

DE GRUYTER

*Devorah Dimant,
Reinhard G. Kratz (Eds.)*

REWRITING AND INTERPRETING THE HEBREW BIBLE

THE BIBLICAL PATRIARCHS IN THE LIGHT OF THE
DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible

Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die
alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
John Barton · F. W. Dobbs-Allsopp
Reinhard G. Kratz · Markus Witte

Band 439

De Gruyter

Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible

The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light
of the Dead Sea Scrolls

Edited by
Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-029042-4
e-ISBN 978-3-11-029055-4
ISSN 0934-2575

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2013 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen
∞ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany
www.degruyter.com

Preface

In the past two decades, many previously unknown texts from Qumran that rework passages from the Hebrew Bible have been published. Dated to the second and first centuries BCE, these documents attest to the methods of biblical exegesis employed during the transitional phase between the finalizing of the literary and textual shape of the Hebrew Bible and the commencement of extra-biblical interpretation. At this early stage, the book of Genesis was the object of multiple reworking and exegetical elaborations and, therefore, has been selected as the subject of the present volume, with a particular emphasis on the patriarchs and the relationship between narrative and law. The volume thus contributes to the understanding of the early exegesis of the book of Genesis and the patriarchal tradition, and the prehistory of this tradition within the Hebrew Bible.

The volume is concerned in particular with the links displayed by Qumranic biblical interpretation to inner-biblical interpretation and the final shaping of the Hebrew Scriptures. Moshe Bar-Asher studies cases of inner-biblical interpretative comments while Emanuel Tov investigates the phenomenon of harmonizations within the textual history of the patriarchal stories. Moshe Bernstein provides an overview of the references to the patriarchs in the Qumran scrolls. Three contributions deal with primeval history as the preamble to the lives of the patriarchs. Michael Segal treats the garden of Eden story in the scrolls and other contemporary Jewish sources. Devorah Dimant examines how the Flood story is viewed in the Qumran scrolls while Reinhard Kratz analyses this story and its tradition history in the Hebrew Bible. Roman Vielhauer explores the story of Sodom and Gomorrah both in the Hebrew Bible and in the scrolls. George Brooke and Atar Livneh discuss aspects of Jacob's career. Harald Samuel reviews the career of Levi while Liora Goldman examines the Aramaic *Visions of Amram*. Lawrence Schiffman and Aharon Shemesh analyse halakhic aspects of stories about the patriarchs.

The essays assembled in this volume are based on the lectures given in an international symposium held in Göttingen, May 2–4, 2011 as part of the German-Israeli cooperative project "The Interpretation of the Book of Genesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," funded by the *Deutsche*

Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) and organized under the auspices of the *Centrum Orbis Orientalis et Occidentalis* (Centre for Ancient and Oriental Studies of the University of Göttingen and the Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Göttingen). We would like to express our gratitude to the contributors from England, Germany, Israel and the United States for their participation in the symposium and their valuable articles. Our thanks are due to the *Lichtenberg-Kolleg* of the Georg-August University, Göttingen for funding and hosting this conference. Both editors of this volume as well as Emanuel Tov were fortunate to be elected fellows of the *Kolleg* during the academic year 2010–2011 and they would like to thank its former director, Professor Dagmar Coester-Waltjen, for the generous and unfailing support in all relevant respects. Further, we thank the editors of the series *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Prof. Dr. John Barton (Oxford) and Prof. Dr. Markus Witte (Berlin), in cooperation with the publishing house De Gruyter (Berlin), for accepting the volume for publication and the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG) for their financial support for the printing of the volume. Last but not least, we owe special thanks to stud. theol. Laura Victoria Schimmelpfennig and stud. theol. Johannes Müller who prepared the manuscript and the indices.

Haifa and Göttingen, November 2012
Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz

Table of Contents

<i>Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz</i>	
Preface.....	v
<i>Moshe Bar-Asher</i>	
The Bible Interpreting Itself	1
<i>Emanuel Tov</i>	
Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs	19
<i>Moshe J. Bernstein</i>	
Where Are the Patriarchs in the Literature of Qumran?.....	51
<i>Michael Segal</i>	
The First Patriarchs: Law and Narrative in the Garden of Eden Story	77
<i>Devorah Dimant</i>	
The Flood as a Preamble to the Lives of the Patriarchs: The Perspective of Qumran Hebrew Texts.....	101
<i>Reinhard G. Kratz</i>	
The Flood as a Preamble to the Lives of the Patriarchs: The Biblical Perspective.....	135
<i>Roman Vielhauer</i>	
Sodom and Gomorrah: From the Bible to Qumran	147
<i>George J. Brooke</i>	
Jacob and His House in the Scrolls from Qumran	171
<i>Atar Livneh</i>	
With My Sword and Bow: Jacob as Warrior in <i>Jubilees</i>	189
<i>Harald Samuel</i>	
Levi, the Levites, and the Law.....	215

