicked monarch. But that monarch didn’t fall; why assert that Antiochus did?

Moreover, as we saw, the vulgate tradition about the death of Antiochus has no such element. Nevertheless, if we ask where RGMH got his information, it is very simple to reply: as was long ago noted, we should point to *Josippon*, where Ch. 18 (ed. Flusser, p. 84) has God smiting Antiochus with *shehin* (inflammation?) and abdominal disease and then, in a chariot accident, “falling” and “breaking” his bones (... ויפול ויתחברנה כל עצמותיו). Here, and again in Ch. 29,¹³ *Josippon* specifically has Antiochus dying בתהלוואים רעים, as does RGMH.¹⁴ And *Josippon*, in turn, clearly is based upon II Maccabees 9, which Ch. 18 of *Josippon* follows very closely, beginning with the opening references to Persis and Ecbatana.¹⁵

This simple tracing of the chain of tradition only underscores the issue with which we began, however, for it lets us see clearly a problem in II Maccabees 9 that RGMH’s short poetic version avoided. Namely, whereas RGMH has Antiochus falling and then breaking up and dying “in severe illnesses,” that is, it refers to one continuous process which only on second thought seems puzzling because falls don’t cause illnesses, II Maccabees 9 has the sufferings coming in two totally different stages:

¹³ Ed. Flusser, 114.

¹⁴ RGMH’s dependence upon *Josippon* (already noted by S. J. L. Rapoport, *Erech Millin* [Prague: Landau, 1851/2], 146–147 [Hebrew], s.v. Antiochus) is especially likely if he himself copied the book—as D. Flusser argued on the basis of manuscripts that name “Rabbenu Gerschom, the great rabbi” as one of its copyists (*Sepher Josippon*, II [Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1980], 3–6 [Hebrew]). For some doubt about this fine point, see H. Soloveitchik, “Halakhah, Hermeneutics and Martyrdom in Medieval Ashkenaz,” *JQR* 94 (2004): 280–281.

¹⁵ For *Josippon*’s use of II Maccabees in general, see Flusser, *ibid.*, 132–133, where he also argues that before composing *Josippon* its author wrote another Hebrew work based on Latin versions of First and Second Maccabees (for a brief English statement of this thesis, see *idem*, “*Josippon*, A Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” in: *Josephus, Judaism, and History* [ed. L. H. Feldman & G. Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University, 1987], 397, n. 19.)

first the disease, and then, with no relationship at all, a few lines later, the fall. Why did the ancient story-teller need such a two-part tale of woe? Why was one calamity not enough?

Of course, the author of II Maccabees so much enjoys telling us about Antiochus' suffering—which he uses as an occasion to write a long parody of a royal letter (9:19–27)¹⁶—that it could be that he doubled it just to have more fun; having first stuck the knife in, he enjoyed turning it around. However, this would seem not to be enough, for other ancient Jews with similar animus and motivations were, one after the other, willing to settle for illness and saw no need to add in any bone-breaking falling.¹⁷ Similarly, it has been noted that the long and delightfully gruesome account of Maximian Galerius' malady, in Lactantius' *De morte persecutorum* 33, specifically reflects II Macc. 9, but it too has no fall at all.¹⁸ While given the fact that the fall is firmly anchored in the textual tradition of II Maccabees there is no need to suspect this omission indicates its absence from Lactantius' text of the biblical book, it does point up how detached this element is from the main thrust of the chapter.¹⁹

Moreover, consideration of the relevant passage in II Macc. 9 will highlight the problem even more:

- (5) But the all-seeing Lord, the God of Israel, struck him with an incurable and invisible blow: right after he ceased speaking he was overcome by unremitting pain in his entrails and bitter torments of his innards—
 (6) quite justly, for he had with numerous and exotic sufferings tormented

¹⁶ That this is a parody results clearly from its exaggerated promises, from the comic effect of the way neither God nor the Jews give it any consideration at all (note the abrupt passage at vv. 27–28 from the end of the letter to Antiochus' terrible fate), and from various other considerations. See C. Habicht, "Royal Documents in Maccabees II," *HSCP* 80 (1976): 3–7.

¹⁷ See Daniel 4 and the Prayer of Nabonid (4Q242), I Macc. 6:1–16 (on Antiochus IV), Josephus' *Antiquities* 17.168ff. (on Herod) and 19.346–350 (on Agrippa I; cf. Acts of the Apostles 12:21–24), *Jewish War* 7.451–453 (on a Roman governor of Cyrene) and *Against Apion* 2.143 (on Apion). On the bowel disease and worms motif, see also: T. Africa, "Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History," *Classical Antiquity* 1 (1982): 1–17. For a discussion of the Prayer of Nabonid (ed. by J. J. Collins in *Qumran Cave 4, XVII: Parabiblical Texts*, Part 3 [DJDP 22; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996] 83–93) from the present point of view, see D. Mendels, "A Note on the Tradition of Antiochus IV's Death," *IEJ* 31 (1981) 53–56.

¹⁸ For the text, see Creed (above, n. 1) 50–53. For the comparison with II Macc 9, see *ibid.* xxxviii and G. W. Lorein, *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period* (JSPSup 44; London & New York: Clark, 2003), 73, n. 178.

¹⁹ For another telling indication of this, note that Nestle's detailed study (above, n. 1) summarizes II Macc 9 but ignores the fall; see "Legenden" 263 = *Griechische Studien*, 588.

the entrails of others. (7) But he in no way gave up his haughtiness, but was even filled with arrogance, breathing fire in his anger against the Jews and ordering (his driver) to make haste along the way. But it happened that, carried along by the rush, he fell from the chariot; in the severe fall it befell all the parts of his body to be racked intensely. (8) And so he—who until just now had thought, in superhuman vainglory, to give orders to the ocean’s waves, and who had supposed he could weigh in a balance the heights of mountains—came back to earth and, being carried in a litter, exhibited to all the revealed power of God,²⁰ (9) in that worms came bubbling up out of the villain’s eyes,²¹ his flesh disintegrated painfully, and the entire camp was belabored under the stench of his decaying. (10) And he who just a bit earlier had thought he could touch the stars of heaven—no one could bear him due to the intolerable burden of his stench.

Here, despite the opening “in that” (ὅσταν) of v. 9, which attempts to link that verse to the preceding one, it is obvious that v. 9 in fact continues the story of Antiochus’ bowel disease left off at the end of v. 6. Had nothing intervened between v. 6 and v. 9 (which speaks only of flesh but not of bones), we wouldn’t have missed anything. That is, the bowel disease story was interrupted by that of the bone-breaking fall. Why would the author do this?

A partial answer is indicated by v. 8, which refers back to 5:21:

Now Antiochus, having taken 1800 talents from the Temple, hurriedly departed to Antioch, thinking in his arrogance to make the land navigable, and in the soaring of his heart—to make the sea walkable.

The statement in 9:8, that Antiochus “had thought, in superhuman vainglory, to give orders to the ocean’s waves,” corresponds to that in 5:21 about his having thought to make the land navigable and the sea walkable, and both, of course, point us to Herodotus’ famous description of Xerxes (Her. 7.22,33–36; cf. Aeschylus, *Persians*, 744–751, 820).²² Accordingly, since 5:21 (as already 5:17) characterizes such arrogance as “soaring,” it had to be that Antiochus would have to fall back again to earth. Hence the fall from his chariot. Why, however, did the author need to characterize such arrogance as “soaring” (μετεωρίζω—5:17, 21; 7:34)?

²⁰ The use of φανεράν here is one of several in this chapter that play at the expense of Antiochus’ byname, Epiphanes; see also vv. 4 (ὑπερηφάνως), 7, 11 (ὑπερηφανία). Similarly, 2:20–21 contrasts Antiochus Epiphanes with the heavenly “epiphanies” on behalf of the Jews.

²¹ On the text here, see D. De Bruyne, “Notes de philologie biblique,” *RB* 30 (1921): 407–8.

²² For the continued life of this topos, see inter alia Seneca, *De brevitate vitae* 18.5; Josephus, *War* 2.358 and *Ant.* 19.5–6; and Cassius Dio 59.17.11.

It seems to me that an answer is suggested by the other way that 9:8 characterizes Antiochus' arrogance: he "had supposed he could weigh in a balance the heights of mountains (τὰ τῶν ὀρέων οἰόμενος ὕψη στήσειν)." This one points us not to Herodotus and the Greek tradition but, rather, straight to Isa. 40:12: "Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and marked off the heavens with a span, enclosed the dust of the earth in a measure and weighed the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance (LXX: τίς ἔστησεν τὰ ὄρη σταθμῶ καὶ τὰς νόπας ζυγῶ)? But that passage, coming as it does at the outset of Isaiah's consolatory chapters, would quite naturally have been read in connection with Ch. 14's portrayal of the arrogant king of Babylon, a chapter that focuses on the following elements:

- a. The king thought himself among the stars (v. 12a).²³
- b. He thought he would be equivalent to God (v. 14b).
- c. He "fell" from heaven, to which he had thought to raise himself up (vv. 12–14a).
- d. He was afflicted by an "unceasing blow," which the Septuagint takes to mean it was "incurable" (πληγῆ ἀνιάτω) following ἀνιάτω (plege aniato – v. 6).
- e. He was afflicted by worms and maggots (v. 11).
- f. He died in the mountains (v. 19, according to Septuagint).
- g. He was denied proper burial (vv. 18–20).

Here we have all the central elements of Antiochus' fate according to II Macc 9:²⁴ stars (v. 10), imagined equivalence to God (v. 12),²⁵ falling (vv. 6–8), incurable blow (v. 5: ἀνιάτω . . . πληγῆ), worms (v. 9), dying in the mountains (v. 28),²⁶ lack of proper burial (vv. 28–29).²⁷ And Antiochus

²³ Assuming, as is usual, that *helal ben shahar* means "morning star."

²⁴ For Isa 14's impact on II Macc 9 see already I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux: Mededelingen en verhandelingen 9; Leiden: Brill, 1948), 83–84; G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Jr., *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1972), 79.

²⁵ "No longer able even to stand his own smell, he said: 'It is right to submit to God and, being mortal, not to think oneself equal to God,'" reading ἰσόθεα; on the text here, see Nickelsburg, *ibid.*, 79, n. 24, and C. Habicht, 2. *Makkabäerbuch* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit I/3; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979), 245, n. 12a.

²⁶ The very correspondence between ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν in these two passages (LXX Isa. 14:19/II Macc 9:28) is reason to reject Drew-Bear's suggestion (see above, n. 3) that we should translate the latter as "in the deserts;" in any case, the latter meaning of ὄρος rare and the plural would be puzzling. Be that as it may, note that by having Antiochus die ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν our author not only compares him to the king of Babylon; he also prescribes for him tit-for-tat reprisal for what he had forced upon the Jews he persecuted (II Macc. 5:27; 10:6). Cf. below, at n. 30.

²⁷ For the argument that the use of the imperfect (παρεκομίζετο) in v. 29 means

was, after all, as the Seleucid monarch, heir to the king of Babylon. Hence, just as much as Joel 2:20, which speaks of the stinking fate of “the northerner” during his campaign to far-off lands,²⁸ so too Isa 14 would have been quite a natural prism for an ancient Jewish observer to use when viewing and understanding Antiochus Epiphanes; Daniel does the same.²⁹ Thus, we may infer that the “soaring heart” language of 5:21 alludes back to Isa 14:13 (“Once you thought in your heart, ‘I will climb up to the sky’”) and that, accordingly, Antiochus’ falling back to earth in Ch. 9 points us to the continuation of that story (Isa 14:12, “how are you fallen from heaven;” v. 15, “you are brought back down to Sheol”).

It seems, in other words, that II Macc. 9:8, which clearly points us to Isa 40:12, just as clearly indicates that our author—who combines Hellenistic and biblical traditions—was thinking more broadly about the way Isaiah contrasts man and God. In such a context, the assimilation of Antiochus IV to Isa 14’s King of Babylon seems to have been so natural and attractive that the author felt a need to add, into the traditional Greek materials pertaining to the king’s death that focused, as we saw, upon his being (a) afflicted by a disease (b) far from his home, something that corresponded to Is. 14’s emphasis on falling. While the author couldn’t really make Antiochus fall from heaven, v. 7’s fall from a somewhat elevated platform was his way of achieving his goal as best as possible, just as v. 8 gave him the opportunity to allow Antiochus’ fall to match, tit for tat, his earlier “soaring.”

Now if we revert to the fact that vv. 7–8 interrupt the main narrative, that focuses—as do all other sources—on Antiochus’ disease, it seems we can understand what happened. The author of 2 Maccabees is a great fan of tit-for-tat making the punishment fit the crime; time and again, he insists on poetic justice in making a villain’s end fit his crime.³⁰ This is emphasized explicitly in Ch. 9 both in v. 6, where the fact that the illness affected his stomach fits the fact that he sinned by requiring

that Philip *tried* to bring Antiochus’ body back for burial but gave it up due to his fear of Ptolemy, mentioned in the end of the verse, see J. A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 372–373.

²⁸ For use of Joel 2:15–20 in II Maccabees, see also 3:15 and 10:26.

²⁹ On Dan 11:36 and 8:9–10 see Seeligman, *Septuagint Version*, 82 and Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 70 and 75, n. 112.

³⁰ See, inter alia, 4:26; 5:9–10; 8:33; 9:6, 28; 13:7–8; 15:32–33 (cf. 14: 33); R. Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 94–95.

Jews to eat forbidden foods, and in v. 28, where the circumstances of his death are like those he imposed upon others.³¹ But sometimes making this happen involves disrupting a narrative. The clearest case of this is that of Menelaus, whose death in 13:4–8, however appropriate it was to his crimes, and whatever its source,³² interrupts a story that flows much better without it: the first two verses of the chapter have Antiochus V invading Judaea, but vv. 3–8 have him recognizing that really Menelaus was the troublemaker and therefore he executes him in a spectacular but (as he pedantically points out in v. 8) precisely tit-for-tat way—leaving us bewildered as to why, right after Menelaus' death, the king resumes his attack upon the Jews as if nothing had happened. This bewilderment is a reflection of just how important it was for the author to make sure to tie crimes and punishments together. It seems that the case of Antiochus is similar, if less spectacular: having characterized Antiochus' crime as one of “soaring” (5:17, 21), the author had to make him tumble back to earth, and if the narrative he had, as the usual vulgate about Antiochus' death, knew only of an illness, he had to insert a fall forcefully, prying v. 6 away from v. 9 in order to insert something that picks up and answers the crime of 5:21.

Thus, just as Doron Mendels has shown that our author supplemented the Greek vulgate tradition about Antiochus' disease with an eastern or Jewish one about Nabonid's disease,³³ and just as at 5:21 our author supplements Herodotus' *topos* of royal arrogance with Isaiah's (“soaring”), so too does 9:7–8 show him completing his tit-for-tat story by combining the continuation of that Isaianic image with the (easternized) Greek disease tradition. The ease with which he made these combinations is a measure of his being at home in two worlds,³⁴ while the way vv. 7–8 interrupt the main narrative of II Macc 9, which reflects the vulgate version of Antiochus' death, shows us his own creativity—if not his ability (or concern) to smooth over all the seams. The latter would have to wait for RGMH.

³¹ For another and subtler case in Ch. 9, note the usage in vv. 10, 29: Antiochus was “unbearable” as long as he was alive, but not thereafter!

³² Note the great similarity of Josephus' parallel account (*Ant.* 12.384–385), which—given the fact that Josephus' seems not to have used II Maccabees—may suggest that both writers used a common source. This need not concern us here.

³³ See above, n. 17.

³⁴ See M. Himmelfarb, “Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees,” *Poetics Today* 19 (1998): 19–40.

THE END OF THE MATTER? JUBILEES 50:6–13 AND THE UNITY OF THE BOOK

James C. VanderKam
University of Notre Dame

The Book of Jubilees has been regarded by most who have studied it as a literary unity. The first scholar to publish a translation, analysis, and text of the book, August Dillmann, said nothing about subsequent editions of the composition.¹ R. H. Charles, in his translation and commentary of 1902, entitled the relevant section in his introduction “Jubilees from one author; but based on earlier books and traditions.”² This is a remarkable circumstance for such experts who were also biblical scholars, when one considers how frequently commentators have found evidence of redactions in scriptural and other works from antiquity.

Over the last several decades the issue of literary unity has not been a major topic of research, but there have been a few proposals to the effect that the present text of Jubilees is the result of one or more editorial revisions to an original base. For example, Michel Testuz, in his book *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*,³ found three interpolated passages: 1:7–25, 28; 23:11–32; and 24:28b–30. Although he devoted most of the book to setting forth the principal teachings in Jubilees, he prefaced to it a section in which he treated some standard introductory subjects. He thought the author was a priestly Essene who was an advocate of the Hasmonean dynasty and who wrote Jubilees in ca. 110 B.C.E. The last section of the introduction he entitled “Remarques sur trois passages,” (pp. 39–42) and here he presents the reasons why he believed the three sections are later than the rest of the book.

On his view, the three call special attention to themselves “par leur style, leurs tendances, et l’intérêt qu’elles portent à d’autres objets que le contexte...”⁴ The first passage allows one to see clearly the suture

¹ “Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis,” *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 2 (1850): 230–56; 3 (1851): 1–96.

² *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (Oxford, 1902), xlv–xlvii.

³ *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés* (Geneve: Librairie E. Droz/Paris: Librairie Minard, 1960).

⁴ *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*, 39.

points, as nearly the same words appear at the beginning and end of it (vv. 7 and 26).⁵ The third section (24:28b–30) presents a similar situation. Testuz thinks that v. 28, rather than referring to “the Philistines” (plural), originally mentioned “the Philistine” and that v. 31 directly follows, revealing that vv. 28b–30 are an addition. In this instance he was forced to revise the text to make his case.

Stylistically, he thought the passages were distinctive in that they showed “une prédilection pour les termes accumulés et presque synonymes dans une même phrase...”⁶ The tone in the added sections is more oratorical and passionate. They evince a great hatred for gentiles, whereas in the remainder of the book non-Israelites are held in contempt and ignored more than they are loathed. They belong far away in time and in space, but in the three passages highlighted by Testuz they are very much present as they make war on Israel—successfully, it seems. Perhaps sensing a weakness at this juncture, Testuz allows that there are strong statements about gentiles elsewhere in the book (e.g. chap. 30) but he insists there is still a difference: such statements, though markedly negative, have a rhetorical quality about them in most of the book, but in the three texts there is pure hatred caused by recent events. Also in the three passages the gods of other peoples are named as present realities, as equals dangerous to the God of Israel. This stands in contrast to chap. 12, for instance where the gods are simply called dumb statues, works of human hands. The leader of the demons is usually called Mastema in Jubilees, but in 1:20 the name is Beliar.

Testuz thought the three passages were added at some time between ca. 65 and 38 by a scribe who belonged to the same tradition as the author and who was a member of the Qumran community where the book was preserved.

Testuz’s proposals have received some support but not very much. In fairness to him, we should note that his book appeared before most of the copies of Jubilees from Qumran were available. Now that they have been published, the weakness of his arguments is even more apparent than before. He isolated three eschatological passages and was correct in pointing to their unusual character in that Jubilees is mostly concerned with retelling stories about the past, not with predicting. But to say that

⁵ For the point to be valid, he has to say that v. 28 must be read directly after v. 25 (*Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*, 39).

⁶ *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*, 40.

the subject of these sections is unusual is different than saying they are additions to the book.

The criteria he uses for isolating additions to the original core of Jubilees are vague, even subjective. So, for example, his argument about style fails to convince. There are other passages in which synonymous terms accumulate (see several instances in chap. 20). The attitude toward non-Israelites is consistently hostile throughout the book, and the gentiles are a continuing and present danger, as is clear in the stories about Jacob and his descendants. The same may be said about the attitude toward the gods of the nations: the book consistently teaches that though they are manufactured they can hardly be ignored because others worship them and because they prove alluring when intermarriage with the nations takes place. The leader of the demons is indeed called Beliar in Jub 1:20, but the name figures in 15:33 as well; as a result the name is not unique to Testuz's sections.

It seems highly unlikely that the three passages could have been added as late as Testuz argued they were. Among the Qumran copies of Jubilees, 4QJub^a (4Q216) contains several parts of 1:7–25, 28 written in a hand that can be dated to ca. 50 B.C.E. The sheet on which these verses were copied appears to be a replacement sheet now sewn together with other columns that were copied in perhaps 125 B.C.E.⁷ The implication is that the material in the chapter is considerably older than Testuz thought and that Jubilees itself is probably also more ancient than he suspected. In addition, it is strange that he used information from these supposedly later passages in the section of his book in which he attempts to identify who the *author* was.⁸

A short time after Testuz's book appeared, Ernest Wiesenberg took another approach to the issue of authorial unity.⁹ After a detailed analysis of the dates in Jubilees, he concluded that the chronology of the original book placed the date of *the Exodus and the arrival at Mt. Sinai* in the year of the world 2451. An editor then modified this composition so that the *entry into Canaan* was the event that occurred in 2451, 40 years

⁷ See VanderKam and J. T. Milik, "216. 4QJubilees^a," in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (J. VanderKam, consulting ed.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 1–22, with plates I–II. Some of the verses from 23:10–32 are also present on copies from Qumran: 3Q5 (first century C.E.), 4Q176 (Herodian), 4Q221 (early Herodian).

⁸ *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*, 25–39.

⁹ "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RevQ* 9/3 (1961–62): 3–40.

after the Exodus and the covenant at Sinai.¹⁰ In response to his study, I examined the numerous dates in Jubilees and the author's explanation of the entire system in 50:2–5. I agreed that there are indeed a number of mistakes or inconsistencies in the book but thought that “all of them are explicable in simpler ways than assuming sundry editions of the book.”¹¹ More importantly, perhaps, Wiesenberg misunderstood the explicit goal or meaning of Jubilees' chronological system: by dating the release from Egyptian bondage and return to the ancestral land in the fiftieth jubilee (years of the world 2402–2450), the writer makes the nation's experience parallel that of the individual Israelite who, according to scriptural legislation, would receive freedom from slavery and return of property in the fiftieth year.¹²

A third hypothesis challenging the unity of Jubilees was formulated by Gene Davenport. We have seen that the passages which Testuz considered additions were eschatological ones, and it is to such passages that Davenport turned his attention. In his book *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*,¹³ he applied the methods of form and redaction criticism to Jubilees; failure to do so had, he believed, resulted in faulty analyses of the book's theology, including its eschatology, because scholars had mistakenly assumed one person wrote all of it. After summarizing the ways in which R. H. Charles, P. Volz, J. Klausner, and Testuz had explained the eschatology of Jubilees, he criticized their interpretations and wrote: “Form and redaction criticism show that editorial work frequently is not merely a matter of interpolations, but of major redaction and that the whole meaning of a work may thus be changed. Such, in fact, will be shown to be the case with Jubilees.”¹⁴

In his second chapter, entitled “A Brief History of the Growth of Jubilees,” he details his thesis about the evolution of the text. He

¹⁰ Wiesenberg refers to “erratic revisions by some later writer” who also added the important chronological information in 50:4 (“The Jubilee of Jubilees,” 38). He thinks it likely that writer was a Zealot (38–40). Although he contrasts only two ending points of the chronology, on p. 32 he mentions “several—mutually exclusive—chronological systems in the *Book of Jubilees*; a sign of repeated revisions of that book which were not consistently carried through.”

¹¹ “Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees,” in J. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 522–44 (the quotation is from p. 540). The essay originally appeared as “Das chronologische Konzept des Jubiläenbuches,” *ZAW* 107 (1995): 80–100.

¹² “Studies in the Chronology,” 540–43.

¹³ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees* (StPB 20; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

¹⁴ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 4.

argued that to an original core (an “Angelic Discourse” [A]), consisting of 1:1–4a, part of 1:29; 2:1–50:4, an editor (R₁) added 1:4b–26, part of 1:29; 23:14–20, 21–31; and 50:5. A second editor (R₂) further modified the text by adding 1:27–28, yet another part of 1:29; 4:24; 23:21; 31:14; and 50:6–13, the conclusion to the book.¹⁵

The original Angelic Discourse (A) was written in the late third or early second century. “Its purpose was to teach a particular system of Torah.”¹⁶ No section of this original form of the book *functioned* to teach eschatology, although there were eschatological presuppositions in it as well as elements of prophetic and apocalyptic eschatology. The writer believed his generation was the final one before blessings, curses, and judgment took place. “A’s primary hermeneutical method was to show how the stories, blessings, curses, and judgment sayings in the tradition accounted for contemporary conditions and laws and for events yet to occur.”¹⁷ R₁, written in the years 166–60, supplies a new introduction (1:4b–26) along with other material (such as 23:14–20, 21–31; 50:5). It reflects a time of trouble and was written to reassure and to shame: “...this redactor turned the angelic discourse into an eschatological word of hope and judgment.”¹⁸ Although he found little to distinguish the eschatology of this redaction from that in A, he considered it more apocalyptic in that the editor believed the scriptures and other traditions he used spoke of his own day. The second redactor, who altered the text in a sanctuary-oriented way, did his modest editorial work during the Hasmonean period in order to highlight the importance of the temple which, in his opinion, was being desecrated.