<i>Liora Goldman</i>	
The Burial of the Fathers in the <i>Visions of Amram</i> from Qumran.	231
<i>Lawrence H. Schiffman</i>	
The Patriarchs and Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls	251
<i>Aharon Shemesh</i>	
Shabbat, Circumcision and Circumcision on Shabbat in Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls	263
Index	289

The Bible Interpreting Itself

Moshe Bar-Asher

Introduction

1. In this study I would like to comment on the phenomenon which can be called "The Bible as the interpreter of its own language."¹ Certain aspects of this phenomenon have been well known for a long time,

1 Various aspects of internal commentary in the Bible have been discussed in studies conducted in the previous generation; I will mention only a few: Fishbane 1985, and in some of Yair Zakovitch's studies. Firstly in Zakovitch 1986, and later, and in greater detail, in Zakovitch 1992. Occasionally, linguistic topics are dealt with in studies such as these (example 19 on p. 25 in Zakovitch's book is brought below in § 12; I will also mention the examples alluded below n. 40 in Yellin 1983, 280–291). However, I have not seen anyone who has presented the issues in the way that they are presented here: a linguistic explanation of words and expressions, primarily in context, while presenting four different aspects of the phenomenon, with explicit examples. Beyond the others, there is the comprehensive and instructive study by Abraham Kariv "The Bible Interpreting Itself." An updated version of this study appears in Kariv 1970, 239–263. His exegetical comments on the verses he deals with come in the course of his commentary, that is the word being explained and its explanation appear in one sequence (in sort of glosses). For example, in the verse "he called up his retainers, born into his household" (Gen. 14:14) the phrase "born into his household" explains "his retainers." Many good, sensible examples appear in this study, but there are also some unconvincing, and even baseless, ones. In any event, my study differs from his. I almost never deal with the many small details of a running commentary in this study. Two examples deal with synonyms that appear consecutively in the text: "in troughs – the water receptacles" (Gen. 30:38, in Kariv 1970, 240); "then is the prey of a great spoil divided" (Isa. 33:23, in Kariv 1970, 262). In his study these examples are two of many whereas in my study this type is mentioned only casually (see below § 15). We disagree about the explanation of the third example. In the sentence "and [he] became a young man, an archer" (Gen. 21:20, this example appears in Kariv 1970, 239) he believes that the word *qāššāt* explains the word *rōbe*, implying he understood the word *rōbe* is equivalent to "shooting [arrows]." I am of the opinion that the word *rōbe* means "young man" and the word *hanna'r* that appears in the first part of the verse comes to clarify the meaning of *rōbe* that appears in the second part (see below §§ 19–21 and n. 37). I wish to say already now that in the phenomenon dealt with in this study, Biblical style serves linguistic ends, whether intentionally or unintentionally.

while others less so. The best known aspect is an explanation that becomes evident in the language of Biblical poetry from the use of synonyms in parallel hemistiches. Obviously, it is possible to use synonyms that appear in parallel to each other even outside of the realm of parallelism in order to clarify the exact usage of many words.² On this aspect I shall offer a few short comments.

2. A more interesting example of this phenomenon is the use of Hebrew words or Aramaic loanwords, or the application of an uncommon usage to standard Hebrew words, whose exact meaning becomes clear from their immediate context or from their parallel context. I do not mean to imply that in every place where the interpretation is evident, the explanation is the explicit intention of the author. It is very possible that in most cases the meaning is expressed unintentionally. In order to express stylistic variations in a specific context, the author employs a rare word in Biblical Hebrew. The author then uses in proximity to the rare word a more common and more frequently used word or expression, parallel to the rare word and the meaning of the rare word thus becomes evident. I shall deal with a number of examples of different types where the Bible interprets itself in a given context and I shall comment thereon when necessary. I shall open with better known examples and then proceed to the lesser known. I believe that both kinds of examples will clarify an important phenomenon in Biblical literature and language.

2 In recent decades a number of scholars have researched Biblical Parallelism. I will mention only two: The seven chapters of Kugel 1981 are replete with material and extremely important discussions. I wish to emphasize that the stress is very often on poetry. I also want to mention the important work by Berlin 1985. This book, in its six chapters, focuses on linguistic issues (Here are the topics of four chapters – chap. II: The Linguistic Study of Biblical Parallelism; chap. III: The Grammatical Aspect; chap. IV: The Lexical and Semantic Aspects; chap. V: The Phonological Aspect: Sound Pairs). Without a doubt these two books contain important discussions on the topic of parallelism. Anyone interested in this topic will find in them interesting material and thorough discussions. My study in parallelism presented here is extremely short and is presented primarily as a first chapter in a short study dedicated to a comprehensive topic – The Bible interpreting its own words.