¹⁵ If I have followed his scattered notes correctly, Davenport divides the much revised text of Jub 1:29, a verse Testuz considered part of the original book, as follows (R₁ additions are in italics, those of R₂ are underlined): “The angel of the presence, who was going along in front of the Israelite camp, took the tablets (which told) of the divisions of the years *from the time the law and the testimony were created*—for the weeks of their jubilees, year by year in their full number, and their jubilees from [the time of the creation until] the time of the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures will be renewed like the powers of the sky and like all the creatures of the earth, until the time when the temple of the Lord will be created in Jerusalem on Mt. Zion. All the luminaries will be renewed for (the purposes of) healing, health, and blessing for all the elect ones of Israel and so that it may remain this way from that time throughout all the days of the earth.” This and all translations of Jubilees are from VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510–11, *Scriptores Aethiopic* 87–88), vol. 2.

¹⁶ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 10.

¹⁷ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 73.

¹⁸ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 74.

The book still proclaims the nearness of the new age. The content of his eschatology, however, was somewhat cosmic in orientation, in contrast to his predecessors. He looked for the renewal of the powers of the heavens and of the earth and of all that is within them. To the legalistic, nationalistic, and individualistic outlook of the work as he found it, he has added a portrait of Jerusalem and Zion as the focal points of a cosmic renewal that will spread throughout the creation. In this respect, the content of his eschatology was more apocalyptic than was the content of that of his predecessors.¹⁹

The second redactor probably was a member of the Qumran community, working at some point in the period 140–104, that is, during the reigns of Simon and John Hyrcanus.²⁰

As with Testuz's theory, one of the problems that besets Davenport's thesis is the lack of any objective indicator that redaction has indeed taken place. It appears that little in the teaching of the book was altered by the suggested redactions, and thus distinguishing layers is based on rather shaky footing—hardly justifying his claim, quoted above, that the whole meaning of the book was changed. It is surely not implausible to think that an author, whose primary aim may have been to teach legal lessons from older stories, saw fit to attach to them warnings and exhortations about what was to happen and included among his few statements about eschatology references to Jerusalem and a new sanctuary. One specific indicator to which Davenport did point was the contradiction in Jubilees regarding who actually wrote the book: Moses or the angel of the presence. According to 1:5, 26 Moses is to write the account of what will happen forever, while in 1:27–28 the angel of the presence is told to write what will occur until the sanctuary is built.²¹ I have dealt with this alleged contradiction, suggesting that it does not come from a redactor who introduced a conflict (why would an editor do this?) but from a graphic confusion between *qal* and *hiphil* forms of the verb כָּתַב or failure by the Greek translator of Jubilees to distinguish the meanings of the two. This solution, which now has support from 4Q216, provides a simpler explanation: the angel *dictated* the contents of the book which Moses *wrote*.²² By eliminating the contradiction, it also removes Davenport's only objective reason for separating his first

¹⁹ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 75.

²⁰ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 16.

²¹ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 15.

²² "The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees," *JSS* 26 (1981): 209–17. For the Qumran evidence, see 4Q216 IV 6.

and second redactions. We may add that the early date of 4Q216, which contains verses that he assigns to the second redactor, makes his chronological suggestions unlikely.

Though each of these scholars approached the question of Jubilees' unity in a different way, Testuz and Davenport agree to a certain extent in isolating eschatological passages as supplements (especially in chaps. 1 and 23). In the remainder of the paper, I wish to investigate a new hypothesis regarding the composition of the book, specifically that the end of Jubilees, 50:6–13, is an addition. It should be noted that Davenport somewhat hesitantly placed this section in his second redaction.²³

Liora Ravid has made a case for the secondary character of 50:6–13—the only passage in the book that she regards as not coming from the author.²⁴ These verses offer a set of sabbath laws revealed to Moses. The section follows a paragraph (50:1–5) in which there is reference to the sabbath (50:1), to seven-year periods (sabbaths of the land), and to jubilee years, and in which the chronological scheme of the book is explained (vv. 2b–5). Jubilees 50:6–13 then begins with another statement from the angel of the presence: “I have now written for you²⁵ the sabbath commandments and all the statutes of its laws.” (50:6) Many of the remaining verses detail the types of activity that fall under the prohibition of work on the sabbath. That the writer of Jubilees would include teachings about the sabbath and fix them in a place so prominent as the end of his book would not be surprising because the sabbath is one of his most important subjects, as is apparent from the lengthy section about it at the end of his retelling of the creation account (Jub 2:15–33).

Ravid does not, of course, maintain that a sabbath section at the end of Jubilees would be out of place for the writer. Rather, a central argument for her is that Jub 50:6–13 contradicts the practice of the writer elsewhere in the book. As he rewrites Genesis and the first part of Exodus, he carefully follows the order of events in the older text and adds legal sections at points where the narratives provide the occasion for the laws in question. A good example among many is the

²³ *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*, 68, 75.

²⁴ “The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13,” *Tarbiz* 69 (2000): 161–66 (Hebrew).

²⁵ This is another passage in which the original probably read a *hiphil*: “I have now dictated to you....”

first sabbath section in 2:15–33: it is directly tied to mention of the sabbath in the creation week (Gen 2:1–3; cf. Jub 2:15–17) and provides a fuller explication of what it means. In Jubilees 2 one finds emphases that are characteristic of the author's understanding of the sabbath: it is so extraordinarily special that God permits only the two highest classes of angels to celebrate it with him in heaven, and on earth this privilege belongs to Israel alone whose holiness is compared with that of the highest angels (2:17–21).

The same cannot be said, according to Ravid, about the sabbath material in 50:6–13. Whereas in the other cases there is a clear, thematic connection between scriptural event and the law enunciated—laws that obligate Israel because the ancestors practiced them—the last eight verses of the book do not arise from an event in the scriptural sequence. Instead, these verses resume treatment of laws that were known and kept from the first week of creation. “Contrary to all the other laws in Jubilees, they were made known without connection to an event in the lives of the patriarchs which required that they be revealed; the patriarchs who strictly implemented all the laws introduced in the book as they were instructed did not implement these.”²⁶

Another difference when 2:15–33 and 50:6–13 are compared is that the sabbath in the latter applies to servants, sojourners, and animals (v. 7); in the former it is for God, the holy angels, and Israel. Naturally, Ravid thinks the original writer knew the fourth commandment as formulated in Exod 20:9–11 and was opposed to having servants and sojourners working on the sabbath, but “he chose to ignore their existence, something that permitted him to retain the connection of holiness between the sabbath and those who keep it,” that is, Israel alone.²⁷

Ravid also draws an analogy with procedures found in other texts, specifically the ways in which ancient editors added material to compositions they were editing. She invoked J. Licht's thesis regarding the Torah: when one wanted to add a law to an already existing legal text the accepted way was to formulate it as a new law and to include in it clear allusions to the original law.²⁸ In this way after a time the new law also would become part of the Torah. The law of the second passover

²⁶ “The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13,” 162 (the translations are mine).

²⁷ “The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13,” 163.

²⁸ She is referring to J. Licht, *A Commentary on the Book of Numbers (I–X)* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985 [Hebrew]), 62.

is an example (Num 9:6–14).²⁹ She also appealed to the work of D. Daube who showed that in antiquity editors, due to the great power of tradition, would leave an existing law in its place and would attach the new one at the end of the composition.³⁰ This is what happened with the Book of Jubilees, with the new section—50:6–13—appended to the existing book which ended at 50:5. A copyist, sensing that the sabbath laws in chap. 2 were not sufficiently detailed, formulated them anew, inserted allusions in them to the original law, and placed them at the end of the work.³¹ Ravid suspects this copyist was a member of the Qumran sect, since Jubilees was available and copied there.³² So, like Davenport (and Testuz, in a sense), she posits a Qumran redaction of the book. It follows from Ravid's hypothesis that one should not draw consequences about the author of Jubilees and the situation in which he wrote the book from the last eight verses in it.³³

We have, then, two scholars who have opposed the majority view that Jubilees is the product of one writer and have agreed to the extent that they think 50:6–13 is an addition appended to the text at Qumran. They have different reasons for considering the passage a supplement but both consider it to be later than the original book. Ravid's case for identifying 50:6–13 as a unit added to Jubilees has elicited several responses, among which the most detailed is the one by Lutz Doering.

In general Doering argues that:

[Ravid's] "claims are unwarranted and that *Jub* 50:6–13 makes good sense as the original closing section of Jubilees. In detail, it is shown that the title quotation in *Jub* 50:13 confirms [sic] to formal standards, that the frame created by *Jub* 2 and 50 corresponds to the sequence of sabbath texts in the Pentateuch, that *Jub* 50 does not contradict the focus on Israel established by *Jub* 2, and finally that there are tensions between the regulations in *Jub* 50:8, 12 and halakhic sabbath texts from Qumran, which do not suggest a Qumran provenance of this chapter."³⁴

²⁹ The argument about intertextual connections could be reversed: such allusions could be interpreted as signs of unity and coherence between the two sections.

³⁰ "The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13," 164. See Daube, *Studies in Biblical Law* (New York: Ktav, 1969), 74, 77.

³¹ She added to her article a list of works prohibited on the sabbath: 15 are listed in *Jub* 50:6–13, three of which appear also in chap. 2. The two types of work permitted on the sabbath in 50:10–11 are not mentioned in chap. 2 ("The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13," 165).

³² "The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13," 165.

³³ "The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13," 166.

³⁴ "*Jub* 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des *Jubiläenbuchs*-Nachtrag aus Qumran oder

More specifically, Doering has countered Ravid's formal argument by maintaining that Jub. 50:6–13 is well integrated with the remainder of Jubilees. The last line in v. 13 (“Here the words regarding the divisions of the times are completed”) conforms to more general codicological practices, and terms or themes in it such as the tablets and sabbath/weeks of sabbaths are characteristic of the book. As Jubilees contextualizes them, the sabbath commands in 50:6–13 spell out the requirements for Israel when they will dwell in the land, a theme broached in 50:2–5.³⁵

As for the argument that 50:6–13 fails to harmonize with the author's practice of tying laws to scriptural events in the order in which they arise, Doering insists that the section does indeed follow that practice. Noting that the book rewrites the material in Genesis 1–Exodus 19 (not just until Exodus 12), he correctly states “dass das Jubiläenbuch die *beiden einzigen* ‘Stellen,’ an denen die biblische Vorgabe *Gen 1–Exod 19* den Sabbat erwähnt, nutzt, um sabbathalacha zu etablieren. Mit anderen Worten: Das Jubiläenbuch *folgt auch hier dem Vorbild des Pentateuch*.”³⁶ Teachings about the sabbath are an important part of Exodus 16 (vv. 5, 22–30), where they arise in connection with the story about gathering manna, and Jubilees refers to this setting in 50:1, with the laws following in vv. 6–13.

Doering adds to his critique of Ravid a lengthy discussion of whether inclusion of the “sojourner/ foreigner” in 50:7 is consistent with Jubilees' exclusive linking of Israel and the sabbath in chap. 2. He believes that the word נָכְרִי stood in the Hebrew text of Jubilees and that the author understood by it “ein in das Volk Israel integrierter Nichtisraelit—und nicht unmittelbar ein Heide...”³⁷ It is therefore consistent with the teaching in chap. 2 and not a polemical element added to the book. He also doubts 50:6–13 was added by a Qumran scribe since there is tension between this unit and several Qumran texts that offer sabbath laws. Whereas Jubilees forbids sabbath travel, the Qumran texts

ursprünglicher Bestandteil des Werks?” *RevQ* 79/20 (2002): 359–87. The quotation is from the English summary, 359–60. Doering has written more widely about the sabbath, including the way in which it is presented in Jubilees, in his *Schabbat: Sabbathalacha und -praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum* (TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999). The section on Jubilees is chap. III (43–118). See also his essay “The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 179–205.

³⁵ “Jub 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des *Jubiläenbuchs*,” 362–69.

³⁶ “Jub 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des *Jubiläenbuchs*,” 371.

³⁷ “Jub 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des *Jubiläenbuchs*,” 382.

distinguish permissible distances (1000 ells for any journey, 2000 when pasturing animals).³⁸

M. Kister wrote a short response to Ravid's paper, and in it he opposed several of her arguments although he thought the matter required more study.³⁹ With others, Kister noted the inclusio formed by 50:13 with the prologue and Jub 1:26–29 and adds that, if one were to accept Ravid's hypothesis, one would still have to connect 50:13c (where the tablets are mentioned) to 50:5. He also pointed out that 50:1 ("After this law I informed you about the sabbath days in the wilderness of *Sin* which is between Elim and Sinai") is left without explanation if 50:6 does not belong to the text. He recognized that the author does not adduce the event of gathering manna but that many, though not all, of the laws in vv. 6–13 could have been inferred from Exodus 16 (laws in vv. 8–12 could have been derived from Exod 16:23, 25). But the remaining difficulties led him to wonder whether the connections between the sabbath laws in Jub 50:6–13 and Exodus 16 are accidental.

M. Segal, who briefly surveyed the work of Testuz, Davenport, and Ravid, has concluded that Doering's refutations of Ravid's arguments are mostly convincing,⁴⁰ but he also reports that Kister, one of the directors of his dissertation, has conveyed to him orally a consideration that supports Ravid. In Jub 50:13 there are two different meanings of the word שִׁבָּת: "a man who does any of these things on the sabbath day [= meaning 1] is to die, so that the Israelites may continue observing the sabbath in accord with the commandments for the sabbaths of the land [meaning 2]...." While the reference to the sabbaths of the land (the sabbatical years) continues in a natural way the contents of 50:1–5, the laws of the sabbath day in 50:6–13a do not. This is a reason for

³⁸ "Jub 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des *Jubiläenbuchs*," 386–87.

³⁹ "Two Formulae in the Book of Jubilees," *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 297 n. 47. His comments appear in the context of discussing references to the tablets in Jubilees 1 and 50.

⁴⁰ "The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology" (Ph.D. dissertation, Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2004), 13–17 (Hebrew). Segal defends a more comprehensive view of Jubilees' literary growth: he argues that the legal sections and the chronology (and some other passages with similar terminology) are from the editor who adopted the narrative rewritings from elsewhere. Among the passages illustrating similar terminology with the legal and chronological sections are chap. 1; 23:9–32; 50:1–5, 13b; there is thus a considerable overlap with passages Davenport considered secondary and in part with ones Testuz thought were added. By attributing the chronology to the editor, Segal takes a stand far different from Wiesenbergs theory.

thinking these verses were attached in a place where they do not fit.⁴¹

In the concluding section of this paper I wish to supplement Doering's case that Jub 50:6–13 is a well integrated part of the unified Book of Jubilees. The final verse does indeed resume topics that arise at the beginning of the book and the last sentence repeats the title of the book as it appears in chap. 1. In that sense 50:13 forms a fitting conclusion to the book, one that harks back to the beginning. But 50:6–13 forms another kind of inclusio. By centering on the sabbath, it recalls 2:15–33 and thus creates a ring around Jubilees' retelling of the scriptural stories. Sabbath legislation encircles the events from creation to Sinai.

Jubilees 50 is obviously linked to Exodus 16 as its narrative peg. This follows from 50:1 which says: "After this law [of passover and the festival of unleavened bread in chap. 49] I informed you about the sabbath days in the wilderness of *Sin* which is between Elim and Sinai." The sentence contains a citation of several words from Exod 16:1: מִדְּבַר סִינַי אֲשֶׁר בֵּין אֵילָם וּבֵין סִינַי. As editors and commentators have observed, the word *Sinā*, attested in all the Ethiopic manuscripts for the first place name in 50:1, resulted from a simple error—replacing the less familiar name *Sin* with the more familiar and graphically similar *Sinā*. So, the writer explicitly calls the reader's attention to this passage in Exodus where the sabbath plays an important role, as we have seen. Since Exodus 16 deals only with sabbath days, not sabbatical years, the writer mentions only "the sabbath days" in 50:1. It is natural, then, that laws for keeping the sabbath day, a number of them deriving directly or by inference from Exodus 16, should follow this narrative statement. In other words, the legal material in 50:6–13a fits in the context and with v. 1 is another example of the author's habit of connecting narrative triggers with legal prescriptions.

But Jub 50:1 is not the only passage that introduces the themes of the chapter. In Jub 50:2 the angel of the presence adduces another narrative context: "On Mt. Sinai I told you about the sabbaths of the land and the years of jubilees in the sabbaths of the years,..." This verse returns the reader to the prologue and Jub 1:1–4 where Moses ascends Sinai on the day after the covenant was concluded on the mountain and apparently the material in Exodus 20–23 was revealed. Jubilees 1:1–4, a rewriting of Exod 24:12–18, refers to a seven-day period followed by another forty days that he remained there. By introducing

⁴¹ Segal, "The Book of Jubilees," 16–17.

these time periods, the narrator potentially places before the reader's eye the entire stretch of scriptural material that runs from the end of Exodus 24 through at least Exodus 31. All of this is presented in Exodus as revelation from God to Moses during his first forty-day stay on the mountain. Moses does not descend from Sinai until Exodus 32 where he responds to the golden calf incident. Consequently Jub 50:2, by mentioning revelation at Sinai, could be referencing the contents of Exodus 20–31.

According to Jub 50:2 the angel told to Moses on Mt. Sinai information about the sabbaths of the land and the years of jubilees. The first of these topics—the sabbaths of the land—is found in Exod 23:10–11,⁴² just before the law of the sabbath in 23:12. Both are part of the Covenant Code which Exodus locates at Sinai. More problematic is the reference in 50:2 to the years of jubilees, since one reads nothing about them in Exodus 20–31, the chapters which serve as the setting for the Book of Jubilees. The jubilee years, following seven weeks of years or sabbatical periods, are first legislated in Leviticus 25 (especially vv. 8–17), a passage placed at Sinai, of course, but well after Moses's first stay on the mountain. The chapter also deals with sabbatical years (vv. 2–7). Why did the author of Jubilees, a precise student of the scriptural text, claim the angel of the presence revealed the years of jubilees to Moses during his first forty-day period on Mt. Sinai when Exodus says nothing about them?

It is likely that he felt quite justified in doing so. There is something peculiar about Leviticus 25 that caught the eye of ancient expositors and probably influenced the writer of Jubilees. It begins with these words: “The Lord spoke to Moses on Mount Sinai, saying. . . .”⁴³ This is not the only instance in Leviticus in which “at Sinai” appears (see 7:38 [in a summary statement at the end of chaps. 1–7]; 26:46 [in a summary at the end of the Holiness Code but one which forms an *inclusio* with 25:1];⁴⁴ 27:34 [in the last verse in the book—another summary]), but it is the only passage in which a specific section is so introduced. Naturally, the anomaly did not escape the attention of early commentators. In *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael, Bahodesh 3*, there is a discussion of

⁴² The actual term is not used here in Exodus; it comes, significantly (see below) from Lev 25:6.

⁴³ Scriptural quotations are from the *NRSV*.

⁴⁴ See J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27* (AB 3B; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 2150, 2342–43.

Exod 24:7: “Then he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the hearing of the people. . . .” The question raised by the verse concerned what exactly it was that Moses read to the people. Several rabbis offered their opinions⁴⁵ before R. Ishmael articulated his view:

At the commencement of the passage what does Scripture say? ‘Then shall the land keep a sabbath to the Lord. Six years you shall sow your field’ (Lev. 25:2–3). [He read to them about the laws about] years of release and jubilees, blessings and curses. And at the end of the passage what does Scripture say? ‘These are the statutes and ordinances and laws’ (Lev. 26:46). Then the people said, ‘We accept responsibility for ourselves for all these.’ When he saw that they accepted responsibility to keep all these laws, ‘Moses took the blood and sprinkled it on the people’ (Ex. 24:8).⁴⁶

The reference to Sinai in Lev 25:1 seems to have caused Leviticus 25–26 to be understood as part of the book of the covenant.⁴⁷ Jubilees, by locating both sabbatical and jubilee laws at Sinai during Moses’s first forty-day stay on the mountain, is a much earlier realization of the connection spotted centuries later by R. Ishmael.

Once the writer of Jubilees has introduced the subject of sabbatical and jubilee years, he proceeds to explain the chronology of the book which is based on such units as he understood them⁴⁸ and the goal toward which sacred history was directed. This was the natural place in which to do so, but the result is that the sabbath laws in 50:6–13 are separated from the citation of Exod 16:1 in Jub 50:1 by vv. 2–5.

There is no need to offer a detailed exegesis of Jubilees 50 here, but it will be helpful to conclude with some additional notes about how the chapter is formed and phrased in keeping with the pseudepigraphic

⁴⁵ Considering the Sinaitic setting and the contents of Jubilees (material from Genesis 1 until Sinai), the view expressed by R. Yose b. R. Judah that the book contained the material from the beginning of Genesis to that very time is interesting. This was also Rashi’s view.

⁴⁶ The translation comes from J. Neusner, *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Analytical Translation*, vol. 2: *Amalek, Bahodesh, Neziqin, Kaspa and Shabbata* (BJS 54; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 53–54.

⁴⁷ Milgrom, who mentions the Mekhilta passage, refers to the view of Ibn Ezra and Abravanel that Leviticus 25–26 were transferred from their proper setting in Exodus 20–24 to their present location in Leviticus to place them with laws whose violation was a cause of expulsion (Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, 2151).

⁴⁸ Throughout the book the word *jubilee* means a 49-year unit, but 50:2–5 shows the author also accepts the meaning *fiftieth year* for it. In fact, the fiftieth jubilee period of 49 years is the culminating one in the chronology of the book.

setting of the book.⁴⁹ The entire chapter, including vv. 6–13, is tightly integrated into the author’s rewriting of scripture and development of scripturally inspired legal themes.

Jub 50:1 Narrative setting: As we have seen, it situates the chapter by citing from Exod 16:1.

Jub 50:2–3 Sabbatical and jubilee years: The writer names two subjects—the sabbaths of the land and the years of jubilees—both of which derive from Leviticus 25 (understood to belong to the Jubilean setting of Moses’s first forty-day sojourn atop Sinai). The legislation in Leviticus 25 is intended for the time when Israel will live in the land (v. 2), and this idea is expressed at the end of Jub 50:2. The phrase “sabbath of the land” occurs in Lev 25:6 (cf. vv. 4–5), and the year of jubilee (for the phrase see, for example, Lev 25:28) is treated in vv. 8–17, while most of the remainder of the chapter deals with legal matters related to it.

Jub 50:4–5 Chronology and goal: These verses explain the chronology of Jubilees which runs throughout the entire book and culminates in the fiftieth jubilee period. At some later point ideal conditions will prevail. During the fiftieth jubilee period the nation enjoys on a grand scale the two experiences that an individual Israelite could have in the jubilee year: freedom from servitude and return to ancestral land (see 25:10, etc.). Leviticus 25, therefore, continues to be the scriptural foundation here. The return of Israel to its ancestral home presupposes Jubilees’ lengthy section about the assignment of the land to Shem and the theft of it by Canaan (Jubilees 8–10).

Jub 50:6 Introduction to sabbath laws: The verse stands as a heading over the following section. In it the author continues his practice of having the angel speak to Moses in the first person, and he phrases it in such a way that a listing of laws regarding the sabbath day, the subject with which the chapter began, would follow naturally. The beginning of v. 1 had led the reader to expect information about the sabbath laws in connection with Exodus 16. Now that the writer has dealt with the

⁴⁹ For an outline of the chapter, see Doering, *Schabbat*, 58–59; he also provides detailed comments on the various laws and situates them in the development of sabbath legislation on pp. 70–108. Ch. Albeck had earlier provided a survey of the sabbath laws in Jubilees and had compared them with the teachings of rabbinic texts and other sources (*Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha* [Sieben und vierziger Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin; Berlin-Schöneberg: Scholem, 1930], 7–12).

extended sabbatical units, he resumes the theme of the sabbath day and focuses on its “commandments and all the statutes of its laws.”

50:7 Sabbath commandment: In a section detailing sabbath law, it is reasonable to begin with a statement of the most fundamental one—the fourth commandment as formulated in Exod 20:9–10. The writer could cite this commandment because he had already introduced Moses’s stay on Mt. Sinai in v. 2.

50:8–9, 12 Sabbath laws: As he begins to elaborate what this commandment means, the author mentions some general categories and specific types of prohibitions that fall under these larger rubrics. Jubilees 50:8 imposes the death penalty on anyone who performs labor on the sabbath. The appropriate Sinaitic basis for this general statement about capital punishment, one cited almost verbatim in v. 8,⁵⁰ is Exod 31:15 (cf. v. 14 and Jub 2:7): “whoever does any work on the sabbath day shall be put to death.”

In the same verse (50:8) the writer presents a general category of behavior that subjects one to the death penalty stated in the previous line: “any man who desecrates this day . . . is to die” (see 2:25–27). Exodus 31:14 lies behind the statute: “You shall keep the sabbath, because it is holy for you; everyone who profanes it shall be put to death . . .” Jubilees, within the general statement about desecration of the sabbath, inserts several types of desecration: sex,⁵¹ speaking about various types of work on the sabbath (going on a trip, buying and selling, drawing water, carrying burdens). The prohibition of speaking about work is probably related to Isa 58:13, but the law regarding not only speaking about a journey but actually going on one (see Jub 30:12) relates to Exod 16:29: “each of you stay where you are; do not leave your place on the seventh day.”⁵²

⁵⁰ The wording in 50:8 is actually closer to the parallel statement of this law in Exod 35:2.

⁵¹ Doering relates this prohibition to the sanctity of the sabbath (Exod 20:8); avoidance of sex was required at Sinai so that the people could sanctify themselves and, by analogy, one would have to avoid sex to sanctify the sabbath (*Schabbat*, 79–80).

⁵² *Tg Ps.-J.* Exod 16:29 reads: “See that the Lord has given you the sabbath. Therefore he gives you bread for two days on the sixth day. Let everyone remain *in his place*. Do not move anything more than four cubits from domain to domain, and let no one leave his place to walk more than two thousand cubits on the sabbath day,” translation of M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus* (The Aramaic Bible 2; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1994). The targum shows that laws about burdens and travel could be derived from this verse. For travel, see Mekhilta, Wayassa 6.

In Jub 50:9 one finds the prohibition of using on the sabbath something that had not been prepared on the sixth day. The prescription may have been derived from Exod 16:5: “On the sixth day, when they prepare what they bring in, it will be twice as much as they gather on other days” (cf. vv. 22). Exodus 16:23 quotes Moses as saying: “Tomorrow is a day of solemn rest, a holy sabbath to the Lord; bake what you want to bake and boil what you want to boil, and all that is left over put aside to be kept until morning.”

When specific sabbath commands resume in 50:12, they again concern subjects that may be related to Exodus 16. The twelfth verse provides a short list of types of work that fall under the sabbatical ban: travel (later, travel by ship is included as is riding an animal),⁵³ working farmland, lighting a fire, and (attempts to procure food by?) hunting and killing animals, birds, or fish. The prohibition of travel, as we have seen, may derive from the order to stay in one’s place in Exod 16:29, while the command having to do with foods (?) could fall under the heading of using only what is prepared on the sixth day. The statement about farm land has been interpreted as reflecting Exod 34:21 (“even in plowing time and in harvest time you shall rest”), but it could have been an inference from the inclusion of animals and servants in the sabbath command. The law against kindling a fire echoes Exod 35:3, although it could be inspired by Exod 16:23 (regarding baking and boiling on the sixth day, not on the seventh).⁵⁴

Jub 50:5, 9b–10 Jubilean themes: The laws for the sabbath day in Jubilees 50 are interspersed with themes expressed elsewhere in the book or with ones fitting to the pseudepigraphic setting. Jubilees 50:5 speaks of the future when Israel becomes “pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin, and error.” These terms appear frequently in the book and are central to the author’s concerns. His claim in the same verse that in the ideal future Israel “will no longer have any satan or any evil person” echoes a phrase found in another statement about the future (23:29) and in descriptions of ideal conditions (40:9; 46:2, both about Joseph’s rule).

⁵³ Doering connects the law about riding an animal with the inclusion of animals in the fourth commandment or in Exod 23:12 (*Sabbat*, 98).

⁵⁴ The law against fasting on the sabbath could arise from Exod 16:25: “Moses said, ‘Eat it today, for today is a sabbath to the Lord...’” (cf. Mekhilta Wayassa 5; Kister, “Two Formulae,” 297 n. 47). The prohibition of making war on the sabbath is not mentioned in Exodus 16, but if one was not to leave his place on the sabbath, it would be difficult to fight a war.

Jubilees 50:9b–10 contains teachings about the sabbath that recall ones expressed in chap. 2. The writer refers to eating, drinking,⁵⁵ resting, keeping sabbath from work, and blessing God on that day, the day of the holy kingdom. Observing the day in this festal way is a great honor for Israel. We have seen how the second chapter compares Israel's holiness with that of the angels and speaks of Israel's extraordinary privilege of celebrating sabbath with the Lord and his great angels (see 2:31). "In this way he made a sign on it by which they, too, would keep sabbath with us on the seventh day, to eat, drink, and bless the creator of all as he had blessed them and sanctified them for himself as a noteworthy people out of all the nations; and to keep sabbath together with us." (2:21)

Jub 50:10–11 Exceptions to the ban on work: Jubilees does allow exceptions to the blanket prohibition of work: on the sabbath incense and the sabbath sacrifices are to be offered in the sanctuary (cf. Num 28:9–10). Only at this point in Jubilees was it appropriate to mention such sanctuary-related topics because it was during Moses's first stay on the mountain that the instructions for the tabernacle were revealed to Moses (beginning in Exodus 25). The author may be alluding to this period-sensitive approach when he writes in v. 13 that the angel revealed "the laws of each specific time in every division of its times."

One additional inference to be drawn from this study of Jubilees 50 is that the presence of the word *sabbath* in two meanings in Jub 50:13 ought not to raise suspicions about the secondary character of the sabbath laws in 50:6–13. The verse, the last one in the book, closes the chapter by naming the two kinds of sabbaths treated in the chapter and in so doing may also call attention to the numerous overlaps between the sabbath and sabbatical laws.

These notes are meant to show that Jub 50:6–13 not only accords with the author's manner of introducing laws throughout the book but also to demonstrate that the entire chapter coheres well with the rest of the book.

⁵⁵ *Tg Ps.-J.* Exod 31:16 imports the word "delicacies" from Isa 58:13 into its rendering of this verse which deals with keeping the sabbath (Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*, 250 n. 11).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, William. *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1989.
- . “Abraham and the Burning of the Temple of Idols: Jubilees’ Traditions in Christian Chronography,” *JQR* 77:2–3 (1986–87): 95–117.
- Africa, Thomas. “Worms and the Death of Kings: A Cautionary Note on Disease and History,” *Classical Antiquity* 1 (1982): 1–17.
- Albeck, Chanoch. *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*. Sieben und vierziger Bericht der Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin. Berlin-Schöneberg: Scholem, 1930.
- Alexander, Philip. “3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983, 1:223–315.
- . “Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept,” in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, ed. L. I. Levine. New York: Continuum, 1999, 104–19.
- . “A Note on the Syntax of 4Q448,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 301–2.
- . “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi’ of the Book of Jubilees,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 197–213.
- . “The Redaction History of Serekh ha-Yahad: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–53.
- Allegro, John M. *Qumran Cave 4I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Amir, Y. “Philo’s Version of Pilgrimage to Jerusalem,” in Y. Amir. *Die Hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandrien*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983, 52–64; originally published in Hebrew in A. Oppenheimer et al. (eds.), *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period. A. Schalit Memorial Volume*. (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi: Ministry of Defence, 1980).
- Artom, E. S. *Ha-Seferim ha-Hizonim: Sippurei Aggadah*. Vol. 2. Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1965.
- Attridge, Harold W. *The Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Baars, W. and H. Schneider. “Prayer of Manasseh,” in *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshitta Version, part IV, fascicle 6, Canticles or Odes—Prayer of Manasseh—Apocryphal Psalms—Psalms of Solomon—Tobit—1 (3) Esdras*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Baeck, Leo. *The Pharisees and other Essays*. New York: Schocken Books, 1966.
- Baillet, Maurice. *Qumrân Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD 7. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
- Bal, Mieke. “Head Hunting: ‘Judith’ on the Cutting Edge of Knowledge,” *JSTOT* 63 (1994): 3–34.
- Barclay, J. M. G. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 B.C.E.–117 C.E.)*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996.
- . *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Bar-Ilan, Meir. “Magical Seals on the Body Among Jews in the First Centuries of the Era,” *Tarbiz* 57 (1984): 37–50 (Hebrew).
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. “Judaism and Hellenism: Between Scholarship and Journalism,” *Tarbiz* 63 (1994): 451–80 (Hebrew).
- . *Pseudo-Hecataeus, “On the Jews:” Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 21. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Barrett, Charles K. *The New Testament Background*. Rev. ed. San Francisco: HarperSan-Francisco, 1989.

- Barthélemy, Dominique and J. T. Milik. *Qumran Cave I*. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Baumgarten, Albert I. "But Touch the Law and the Sect Will Split: Legal Dispute as the Cause of Sectarian Schism," *Review of Rabbinic Judaism* 5 (2002): 301–15.
- . *The Flowering of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. "Damascus Document," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 166–70.
- and Daniel R. Schwartz. "Damascus Document," in *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1995.
- . "The Laws of 'Orlah and First Fruit in the Light of Jubilees, The Qumran Writings, and Targum Ps. Jonathan," *JJS* 38 (1987): 195–202.
- . ed. *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD 18. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- Beckwith, Roger T. "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology," *RevQ* 10 (1980): 167–202.
- Berger, Klaus. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*. JSHRZ, II: Unterweisung in erzählender Form; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1981.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the 'Genesis Apocryphon,'" in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran*, eds. E. Chazon, D. Dimant, and R. A. Clements. STDJ 57. Boston: Brill, 2005, 39–63.
- . "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Boston: Brill, 1999, 199–231.
- . "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation, and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 3 (1996): 37–57.
- . "Walking in the Festivals of the Gentiles: 4QpHosea^a 2.15–17 and *Jubilees* 6.34–38," *JSP* 9 (1991): 21–34.
- Betz, Hans Dieter, ed. *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Volume I: Texts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986.
- Bickerman, Elias J. "The Jewish Historian Demetrios," in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. AGJU 9:1. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Birnbaum, Ellen B. *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews and Proselytes*. SPM 2. Brown Judaic Studies 290. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Birnbaum, Philip, ed. *Daily Prayer Book*. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1977.
- Bohak, Gideon. "Greek, Coptic and Jewish Magic in the Cairo Genizah," *BASP* 36 (1999): 27–44.
- . "Hebrew, Hebrew Everywhere? Notes on the Interpretation of *Voces Magicae*," in *Prayer, Magic and the Stars in the Ancient and Late Antique World*, ed. Scott Noegel, Joel Walker, and Brannon Wheeler (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2003), 69–82.
- . "The Impact of Jewish Monotheism on the Greco-Roman World," *JSQ* 7 (2000): 1–21.
- . "A Jewish Myth in Pagan Magic in Antiquity," in *Myths in Judaism: History, Thought, Literature*, ed. Ithamar Gruenwald and Moshe Idel (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2004), 97–122 (Hebrew).
- Bokser, Baruch M. "Ma'al and Blessings Over Food: Rabbinic Transformation of Cultic Terminology and Alternative Modes of Piety," *JBL* 100 (1981): 557–74.
- Bonner, Campbell. *Studies in Magical Amulets, Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1950.
- Borgen, Peder. *Philo of Alexandria, an Exegete for His Time*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- . “Philo of Alexandria,” in M. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT 2. The Literature of the Second Temple and the Talmud. Assen: van Gorcum, 1984, II: 233–82.
- Böttrich, Christfried. “Gottesprädikationen im Jubiläenbuch,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1997.
- Boyarin, Jonathan and Daniel Boyarin. *Powers of Diaspora: Two Essays on the Relevance of Jewish Culture*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2002.
- Brashear, William. “The Greek Magical Papyri: An Introduction and Survey; Annotated Bibliography (1928–1994),” *ANRW* II.18.5 (1995), 3380–3684.
- Bream, Howard N. “Manasseh and His Prayer,” *Lutheran Theological Seminary Bulletin* 66 (1986): 5–47.
- Brock, Sebastian P. “Abraham and the Ravens: A Syriac Counterpart to Jubilees 11–12 and Its Implications,” *JSTJ* 9 (1978): 135–52.
- Brooke, George J. “Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, ed. C. Hempel et al. Leuven: Peeters, 2002, 201–20.
- . “Deuteronomy 5–6 in the Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, Weston W. Fields. VTSup 94. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . “Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies, Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke with Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill, 1994, 117–32.
- Broshi, Magen, ed. *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992.
- Büchler, Adolf. “Traces des idées et des coutumes hellénistiques dan le Livre des Jubilés,” *Revue des études juives* 89 (1930): 321–48.
- Cahana, A. *Ha-Sefarim ha-Hizonim*. Vol. 1. Tel Aviv: Mekorot, 1937.
- Carlier, C. *La Métropole chez Philon d’Alexandrie: le Concept de Colonisation appliqué à la Diaspora Juive*. Jerusalem: Mémoire pour l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, École Biblique et Archéologique Française, 1991.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York: Oxford, 2005.
- Ceriani, Antonius Maria, ed. *Monumenta sacra et profana ex codicibus praesertim Bibliothecae Ambrosianae: Opera collegii doctorum ejusdem*. Mediolani: Typis et impensis Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, 1861–.
- Charles, Robert H. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- . *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. Oxford, 1902.
- . *The Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees: Otherwise Known Among the Greeks as HE LEPTÉ GENESIS; Edited from Four Manuscripts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895.
- Charlesworth James H., and Carol A. Newsom, eds. *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice. The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. 4B. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1999.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994–.
- , Mark Harding and Mark Kiley, eds. *The Lord’s Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- . ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983–85.

- Chazon, Esther G. "Is *Divrei Ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- . *A Liturgical Document from Qumran and its Implications: 'Words of the Luminaries' (4QDibHam)*. PhD. diss., Hebrew University, 1991 (Hebrew).
- Chesnutt, Randall D. "Prayer of a Convert to Judaism (Joseph and Aseneth 12–13)," in *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Mark Kiley. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . "Revelatory Experiences Attributed to Biblical Women in Early Jewish Literature," in *Women Like This?: New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine. SBLEJL 1. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991, 107–125.
- Clifford, James. "Diasporas," *Cultural Anthropology* 9 (1994): 302–308.
- Cohen, Shaye D. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad, 1983; rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- . "The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part 5: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. 1. Theory of Israel*, ed. A. J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner and B. D. Chilton. Leiden: Brill, 2001, 25–42.
- . "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Emanuel. Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman and W. W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003, 97–111.
- . "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 595–618.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.
- . *Qumran Cave 4, XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD 22. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
- . *Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*. Dissertation Series 13. Missoula, Mont.: SBL and Scholars Press, 1974.
- . "Structure and Meaning in the Testament of Job," *SBLSP* 1 (1974): 35–52.
- . "Testaments," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 325–355.
- Conzelmann, H. *Gentiles, Jews, Christians: Polemics and Apologetics in the Greco-Roman Era*, trans. M. Eugene Boring. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Coogan, Michael David, Marc Zvi Brettler, Carol A. Newsom, and PHEME PERKINS, eds. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: With the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Cooper, Alanna. "Conceptualizing Diaspora: Tales of Jewish Travelers in Search of the Lost Tribes," *AJS Review* 30:1 (2006): 95–117.
- . "Reconsidering the Tale of Rabbi Yosef Maman and the Bukharan Jewish Diaspora" *Jewish Social Studies* 10:2 (2004): 80–115 .
- Cousland, J. R. C. "Tobit: A Comedy in Error?," *CBQ* 65.4 (2004): 535–53.
- Craven, Toni. *The Book of Psalms*. MBS 6. Michael Glazier Books; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Crawford, Sidnie. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, forthcoming.
- Creed, J. L., ed. *Lactantius, De mortibus persecutorum*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984.
- Criniti, N., ed. *Grani Licimiani Reliquiae*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1981.
- Cross, Frank M. et al., eds. *Qumran Cave 4. XII: 1–2 Samuel*. DJD 17. Oxford: Clarendon, 2005.

- Crowfoot, Grace M. "The Linen Textiles," in *Qumran Cave I*, ed. Dominique Barthélemy and J. T. Milik. DJD 1. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955, 18–39.
- Dan, Joseph. *The Ancient Jewish Mysticism*. Tel Aviv: Ministry of Defense Press, 1993.
- Daniel, Robert W. and Franco Maltomini. *Supplementum Magicum. Papyrologia Coloniensia XVI:1–2*. Opladen, 1989–92.
- Daniel, Robert W. *Two Greek Magical Papyri in the National Museum of Antiquities in Leiden. Papyrologia Coloniensia XIX*. Opladen, 1991.
- Dasen, Véronique. *Dwarfs in Ancient Egypt and Greece*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Daube, David. *Studies in Biblical Law*. New York: Ktav, 1969.
- Davenport, Gene. *The Eschatology of the Book of Jubilees*. StPB 20. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- Davies, Philip R. "The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document," in *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery*, ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 27–43.
- Davila, James R. *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature*. JSJSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . "(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon has been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?" *JSP* 15 (2005): 3–61.
- . "The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha as Background to the New Testament," *Expository Times* 117 (2005): 53–57.
- . *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha: Jewish, Christian, or Other?* (JSJSup 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Dawson, Lorne L. "Creating 'Cult' Typologies: Some Strategic Considerations," *Journal of Contemporary Religion* 12 (1997): 363–81.
- Day, Linda. "Faith, Character and Perspective in Judith," *JSTOT* 95 (2001): 71–93.
- De Bruyne, D. "Notes de philologie biblique," *RB* 30 (1921): 400–09.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light From the Ancient East*. Repr. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1978.
- Denis, Albert-Marie. *Introduction aux pseudepigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament*. SVTP 1. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- DeSilva, David A. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context, and Significance*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2002.
- Dieleman, Jacco. *Priests, Tongues and Rites: The London-Leiden Magical Manuscripts and Translation in Egyptian Ritual (100–300 C.E.)*. RGRW 153. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005.
- Dillmann, August. "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis," *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft* 2 (1850): 230–56; 3 (1851): 1–96.
- . *Lexicon linguae aethiopiae*. Lipsiae: T. O. Weigel 1865; reprint: Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1970.
- Dillon, John M. *The Middle Platonists*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," in *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible*, eds. M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergren. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998, 123–50.
- . "Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Peshet of Isa. 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community*," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 21–36 (Hebrew).
- . "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. M. E. Stone. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 483–550.
- Doering, Lutz. "The Concept of the Sabbath in the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997, 179–205.
- . "Jub 50:6–13 als Schlussabschnitt des Jubiläenbuchs—Nachtrag aus Qumran oder ursprünglicher Bestandteil des Werks?," *RevQ* 79/20 (2002): 359–87.
- . *Sabbat: Sabbathalacha und—praxis im antiken Judentum und Urchristentum*. TSAJ 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Doran, R. "The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context," *JST* 20 (1989): 1–11.

- Doran, Robert. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. CBQMS 12. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
- Drawnel, Henryk. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran*. JSJSup 86. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Drew-Bear, Thomas. "Où mourut Antiochos IV?," *Revue des études anciennes* 82 (1980): 155–157.
- Drews, Robert. *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*. Publications of the Center for Hellenic Studies. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 1973.
- Droge, Arthur J. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Hermeneutische untersuchungen zur Theologie 26. Tübingen: Mohr, 1989.
- Eitrem, Samson. *Some Notes on the Demonology in the New Testament*. *Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. Supplet. XII*. Oslo: Brøgger, 1950.
- Elbogen, Ismar. *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History*, trans. Raymond P. Scheindlin. Philadelphia: New York, 1993 (German, 1913/Hebrew 1972).
- Elgvin, Torleif. *An Analysis of 4QInstruction*. PhD. Diss.: Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1998.
- . "Priestly Sages? The Milieu of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20–22 May, 2001*, ed. J. J. Collins and G. Sterling. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century B.C.E: The Evidence of 4QInstruction," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000, 226–47.
- Elior, Rachel. "The *Merkavah* Tradition and the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism," in *Sino-Judaica: Jews and Chinese in Historical Dialogue*, ed. Aharon Oppenheimer. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1999, 101–158.
- . *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism*. Oxford: Littman Library, 2004.
- Endres, John C. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQMS 18. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987.
- Enermalm-Ogawa, Agneta. *Un langage de prière juif en grec: Les témoignages des deux premiers livres des Maccabées*. ConBNT 17. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1987.
- Erichsen, Wolja. *Demotisches Glossar*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1954.
- Eshel, Esther. "4QDeut^a—A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117–53.
- . "Isaiah 11:15: A New Interpretation based on the *Genesis Apocryphon*," *DSD* 13 (2006): 38–45.
- , Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni, "448. 4QApocryphal Psalm and Prayer," in *Qumran Cave 4 VI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I*, ed. Esther Eshel et al. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- , Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni. "Qumran Composition Containing Part of Ps. 154 and a Prayer for the Welfare of King Jonathan and his Kingdom," *IEJ* 42 (1992): 199–229.
- et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam and M. Brady. *Qumran Cave 4, VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I*. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Eshel, Hanan. "4Q390, the 490-Year Prophecy, and the Calendrical History of the Second Temple Period," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, ed. G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005, 102–110.
- . "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, eds. J. Kampen and M. S. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996, 53–65.
- . "The Historical Background of the Peshet Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 409–20.

- and John Strugnell. “Alphabetical Acrostics in Pre-Tannaitic Hebrew,” *CBQ* 62 (2000): 441–58.
- Falk, Daniel K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Feldman, L. H., ed. *Judean Antiquities 1–4*. Vol. 3 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*, ed. S. Mason. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Feldmeier, Reinhard. “Weise hinter ‘eisernen Mauern,’ Tora und jüdisches Selbstverständnis zwischen Akkulturation und Absonderung im Aristeasbrief,” *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*, eds. M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer. WUNT 72. Tübingen: Mohr, 1994, 20–37.
- Fiensy, David A. *Prayers Alleged to be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones Apostolorum*. BJS 65. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary*. 3rd ed. Biblica et orientalia 18/B. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004.
- . “Genesis Apocryphon,” *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 302–4.
- . *Romans*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Fleischer, Ezra. *Eretz-Israel Prayer and Prayer Rituals as Portrayed in the Geniza Documents*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988 (Hebrew).
- Fletcher-Louis, Crispin. *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Flint, Peter. “Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, L. H. Schiffman and W. W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003, 269–304.
- Flusser, David. “The Dedication of the Temple by Judas Maccabaeus: Story and History,” in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, ed. I. M. Gafni, A. Oppenheimer & D. R. Schwartz. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center & Historical Society of Israel, 1996 (Hebrew).
- . “*Josippon*, A Medieval Hebrew Version of Josephus,” in *Josephus, Judaism, and History*, ed. L. H. Feldman & G. Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1987.
- . *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.
- . “Psalms, Hymns and Prayers,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Michael E. Stone. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984, 551–77.
- . *Sepher Josippon*. Jerusalem: Mossad Bialik, 1980 (Hebrew).
- . “Some Notes about the Prayer for the King Jonathan,” *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 297–300 (Hebrew).
- Fowden, Garth. *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind*, 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Fraade, Steven D. “Ascetical Aspects of Ancient Judaism,” in *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible Through the Middle Ages*, ed. Arthur Green. New York: Crossroad, 1987, 253–88.
- Frankfurter, David. “The Magic of Writing and the Writing of Magic: The Power of the Word in Egyptian and Greek Traditions,” *Helios* 21.2 (1994): 189–221.
- . “Ritual Expertise in Roman Egypt and the Problem of the Category ‘Magician,’” in *Envisioning Magic: A Princeton Seminar and Symposium*, ed. Peter Schäfer and Hans G. Kippenberg. Studies in the History of Religions LXXV; Leiden: Brill, 1997, 115–136.
- . *Religion in Roman Egypt: Assimilation and Resistance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Franxman, Thomas W. *Genesis and the ‘Jewish Antiquities’ of Flavius Josephus*. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1979.

- Fraser, Peter M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Frey, Jörg. "Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, ed. C. Hempel et al. Leuven: Peeters, 2002, 367–404.
- . "The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. D. K. Falk et al. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 197–226.
- Gafni, Isaiah M. *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*. JSPSup 21. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Gager, John G., ed. *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells From the Ancient World*. New York: Oxford, 1992.
- . *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1973.
- García Martínez, Florentino. "Interpretación de la creación en el Judaísmo antiguo," in *Religions del món antic: La creació*, ed. Maria Luisa Sánchez León. Palma de Mallorca, Sanja: Universitat des Illes Balears, 2001, 115–135.
- . "Maurice Baillet, Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII. Qumrán Grotte 4 III (4Q482–4Q520)," *JSS* 15 (1984): 157–64.
- . *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill and Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1998.
- Gera, Dov. "The Battle of Beth Zachariah and Greek Literature," in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, eds. I. M. Gafni et al. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History; The Historical Society of Israel, 1996, 25–54 (Hebrew).
- . *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics, 219 to 161 B.C.E.* Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1928.
- Glessmer, Uwe. "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 1:213–78.
- Glorie, Frater, ed. *Sancti Hieronymi Presbyteri Commentariorum in Daniele Libri III*. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 75a. Turnholt: Brepols, 1964.
- Goff, Matthew J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Golb, Noran. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* New York: Scribner, 1995.
- Goldschmidt, Daniel S., ed. *Seder Rab Amram Ga'on*. Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1971 (Hebrew).
- Goldschmidt, Henry. "'Crown Heights is the Center of the World:' Reterritorializing a Jewish Diaspora," *Diaspora* 9:1 (2000): 83–106.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. *II Maccabees*. AB 41A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. Bollingen 37. New York: Pantheon, 1953–1968.
- . *By Light, Light*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935.
- Goodman, Martin. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. 3 vols.; rev. ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–87.
- Gordon, Richard L. "Sarapis," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003, 1355–56.
- Goitein, S. D. *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Cairo Geniza*, 6 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Graham, John. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, 2nd Edition. Chicago: Ares Press, 1983.

- Gray, George B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Isaiah I–XXVII*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. "The Meaning of מַלְאָכִים," in *Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology*, eds. S. M. Paul, M. E. Stone, and A. Pinnick. Jerusalem: Magnes. 2001, 725–30.
- . "The Words of Levi Son of Jacob in Damascus Document IV, 15–19," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 319–22.
- , Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn, "The Symbolism of Red in Egyptian Religion," in *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studia Geo Widengren I*, ed. C. J. Bleeker et al. Leiden: Brill, 1972, 81–90.
- Gruen, Erich, "Fact and Fiction: Jewish Legends in a Hellenistic Context," in *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History and Historiography*, ed. P. Cartledge et al. Hellenistic Culture and Society 26. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997, 72–88.
- . *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greek and Romans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Gruenewald, Ithamar. *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism*. AGJU 16. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- . *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1988.
- . "From Priesthood to Messianism: The Anti-Priestly Polemic and the Messianic Factor," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*, ed. I Gruenewald, S. Shaked, G. Stroumsa. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992, 75–93.
- Haberman, A. M., ed. *Selihot uPhizmonim*. Jerusalem: Mossad HaRav Kook, 1953–54.
- Habicht, Christian. *2 Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ I/3. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1979.
- . "Royal Documents in Maccabees II," *HSCP* 80 (1976): 1–18.
- and Noah Hacham. "Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenistic Judaism," in *New Perspectives on Old Texts: Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, January 2005*, ed. Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern-Amaru, and Ruth Clements. STDJ series, Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- Hacham, Noah, "Exile and Self-Identity in the Qumran Sect and in Hellenistic Judaism." Paper presented at the 10th Annual Orion Center International Symposium, January 9–11, 2005.
- Hadas, Moses. *Aristeas to Philocrates*. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1951.
- Halperin, David. *Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 60. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1999.
- . "Land Theology in Philo and Josephus," in L. A. Hoffman (ed.), *The Land of Israel: Jewish Perspectives* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986): 65–93.
- . *Rewriting the Bible: Land and Covenant in Postbiblical Jewish Literature*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Hamilton, Edith and H. Cairnes, eds. *Plato: The Collected Dialogues*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Harley, J. Brian and D. Woodward, eds. *The History of Cartography*. Vol. 1: *Cartography in Prehistoric, Ancient and Medieval Europe, and the Mediterranean*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Harrington, Daniel J. *Invitation to the Apocrypha*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Harvey, Charles D. *Finding Morality in the Diaspora? Moral Ambiguity and Transformed Morality in the Books of Esther, Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft; Bd. 328*. New York/Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

- Heinemann, I. "The Relationship between the Jewish People and their Land in Hellenistic-Jewish Literature," *Zion* 13–14 (1948–49): 1–9 (Hebrew)
- Helleman, Wendy E. "Philo of Alexandria on Deification and Assimilation to God," *StPhA* 2 (1990): 51–71.
- Hempel, Charlotte. "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 316–29.
- . "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 67–92.
- . *The Damascus Texts. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1*. Sheffield: Academic Press, 2000.
- . *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Traditions and Redaction*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, ed. C. Hempel et al. Leuven: Peeters, 2002, 277–295.
- Hengel, Martin. *The 'Hellenization' of the Judaea in the First Century after Christ*. London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989.
- . *Judaism and Hellenism*. Trans. J. Bowden. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . "Qumran und der Hellenismus," *Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie, et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor. BETL 46. Paris: Duculot, 1978, 333–72.
- Henze, Matthias. "Psalm 91 in Premodern Interpretation and at Qumran," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*, ed. Matthias Henze. SDSS 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans, 2005.
- Herr, Moshe D. "The End of the Jewish Hellenistic Literature: When and Why?," in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, eds. I. M. Gafni et al. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center of Jewish History/The Historical Society of Israel, 1996, 361–78 (Hebrew).
- . "Ha-Hellenismus ve-ha-Yehudim be-Erez Yisrael," *Eshkolot*, n.s. 2–3 (1977–78): 20–27.
- Hertz, J. H., ed. *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*. Rev. ed., New York: Bloch, 1948.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford, 1993.
- . "Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees," *Poetics Today* 19 (1998): 19–40.
- Hirschfeld, Yizhar. "The Architectural Context of Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*, ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000, 673–83.
- . "Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran," *JNES* 57 (1998): 161–89.
- Holladay, Carl R., ed. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*. 4 vols. SBL Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 20;10. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Hollander, Harm W. and M. de Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985.
- Holleaux, Maurice. *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*. Paris: de Boccard, 1942.
- . "La mort d'Antiochos IV Épiphane," *Revue des études anciennes* 18 (1916): 77–102.
- Honigman, Sylvie. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*. London/New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents*. Vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2002.

- Horst, Pieter W. van der. "Images of Women in the Testament of Job," in *Studies on the Testament of Job*, ed. Michael A. Knibb and Pieter W. van der Horst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, 93–116.
- Hutton, Rodney R. "The Case of the Blasphemer Revisited (Lev. XXIV 10–23)," *VT* 49 (1999): 532–41.
- . "Narrative in Leviticus: The Case of the Blpheming Son (Lev 24:10–23)," *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 3 (1997): 145–63.
- Jacobson, Howard. "Thoughts on the *Chronicles of Jerahmeel*, Ps-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and Their Relationship," *StPh A* 9 (1997): 239–63.
- Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1929.
- Janowitz, Naomi. *The Poetics of Ascent*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1989.
- Jokiranta, Jutta M. "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes," *RevQ* 20 (2001) 223–40.
- Jonge, Marinus de. "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and Related Qumran Fragments," in *For a Later Generation: The Transformation of Tradition in Israel, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*, eds. Randal A. Argall, Beverly A. Bow, and Rodney A. Werline. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2000, 63–77.
- Kasher, Aryeh. "Jerusalem as a 'Metropolis' in Philo's National Consciousness," *Cathedra* 11 (1979): 45–56 (Hebrew).
- Kee, Howard Clark. "Satan, Magic, and Salvation in the Testament of Job," *SBLSP* 1 (1974): 53–76.
- Kiley, Mark, ed. *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Kister, Menahem. "Concerning the History of the Essenes," *Tarbiz* 56 (1987): 1–18 (Hebrew).
- . "A Contribution to the Interpretation of Ben Sira," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989–90): 303–78 (Hebrew).
- . "Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 280–90.
- . "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakha," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, eds. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. STDJ 11,2. Leiden: Brill, 1992, 581–6.
- . "Studies in 4Qmiqṣat Ma'āšē Ha-Torah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317–71 (Hebrew).
- . "Two Formulae in the Book of Jubilees," *Tarbiz* 70 (2001): 289–300 (Hebrew).
- Klauck, H.-J. "Die Heilige Stadt, Jerusalem bei Philo und Lukas," *Kairós* 28, 1986: 129–36.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. "The Manual of Discipline in the Light of Statutes of Hellenistic Associations," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects*, ed. M. O. Wise et al. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722. New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994, 251–70.
- Knibb, Michael A. "Exile in the Damascus Document," *JSTOT* 25 (1983): 99–117.
- and Pieter W. van der Horst, eds. *Studies on the Testament of Job*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Knowles, Michael P. "Abraham and the Birds in Jubilees 11," *NTS* 41 (1995): 145–151.
- Knox, Wilfred L. "Jewish Liturgical Exorcism," *HTR* 31 (1938): 191–203.
- Koester, Helmut. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Kohler, Kaufman. "The Testament of Job: An Essene Midrash on the Book of Job Reedited and Translated with Introductory and Exegetical Notes," in *Semitic Studies in Memory of Rev. Dr. Alexander Kohut*, ed. George A. Kohut. Berlin: Calvary, 1897, 264–338.
- Kosmala, Hans. *Studies, Essays and Reviews*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Kotansky, Roy. *Greek Magical Amulets*. Papyrologica Coloniensia XXII:1. Opladen: Westdeutsche Verlag, 1994.

- Kovelman, Arkady. *Between Alexandria and Jerusalem: The Dynamic of Jewish and Hellenistic Culture*. Brill Reference Library of Judaism 21. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Kraft, Robert A. "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," in *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha*, ed. John C. Reeves. SBLEJL 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994, 55–86.
- . "The Pseudepigrapha and Christianity Revisited: Setting the Stage and Framing Some Central Questions," *JStJ* 32 (2001): 371–95.
- , Harold Attridge, Russell Spittler, and Janet Timbie, eds. *The Testament of Job According to the SV Text*. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Kugel, James L. "Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings," *HTR* 86 (1993): 1–64.
- . *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kugler, Robert A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. SBLEJL 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. "On Women and Honor in the *Testament of Job*," *JStJ* 14 (2004): 43–62.
- Ladouceur, David J. "The Death of Herod the Great," *Classical Philology* 76 (1981): 25–34.
- Lake, Kirsopp, trans., *Didache*, in *The Apostolic Fathers*. LCL 24. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1977, 1.322–25.
- Landsberger, Benno. "Corrections to the Article, 'An Old Babylonian Charm against Merhu,'" *JNES* 17 (1958): 56–8.
- Lange, Armin. "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, eds. M. Bernstein et al. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997, 377–435.
- . "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*, ed. A. Schoors. Leuven: Peeters, 1998, 113–59.
- . *Weisheit und Prädestination*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Laporte, Jean. "Sacrifice in Origen in Light of Philonic Models," in *Origen of Alexandria: His World and His Legacy*, ed. Charles Kannengiesser and William Peterson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988, 250–76.
- Leses, Rebecca Macy. *Ritual Practices to Gain Power: Angels, Incantations, and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*. HTS 44. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1998.
- Levine, Amy-Jill. "Sacrifice and Salvation: Otherness and Domestication in the Book of Judith," in *'No One Spoke Ill of Her: Essays on Judith*, ed. James C. VanderKam. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992, 17–30.
- Levine, Lee I. *Judaism and Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence*. Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.
- Leicht, Reimund. "A Newly Discovered Hebrew Version of the Apocryphal 'Prayer of Manasseh,'" *JStJ* 3 (1996): 359–73.
- . "Qedushah and Prayer to Helios: A New Hebrew Version of an Apocryphal Prayer of Jacob," *JStJ* 6 (1999): 140–76.
- Leslau, Wolf. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez [Classical Ethiopic]*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1991.
- Licht, J. *A Commentary on the Book of Numbers (I–X)*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985 (Hebrew).
- LiDonnici, Lynn. "Compositional Patterns in PGM IV (= P.Bibl.Nat.Suppl. gr. no. 574)," *BASP* 40 (2003): 141–78.
- . "The Disappearing Magician: Literary and Practical Questions About the Greek Magical Papyri," in *A Multiform Heritage: Studies on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Robert A. Kraft*, ed. Benjamin G. Wright. Scholars Press Homage Series 24. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999, 227–43.

- Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York: Jewish Theological Association of America, 1962.
- Lorein, Geert W. *The Antichrist Theme in the Intertestamental Period*. JSPSup 44. London & New York: Clark, 2003.
- . “Some Aspects of the Life and Death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes: A New Presentation of Old Viewpoints,” *Ancient Society* 31 (2001): 157–171.
- Luger, Yehezkel. *The Weekday Amidah in the Cairo Genizah*. Jerusalem: Orhot, 2001 (Hebrew).
- Mack, Burton L. “Imitatio Mosis: Patterns of Cosmology and Soteriology in the Hellenistic Synagogue,” *StPh* 1 (1972): 27–55.
- . “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in Philo,” *StPhA* 3 (1991): 21–39.
- Magnus, Jodi. *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Maher, Michael. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*. The Aramaic Bible 2. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1994.
- Maier, Johann. “Zu ethnographisch-geographischen Überlieferungen über Japhetiten (Gen 10, 2–4) im frühen Judentum,” *Enoch* 13 (1991): 157–94.
- Main, Emmanuelle. “For King Jonathan or Against? The Use of the Bible in 4Q448,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 May 1996*, ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon. STDJ 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998, 113–35.
- Malkin, Irad. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Marcus, Ralph. *Philo Supplements*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.
- Martinez, David. *Michigan Papyri XVI: A Greek Love Charm From Egypt (P.Mich. 757)*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Master, John R. “The Place of Chapter 24 in the Structure of the Book of Leviticus,” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 159 (2002): 415–24.
- Mauersberger, Arno. *Polybios-Lexikon*. Berlin: Akademie, 1961.
- McDonough, Sean M. *YHWH at Patmos: Rev. 1:4 in its Hellenistic and Early Jewish Setting*. WUNT 2:107. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- McKirahan, Jr., Richard D. *Philosophy Before Socrates*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994.
- McNamara, Martin. *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis*. The Aramaic Bible 1A. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.
- Mendels, Doron. “Baruch, Book of,” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992, 1.617–20.
- . *Identity and Historiography: Studies in Hellenistic History*. JSPSup 24. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- . *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in the Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*. TSAJ 15. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987.
- . “A Note on the Tradition of Antiochus IV’s Death,” *IEJ* 31 (1981): 53–56.
- Mendelson, Alan. *Philo’s Jewish Identity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold and Maria Totti, eds. *Abrasax: Ausgewählte Papyri Religiösen und Magischen Inhalts*. Papyrological Coloniensia XVII, vols. 1 and 2. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1990–91.
- Merkelbach, Reinhold, ed. *Abrasax: Ausgewählte Papyri Religiösen und Magischen Inhalts*. Papyrological Coloniensia XVII, vols. 3, 4, 5. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1992–2001.
- Metso, Sarianna. “In Search of the Sitz im Leben of the Community Rule,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 306–15.
- . “The Relationship between the Damascus Document and the Community

- Rule," in *The Damascus Document. A Centennial of Discovery*, ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 85–93.
- Metzger, Marcel. *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*. SC 320, 329, 336. Paris: Cerf, 1985–1987.
- Meyer, Marvin, and Richard Smith, eds. *Ancient Christian Magic: Coptic Texts of Ritual Power*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1994.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 23–27*. AB 3B; New York: Doubleday, 2000.
- . *Numbers [Ba-midbar]: the Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.
- Milik, Józef T. "Écrits préesséniens de Qumran: d'Hénoch à Amram," in *Qumran: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor. BETL 46. Paris: Duculot, 1978, 91–106.
- Milikowsky, H. *Seder Olam: Mahadurah Madait ve-Perush, forthcoming*.
- Miller, Patricia Cox. "In Praise of Nonsense," in *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality: Egyptian, Greek, Roman*, ed. A. H. Armstrong. World Spirituality 15. New York: Crossroad: 1989, 481–505.
- Mittwoch, H. "The Story of the Blasphemer Seen in a Wider Context," *VT* (1965): 386–89.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- . *On Pagans, Jews and Christians*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1987.
- Montgomery, James. "Ascetic Strains in Early Judaism," *JBL* 51 (1932): 183–213.
- Moore, Carey A. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. 1st ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985.
- Morgenstern, Matthew, E. Qimron, and D. Sivan. "The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon," *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (1995): 30–53.
- Mørkholm, Otto. *Antiochus IV of Syria*. København: Gyldendal & Nordisk, 1966.
- Murphy, Catherine M. *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "The Critique of the Princes of Judah," *RB* 79 (1972): 200–16.
- Najman, Hindy. "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Concerning Strategies," *JSS* 30 (1999): 379–410.
- . *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSSup 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Naveh, Joseph, and Shaul Shaked, eds. *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1987.
- . *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993.
- Nestle, Walter. "Legenden vom Tod der Gottesverächter," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 33 (1936): 246–269 = idem, *Griechische Studien*. Stuttgart: Hannmann, 1948, 567–596.
- Neuman, M. Gary. *Emotional Infidelity: How to Affair-Proof Your Marriage and 10 Other Secrets to a Great Relationship*. Three Rivers, MI: Three Rivers Press, 2002.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Mekhilta According to Rabbi Ishmael: An Analytical Translation*, vol. 2: *Amalek, Bahodesh, Neziqin, Kasha and Shabbata*. BJS 54. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Newman, Judith H. *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. SBLEJL 14. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1999.
- Newsom, Carol A. "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters*, ed. W. H. Propp, B. Halpern and D. N. Freedman. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990, 167–87.
- . "Shirot 'Olat Hashabbat," in *Qumran Cave 4 VI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I*, ed. Esther Eshel et al. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998, 173–401.
- . *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*. Harvard Semitic Studies 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . “Patriarchs Who Worry About Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. M. E. Stone and E. G. Chazon. STDJ 28. Leiden: Brill, 1998, 137–158.
- . *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. HTS 26. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1972.
- Niehoff, Maren R. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. “Spiritualisation et Culte Sacrificiel chez philon d’Alexandrie,” *Semítica* 16 (1967): 97–116.
- Nitzan, Billah. “4Qberakot,” in *Qumran Cave 4 VI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I*, ed. Esther Eshel et al. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998, 1–74.
- . *Qumran Prayer & Religious Poetry*, trans. J. Chipman. STDJ 12. Leiden, Brill, 1994.
- Noam, Vered. *Megillat Ta’anit*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003 (Hebrew).
- Nock, Arthur Darby. “Religious Symbols and Symbolism I,” *Gnomon* 27 (1955): 558–72; repr. in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. Zeph Stewart. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972, 877–94.
- Oegema, Gerbern S. “Das Gebet Manasses,” in *Poetische Schriften*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema. JSHRZ Supplement VI.1.4. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 2002, 1–10.
- Olson, Daniel, in consultation with Archbishop Melkesedek Workeneh. *Enoch: A New Translation*. North Richland Hills, Texas: BIBAL Press, 2004.
- OBwald, Eva. “Gebet Manasses,” in *Das Gebet Manasses. Die fünf syrischen Psalmen*, ed. Eva Osswald and A. S. van der Woude. 2nd ed. JSHRZ IV.1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1977, 15–27.
- Parry, Donald W. and Emanuel Tov, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Pearce, Sarah. “Jerusalem as Mother City in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria,” in *Negotiating Diaspora*, ed. John Barclay. London and New York: T&T Clark International, 2004, 19–36.
- Pelletier, André. *Lettre d’Aristée a Philocrate*. SC 89. Paris: Éditions Cerf, 1962.
- Phillips, Richard L. *Invisibility Spells in the Greek Magical Papyri: Prolegomena, Texts, and Commentaries*. PhD. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2002.
- Philo. Translated by E. H. Colson, Francis H. and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. LCL. London: Heinemann, 1929–.
- Portier-Young, Anthea. “Alleviation of Suffering in the Book of Tobit: Comedy, Community, and Happy Endings,” *CBQ* 63:1 (2004): 35–54.
- Preisendanz, Karl. *Akephalos: Der Kopflose Gott*. Beihefte zum Alten Orient 8. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926.
- ed. *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die Griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1928 [vol. I] and 1931 [vol. II]; 2nd ed. by Albert Hinrichs, 1973–74.
- Puech, Émile. *Qumran Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens Première partie (4Q529–549)*. DJD 31. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
- Qimron, Elisha. “Concerning the Blessing over King Jonathan,” *Tarbiz* 61 (1992): 565–67 (Hebrew).
- . “Prayers for the Festivals from Qumran: Reconstruction and Philological Observations,” in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. M. F. J. Baasten and W. Th. Van Peursen. OLA 118. Leuven: Peeters, 2003, 383–93.
- and John Strugnell, eds. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma’ase Ha-Torah*. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Rabin, Chaim. *Qumran Studies*. Scripta Judaica 2. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- . *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.

- Rahlf's, Alfred. *Psalmi cum Odis*. Septuaginta Societatis Scientiarum Gottingensis 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931.
- Rajak, Tessa. "The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism," in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes*, eds. P. R. Davies and R. T. White. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990, 261–80.
- . *Josephus: The Historian and His Society*. JSOTSup 100. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Rapoport, Salomon J. L. *Erech Millin*. Prague: Landau, 1851–2 (Hebrew).
- Rappaport, Uriel. "The Hasmonean State and Hellenism," *Tarbiz* 60 (1990–91): 477–503 (Hebrew).
- Ravid, Liora. "The Sabbath Laws in Jubilees 50:6–13," *Tarbiz* 69 (2000): 161–66 (Hebrew).
- Rehm, Bernhard. *Pseudoklementinen II: Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*. Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994.
- Reinhartz, Adele. "Better Homes and Gardens: Women and Domestic Space in the Books of Judith and Susanna," in *Text and Artifact in the Religions of Mediterranean Antiquity: Essays in Honour of Peter Richardson*, ed. Stephen G. Wilson and Michel Desjardins. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2000, 325–39.
- Ritner, Robert K. *The Mechanics of Ancient Egyptian Magical Practice*. SAOC 54. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1993.
- Rohrbacher-Sticker, Claudia. "From Sense to Nonsense, From Incantation Prayer to Magic Spell," *JSQ* 3 (1996): 24–46.
- Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard. "Apocalypse of Abraham," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983, 1:681–705.
- Ruiten, J.T. van. *Primaevial History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJSup 66. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- Runia, David T. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Amsterdam: VU Boekhandel, 1983.
- Ryle, Herbert E. "The Prayer of Manasses," in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, ed. R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913, 1:612–24.
- Safran, William. "Diasporas in Modern Societies: Myths of Homeland and Return," *Diaspora* 1(1): 83–99.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM Press, 1977.
- Schäfer, Peter, ed., *Geniza Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. TSAJ 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984.
- . *Hekhalot Studien*. TSAJ 19. Tübingen: Mohr, 1988.
- . *The Hidden and Manifest God*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1992.
- . *Judeophobia: Attitudes Toward the Jews in the Ancient World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- and Shaul Shaked. *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza*. 2 vols. TSAJ 64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- . ed. *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur*. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1981.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*. Vol. 1: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910.
- . "Geniza Specimens," *JQR* [old series] 10 (1898): 654–9.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy," *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, ed. Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: ASOR, 1987.
- . "Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts from Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20–22 May, 2001*, ed. J. J. Collins and G. Sterling. Leiden: Brill, 2004, 89–100.
- . "Phylacteries and Mezuzot," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols.; New York: Oxford, 2000, s.v.
- Schmidt, F. "Jewish Representations of the Inhabited Earth during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," in *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays*, eds. A. Kasher,

- U. Rappaport, and G. Fuks. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi and the Israel Exploration Society, 1990, 119–34.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul*. WUNT 2. Reihe 16. Tübingen: Mohr, 1985.
- Schneider, Heinrich. “Die biblischen Oden im christlichen Altertum,” *Biblica* 30 (1949): 28–65.
- Schneidewind, William M. “Manasseh, King,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000, 504–505.
- Scholem, Gershom. *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition*. 2nd edition. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965.
- . *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. New York: Schocken, 1941.
- Schuller, Eileen. “Non-Canonical Psalms,” in *Qumran Cave 4 VI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I*, ed. Esther Eshel et al. DJD 11. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998, 75–172.
- . “Petitionary Prayer and the Religion of Qumran,” in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. John J. Collins and Robert A. Kugler. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000, 29–45.
- . “Prayer at Qumran,” in *Prayer from Tobit to Qumran. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature: Yearbook 2004*, ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel and Jeremy Corley. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004, 411–28.
- Schürer, Emile. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Rev. and ed. by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. “Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Jerusalem,” in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmonaeans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. D. Goodblatt, A. Pinnick, and D. R. Schwartz. STDJ 37. Boston: Brill, 2001, 45–56.
- . “Diodorus Siculus 40.3: Hecataeus or Pseudo-Hecataeus?,” in *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land*, eds. Menahem Mor et al. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003, 181–97.
- . “The Jews in Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven,” *Zion* 62 (1997): 5–22 (Hebrew).
- . “MMT, Josephus and the Pharisees,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History*, eds. J. Kampen and M. S. Bernstein. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996, 67–80.
- . “On Two Aspects of a Priestly View of Descent at Qumran,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. L. H. Schiffman. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990, 157–79.
- . *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2004 (Hebrew).
- . *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. WUNT 60. Tübingen: Mohr, 1992.
- Scott, James M. *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- . *Paul and the Nations: The Old Testament and Jewish Background of Paul’s Mission to the Nations with Special Reference to the Destination of Galatians*. WUNT 84. Tübingen: Mohr, 1995.
- Seeligmann, Isaac L. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap “Ex Oriente Lux.” Mededelingen en verhandelingen 9. Leiden: Brill, 1948.
- Segal, Judah B., ed., with a contribution by Erica C. D. Hunter. *Catalogue of the Aramaic and Mandaic Incantation Bowls in the British Museum*. London: British Museum, 2000.
- Segal, M. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. (Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 2004 (Hebrew)).
- Shaw, Frank E. *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of ΙΑΩ*. Ph.D. diss., University of Cincinnati, 2002.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

- Smith, Morton. "The Eighth Book of Moses and How It Grew," *Atti del XVII Congresso internazionale di papirologia*. Naples, 1984, 683–93 (= *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh*, ed. Shaye Cohen. RGRW 130. Leiden: Brill, 1996, 2.217–26).
- . *Jesus the Magician*. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.
- . "The Jewish Elements in the Greek Magical Papyri," reconstructed version in *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh*, ed. Shaye Cohen. RGRW 130. Leiden: Brill, 1996, 2.242–56.
- . "P. Leid. J 395 (PGM XIII) and Its Creation Legend," in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage À Valentin Nikiprowetzky*, ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud (Leuven-Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1986), 491–98 (= *Studies in The Cult of Yahweh*, ed. Shaye Cohen. RGRW 130. Leiden: Brill, 1996, 2.227–34).
- Soloveitchik, Haym. "Halakhah, Hermeneutics and Martyrdom in Medieval Ashkenaz," *JQR* 94 (2004): 278–99.
- Sokoloff, Michael. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic*. 2nd ed. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 2002.
- Sowers, Sidney G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews: A Comparison of the Interpretation of the Old Testament in Philo Judaeus and the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Zurich: Müller, 1965.
- Speiser, E. A. "In Search of Nimrod," *Eretz Israel* 5 (1958): 32–6 (English section).
- Sperber, Daniel. *Magic and Folklore in Rabbinic Literature*. Ramat-Gan, Israel: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1994.
- . "Some Rabbinic Themes in Magical Papyri," *JSJ* 16.1 (1985): 93–103.
- Spittler, Russell P. "The Testament of Job: A History of Research and Interpretation," in *Studies on the Testament of Job*, ed. Michael A. Knibb and Pieter W. van der Horst. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, 7–32.
- . "Testament of Job: A New Translation and Introduction," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983, 1:829–868.
- Stambaugh, John E. *Sarapis Under the Early Ptolemies*. Leiden: Brill, 1972.
- Stark, Rodney and W. S. Bainbridge. *The Future of Religion. Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Steck, Odil H. "Die Aufnahme von Genesis 1 in Jubiläen 2 und 4 Esra 6," *JSJ* 8 (1977): 154–82.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*. Freiburg: Herder, 1993. Engl. trans., *The Library of Qumran. On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist and Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Steiner, Richard C. "The Heading of the *Book of the Words of Noah* on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work," *DSD* 2 (1995): 66–71.
- Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. NovTSup 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Stern, Chaim, ed. *Gates of Prayer for Weekdays: A Gender Sensitive Prayerbook*. New York: Central Conference of American Rabbis, 1993.
- Stern, Menahem. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976.
- . "Yahadut ve-yavnut be-erez yisrael ba-me'ot ha-shelishit ve-ha-sheniyah lifnei ha-sefirah," *Acculturation and Assimilation: Continuity and Change in the Cultures of Israel and the Nations: Collected Essays*, eds. Y. Kaplan and M. Stern. Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1989, 41–60. (Hebrew).
- . "M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*," *Kirjath Sepher* 46 (1970–71): 94–99 (Hebrew).
- Stone, Michael E. "The Book(s) Attributed to Noah," *DSD* 13 (2006): 4–23.
- . ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- . "Noah, Texts of," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 1: 613–15.

- Strugnell, John. "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran—4Qšerek Širot 'Olat Hassabbat," in *International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament—Congress Volume*. VTSup 7. Oxford, 1959, 318–345.
- . Harrington, D. and T. Elgvin. *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV. Sapiential Texts, Part 2*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- and Daniel J. Harrington. "Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication," *JBL* 112 (1993): 491–99.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren. "8. 6QpapGiants ar (Re-edited)," in *Qumran Cave 4. XXVI: Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD 36. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000, 76–94.
- Sussman, Ya'akov. "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*, eds. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994, 179–200.
- Sutcliffe, Edmund F., S. J. "The First Fifteen Members of the Qumran Community," *JSS* 4 (1959): 134–8.
- Swartz, Michael. *Mystical Prayer in Early Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah*. TSAJ 28. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992.
- . *Scholastic Magic: Ritual and Revelation in Early Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, vol. 3, *Hosea-4, Maccabees, Psalms of Solomon, Enoch, The Odes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989.
- Tcherikover, Victor. "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos* 48 (1956): 169–93.
- Testuz, Michel. *Les idées religieuses du Livre des Jubilés*. Geneve: Librairie E. Droz/Paris: Librairie Minard, 1960.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C. "The Addressees of 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*, ed. D. K. Falk et al. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 62–75.
- . *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Tölölyan, Khachig. "The Nation State and its Others: In Lieu of a Preface," *Diaspora* 1(1): 3.
- Torijano, Pablo A. *Solomon the Esoteric King: From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition*. JSJSup 73. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Tov, Emanuel. *The Book of Baruch*. SBLTT 8, Pseudepigrapha Series 6. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Treuer, John C. "Completion of the Publication of Some Fragments from Qumran Cave I," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 323–45.
- Tsitskhladze, Gocha R. "Anatolia," in *Encyclopedia of Greece and the Hellenic Tradition*, ed. G. Speake, vol. 1. London and Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 2000, 67–9.
- Ulrich, Eugene. "The Non-Attestation of a Tri-Partite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–214.
- Unnik, W. C. van and P. W. van der Horst. *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistischen-römischen Zeit*. AGJU 17. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993.
- VanderKam, James C., "216. 4QJubilees^a," in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part I*, ed. H. A. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994, 1–22, with plates I–II.
- . "228. Text with a Citation of *Jubilees*," in *Qumran Cave 4 VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, ed. H. A. Attridge et al., in consultation with J. VanderKam. DJD 13. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994, 177–85.
- . trans. *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO 511. Scriptorum Aethiopicorum 88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- . *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 1998.

- . “The Demons in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Demons: The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment*, ed. Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Diethard Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- . “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources,” in James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup 62; Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 2000.
- and J. T. Milik, “The First Jubilees Manuscript from Qumran Cave 4: A Preliminary Publication,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 243–70.
- . *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup 62. Boston: Brill, 2000.
- . “Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 300–21.
- . “The Putative Author of the Book of Jubilees,” *JSS* 26 (1981): 209–17.
- . *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Velde, H. te. *Seth: God of Confusion*, 2nd ed. Probleme de Ägyptologie 6. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin, 1997.
- . “Pre-Mishnaic Worship and the Phylacteries from the Dead Sea,” *VT* 9 (1959): 65–72.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*. CSCO 401–402, 407–408. Scriptores Syri 175–76, 179–80. Louvain: CSCO, 1979.
- Wacholder, Ben Zion. “The Date of the Eschaton in the Book of Jubilees: A Commentary on Jub 49:22–50:5, CD 1:1–10 and 16:2–3.” *HUCA* 56 (1985): 87–101.
- . *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. HUCM 8. Cincinnati: HUC Press, 1983.
- . “Pseudo-Eupolemus’ Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham,” *HUCA* 34 (1963): 83–113.
- Wallbank, Frank William. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Wallis, Roy, ed. *Sectarianism. Analyses of Religious and Non-Religious Sects*. London: Owen, 1975.
- Wasserstein, Abraham. “Non-Hellenized Jews in the Semi-Hellenized East,” *Scripta Classica Israelica* 14 (1995): 111–37.
- Weeks, Stuart, Simon Gathercole, and Loren Stuckenbruck. *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions*. Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes 3; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2004.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. *Hamishah Humshei Torah im Perush Hadash*, vol. 1: *Bereshit u-Shemot*. Tel Aviv: S. L. Gordon, 1975.
- . *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect: A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1986.
- Weingreen, J. “The Case of the Blasphemer (Leviticus XXIV 10ff.),” *VT* 22 (1972): 118–23.
- Weitzman, Steven. “Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit,” *JBL* 115 (1996): 49–61.
- Werline, Rodney A. *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution*. SBLEJL 13. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Werman, Cana. *The Attitude Towards Gentiles in the Book of Jubilees*. Ph.D. diss., Hebrew University, 1996 (Hebrew).
- . “The Book of Jubilees in Hellenistic Context,” *Zion* 66 (2001): 275–96 (Hebrew: translation in this volume).
- . “The Concept of Holiness and the Requirements of Purity in Second Temple and Tannaic Literature,” in *Purity and Holiness*, eds. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 2. Leiden: Brill, 2000, 163–79.

- . “Levi and Levites in the Second Temple Period,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 211–25.
- . “Qumran and the Book of Noah,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*, eds. E. G. Chazon and M. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999, 171–81.
- . “The Torah and the *te’udah* on the Tablets,” *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 473–92 (Hebrew).
- Wiesenberg, Ernest. “The Jubilee of Jubilees,” *RevQ* 9/3 (1961–62): 3–40.
- Wills, Lawrence M. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World, Myth and Poetics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Wilson, Bryan R. *Magic and the Millennium. A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest Among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*. London: Heinemann, 1973.
- . *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Wimbush, Vincent. *Renunciation Towards Social Engineering (An Apologia for the Study of Asceticism in Greco-Roman Antiquity)*. OPIAC 8, ed. C. N. Jefford. Claremont: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 1986.
- Winston, David. “Judaism and Hellenism: Hidden Tensions in Philo’s Thought.” *StPhA* 2 (1990): 1–19.
- . “Philo and the Hellenistic Jewish Encounter,” *StPhA* 7 (1995): 124–42.
- . *The Wisdom of Solomon: New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wise, Michael O. *The First Messiah. Investigating the Savior before Christ*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999.
- Wolfson, Elliot R. *Through a Speculum That Shines*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Wolfson, Harry A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Scroll of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Yarbro Collins, Adela. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. JSJSup 50. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

INDEX OF MODERN SCHOLARS*

- Adler, William 41 fn 25, 147 fn 71
 Africa, Thomas 261 fn 17
 Alexander, Philip 52 fn 13, 118 fn 31,
 119 fn 32, 34; 122 fn 49, 136 fn
 17–20, 160 fn 6, 171 fn 30, 181 fn 12
 Allegro, John M. 248 fn 21
 Amaru, Betsy *see Halpern-Amaru, Betsy*
 Amir, Y. 196 fn 8, 10
 Artom, E. S. 251 fn 27
 Attridge, Harold W. 18 fn 15
- Baars, W. 79 fn 16
 Baeck, Leo 207 fn 47
 Baillet, Maurice 162 fn 11, 163 fn 12
 Bainbridge, W. 177 fn 1
 Bal, Mieke 232 fn 9
 Barclay, J. M. G. 91 fn 22, 193 fn 2
 Bar-Ilan, Meir 63, 63 fn 67–69, 64, 64
 fn 76, 68 fn 95
 Bar-Kochva, Bezalel 141 fn 44, 142 fn
 46, 145 fn 62
 Barrett, Charles K. 95 fn 41
 Barthélemy, Dominique 162 fn 11
 Baumgarten, Albert I. 177 fn 2, 192 fn
 54, 252 fn 36
 Baumgarten, Joseph M. 160 fn 6, 244
 fn 4, 247 fn 17, 255 fn 46
 Beckwith, Roger T. 246 fn 13
 Berger, Klaus 35 fn 16
 Bergman, Jan 106 fn 88
 Bernstein, Moshe J. 111 fn 4, 113 fn
 11, 124 fn 53, 243 fn 1
 Berrin, Shani 21 fn 19
 Betz, Hans Dieter 51 fn 6, 56 fn 35,
 57 fn 38, 87 fn 1, 89, 89 fn 12, 92 fn
 30, 99 fn 64, 102 fn 74, 105 fn 84,
 135 fn 13
 Birnbaum, Ellen B. 153 fn 89, 200 fn 20
 Birnbaum, Philip 62 fn 66
 Bohak, Gideon 89–90, 89 fn 10,
 14–15, 90 fn 16, 91, 91 fn 26, 92
 fn 28, 96 fn 47, 49
 Bokser, Baruch M. 254 fn 44
 Bonner Campbell 69 fn 96, 88 fn 7
 Borgen, Peder 195 fn 7, 196 fn 10,
 220 fn 13–14
 Böttrich, Christfried 42 fn 26
- Boyarin, Daniel 193 fn 2, 194
 Boyarin, Jonathan 193 fn 2, 194
 Brashear, William 87 fn 1, 103 fn 78
 Bream, Howard N. 75 fn 2, 89
 fn 11
 Brettler, Marc Zvi 229 fn 6
 Brock, Sebastian P. 41 fn 25, 150
 fn 77, 79
 Brooke, George J. 24 fn 22, 161 fn 6,
 186 fn 30, 188 fn 39
 Broshi, Magen 244 fn 2
 Buber, S. 128 fn 61
 Büchler, Adolf 134 fn 9
- Cahana, A. 250 fn 27
 Carr, David M. 27, 27fn 28
 Ceriani, Antonius Maria 31, 31 fn 1
 Charles, Robert H. 31 fn 1, 245,
 245 fn 7, 246 fn 13, 167, 267 fn 2,
 270
 Charlesworth, James H. 32 fn 6, 76
 fn 4, 6; 79 fn 15, 80, 80 fn 19–20,
 244 fn 3
 Chazon, Esther G. 32, 160 fn 4, 167
 fn 21, 168 fn 22, 169 fn 23
 Chestnutt, Randall D. 43 fn 27, 53
 fn 19
 Chipman, J. 47 fn 31
 Clements, Ruth 160 fn 4, 161 fn 7
 Clifford, James 194, 194 fn 5
 Cohen, Shaye D. 88 fn 5, 91 fn 23, 26
 Collins, John J. 49 fn 2, 55 fn 20, 142
 fn 48, 145 fn 59, 61, 63; 146 fn 68,
 148 fn 74, 152 fn 84, 153 fn 89, 91,
 92, 96; 154 fn 98–99, 155 fn 103,
 178 fn f, 180 fn 11, 181 fn 14, 186
 fn 27, 188 fn 38
 Conzelmann, H. 146 fn 63
 Coogan, Michael David 229 fn 6
 Cooper, Alanna 193 fn 2
 Cousland, J. R. C. 234 fn 11
 Craven, Toni 40 fn 22
 Crawford, Sidnie 23 fn 22
 Creed, J. L. 257 fn 1, 261 fn 18
 Criniti, N. 258 fn 8
 Cross, Frank M. 248 fn 20
 Crowfoot, Grace M. 11 fn 2

* Compiled by Carylyn Gwyn Moser

- Dan, Joseph 50 fn 4
 Daniel, Robert W. 90 fn 21, 100
 fn 68
 Dasen, Véronique 100 fn 69
 Daube, David 275, 275 fn 30
 Davenport, Gene 270–273, 270
 fn 13–14, 271 fn 15–18, 272
 fn 19–21, 273 fn 23, 277, 277 fn 40
 Davies, Philip R. 183 fn 18
 Davila, James R. 50fn 4, 77 fn 8, 79
 fn 17, 80 fn 20, 82 fn 23, 83 fn 27,
 87, 87 fn 4, 88 fn 5, 96 fn 48, 98
 fn 62, 107 fn 93
 Dawson, David 152 fn 86
 Dawson, Lorne L. 177 fn 1
 Day, Linda 231 fn 7
 De Bruyne, D. 262 fn 21
 Deissman, Adolf 95 fn 41, 96 fn 46
 Dennis, Albert-Marie 75 fn 3, 76
 fn 6, 78 fn 9, 81 fn 22
 DeSilva, David A. 75 fn 3, 81–82, 82
 fn 23
 Dieleman, Jacco 89 fn 11, 90–91,
 90 fn 18, 20–21; 97 fn 51, 98, 98
 fn 53–56, 61; 99, 99 fn 63–64; 104
 fn 82
 Dillmann, August 38 fn 18
 DiLella, Alexander A. 164 fn 15
 Dillon, John M. 92 fn 30, 153 fn 90
 Dimant, Devorah 161 fn 6, 185
 fn 24
 Doering, Lutz 275–276, 275 fn 34,
 276 fn 35–37, 277, 281 fn 49, 282
 fn 51, 283 fn 53
 Doran, Robert 134 fn 11, 264 fn 30
 Drawnel, Henryk 247 fn 17
 Drew-Bear, Thomas 275 fn 3, 263
 fn 26
 Drews, Robert 148 fn 72
 Droge, Arthur J. 144 fn 53
- Eitrem, Samson 95 fn 41, 96 fn 47
 Elbogen, Ismar 175 fn 40
 Elgvin, Torleif 186 fn 28, 187 fn 35,
 190 fn 48, 50; 191 fn 52, 192 fn 53
 Elior, Rachel 50 fn 4, 51–3, 51 fn 7
 Endres, John C. 45 fn 28
 Enermalm-Ogawa, Agneta 164 fn 14
 Epstein, Marc 87
 Erichsen, Wolja 94 fn 38
 Eshel, Esther 24 fn 22, 115 fn 18, 171
 fn 28, 246 fn 11
 Eshel Hanan 171 fn 28, 248 fn 19,
 250 fn 23, 252 fn 33, 254 fn 43
- Falk, Daniel K. 163 fn 12, 166 fn 16,
 167 fn 19–20
 Feldman, Louis H. 118 fn 33, 121
 fn 41–42, 124 fn 55, 218 fn 8
 Feldmeier, Reinhard 141 fn 44
 Fiensy, David A. 156 fn 110
 Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 18 fn 14, 111
 fn 3, 112 fn 5, 9; 113 fn 13, 115
 fn 20, 136 fn 21
 Fleischer, Ezra 166 fn 16
 Fletcher-Louis, Crispin 190 fn 46
 Flint, Peter 75 fn 1
 Flusser, David 76 fn 6, 171 fn 30,
 172–3, 172fn 33, 173 fn 37, 252
 fn 30, 258 fn 8, 260 fn 13–15
 Fowden, Garth 89 fn 11
 Fraade, Steven D. 184 fn 21, 208
 fn 52
 Frankfurter, David 90 fn 19–20, 97
 fn 52, 100 fn 68, 106 fn 89
 Franxman, Thomas W. 120 fn 39
 Fraser, Peter M. 144 fn 54
 Frey, Jörg 188 fn 41, 189 fn 41
- Gafni, Isaiah M. 159, 159 fn 1–2, 160
 fn 3, 170 fn 25, 195 fn 7
 Gager, John G. 57 fn 41, 59 fn 47,
 71 fn 103, 87 fn 2, 88 fn 7, 89, 89
 fn 12, 105 fn 86, 106 fn 91, 107
 fn 92
 García Martínez, Florentino 46 fn 30,
 41 fn 24, 167 fn 19
 Gathercole, Simon 80 fn 18
 Gera, Dov 134 fn 5, 142 fn 46
 Ginzberg, Louis 218 fn 9
 Glessmer, Uwe 162 fn 10
 Glorie, Frater 258 fn 5–6
 Goff, Matthew J. 189 fn 43–44, 192
 fn 53
 Goitein, S. D. 194 fn 6
 Golb, Noran 180 fn 9
 Goldschmidt, Daniel S.
 Goldschmidt, Henry 193 fn 2
 Goldstein, Jonathan A. 164 fn 14–15,
 264 fn 27
 Goodenough, Erwin R. 69 fn 97, 198
 fn 17
 Goodman, Martin 76 fn 6
 Gordon, Richard L. 219 fn 10
 Graham, John 196 fn 9
 Gray, George B.
 Greenfield, Jonas C. 245 fn 10–11,
 246 fn 14, 248 fn 20, 249 fn 22
 Griffiths, J. Gwyn 95 fn 39

- Gruen, Erich 141 fn 43, 142 fn 46,
144 fn 57, 152 fn 86
- Gruenwald, Ithamar 50 fn 4, 207
fn 47
- Haberman, A. M.
- Habicht, Christian 161 fn 7, 261
fn 16, 263 fn 25
- Hacham, Noah 161 fn 7, 174 fn 39
- Hadas, Moses 13–14, 13 fn 4–5, 14
fn 6–7, 15 fn 10, 16 fn 12, 23 fn 21
- Halperin, David 50 fn 4
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy 32, 32 fn 4–5,
49 fn 111, 75 fn 133, 87 fn 159, 193
fn 1, 195 fn 7, 196 fn 8
- Hamilton, Edith 200 fn 22
- Harding, Mark 32 fn 6
- Harley, J. Brian 111 f 1
- Harrington, Daniel J. 75 fn 3, 82, 82
fn 24, 186 fn 28, 188 fn 40
- Harvey, Charles D. 228 fn 2
- Heinemann, I 196 fn 8
- Heinrichs, Albert 51 fn 6, 56 fn 35,
87 fn 1
- Helleman, Wendy E. 153 fn 93
- Hempel, Charlotte 178 fn 6, 182
fn 15–16, 183 fn 17–18, 184 fn 19,
192 fn 53
- Hengel, Martin 133 fn 1, 141 fn 41,
143 fn 32, 146 fn 64, 153 fn 88, 157
fn 112, 158 fn 113
- Henze, Matthias 34 fn 14
- Herr, Moshe D. 134 fn 6, 142 fn 45
- Hertz, J. H. 259 fn 11
- Himmelfarb, Martha 141 fn 44, 209
fn 55 265 fn 34
- Hirschfeld, Yizhar 180 fn 9
- Holladay, Carl R. 142 fn 47, 143
fn 50, 144 fn 54, 56–57; 156 fn 108
fn 8
- Hollander, Harm W. 19 fn 16, 245
fn 8
- Holleaux, Maurice 257 fn 2, 4; 258
fn 8
- Honigman, Sylvie 26, 27 fn 26
- Horgan, Maurya P. 253 fn 40
- Horst, Pieter W. Van der 49 fn 2, 53,
53 fn 18–19, 55 fn 20, 65 fn 80–82,
66, 66 fn 87, 196 fn 8, 213 fn 1, 217
fn 7
- Jacobson, Howard 80 fn 18
- Jacoby, Felix 258 fn 5–6
- Janowitz, Naomi 50 fn 4
- Jokiranta, Jutta M. 177 fn 1,3
- Jonge, Marinus de 19 fn 16, 245 fn 8–9
- Kasher, Aryeh 196 f 10
- Kee, Howard Clark 52 fn 8
- Kiley, Mark 32 fn 6, 33
- Kister, Menahem 112 fn 6, 135 fn 12,
171 fn 30, 243, 243 fn 1, 246 fn 13,
247 fn 17, 248 fn 20, 252, 252 fn 37,
253 fn 41, 254 fn 44, 277, 277 fn 39
- Klauck, H.-J. 196 fn 8
- Klausner, J. 270
- Klinghardt, Matthias 181 fn 13
- Knibb, Michael A. 160 fn 6
- Knowles, Michael P. 41 fn 25
- Knox, Wilfred L. 96 fn 45, 97 fn 50
- Koester, Helmut 251 fn 28
- Kohler, Kaufman 51 fn 8
- Kosmala, Hans 245 fn 6, 250 fn 26,
251, 251 fn 29
- Kotansky, Roy 88 fn 7
- Kovelman, Arkady 27, 27 fn 27
- Kraft, Robert A. 65 fn 79, 76, 76 fn 7,
87, 87 fn 3
- Kugel, James L. 134 fn 10, 135 fn 16,
147 fn 69, 247 fn 17–18
- Kugler, robert A. 49 fn 2, 74 fn 105,
247 fn 17
- Ladouceur, David J. 257 fn 1
- Landsberger, Benno 150 fn 80
- Lange, Armin 34, 34 fn 12, 151 fn 82,
185 fn 23, 26; 187 fn 36, 188 fn 37,
39; 190 fn 47
- Laporte, Jean 208 fn 51
- Leicht, Reimund 79 fn 17, 80, 80
fn 19
- Leslau, Wolf 38 fn 18
- Lesses, Rebecca Macy 50 fn 5, 51
fn 6, 53 fn 16, 61 fn 60, 71 fn 103,
79 fn 17
- Levine, Amy-Jill 233 fn 10
- Levine, Lee I. 133 fn 1, 134 fn 7
- Licht, J. A. 274, 274 fn 28
- LiDonnici, Lynn 88 fn 6, 103 fn 79
- Lieberman, Saul 203 fn 30
- Lorein Geert W. 258 fn 7, 261 fn 18
- Luger, Yehezkel 166 fn 17
- Machiela, Dan 125 fn 56
- Mack, Burton L. 152 fn 83, 154
fn 98
- Magness, Jodi 180 fn 9
- Maher, Michael 282 fn 52, 284 fn 55
- Maier, Johann 119 fn 32
- Main, Emmanuelle 172 fn 31–33
- Malkin, Irad 196 fn 9
- Maltomini, Franco 100 fn 68

- Marcus, Ralph 204 fn 35
 Martinez, David 90 fn 19, 103 fn 78
 Master, John R. 213 fn 1
 Mauersberger, Arno 257 fn 4
 McDonough, Sean M. 88 fn 8
 McKirahan, Jr. 202 fn 26
 McNamara, Martin
 Mendels, Doron 133 fn 4, 134 fn 9,
 170 fn 27, 265
 Mendelson, Alan 219 fn 12
 Merkelbach, Reinhold 87 fn 1, 92
 fn 27–30, 96 fn 30, 45; 99 fn 65, 67;
 100 fn 67, 71; 102 fn 72, 75; 103
 fn 77
 Metso, Sarianna 179 fn 7, 181 fn 12
 Metzger, Marcel 78 fn 11
 Meyer, Martin 64 fn 73; 69 fn 97
 Milgrom, Jacob 39 fn 20, 279 fn 44,
 280 fn 47
 Milik, Józef T. 20 fn 18, 245 fn 10,
 269 fn 7
 Milikowsky, H. 135 fn 13
 Millar, Fergus 76 fn 6
 Miller, Patricia Cox 92 fn 31
 Mittwoch, H. 215 fn 4
 Momigliano, Arnaldo 135 fn 14, 141
 fn 41, 144 fn 55
 Montgomery, James 208 fn 32
 Moore, Carey A 235 fn 12
 Morgenstern, Matthew 113 fn 13, 136
 fn 21
 Mørkholm, Otto 257 fn 3
 Murphy, Catherine M. 186 fn 29
 Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome 251 fn 30

 Najman, Hindy 28–29, 28 fn 29–30;
 29 fn 31; 120 fn 38
 Naveh, Joseph 59 fn 48
 Nestle, Walter 257 fn 1, 261 fn 19
 Neuman, M. Gary 227 fn 1
 Neusner, Jacob 280 fn 46
 Newman, Judith H. 33, 33 fn 9
 Newsom, Carol A. 51 fn 7, 52 fn 11,
 112 fn 10, 162 fn 9, 179 fn 8, 229
 fn 6, 263 fn 24–25
 Niehoff, Maren R. 196 fn 10, 219
 fn 11, 220 fn 15
 Nitzan, Bilhah 47 fn 31, 163 fn 12
 Noam, Vered 258 fn 9
 Nock, Arthur Darby 90 fn 17

 Oegema, Gebern S. 75 fn 3, 76 fn 6,
 84, 84 fn 31
 Olson, Daniel 38 fn 19, 40 fn 20

 Ordan, Dena 243
 Oßwald, Eva 75 fn 3, 76 fn 6, 81
 fn 22

 Parry, Donald W. 160 fn 6
 Pearce, Sarah 196 fn 10, 197–8, 197
 fn 13–14
 Pelletier, André 14, 14 fn 8, 20, 20
 fn 17, 26 fn 24
 Perkins, PHEME 229 fn 6
 Portier-Young, Anatheia 234 fn 11
 Preisendanz, Karl 51 fn 6, 56 fn 35,
 57 fn 38, 87 fn 1, 90 fn 21, 92
 fn 30, 95 fn 42, 98 fn 54, 57–58; 99
 fn 64, 67; 102 fn 73, 104 fn 80–81

 Qimron, Elisha 113 fn 13, 136 fn 21,
 162 fn 8, 163 fn 12, 171 fn 30, 184
 fn 20, 252 fn 38, 253 fn 42

 Rabin, Chaim 245 fn 6, 251 fn 30
 Rahlfs, Alfred 79 fn 14
 Rajak, Tessa 133 fn 2–4
 Rapoport, Salomon J. 260 fn 14
 Rappaport, Uriel 133 fn 1–2, 134
 fn 5
 Ravid, Liora 273–277, 273 fn 24,
 26–28; 275 fn 29–33
 Rehm, Bernhard
 Reinhartz, Adele 231 fn 8
 Ritner, Robert K. 95 fn 40, 105 fn 84
 Rohrbacher-Sticker, Claudia 96 fn 77
 Rohrbaugh, Richard L. 49 fn 2, 74
 fn 105
 Rubinkiewicz, Ryszard 73 fn 104
 Ruiten, J. T. Van 119 fn 32, 130 fn 66
 Runia, David T. 153 fn 95
 Ryle, Herbert E. 75 fn 3, 76 fn 6, 81,
 81 fn 21–22, 82–84, 82 fn 26, 83 fn
 28–30

 Safran, William 193, 194 fn 4
 Sanders, E. P. 251 fn 30
 Schäfer, Peter 50 fn 4, 52 fn 12–14,
 53 fn 15, 17; 59 fn 49, 61 fn 60–62,
 62 fn 63, 63 fn 70–71, 64 fn 74–75,
 67 fn 88–90, 68 fn 91–94, 70 fn
 98–101, 76 fn 5, 79 fn 17, 94 fn
 35–38
 Schechter, Solomon 166 fn 17, 245, 245
 fn 5
 Schiffman, Lawrence H. 12 fn 2, 20
 fn 18, 24 fn 22, 163 fn 12, 166 fn 16,
 186, 186 fn 31, 187 fn 32

- Schmidt, F. 129 fn 64, 130 fn 65, 140 fn 39–40, 141 fn 41
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. 154 fn 100, 155 fn 103
- Schneider, Heinrich 78 fn 12–13, 79 fn 16
- Schneidewind, William M. 76 fn 5
- Scholem, Gershom 50 fn 4, 207 fn 47
- Schuller, Eileen 32–33, 33 fn 7–8, 34 fn 11, 76 fn 5
- Schürer, Emile 76 fn 6, 81 fn 22, 198 fn 17
- Schwartz, Daniel R. 141 fn 44, 142 fn 46, 143 fn 49, 146 fn 66, 158 fn 113, 164 fn 14, 247 fn 17, 254 fn 44, 259 fn 10
- Scott, James M. 119 fn 32, 149 fn 75
- Seeligmann, Isaac L. 263 fn 24, 264 fn 29
- Segal, Judah B. 59 fn 48
- Segal, M. 34, 34 fn 13, 119 fn 36, 277–278, 277 fn 40, 278 fn 41
- Shaked, Shaul 59 fn 48, 64 fn 74–75, 76 fn 5, 79 fn 17
- Shaw, Frank E. 88 fn 8
- Shutt, R. J. N. 14, 14 fn 8
- Silberman, A. M. 128 fn 61
- Sivan, D. 113 fn 13, 136 fn 21
- Skehan, Patrick W. 164 fn 15
- Smith, Morton 57 fn 38 88 fn 6, 90 fn 17, 97 fn 50, 105 fn 86, 106 fn 90
- Smith, Richard 64 fn 73, 69 fn 97
- Soloveitchik, Haym 260 fn 14
- Sokoloff, Michael 260 fn 14
- Sowers, Sidney G. 206 fn 73
- Speiser, E. A. 148 fn 73
- Sperber, Daniel 69 fn 97, 96 fn 44
- Spittler, Russell P. 49 fn 2, 52 fn 8
- Stambaugh, John E. 219 fn 10
- Stark, Rodney 177 fn 1
- Steck, O. H. 155 fn 105
- Stegemann, Hartmut 185 fn 25
- Steiner, Richard C. 112 fn 8
- Sterling, Gregory E. 121 fn 40, 143 fn 50–51, 144 fn 59, 146 fn 64–65, 67
- Stern, Chaim 175 fn 40
- Stern, Menahem 94 fn 38, 134 fn 6, 146 fn 64, 155 fn 104, 157 fn 112, 258 fn 5–6
- Stone, Michael E. 111 fn 3, 112 fn 8, 10; 246 fn 11
- Strugnell, John 51 fn 7, 171 fn 31, 184 fn 20, 186 fn 28, 188 fn 40, 250 fn 23, 252 fn 38, 253 fn 42
- Stuckenbruck, Loren 80 fn 18
- Sussman, Ya'akov 252 fn 36
- Sutcliffe, Edmund 180 fn 10
- Swartz, Michael 50 fn 4–5, 53 fn 16, 61 fn 60, 62 fn 63
- Swete, Henry Barclay 79 fn 14
- Talmon, Shermayahu 252 fn 35
- Tawil, Hayim 225 fn 20
- Tcherikover, Victor 141 fn 42
- Testuz, Michel 267–269, 267 fn 3–4, 268 fn 5–6, 269 fn 8, 270, 272–3, 277, 277 fn 40
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C. 46 fn 30, 187, 187 fn 33, 35–36; 189 fn 42, 190 fn 43, 48–49
- Tölölyan, Khachig 193, 193 fn 3
- Torijano, Pablo A. 87 fn 2
- Totti, Maria 87 fn 1, 92 fn 30
- Torijano, Pablo A. 87 fn 2
- Tov, Emanuel 169 fn 23, 170 fn 26
- Treuer, John C. 162 fn 11
- Tsetsckhladze, Gocha R. 124 fn 52
- Ulrich, Eugene 113 fn 11, 181 fn 12, 182 fn 15, 184 fn 20, 188 fn 38
- Unnik, W. C. Van 296 fn 8, 10
- VanderKam, James C. 31 fn 1, 32, 32 fn 2–3, 37 fn 17, 38 fn 17, 40 fn 21, 45 fn 29, 112 fn 10, 114 fn 17, 119 fn 32, 36–37; 120 fn 38, 127 fn 58, 129 fn 62, 137 fn 22, 138 fn 31, 33; 155 fn 104, 243 fn 1, 253 fn 39, 269 fn 7, 270 fn 11–12, 271 fn 15, 272 fn 22
- Velde, H. 93 fn 32–34, 94 fn 37–38
- Vermes, Geza 24 fn 22, 76 fn 6, 160 fn 6 187, 187 fn 34
- Volz, P. 270
- Vööbus, Arthur 78 fn 9–10
- Wacholder, Ben Zion 143 fn 50, 246 fn 13, 251 fn 31
- Walbank, Frank William 257 fn 3
- Wallis, Roy 177 fn 1
- Walters, Peter 15 fn 11
- Wasserstein, A. 133 fn 3, 151 fn 80, 152 fn 86, 158 fn 113
- Weeks, Stuart 80 fn 18
- Weinfeld, Moshe 147 fn 70, 158 fn 113, 181 fn 13

- Weingreen, J. 216 fn 5, 224 fn 18–19
Weitzman, Steven 170 fn 24
Werline, Rodney A. 170 fn 26–27
Werman, Cana 123 fn 31, 130 fn 67,
134 fn 11, 135 fn 15–16, 151 fn 81,
154 fn 101, 157 fn 111, 247 fn 18
Wevers, John 15 fn 11
Wiesenberg, Ernest 269–270, 269 fn 9,
277 fn 40
Wills, Lawrence M. 229 fn 3–5, 235
fn 12
Wilson, Bryan R. 177 fn 1
Wimbush, Vincent 208 fn 52
Winston, David 152 fn 87, 153 fn 89,
91–92, 95
Wise, Michael O. 183 fn 17
Wolfson, Elliot R. 50 fn 4, 53 fn 15,
67 fn 89
Woodward, D. 111 fn 1
Workeneh, Archbishop Melkesedek 38
fn 19, 40 fn 20
Wright, Benjamin G. 87
Yadin, Yigael 111 fn 2
Yarbro Collins, Adela 156 fn 107, 109
Yardeni, Ada 171 fn 28

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES*

HEBREW BIBLE

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Exodus</i>	
1	40–41, 46, 83, 155, 276	1:8	221
1:6–7	156	2:11–12	215 fn 4
1:22, 28	41 fn 23	8:21–23	225
1:27	188	12	276
1–2	43 fn 27	12:38	218
2:1–3	274	12:43	23
2:4	156	13:1–16	23
2–3	188	13:9, 16	21–22
4:20–22	150	16	281
4:33	125	16:1	278, 280
5:2	38	16:5	276, 283
5–15	111	16:8–12	277
6:1–4	38	16:23	277, 283
6:1–8	38	16:25	277
6:3–6	39	16:29	282, 282 fn 52
6:10	125	19	276
6:11	37, 38	20:1	20
6:12	37	20:7	217, 224
7:23	38	20:1–14	20
9:1, 7	40 fn 21	20:9–10	282
10	111 fn 2, 120, 124, 125, 129	20–23	278
10:1	124, 125	21:18	258
10:2–4	119	22:13	259, 260
10:2, 6, 22	124	22:27	221, 224
10:2–32	125	23:10–11	279
10:10–11	147	24:7–8	280
10:22	125	24:12–18	278
10:32	120	25	284
11:4, 8	120	28	15, 20 fn 16, 26
11:9	119 fn 36, 120	29	15
12:1–3	82	31	279
12:6	128 fn 61	31:14–15	282
12:16	128 fn 61	31:16	284 fn 35
13:14–16	82	32	214, 279
14:18	128 fn 61	32:11–14	35
15:5–6	82	34:21	283
17:16	41 fn 23	35:3	283
24:1	41 fn 23		
25:3	138 fn 30	<i>Leviticus</i>	
27:1–29	214	1–7	279
30:37–38	214	5:15–16	253
38	214	7:38	279
49:4	248, 249	10:1–7	213
		16:17	206, 206 fn 45
		24:10–16	213–226

* Compiled by Carylyn Gwyn Moser

24:10–23	213 fn 1	11:21	23
24:11	215	12:2–3	225
24:11–12	223	13:14	259, 259 fn 12
24:15	216, 224	15:19–23	13 fn 4
24:15–16	216, 225	21:18–21	218, 218 fn 8
24:16	216	22:12	13
24:17–22	217	28:58	224
25	279, 281	28–30	170 fn 26
25:1	279, 280	30:1–3	167, 168, 169
25:2–3	280	30:1–5	169, 170, 174
25:4–6	281	30:2	169
25:8–17	281	30:3	169
25:10	281	30:4	160 fn 2, 1164, 164 fn 15, 169
25:28	281	30:5	169
25–26	280	31–32	170 fn 24
26:44–45	169	32	23
26:46	279, 280	33:9–10	16
27:21	15		
27:34	279		
		<i>Judges</i>	
<i>Numbers</i>		9:4	248
8:14	190		
9:1–4	223	<i>Joshua</i>	
9:6–14	275	15	127
11:11–13	214	15:1	127
12:10	214	16:1	127
15:32–36	223		
15:38–39	13	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
16:9	190	8:11–17	147
16:22	39 fn 20	10:9	65 fn 80
18:20	190	20:34	248 fn 20
21	182	25:9	248 fn 20
21:4–9	214		
24:4, 16	16	<i>1 Kings</i>	
27:1–11	223	8:23–53	169
27:16	39 fn 20	8:23–61	170
28:9–10	284	8:47–50	169
30:10–12	214	8:50	169
		22:10–13	249 fn 22
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>2 Kings</i>	
5:11	217	21:1–17	78
5:22	20		
5–6	24 fn 22	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	
6	22 fn 20	16:35	164 fn 13
6:4–9	13, 20, 23	17:24	82
6:6	14	28:8	127 fn 39
6:6–18	20	29:18	82
6:8	21		
6:9	14	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
7:18	25 fn 23	18:18	84
9:25–29	35–37	20:7	127 fn 39
11	22 fn 20	21:19	260
11:13–21	3, 20, 23	33:1	80
11:18	14, 21		

33:1–13	78		
33:8	80		
33:10–19	75		
33:13	80		
<i>Ezra</i>			
9:12	127 fn 39		
<i>Nehemiah</i>			
1	169, 170		
1:8–9	169, 174		
<i>Esther</i>			
2:7	239		
2:10–11, 20	237		
4:8, 16	238		
7:6–8	237		
7:7–10	238		
8:1–12	238		
8:2	238		
8:8	238		
9:29–32	238		
10:3	238		
<i>Psalms</i>			
1:2	17, 24		
19:14	17		
24:2	43 fn 27		
32:4–9	83		
32:7	83		
33:9	43 fn 27		
51	75		
51:17–21	202 fn 27		
79	163 fn 12		
89:2, 5, 14	40 fn 22		
91	34 fn 14, 47		
106	163 fn 12		
106:47	164 fn 13		
108:4	40 fn 22		
110:5	40 fn 22		
117:2	40 fn 22		
119:14, 23	17		
119:48, 78	17		
119:90	40 fn 22		
119:148	17		
135:3	259		
136:61	43 fn 27		
138:15	83		
147:2	164 fn 15, 166 fn 16		
148:3–8	83		
148:5–6	43 fn 27		
<i>Proverbs</i>			
24:17	257		
29:12	259		
<i>Isaiah</i>			
1:26	197		
2	200		
4:3	168 fn 22		
11:12	163, 163 fn 12, 164, 165–166, 166 fn 17, 173 fn 36, 174		
11:15	115 fn 18		
14	263, 263 fn 14, 264		
14:7–8	264		
14:11	263		
14:12	263, 264		
14:12a	263		
14:12–14a	263		
14:13	264		
14:14 b	263		
14:15	264		
14:18–20	263		
14:19	263, 263 fn 26		
24:17	243–244, 249, 250		
27:13	166 fn 17		
30:27	83		
34:17	127 fn 37		
40:3	160, 161 fn 6		
48:13	43 fn 27		
49:5a	164 fn 15		
49:5–6	164		
49:6, 7	164 fn 15		
56:8	164 fn 15, 166, 166 fn 17		
58:13	282, 284 fn 35		
<i>Jeremiah</i>			
8:1–2	166 fn 16		
14:13	249 fn 22		
20:1–6	249 fn 22		
23	250		
23:9–40	249 fn 22		
23:32	248, 249, 249 fn 22		
24:7	170		
25:23	138 fn 30		
26:17–19	249		
27:9–12	170		
28:1–17	249 fn 22		
29:21–29	249 fn 22		
31:8	166 fn 16		
31:19	259		
32:38–40	170		
36:30	170		
37:19	249 fn 22		
48:43	249		
48:43–44	244, 250		

<i>Ezekiel</i>		<i>Amos</i>	
1	50 fn 3	5:26–27	160 fn 6
13:1–19	249 fn 22	7:12–17	249 fn 22
17	113		
38:13	138 fn 30	<i>Micah</i>	
39:2	137 fn 24	3 250	
		3:9–11	249
<i>Daniel</i>		10	200
3	259	<i>Zephaniah</i>	
4	261 fn 17	3	250
6	259	3:4	248, 249, 249 fn 22
8:8	172		
11:14	172	<i>Zechariah</i>	
12:2	168 fn 22	2:5–17	172
		2:10	172, 172 fn 35
<i>Hosea</i>		6:5	172
2:13	243 fn 1		
6:6	203 fn 32	<i>Malachi</i>	
		1:10	160
<i>Joel</i>			
2:20	264		
4:2	166 fn 16		

APOCRYPHA/DEUTEROCANONICALS

<i>Tobit</i>		16:14	43 fn 27
3	170	16:22	233
3:4	159, 170 fn 25	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
3:16–17	235	9:1	43 fn 27
4:12	229	11:25	43 fn 27
6:18	235	16:24	154 fn 99
7:10–11	234	19:6	154 fn 99
8:4	234	19:18	154 fn 99
10:5	228	19:22	241
11:16	235	19:24	154 fn 99
12:12–14	235	<i>Sirach</i>	
12:19	228	16:27–28	43 fn 27
13	169, 170	33:10–13	184 fn 22
13:2	83, 170 fn 25	36:13	164, 164 fn 15, 165, 174
13:3	160	48:15	159
13:3–4	170	51:12	164 fn 15, 166, 166 fn 17
13:5	170 fn 25	<i>Baruch</i>	
13:5–6	169, 170	1:15	170, 170 fn 25
14:3–6	228	2:13–15	166 fn 16
14:5	241	2:14	169, 174
14:9	241	2:15	170
14:15	228	2:21–25	170
		2:27–34	169
<i>Judith</i>			
5:18	159		
8:3	233		
10:3–4	232, 233		
12:18	232		

2:27–35	170	5:17	262, 265
3:6–7	170	5:21	262, 264, 265
3:8	170, 170 fn 25	5:27	263 fn 26
		7:34	262
<i>1 Maccabees</i>		9	260, 261, 261 fn 18–19, 263
1:5	258	9:4	262 fn 20
1:11	259 fn 12	9:6	262, 263, 264
1:21–24	254	9:7	257–265
2:40–41	229	9:8	262, 263, 264, 265
6	258	9:9	262, 263
6:1	261 fn 17	9:10	263, 265 fn 31
6:8	258	9:11	262 fn 20
6:12	254	9:12	263
		9:28	263 fn 26, 265
<i>2 Maccabees</i>		9:28–29	263
1	170	9:29	263 fn 27
1:27	164, 164 fn 14–15, 165, 166 fn 16, 173, 174	9:31	265 fn 31
		10:6	263 fn 26
2:16	228	11:3	254 fn 45
2:18	164, 165, 169, 173, 174	13:4–8	265
		13:8	265
2:20–21	262 fn 20		
3:4–6	254 fn 45	<i>Prayer of Manasseh</i>	
4:1, 7–9	254 fn 45	1–7	84
4:32, 39–42	254 fn 45	3	83
5:6	265	8	82, 83, 83 fn 27
5:9	265	11	83
5:15–21	254 fn 45	13	80, 83

NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Mark</i>		<i>Romans</i>	
13:27	170	3:2–3	18
		3:23	82
<i>Luke</i>		<i>Ephesians</i>	
1:46–55	78	4:19	251
1:68–79	78	5:1–3	251
2:29–32	78	5:3	251 fn 28
5:32	82	<i>Hebrews</i>	
15:7	82	5:12	18
		5–9	205 fn 43
<i>Acts</i>		<i>1 John</i>	
2:9–11	111 fn 2	3:4–10	82
7:38	18		
12:21	261 fn 17		
15	77		

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>		<i>2–3 Apocalypse of Baruch</i>	
9:7	73 fn 104	<i>2 Baruch</i>	
		21:4–5	43 fn 27
		48:8	43 fn 27

<i>1-2-3 Enoch</i>		3:114-115	149
<i>1 Enoch</i>		3:115-116	128 fn 61
14	51	3:116	149
15:18	39	3:117-118	149
16:1	39	3:117-121	148
17	73 fn 104	3:118-121	149
18:2	43 fn 27	3:120-161	149
106-107	112 fn 10	3:147-153	149
		3:151	149
<i>2 Enoch</i>		3:154-155	149
8	43 fn 27	3:267-276	159
24	43 fn 27	3:421-424	149
		3:629-638	149
<i>3 Enoch</i>			
16	52 fn 13		
<i>4 Enoch</i>			
4:15-26	38 fn 17		
5:1-10	38 fn 17		
7:20-39	38 fn 17		
7:27a	38		
9:9	38		
10:1-17	38 fn 17		
<i>Epistle of Aristean</i>			
§224			
§17	24		
§51-72	26		
§57	26		
§76	24		
§96	25, 26		
§97	15, 16		
§99	16, 25, 26		
§128-171	11		
§155	25		
§157	12		
§158-160	11-29		
§158	12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25		
§159	12-13, 25		
§160	12, 12 fn 3, 24-25		
<i>Greek Apocalypse of Ezra</i>			
<i>4 Ezra</i>	84		
8:20-25	84		
<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>			
8 165			
8:28	164, 164 fn 15, 165, 174		
9:1	159		
<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>			
3:110-114	111 fn 2, 128 fn 61		
3:110-115	148		
		<i>Jubilees</i>	
		1:1-4a	271, 278
		1:4b-26	271
		1:5	272
		1:7	268
		1:7-14	35
		1:7-25, 28	267, 269
		1:9-13	159
		1:15-18	35
		1:16	35
		1:19	33, 35-36
		1:19-20	33
		1:19-21	34, 35-37
		1:20	36, 45, 46, 268, 269
		1:21	36, 46
		1:21a	35
		1:25	37
		1:26-29	277
		1:27-28	271, 272
		1:29	271, 271 fn 15
		1-23	273
		2 276	
		2:2	156
		2:7	282
		2:15-17	274
		2:15-33	273-274, 278
		2:17-21	274
		2:21	284
		2:24	157
		2:25-27	282
		2:31	284
		2:1-50:4	271
		3 39	
		3:10-11	155
		4 39	
		4:17-18	151 fn 82
		4:24	271
		4:28	37
		5:2a	38
		5:19	112 fn 10

6:34–38	243 fn 1	11:12–13	41
7:1–12	112 fn 6	11:16	41
7:20–21	250	11:16a	41
7:21–22	250 fn 27	11:17	33, 41–42, 42 fn 26, 45, 46
7:23	38		
7:36	42 fn 26	11–12	41 fn 25
8:1–2	39	12:1–6	42
8:8	119, 125	12:7–8	42
8:9	119, 140 fn 38	12:9	42
8:10	119, 127, 149	12:12	42
8:10–11	120, 126	12:15	42
8:11	120 fn 38	12:16–18	150
8:12	116	12:19	33, 42, 43–44, 46
8:12–21	120	12:19–20	34
8:12–29	124	12:19–21	33, 34, 42–44
8:14	149	12:20	42, 45
8:15–17	149	12:22	33
8:16	116 fn 26	12:25–27	135
8:21	117 fn 28	13:16	33
8:22–24	120	15:13	269, 277
8:25–30	120	16:2–4	246 fn 13
8:26	114 fn 17, 115	16:26	42 fn 26
8–9	111, 118–120	20	269
9:2	122	20:9–11	274
9:2–6	116, 125	21:3	42 fn 26
9:5	122	21:16–18	42
9:6	123	22:1–5	44
9:13	149	22:4b	44
9:13b	123	22:5	33
9:14	120	22:6	44, 45
9:19	120	22:7–9	44–45
9:29	126	22:7–30	33 fn 10
9–13	120, 124, 125	22:10–22	33 fn 10
10	146, 151	22:10–24	45
10:1–2	39	22:15–22	33 fn 10
10:1–13	34	22:17	45
10:3	33, 45	22:22–33	33 fn 10
10:3–6	33, 34, 37–41	22:27	42 fn 26
10:4	46	23:11	246 fn 13
10:5	40, 45, 46	23:11–32	267
10:8	40, 42 fn 26	23:14–20, 21	271
10:11	40, 47	23:26	268
10:15	40	23:31	271
10:15–17	37	24:28b–30	267, 268
10:19–26	41	23:29	283
10:28–33	149	27:11	33 fn 10
10:36	112 fn 10	29:4	33 fn 10
11	150	30:12	282
11:1–6	42	31:13–29	33 fn 10
11:1–10	41	31:14	271
11:2	147, 149	31:18–20	33 fn 10
11:2–6	41	31:25	33 fn 10
11:7	45	32:7	33 fn 10
11:10	42	36:15–16	33 fn 10

- | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|--------------------|
| 40:9 | 283 | | |
| 46:2 | 283 | | |
| 50:1 | 273, 276, 278,
281 | | |
| 50:1-5 | 273, 277 | | |
| 50:2 | 278, 279 | | |
| 50:2-3 | 281 | | |
| 50:2-5 | 270, 280, 280
fn 48 | | |
| 50:2b-5 | 273 | | |
| 50:4 | 270 fn 10 | | |
| 50:4-5 | 281 | | |
| 50:5 | 271, 275, 276,
283 | | |
| 50:6 | 281-282 | | |
| 50:6-13 | 267-284 | | |
| 50:7 | 282 | | |
| 50:8-9 | 282, 282
fn 50 | | |
| 50:9 | 283 | | |
| 50:9b-10 | 2830284 | | |
| 50:10-11 | 284 | | |
| 50:12 | 282, 283 | | |
| 50:13 | 277, 284 | | |
| <i>Testament of Abraham</i> | | | |
| 9:3 | 83 fn 27 | | |
| 10:13 | 83 fn 27 | | |
| 14:12-14 | | | |
| | | <i>Testament of Job</i> | |
| | | 1 | 55 fn 26 |
| | | 2-5 | 55 fn 21 |
| | | 4:6-9 | 64 fn 78 |
| | | 5:2-3 | 65 fn 79 |
| | | 6 | 64 fn 77 |
| | | 16-20 | 55 fn 22 |
| | | 21-25 | 55 fn 22 |
| | | 22 | 52 fn 8 |
| | | 27 | 55 fn 25 |
| | | 28:7 | 52 fn 9 |
| | | 33:3-9 | 52 fn 9 |
| | | 39-40 | 55 fn 24 |
| | | 44 | 55 fn 25 |
| | | 46:1 | 55 fn 27 |
| | | 46:3-4 | 55 fn 28 |
| | | 46:7-8 | 55 fn 29 |
| | | 46:9 | 55 fn 30 |
| | | 47:3 | 55 fn 31 |
| | | 47:4 | 56 fn 32 |
| | | 47:9 | 56 fn 33 |
| | | 47:10-11 | 56 fn 34, 58 fn 46 |
| | | 47:11 | 66 fn 84 |
| | | 48:2-3 | 65 fn 81 |
| | | 49:1-2 | 65 fn 82 |
| | | 50:1-2 | 66 fn 83 |
| | | 62:6-7 | 66 fn 85 |
| | | 52:9 | 66 fn 86 |
| | | <i>Testament of Solomon</i> | |
| | | 9 | 100 fn 67 |
| PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA | | | |
| <i>De Animalibus</i> | | 95 | 218, 218 fn 8, 219 |
| 77-100 | 220 | 96 | 219 |
| | | 124 | 219 |
| <i>De Confusione Linguarum</i> | | | |
| Conf. 77-78 | 198 fn 15 | <i>In Flaccum/Flaccus</i> | |
| | | 46 | 196 |
| <i>De Vita Contemplativa/On the
Contemplative Life</i> | | <i>De Fuga et Inventione</i> | |
| 8 | 220 | 90 | 219 |
| 25 | 17 | 180 | 221 |
| | | 185 | 15 fn 11 |
| <i>De Decalogo</i> | | <i>Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres Sit/
(Her/Heir)</i> | |
| 20-31 | 156 fn 110 | 84-85 | 206 fn 46 |
| 52-81 | 219 | | |
| 79-80 | 220 | | |
| 102-5 | 156 fn 110 | <i>Legum Allegoriarum</i> | |
| <i>De Ebrietate</i> | | <i>Leg. All.</i> | |
| 13-98 | 222 | 3.102 | 205 fn 47 |

- | | | | |
|--|--------------|---|--------------|
| 3.126 | 15 fn 11 | 1.215 | 206 fn 44 |
| 3.132 | 15 fn 11 | 1.216–217 | 208 fn 50 |
| | | 2.250 | 160 |
| <i>Legatio ad Gaium</i> | | <i>De Specialibus Legibus/Special Laws</i>
(<i>Spec. leg./Spec.</i>) | |
| 139 | 220 fn 16 | 1.53 | 221, 223–224 |
| 163–66 | 220 fn 16 | 1.67 | 199 fn 18 |
| 281–2 | 197 fn 12 | 1.70 | 200 fn 19 |
| <i>De Ofificio Mundi</i> | | 1.77–78 | 197 |
| I.3 | 153 fn 94–95 | 1.79 | 220 |
| 27–29 | 157 | 1.95 | 204 fn 33 |
| 89–128 | 156 | 1.277 | 203 fn 29–30 |
| <i>De Posteritate Caini</i> | | 1.287–288 | 208 fn 53 |
| 158 | 219 | 2.229–30 | 222 |
| 165 | 219 | 3.29 | 218 |
| <i>De Praemiis et Poenis/Rewards</i>
<i>and Punishments</i>
(<i>Praem./Praem. Poen.</i>) | | 3.125 | 220 |
| 1 | 17 | 3.132 | 204 fn 33 |
| 29 | 200 fn 21 | 3.140 | 204 fn 33 |
| 115–117 | 160 fn 2 | 3.195 | 222 |
| 165 | 200 fn 21 | 4.35 | 43 fn 27 |
| 168 | 200 fn 21 | 4.69 | 204 fn 33 |
| <i>De Providentia (Provid.)</i> | | <i>De Vita Mosis(Mos)</i> | |
| 2. 64 | 198 fn 16–17 | 1.2 | 214 |
| <i>Questiones et Solutiones in Exodum;</i>
<i>Questiones in Exodum/Questions</i>
<i>and Answers on Exodus (QE)</i> | | 1.2–3 | 223 |
| 2.5 | 224 | 1.23 | 221 |
| 2.51 | 209 fn 54 | 1.24 | 221 |
| 2.52 | 205 fn 40 | 1.147 | 218 |
| 2.56 | 205 fn 38 | 2.25–44 | 221 |
| 2.59 | 204 fn 36 | 2.113 | 204 fn 33 |
| 2.64 | 204 fn 39 | 2.128–29 | 204 fn 33 |
| 2.69 | 204 fn 37 | 2.161 | 219 |
| 2.76 | 204 fn 37 | 2.162 | 218, 219 |
| 2.77 | 204 fn 37 | 2.187 | 223 |
| 2.78–80 | 204 fn 37 | 2.190 | 223 |
| 2.82 | 205 fn 42 | 2.192 | 223 |
| <i>Questiones et Solutiones in Genesim</i> | | 2.193 | 218 |
| II.64 | 154 fn 99 | 2.193–208 | 215 |
| II.81–2 | 149 fn 76 | 2.194 | 221 |
| <i>De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i> | | 2.194–95 | 221 |
| 130 | 219 | 2.197 | 222 |
| <i>De Somniis/Dreams</i> | | 2.198 | 216, 222 |
| 1:13 | 43 fn 27 | 2.199 | 215 |
| 1.52–60 | 153 fn 97 | 2.202 | 222 |
| | | 2.203 | 222, 224 |
| | | 2.204 | 216, 224 |
| | | 2.205 | 223, 224 |
| | | 2.213–220 | 223 |
| | | 2.222–32 | 223 |
| | | 2.232 | 159 |
| | | 2.234–45 | 223 |
| | | 2.266–7 | 154 fn 99 |
| | | 2.270 | 219 |

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

- Damascus Document (CD)*
- | | | | |
|----------|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 182, 185, 192 | Col. 16:11 | 127 |
| 2 | 185 | Col. 16:12 | 114, 126, 127 fn 39 |
| 2:7-8 | 185 fn 23 | Col. 16:13 | 117 |
| 3:12-13 | 182 | Col.16:14 | 114, 127, 127
fn 39 |
| 4:2-3 | 160 | Col. 16:17 | 127 |
| 4:10-11 | 183 | Col. 16:20 | 127 |
| 4:15 | 243 | Col. 16:26 | 114 fn 116, 117 |
| 4:19 | 244 | Col. 17:5 | 114, 117 |
| 5:21 | 244 | Col. 17:7 | 117, 118 fn 30 |
| 6 | 182 | Col. 17:7-8 | 114 |
| 6:3 | 160 | Col. 17:7-15 | 125 |
| 6:3-4 | 160 | Col. 17:8 | 114, 118 fn 30 |
| 6:19 | 183 | Col. 17:8-9 | 114 |
| 7:1 | 160 | Col. 17:9-10 | 114 |
| 7:6 | 160 fn 5 | Col. 17:10 | 123 |
| 7:14-18 | 160 fn 6 | Col. 17:11 | 118 fn 30 |
| 8:16 | 183 | Col. 17:11-15 | 114 |
| 8:21 | 183 | Col. 17:12 | 127 |
| 14:3 | 160 fn 5 | Col. 17:15 | 126, 126 fn 37 |
| 14:9 | 160 fn 5 | Col. 17:16 | 114 |
| 15:5-6 | 183 | Col. 17:16-17 | 122 |
| 16:3-4 | 243 | Col. 17:17 | 114 |
| 19:2 | 160 fn 5 | Col. 17:18 | 114, 116 |
| 19:33-34 | 183 | Col. 17:18-19 | 114 |
| 51:13 | 250 fn 23 | Col. 21:8 | 113 fn 14 |
| 51:17 | 250 fn 23 | Col. 21:16-19 | 129 |
| | | Col. 22:10 | 113 fn 14 |
- Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen)*
- | | |
|---------------|----------------|
| Col. 0-5 | 112 fn 6 |
| Col. 2 | 112 |
| Col. 5:29 | 112 |
| Col. 6 | 112 fn 6 |
| Col. 6-10 | 112 |
| Col. 8:22-23 | 114 |
| Col.9:1 | 117 |
| Col. 9:12 | 114 |
| Col. 11-12 | 112 |
| Col. 12:3-15 | 13-15 |
| Col. 12:11 | 126 |
| Col. 13-15 | 112 |
| Col. 14:9ff | 113 |
| Col. 14:10 | 113 |
| Col. 14:10-11 | 113 |
| Col. 14:11 | 125 |
| Col. 14:12 | 113, 127 |
| Col. 14:13 | 113 |
| Col. 15:20 | 127 |
| Col. 15:21 | 113, 124 fn 54 |
| Col. 16 | 114, 124 |
| Col. 16:8 | 124 fn 54 |
| Col. 16:9 | 114 fn 25 |
- Thanksgiving Hymns (Hodayôt 1QH)*
- | | |
|-------------|-----|
| <i>1QH9</i> | |
| 5 | 187 |
- War Scroll (1QM)*
- | | |
|----------|----------|
| 2:10-14 | 111 fn 2 |
| 10:14-15 | 111 fn 2 |
- Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab)*
- | | |
|------|-----|
| 11:6 | 160 |
|------|-----|
- Manual of Discipline/*
Rule of the Community (1QS)
- | | |
|---------|-----------|
| 3:13-18 | 187 |
| 3:16-16 | 43 fn 27 |
| 3-4 | 185 |
| 4:15-26 | 187 |
| 5 | 181 |
| 5:1-3 | 181 fn 12 |
| 5:22 | 181 |
| 6:3-7 | 160 fn 5 |
| 6:27 | 216 fn 6 |
| 8 | 191 |

8:1	160 fn 5	4Q 504 1 2 vi	12-14 168, 168 fn 22
8:13-16	160	4Q 504 1 2 vi	15 163 fn 12
<i>Cave One (1Q 1QJ-1Q27)</i>		4Q 504-506	167-171
1Q 19		4Q 506	167 fn 19
frag. 3	112 fn 10	4Q 507-509	161-166
		4Q 509	167 fn 19
1Q28a-1Q72		4Q 509 3	163
1Q 34-34 bis	161-166	4Q 509 3 7	163 fn 12
1Q 34 bis 1 + 2		4Q 509 3 28	162
2-6	162	4Q 509	131-132 ii 5 162
1Q 34 bis 2+1	163	4Q530 (Book of Giants)	
1Q 34 bis 3 I		II 7-12	113 fn 12
5-7	163 fn 12	4QD	179
1Q34 bis 2 +		4QDa (4Q266)	
1-4	163 fn 12	fr 3i	244 fn 4
		2 iii 20,	
		3	
<i>Cave Three (3Q 1-3QJ4)</i>		ii 11-12	160
5	269 fn 7	4QDb	
		fr 2 11-12	160
<i>Cave Four (4Q)</i>		4QMMT	178, 179, 184, 184 fn 19, 252-255
4Q Instruction	179, 186-192		
4Q 166	243 fn 1	2:75-82	252
4Q 176	269 fn 7	3:5-7	252
4Q 184	248	4:20	252 fn 38
4Q 199 1	186 fn 29	5:13	252 fn 38
4Q 216	269, 272-3	4Q Sam b	
4Q 221	269 fn 7	6:7	248 fn 20
4Q 228	243 fn 1	32:7	248 fn 20
4Q 242	261 fn 17		
4Q 286 fr 1a	52 fn 11	<i>Cave Six</i>	
4Q 380-381	76 fn 5	6Q 8 fr 2:1	113 fn 12
4Q 390	243 fn 1, 254, 254 fn 43	<i>Cave Eleven</i>	
4Q 403 fr 1-26	52 fn 11	11Qfs AP	34, 34 fn14, 46, 46 fn 30, 47 fn 31
4Q 405 fr 20-2	52 fn 11	11QPs	
4Q 417	188, 189, 191	22:9	250 fn 23
4Q 417 1	189	<i>Nahal Se'elim</i>	
4Q 417 2i 17	186 fn 29	XHEV/Se 5 A, B	12 n 2
4Q 418	189	Phylactery A-U	11 fn 2
4Q 418 69 ii	189	Mezuzah A-G	12 fn 2
4Q 418 81	189, 191, 192		
4Q 448	171-173, 174		
4Q 504	167, 167 fn 19		
4Q 504 1 2 v	11-14 168,169		

RABBINIC TEXTS

<i>m. Abot</i>		<i>m. Makkot</i>	
4:24	257	3:6	64 fn 76
<i>m. Berakot</i>		<i>m. Sanhedrin</i>	
4:1	175 fn 40	7:5	216, 227
4:3	166 fn 17	56a	216, 217, 224

<i>m. Yoma</i>		<i>Midrash Yalquit Shimoni</i>	
3:8	71 fn 102	44	113 fn 12
4:1	71 fn 102	<i>b. Hag</i>	
6:2	71 fn 102	15a	52 fn 13
<i>y. Berakot</i>		<i>b. Megilla</i>	
2:4	166 fn 17	17b	175 fn 40
4:1	175 fn 40	<i>Targum Onqelos</i>	
4:3	166 fn 17, 175 fn 40	<i>Exodus 22:27</i>	
5a	166 fn 17	216	224 fn 17
7b	175 fn 40	<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>	
8a	166 fn 17, 175 fn 40	Mekhilta, Wayassa	6 282 fn 32, 284 fn 35
<i>b. Berakot</i>		<i>t. Berakot</i>	
26b	175 fn 40	3:1	175 fn 40
28a	175 fn 40	3:25	166 fn 17
28b	166 fn 17, 175 fn 40		
29a	166 fn 17, 175 fn 40		
<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>			
37:1–8	111 fn 2		

EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>		<i>Eusebius</i>	
6. 20	218 fn 9	<i>Praeparatio Evangelica</i>	
<i>1 Clement</i>		9.27.4	221
10:3–6	82	<i>Lactantius</i>	
29:1–3	82	<i>De morte persecutorum</i>	
31:2	82	33	261
64:1	82	<i>Divinae Institutiones</i>	
<i>Didache</i>		4.10	218 fn 9
10:3	172		

GREEK MAGICAL PAPYRI

<i>PGM</i>		IV 1167–1226	97 fn 50
I 87	93	IV 1227–64	56 fn 36
I 262–347	57 fn 41	IV 1252–56	57 fn 37
I 271–77	57 fn 42	IV 1984	88 fn 9
I 3019–20	95	IV 2604	103 fn 76
I 3084	97	IV 3007–86	95–99
II	100 fn 67	IV 3069–71	97 fn 50
III	92	IV 3079–81	97
III 1–164	92–95	V	89 fn 10
III 335	88 fn 9	V 1–53	105 fn 87
III 575	88 fn 9	V 96	104 fn 81
IV	89 fn 10	V 96–172	97 fn 50, 99–102, 107
IV 296–466	63 fn 72	V 114–17	99
IV 575	88 fn 9	V 145–58	101
IV 930–1114	57 fn 40		

V 459–89	102–104, 107	XXIIa	92
Va	89 fn 10	XXXVI	93 fn 34
VII 222–49	100 fn 68	XXXVI	35–68
VII 233–42	101	XXXVI 295–311	88 fn 9, 92
VII 579–90	57 fn 38	XXXVI 333–360	88 fn 9
VIII 64–110	100 fn 68	XXXVI 361–371	88 fn 9
VIII 91–102	101	LXII 1–24	
XII	89 fn 10	line 23	58 fn 43
XII 84–5	105 fn 87	CII 1–17	100 fn 68
XII 121	98		
XII 201–69	104–105, 105 fn 87	<i>P. London-Leiden</i> 384 I verso	90 fn 21
XIII	89 fn 10, 92		
XIII 81–86	105–106, 107	<i>P. Lond. Demot</i> 10070+	90 fn 21
XIII 734–1077	58 fn 44		
XIII 790–806	58 fn 45, 60 fn 54	<i>P. Lugd. Bat.</i> J 383	90 fn 21
XIII 975–78	107	J 384 (V)	90 fn 21
XIV	89 fn 10, 91 fn 21		
XVIIa	88 fn 9		
XIXa 1–54	88 fn 9	<i>P. Oxy</i> XXXVI 2753	100 fn 68, 101
XXI 1–29	58 fn 45, 60 fn 54		

OTHER ANCIENT WORKS

<i>Aeschylus</i>		<i>Herodotus</i>	
<i>Persians</i>		<i>Her.</i> 7.22	262
744–751	262	<i>Her.</i> 7.33–6	262
820	262		
		<i>Hesiod</i>	
<i>Athenaeus</i>		<i>Theogony</i>	
7.299–300	220 fn 16	421–424	149
		629–638	149
<i>Cassius Dio</i>		<i>Homer</i>	
59.17.11	262 fn 22	<i>Iliad</i>	
		2. 216–19	220
<i>Castias</i>		<i>Josephus</i>	
<i>Persica</i>	147 fn 71	<i>Against Apionem (Contra Apionem)</i>	
		1.186–87	160
<i>Cicero</i>		1.224–25	220
<i>De natura deorum</i>			fn 16
1.36.101	220 fn 16	1.249	225
		1.264	225
<i>Diodorus</i>		1.309	225
1.85.4	219	2.66	220 fn 16
		2.81	220 fn 16
<i>Diodorus Siculus</i>		2.86–88	220 fn 16
I.9.3	144 fn 53	2.139	220 fn 16
II.1, 8–2, 4	148	2.143	261 fn 17
II.1, 3–4	148	2.237	224
II.4. 1–7	148		
31.18a	257		

- Antiquities of the Jews*
 1.4 214 fn 2
 1.17 214
 1.18. 6 43 fn 27
 1.104 126
 1.109 120, 124
 1.110 121
 1.120 121
 1.122 115 fn 18, 116
 fn 25, 121
 1.122–47 111, 120–122,
 124
 1.130 121
 1.143 115 fn 18, 121
 1.145 125
 2.304 225
 3.167 15 fn 11
 3.217 15 fn 11
 3.209–11 215
 4.207 224, 225
 12.357 258
 12.384–85 265 fn 32
 17.168 ff 261 fn 17
 19.5–6 262 fn 22
 19.346–50 261 fn 17
- The Jewish War (Bellum Judaicum)*
 311 18
 1.32–33 161
 2.358 262 fn 22
 7:423–425 161
 7.451–453 262 fn 17
- Juvenal*
 15.1–13 220 fn 16
- Lucian*
Deorum Concilium
 10.11 220 fn 16
- Imagines*
 11 220 fn 16
- Jupiter Confutatus*
 42 220 fn 16
- Pliny the Elder*
Historia Naturalis
 13. 46 224
- Plato*
Laws
 10 200–201
 10.882 b 200 fn 22
 10.909d–910b 201 fn 23
 10.910 c–d 201 fn 24
- Plutarch*
De Iside et Osiride/Isis and Osiris
 71 220 fn 16
- Polybius*
 31.9 257
- Pseudo-Philo*
*Liber antiquitatum biblicarum/
 Antiquities of the Bible*
 4.1–10 111 fn 2
 12.3 218, 218 fn 8
- Seneca*
De brevitate vitae
 18.5 262 fn 22
- Strabo*
 16.2.35 220 fn 16
- Tacitus*
Histories
 5.5.2 224

MIEVIAL SOURCES

- Catena Severi* 150 fn 78
- Sefer Josippon*
 Ch. 18 260
 Ch. 29 260

SUBJECT INDEX*

- 1–2 Chronicles 31
 2 Kings 31
 2 Maccabees 141 fn 44
 4 Q Instruction 186–192
 Abaoth 92
 Abihu 213, 215
 Abraham 41, 42, 43, 44–45, 112, 138
 fn 30, 140, 144, 147, 150, 259
 Abram 41, 42, 116
 Abrasax 104–105, 106
 Accad 147
 Achior 231, 233
 Adam the Forefather 93
 Adonai 88, 93
 Adriatic 115
 Aegean 115
 Aeolians 124 fn 52
 Aferag 137, 137 fn 27
 Africa 137 fn 27
 agriculture 41, 150, 150 fn 80
 Aion Iao 102
 Alexander 258
 Alexander Jannaeus 171, 173
 Alps 137 fn 25
 altars
 private 201
 Amana/Amanus 117, 117 fn 28, 121,
 122, 129, 131
 Ambrosian Library 31
 Ambrosius 78
amidah 165–166
 Ammonite 231
 amulets 49–74
 rituals 58
 Anatolia 124 fn 52
 angels 50, 52, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 74,
 151, 234–235, 271, 279
 cherubim 52; language 65–66,
 70–71;
 Metatron 52 fn 13; Šaqadhoziy and
 Padqaram 60–61
 animals
 sacred 218–221, 220 fn 16
 Antiochus IV Epiphanes 134, 161,
 257–265, 258 fn 8
 Antiochus V Eupator 258 fn 9
 Antiochus VII Sidetes 258 fn 9
 Apep 93
Apocalypse of Abraham 73
 apocrypha 228–229, 241–242
 Apollobex 98
 Apophis see Apep
Apostolic Constitutions 77–78
 Appian 258
 Apuleius
 Apology 90
 Arabia 138 f 30, 148
 Aram 114, 122, 123, 125
Aramaic Levi Document 79, 243–255, 246
 fn 13, 247 fn 17–18
 dating 250
 prayer 250 fn 25
 Aramaic texts 90, 111–112, 135
 Aristobulus 152
 Ark 204–205
 Arpachshad 114, 116, 123, 129, 140
 Artapanus 144, 144 fn 57, 145 fn 58,
 60; 150, 152
 Artaxerxes 236–239, 240
 Ashur 138, 147
 Asia Minor 129, 130, 131
 Asmodeus 234, 235
 ass 93–95
 Asshur 114, 123, 125, 129; see also
 Ashur
 assimilation 133, 133 fn 3
 Assyria 147, 147 fn 71
 astrology 143, 145
 Atlas 143
 Azov Sea 115, 123, 137 fn 23; also
 known as Sea of Azov

 Babel 147, 147 fn 69
 Tower of 41, 119 fn 36, 120, 121,
 128, 146, 147 fn 69
 Babylonia 144, 147
 Balaam 16
 Baruch 84
 Bel 143
 Belial 35, 36, 37, 45, 243–244, 247,
 252, 253, 253 fn 41
 Beliar 269
 Ben Sira 79, 135 fn 14, 141 fn 41, 155
 fn 103, 184, 186, 189
 Berossus 143, 144
 Bes 91, 100 fn 76

* Compiled by Carylyn Gwyn Moser

- Bethulia 231, 232
 birds 41, 41 fn 23
 blasphemer 213–226
 blasphemy 214, 215–217, 223–225
 blessings 33, 33 fn 10, 41 fn 23,
 44–45, 46
Book of Daniel 229–230
 breast piece or breastplate 15, 19, 19
 fn 16
 British Isles 138 fn 34

 Cadiz 115 fn 19, 136
 Calneh 147
 Canaan 128, 129, 146, 149
 Canaanites 128 fn 61
 Cainan 37
 Cairo Geniza 76, 79
 manuscripts 244–245
 Calendar 253, 255
 Canon
 Roman Catholic 75
 Eastern Orthodox Church 75, 78
 cartography 111–131
 ancient 111 fn 1
 cedars 112–113
 chastity 234
 chronology 135, 270, 271 fn 13, 272,
 282
Codex Alexandrinus 78
 comedy 234 fn 11
Community Rule 177, 179, 182, 184
 consumption 258
 Corsica 139 fn 36
 covenant 16–17, 183–184
 creation 153, 154, 155–156
 language 43 fn 27; theology 45
 fn 28
 Crete 139 fn 36
 Cronos 143, 148
 Ctesias 148
 cult
 temple 198–201, 204–205, 206–207
 cursing 225–226
 Cyprus 146 fn 64

 Damascus 182–183
Damascus Document 177, 179, 182, 184,
 186, 187, 192, 243–255
 Daniel 227, 230, 231, 240, 241, 264
 Daphnes and Chloe 242
 David 242
 Dead Sea Scrolls 178
 deception 214
 Dedan 122, 138, 138 fn 30

 Delphi 119, 119 fn 34, 123, 136
 demons 40 fn 21, 45–47, 141,
 234–235, 268, 269
 demotic literacy 94
 depression 258
Deuteronomy 22–23
 diaspora 134, 193–210, 228–229;
 Jewish 194–195, 196, 198, 228;
 Hellenistic 228; Philo's 195–198;
 theology of 195
 Dicaerchus 236
 world map 119
Didascalía Apostolorum 76, 77–78, 79
 fn 16, 84, 85
 Diodorus Siculus 143–144, 148
Discourse on the Two Spirits 185, 187–188
 Don River 121 fn 45, 137 fn 23
 donkey 93–95
 Dorians 124 fn 52
 dragons 238
 dreams 238
 Noah's 112–113
 dualism 47

 Egypt 144, 144 fn 57, 158 fn 113;
 Egyptians 217–221
 Egyptian Sea 115–116, 129
Eighth Book of Moses 105–106
 Ela 122, 138, 138 fn 31
 Elam 114, 122, 125, 138, 192
 Eleazar, High Priest, 15–16, 24, 29
 Enlil 150 fn 80
 Enoch 143, 151, 188, 192;
 literature 73; traditions 37–38;
 also known as Enosh
 Ephraim 253 fn 41
 Epiphanes 262 fn 20
 epithets, Greek 102, 104
 Erech 147
 Erythraea 122
 Erythraean Sea 138 fn 29, 32
 eschatology 268, 270, 272
 Essenes 158, 267
Esther 227
 Greek/*Septuagint* 228–229, 236–240,
 241
 Ethiopic 32, 46
 texts 135, 138 fn 31
 Euphrates 114, 115, 117, 121, 122,
 123, 129
 evil spirits 34, 37, 39–40, 42, 43,
 45–47, 40 fn 21
 exiles
 ingathering 200

- Exodus* 22–23, 31
 exorcisms 34, 95–99, 99–102

 Fara 137, 137 fn 27
 flood 37, 38, 112–113, 120, 155
 folk tales 235–236
 formularies 90–91, 91 fn 26, 96–98, 107
 fringes 11–12, 11 fn 2, 13, 14, 21

 Gabriel 93
 Gadir 115, 115 fn 119, 116, 121, 121 fn 46, 136, 139; see also Cadiz
 Gaia 128 fn 61
 Garden of Eden 116, 116 fn 26, 136
 garments
 high priest's 25–26
 Ge'ez 32, 32 fn 2–3, 38, 41 fn 23, 46
Genesis 31
Genesis Apocryphon 135, 136–139
Genesis of Jabal 150
 Geniza manuscripts see Cairo Geniza
 geography 111–131, 136–141, 148
 geographical tradition 118
 Mediterranean 115–116
 Gerschom ben Jehudah of Mainz 259–260, 260 fn 14, 265
 Gibraltar 115
 Straits of 136
 Gihon River 116, 129, 129 fn 63
gloria in excelsis 78
 God
 term for 39 fn 20, 40–42, 42 fn 26, 43, 45–47, 46 fn 30
 Golden Calf see idolatry
 Gomer 114, 122
 Grateful Dead Man 235–236
 Great Salt Sea 115
 Greece 139 fn 35, 140, 144
 Greek Magical Papyri 50, 54, 56, 58, 87–108

 Hagu 188, 189
 Hahyah the Giant 113 fn 12
Halachic Letter 184
 Ham 37, 113–114, 114 fn 15–16, 116–117, 118, 120, 121, 124, 125, 128, 129, 130–131, 139
 Haman 236–239
 Hannukah 228
 Haran 42, 43
 Hasmonean dynasty 133–134, 267, 271
 Hasmonean revolt 134–135

 headless god 99–102, 99 fn 67
 heksher 97–98
 Hellenism 29, 130, 133–158, 133 fn 1, 135 fn 14, 242
 Hellenization 196, 210
 Hecataeus of Abdera 159
 Hekhalot literature 49–74, 41, 52–54, 63, 67, 68, 72, 73
 Hekhalot Rabbati 52, 53, 67, 69;
 Hekhalot Zutarti 68–69
 Heliopolis 161
 Hermes 145
 Herodotus 15, 262
 heroes 143–146, 150–151
 Himalayas 119, 136
 historiography 142–151, 142 fn 48
 Hodayot 187
 Holiness Code 279
 Holofernes 227, 231–233, 237, 240, 241
 Horus 105

 Iao 88, 88 fn 8, 93, 105, 107
 Iapetus 128 fn 61, 148
 identity 193–210
 Jewish 197; diaspora Jews 159–175
 Qumran 160
 idolatry 41, 42, 64
 Golden Calf 215, 218, 279
 illness 258–265
 India 122
 Indian Ocean 121, 121 fn 48
 infidelity 227, 230
 intertextuality 259, 259 fn 12, 278
 intimacy 239
 Ionians 124 fn 52
 Iran 138 fn 31
 Isis 145
 Israel 146
 Italy 139 fn 35

 Jacob 214
 Japheth 37, 113–115, 116, 118, 120, 121, 122, 124, 124 fn 54, 125, 126, 126 fn 57, 128, 130–131, 137–139
 Javan 114, 118, 122, 139
 Jebel Libnan 121 fn 47
 Jerusalem 123, 144 fn 54, 228, 243, 245 fn 8, 245–246, 249, 272
 pilgrimage to 198–201, 203
 Jerusalem Temple 146, 180, 196–198, 244, 250, 252, 254–255
 Jesus 91, 96

- Joakim 229, 230
 Job 49, 69
 daughters of 49, 53, 54, 55, 65–66,
 69, 72
 John Hyrcanus 272
 Joseph 15 fn 11, 18, 144, 145, 242
 Josephus 120–122, 124, 124 fn 55,
 129, 130–131, 215, 219, 221,
 223–225, 236, 258
Josippon 260 fn 15
Jubilees 31–47, 133–158, 250
 literary unit 267–284; year 281
 Judaism 154
 Judith 227, 229, 231–233, 240,
 241
- Kamaturi Islands 123
 kashrut 25
 Kronos 128 fn 61
 Kuntillet 'Arjud 100 fn 70
- language 135
 secret 105–106, 106 fn 89–90
 law 152–155
 Jewish 16–17, 20; Mosaic 24–25
 Lebanon 117, 121, 121 fn 47, 128
Letter of Aristeas 141 fn 44
 Levi ben Jacob 243–244
 linguistics 247–248, 250 fn 27
 literacy 27
 literature 141–157, 141 fn 44
 Babylonian 150 fn 80
 liturgy 162–166, 167–171
 odes 78
 logos 153, 155
 Lud 114, 122, 125, 138
 Lydia 119
 Lysimachus 236
- Ma'aseh Merkabah* 52, 59, 62, 63,
 64
 Madai 114, 118, 122, 128, 129, 138,
 139
 magic
 Greco-Egyptian 90–92, 91 fn 26;
 Jewish 89–92; names/sounds 92–95;
 practical 88–89, 108
 Magog 114, 117, 118, 122, 138, 139
 Manasseh 75, 80, 81, 231, 233
 Manetho 94, 94 fn 37, 145, 225
 Mastemah 40, 41, 42, 45, 47, 268
 Mauq Sea 115, 123, 137, 137 fn 26
 Maximian Galerius 261
 Me'at Sea 138, 140
- Mehri 122
 mountains 138, 138 fn 31
 Mediterranean see geography
 Menelaus 265
 Merkabah 50–51, 52, 53, 59, 72, 74
 Meshech 114, 116, 118, 122, 139
 Mesopotamia 123
 messianic age 200
 mezuzot 11–14, 20, 21, 29
 Michael 93
 Mordecai 227, 237–240
 Moses 144, 145, 145 fn 60, 146 fn 66,
 152 fn 87, 222–223, 272–273, 279
 motifs
 priestly 190; royal 190
 Mount Sinai 128
 Mount Zion 119, 128, 136, 140
 music 66
- Nadab 213, 215
 Nahor 41
 names
 demon 96; divine 88–89; Jewish
 92–93; magical 107
 Nehemiah ben HaQanah 52, 53, 67,
 67 fn 88
New Testament 16, 19
 Nicetas of Remesiana 78
 Nile 116, 129
 Nimrod 147, 147 fn 69–70, 148, 148
 fn 73, 149 fn 76
 Nineveh 138, 147
 Ninus 147–148, 148 fn 73
 Noah 39–41, 40 fn 21, 112–113,
 119–130, 120–121, 126
 numerology 156–157
- Onias 161
 omphalos 119, 136, 140
 oracles 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
 orality 27
 Origen 78
 Orpheus 145
 Osiris 91, 99, 99 fn 67
 Osiris-Apis 219 see also Pharoah
 Osoronophris
 Ouranos 128 fn 61
- Palestine 120, 129, 130–131
 parody 261, 261 fn 16, 265 fn 33
 Parthians 105 fn 84
 Passover 22
 Paul 18
 Peleg 119

- Pharaoh Osoronnohphris 99
 Pharisaios 96
 Philistines 268
 Philo of Alexandria 15 fn 11, 17, 149
 fn 76, 153–154, 153 fn 90, 94; 156,
 158, 195–210, 213–215, 215–217,
 219–220, 223–225
 Diaspora consciousness of 195–198;
 on Judaism 203–204
 Philo of Carpasia
 philosophy
 Greek 141 fn 44; Jewish 151–157;
 neo-Pythagorian 202; Platonic 153;
 Pythagorean 202; Stoic 153
 Phoenicia 144
 phylacteries 11–14, 20, 21, 23–24,
 29
 phylakterion (chords) 49, 54, 55,
 56–59, 60, 65, 66, 72
 rituals 57
 Pibechis 98
 pilgrimages 198–201
 Pillars of Hercules 119, 136
 Pipi 88, 88 fn 9
 Pliny the Elder 224
 pollution 41
 polytheism 219–220, 221
 Porphyry 258
 prayer
 of Abraham 33, 34, 41–42, 42–44,
 44–45; in *Aramaic Levi*
 Document 250 fn 25; concerning
 King
 Jonathan 171–172; definition
 of 32–33, 32 fn 6, 44;
 Festival 161–166; of Jacob 92;
 of Manasseh 75–86, authorship
 84, Hebrew version 79, 79 fn 17,
 Syriac version 79, 79 fn 16; of
 Moses 33, 34, 35–37; of Noah
 33, 34, 37–41; Qumran 46
 priests 181, 206–207, 252, 254
 prophecy 16
 proverbs 189
 pseudepigraphy
 Christian 87 fn 3; Jewish 87–88
 Pseudo-Eupolemus 143, 143 fn 49,
 144, 145 fn 60, 146, 146 fn 64, 150,
 152
 Pseudo-Philo 84
 Biblical Antiquities 80, 80 fn 18
 Ptolemaica 107
 Ptolemy Philadelphus, King 221
 Purim 228
 Pyrenees 137 fn 25
 Pythagoreans 202–203
 Qelt Mountains 137, 137 fn 25
 Qumran 29, 31, 32 fn 2, 34, 46,
 54, 158, 158 fn 113, 161–166,
 167–171, 177–192, 243, 249,
 251–255, 276
 community 180; era of 32
 Rabbi Akiba 72
 Rabbi Ismael 72, 279–280
 Rabbi Meir 216
 Rabbenu Gershom Meor HaGolah
 (RGMH) see Gerschom ben
 Jehudah of Mainz
 Rafa Mountains 140
 Raguel 234
 Raphael 233–235, 241
 Rashi 280 fn 45
raz nihyeh 192
 Red Sea 117, 129, 138, 138 fn 29–30
 Rehoboth 147
 relationships 227–242
 reminders 11
 repentance 82–83
 rite/ritual 11–29, 50, 69,
 209
 romance 230–231, 241
 Rome 140
 Sabaoth 88, 105
 sabbath 274, 276, 278–279, 280, 281
 fn 49, 283 fn 5, 281–285
 sabbatical 281
 sacrifice 13 fn 4, 198, 200, 201,
 202–208
 blood 202–203
 Sak 138
 Samaria 144 fn 54, 228
 Samaritans 143, 143 fn 49
 Samuel the Little 257
 Sanir 117
 Sarah 227, 234–236, 237,
 240
 Sardinia 139 fn 36
 Satan 55, 56, 64
 schadenfreude 257
 scribes 27
 temple, priestly Egyptian 95
 science
 Chaldean 144; hellenistic 140
 scoffer 185
 Scythia 138 fn 33

- seals 50–51, 54, 59–65, 60, 62, 65,
 67, 68
 Seal of Solomon 95–96;
 sealing 50, 65
 Second Temple 74, 111–112, 152–3,
 159, 247, 248, 254 fn 43
 era 32, 33, 43
 sectarianism 177–192
 sectarians 251–255
 self-exile 160–161
Septuagint 14–17, 14 fn 6, 15 fn 11,
 20–22, 80, 204, 236
 language 14–15, 15 fn 11, 16, 20,
 22–23, 23 fn 21, 24, 26
 translator/translation 16, 24, 26
 fn 25
 Serug 41
 Seth-Typhon 93, 93 fn 32–34, 94
 settlements, Jewish 196–197, 198
 sexuality 229–233, 239, 241
 Shavuot, ritual 33, 37, 44, 45
 Shekhem 143 fn 49
 Shem 37, 113–116, 114 fn 15, 117,
 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 128, 129,
 130–131, 138, 140, 281
 Sheva 138 fn 30
 Shivar 138, 147
Shi'ur Qomah 63, 64
 signs 11
 Simon 272
 Solomon 146
 Song(s)
 of the Sabbath Sacrifice 51–52
 of Simeon 78
 of Zachariah 78
 Sons of Zadok 180, 181 fn 12
 Souriel 93
 Spain 139 fn 35
 spells 90 fn 19, 93, 97, 103, 193 fn 79
 Coptic 64 fn 73
 Spirit of the Flesh 188
 spiritualization 202–204, 208, 209
 Stele of Jeu the Painter 99, 100
 Stephen 18–19
 supersessionism, Christian 82
 Susan 138 fn 31
 Susannah 227, 229–231, 233, 240
Sybilline Oracles 148–150
 symbols 11, 13
 syncretism 89–92, 98
 Syria 120, 121 fn 47, 129, 130

 Table of Nations 111, 119, 120, 126
 Tanais River 121, 121 fn 45

 Taurus Mountains 117, 119, 121, 122,
 129, 136
 Temple of Onias 143, 143 fn 49
 Teacher of Righteousness 179, 182,
 185, 192, 247, 250, 253 fn 40
 tefillin see phylacteries
 Ten Commandments 20
 Terah 41, 42
Testament of Job 49–74, 69, 71–72,
 73–74
Testament of Levi 16, 245
Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs 54
 Tetragrammaton 54, 63, 71, 217,
 224
te'udah 154–155
 Theodotus 142 fn 48
 theophany, Sinai 154
 Therapeutae 17, 158
 Thoth 105
 Tiberius Julius Alexander 219, 220
 Tigris 117, 122, 123,
 time 154
 Tina River 114, 115, 118, 137, 138,
 138 fn 32
 Tiras 114, 122, 123
 Titan 128 fn 61, 148–149
 Tobias 233–235, 236, 241
Tobit 80, 80 fn 18, 227, 229, 233, 234,
 234 fn 11, 235, 237, 241
Torah 152–154, 181, 186
 tradition 275
 transmission 79–80, 81, 82
 trans-nationalism 193–194,
 210
 Tubal 114, 122, 138
 Tubal-Cain 150
 Tukulti-Ninurta 148 fn 73
 Tyre 146
 Tyrrhenian Sea 115

 Urartu 122 fn 50
 Urim and Thummin 15
 Uzziah 232, 233

 Van Lake 122 fn 50
 Vashti 236
 visions 65–66, 67, 71

 Wadafa River 138
 Watchers 37, 39, 40, 45
 Book of 38
 wickedness 38
Wisdom of Solomon 152, 152 fn 84, 153,
 153–154

women 53, 65–66, 67, 229–240
Words of the Luminaries 167–171

Xerxes 262

yahad 178–184, 186, 192
Yoksan 138 fn 30

Zeus 102–104, 103 fn 76, 143, 146,
148

SUPPLEMENTS
TO THE
JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM

50. YARBRO COLLINS, A. *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism*. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10587 5
51. MENN, E. *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis*. Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10630 8
52. NEUSNER, J. *Jerusalem and Athens*. The Congruity of Talmudic and Classical Philosophy. 1996. ISBN 90 04 10698 7
54. COLLINS, J.J. *Seers, Sibyls & Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10752 5
55. BAUMGARTEN, A.I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10751 7
56. SCOTT, J.M. (ed.). *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10676 6
57. HENTEN, J.-W. VAN. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People. A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. 1997. ISBN 90 04 10976 5
58. FELDMAN, L.H. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. 1998. ISBN 90 04 10839 4
59. MORRAY-JONES, C.R.A. *A Transparent Illusion*. The Dangerous Vision of Water in Hekhalot Mysticism: A Source-Critical and Tradition-Historical Inquiry. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11337 1
60. HALPERN-AMARU, B. *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11414 9
61. HENZE, M. *The Madness of King Nebuchadnezzar*. The Ancient Near Eastern Origins and Early History of Interpretation of Daniel 4. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11421 1
62. VANDERKAM, J.C. *From Revelation to Canon*. Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11557 9
63. NEWMAN, C.C., J.R. DAVILA & G.S. LEWIS (eds.). *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism*. Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11361 4
64. LIESEN, J.W.M. *Full of Praise*. An Exegetical Study of Sir 39,12-35. 1999. ISBN 90 04 11359 2
65. BEDFORD, P.R. *Temple Restoration in Early Achaemenid Judah*. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11509 9
66. RUITEN, J.T.A.G.M. VAN. *Primaeval History Interpreted*. The Rewriting of Genesis 1-11 in the book of Jubilees. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11658 3

67. HOFMANN, N.J. *Die Assumptio Mosis*. Studien zur Rezeption massgültiger Überlieferung. 2000. ISBN 90 04 11938 8
68. HACHLILI, R. *The Menorah, the Ancient Seven-armed Candelabrum*. Origin, Form and Significance. 2001. ISBN 90 04 12017 3
69. VELTRI, G. *Gegenwart der Tradition*. Studien zur jüdischen Literatur und Kulturgeschichte. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11686 9
70. DAVILA, J.R. *Descenders to the Chariot*. The People behind the Hekhalot Literature. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11541 2
71. PORTER, S.E. & J.C.R. DE ROO (eds.). *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11609 5
72. SCOTT, J.M. (ed.). *Restoration*. Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives. 2001. ISBN 90 04 11580 3
73. TORIJANO, P.A. *Solomon the Esoteric King*. From King to Magus, Development of a Tradition. 2002. ISBN 90 04 11941 8
74. KUGEL, J.L. *Shem in the Tents of Japhet*. Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12514 0
75. COLAUTTI, F.M. *Passover in the Works of Josephus*. 2002. ISBN 90 04 12372 5
76. BERTHELOT, K. *Philanthrôpia judaica*. Le débat autour de la "misanthropie" des lois juives dans l'Antiquité. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12886 7
77. NAJMAN, H. *Seconding Sinai*. The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism. 2003. ISBN 90 04 11542 0
78. MULDER, O. *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50*. An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12316 4
79. BURKES, S.L. *God, Self, and Death*. The Shape of Religious Transformation in the Second Temple Period. 2003. ISBN 90 04 12954 5
80. NEUSNER, J. & A.J. AVERY-PECK (eds.). *George W.E. Nickelsburg in Perspective*. An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning (2 vols.). 2003. ISBN 90 04 12987 1 (set)
81. COBLENTZ BAUTCH, K. *A Study of the Geography of 1 Enoch 17-19*. "No One Has Seen What I Have Seen". 2003. ISBN 90 04 13103 5
82. GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, F., & G.P. LUTTIKHUIZEN. *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome*. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst. 2003. ISBN 90 04 13584 7
83. NAJMAN, H. & J.H. NEWMAN (eds.). *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation*. Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13630 4
84. ATKINSON, K. *I Cried to the Lord*. A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13614 2
85. AVERY-PECK, A.J., D. HARRINGTON & J. NEUSNER. *When Judaism and Christianity Began*. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13659 2 (Set), ISBN 90 04 13660 6 (Volume I), ISBN 90 04 13661 4 (Volume II)
86. DRAWNEL, H. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran*. A New Interpretation of the Levi Document. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13753 X

87. BERTHELOT, K. *L'humanité de l'autre homme» dans la pensée juive ancienne*. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13797 1
88. BONS, E. (ed.) «*Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice . . .*». Recherches sur Osée 6:6 et son interprétation juive et chrétienne. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13677 0
89. CHAZON, E.G., D. SATRAN & R. CLEMENTS (eds.). *Things Revealed*. Studies in Honor of Michael E. Stone. 2004. ISBN 90 04 13885 4
90. FLANNERY-DAILEY, F. *Dreamers, Scribes, and Priests*. Jewish Dreams in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras. 2004. ISBN 90 04 12367 9
91. SCOTT, J.M. *On Earth as in Heaven*. The Restoration of Sacred Time and Sacred Space in the Book of Jubilees. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13796 3
92. RICHARDSON, P. *Building Jewish in the Roman East*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14131 6
93. BATSCH, C. *La guerre et les rites de guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13897 8
94. HACHLLI, R. *Jewish Funerary Customs, Practices and Rites in the Second Temple Period*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 12373 3
95. BAKHOS, C. *Ancient Judaism in its Hellenistic Context*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13871 4
97. NEUSNER, J. *Contours of Coherence in Rabbinic Judaism*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14231 2 (Set), ISBN 90 04 14436 6 (Volume I), ISBN 90 04 14437 4 (Volume II)
98. XERAVITS, G.G. & J. ZSENGELLÉR (eds.). *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20-21 May, 2004. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14376 9
99. ROSENFELD, B-Z. & J. MENIRAV (Translated from the Hebrew by Chava Cassel). *Markets and Marketing in Roman Palestine*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14049 2
100. COLLINS, J.J. *Jewish Cult and Hellenistic Culture*. Essays on the Jewish Encounter with Hellenism and Roman Rule. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14438 2
101. NEUSNER, J. *Rabbinic Categories*. Construction and Comparison. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14578 8
102. SIVERTSEV, A.M. *Households, Sects, and the Origins of Rabbinic Judaism*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14447 1
103. BEYERLE, S. *Gottesvorstellungen in der antik-jüdischen Apokalyptik*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13116 7
104. SIEVERS, J. & G. LEMBI (eds.). *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 14179 0
105. DAVILA, J.R. *The Provenance of the Pseudepigrapha*. Jewish, Christian, or Other? 2005. ISBN 90 04 13752 1
106. BAKHOS, C. (ed.) *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash*. 2005. ISBN 90 04 13870 6

107. FELDMAN, L.H. *Judaism and Hellenism Reconsidered*. 2006.
ISBN 90 04 14906 6
108. BRUTTI, M. *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period*. History, Ideology, Theology. 2006. ISBN 90 04 14910 4
109. VELTRI, G. *Libraries, Translations, and "Canonic" Texts*. The Septuagint, Aquila and Ben Sira in the Jewish and Christian Traditions. 2006.
ISBN 90 04 14993 7
110. RODGERS, Z. (ed.) *Making History*. Josephus and Historical Method. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15008 0
111. HEMPEL, C. & J. M. LIEU (eds.) *Biblical Traditions in Transmission*. Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb. 2006. ISBN 90 04 13997 4
112. GRAPPE, Ch. & J.-C. INGELAERE (éds.) *Le Temps et les Temps dans les littératures juives et chrétiennes au tournant de notre ère*. 2006.
ISBN 90 04 15058 7
113. CAPPELLETTI, S. *The Jewish Community of Rome*. From the Second Century B. C. to the Third Century C.E. 2006. ISBN 90 04 15157 5
114. ORLOV, A.A. *From Apocalypticism to Merkabah Mysticism Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15439 1,
ISBN-10: 90 04 15439 6
115. MACASKILL, G. *Revealed Wisdom and Inaugurated Eschatology in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15582 4,
ISBN-10: 90 04 15582 1
116. DVORJETSKI, E. *Leisure, Pleasure and Healing Spa Culture and Medicine in Ancient Eastern Mediterranean*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15681 4,
ISBN-10: 90 04 15681 X
117. SEGAL, M. *The Book of Jubilees Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15057 7, ISBN-10: 90 04 15057 9
118. XERAVITS, G.G. & J. ZSENGELLÉR (eds.). *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology*. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9-11 June, 2005. 2007. ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15700 2, ISBN-10: 90 04 15700 X
119. LiDONNICI, L. & A. LIEBER (eds.). *Heavenly Tablets*. Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism. 2007.
ISBN-13: 978 90 04 15856 6, ISBN-10: 90 04 15856 1