Words that Explain and Words that are Explained

A. Parallelism and Parallel Verses

3. I shall begin with the well known phenomenon of synonyms and expressions that appear parallel to each other in a Biblical verse. This is especially characteristic of the language of Biblical poetry, whether the parallelism is synonymous or complimentary, or whether it is antithetical or otherwise. For example, אַף (*ap*), עֲבָרָה (*'ebra*), עֵז (*'az*) and קֶשֶׁה (*qāšē*) in the verse אָרוּר אַפָּם כִּי עֵז, וְעֲבָרָתָם כִּי קֶשֶׁה "Cursed be their fury so fierce, And their wrath so relentless!" (Gen. 49:7), or the pairs עֵיר (*'ayir*) and בֶּן אֲתוֹן (*ben 'aton*), יַיִן (*yayin*) and דָּם עֲנָבִים (*dam 'anabim*) in the verse עֵירָה וְלִשְׂרָקָה בְּנֵי אֲתוֹנוֹ, כֶּבֶס בֵּינָו לְבָשׂוּ וּבָדָם עֲנָבִים סוּתָה "He tethers his ass to a vine, His purebred to the choicest stem; In wine he washes his garments, His robes in the blood of grapes." (ibid. 11). In all of these pairs, each word clarifies the meaning of the other.³ Of course, for the reader of the text, the clarification of the less common word by means of the more common one is of greater importance.

4. This is also true in the case of the pair of common nouns שֵׁם (*šēm*) and זֵכֶר (*zēker*). These appear in the same verse in antithetical parallelism: זֵכֶר צְדִיק לְבָרָכָה, וְשֵׁם רָשָׁעִים יִרְקָב "The name of the righteous is invoked in blessing, but the fame of the wicked rots." (Prov. 10:7), or in synonymous parallelism: זֶה שְׁמִי לְעֹלָם, וְזֶה זְכָרִי לְדֹר דֹּר "This is my name to eternity, and this is my designation (by) age" (Exod. 3:15).⁴ In fact both of them – *šēm* and *zēker* – have the same meaning ("name"). Sometimes the two synonymous nouns could come one after the other in one utterance with the same syntactical function. For example, the two nouns come one after the other in the verse לְשִׁמּוֹד וּלְזִכְרָךְ תִּאֲוֹת נִקְשׁ "To invoke your

3 I did not mention the two words גֶּפֶן (*gepen*) and שׁוֹרְקָה (*šōrēqā*) which are parallel to each other in the two first hemistiches of this verse. This is because based upon evidence from Ugaritic, Syriac and other sources scholars have explained these words in ways which differ from the traditional explanation (see Greenfield 2001, 847 n. 2). Greenfield cites Ginzberg 1933, 83, and also the comment of J. N. Epstein, editor of Tarbiz. Greenfield added important comments of his own (I wish to thank Steven Fassberg who brought Greenfield's article to my attention). I would like to add: Yitshak Avishur studied extensively the subject of word pairs in the Bible in his articles and books and made important contributions in this matter. He began his research into this subject in his comprehensive doctoral dissertation (Avishur 1974). He continued researching the subject and published many studies, as can be seen from the extensive bibliography in Avishur 2004. In the present study I concentrate on one aspect alone of this topic.

4 It is not superfluous to state that while this verse is in a prose context, it is built in the structure of Biblical poetry.

name is the soul's desire" (Isa. 26:8).⁵ From the three aforementioned verses we can understand parallel uses of the pair שם and יָכַר (*šēm*, *zēker*) in other portions of the Bible. For example in the verses כִּי מָחָה אֶמְחָה אֶת יָכַר אֶת יָכַר עֲמֹלֵק "I will eradicate, eradicate *zēker* of Amalek" (Exod. 17:14), יְמַחֵה אֶת יָכַר עֲמֹלֵק "you shall blot out *zēker* of Amalek" (Deut. 25:19) on the one hand, compared to וְלֹא יִמָּחַשׂ שְׁמוֹ מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל "that his *šēm* may not be obliterated in Israel" (Deut. 25:6), בְּדוֹר אֶחָד יִמָּחַשׂ שְׁמָם "From the age to come their *šēm* erased" (Ps. 109:13). This comparison shows that the obliteration of *zēker* is equivalent to the obliteration of *šēm*.

5. The occurrence of a pair of words parallel to each other can assist in clarifying the exact meaning of the rare word. I would like to mention the example of one word of a pair of words that is explained with two meanings. It seems to me that the parallel helps favor one meaning over the other. For example in the verse קָחוּט הַשָּׁנִי שֶׁפְתוֹתַיִךְ וּמִדְבָרְךָ נְאוּנָה "Like a scarlet fillet your lips, Your mouth comely" (Song. 4:3). The *hapax legomenon* מְדַבֵּר (*midbār*) occurs here which is derived from the root ד-ב-ר I which signifies "the production of speech from the mouth." This word has no connection with the common noun מְדַבֵּר, derived from the root ד-ב-ר II which signifies "an unsettled area" or "pasture."⁶ (A) Some explain מְדַבֵּר in the above verse as speech ("דיבור"), that is, the verbal noun of the verb דָּבַר (similar to דָּבַר) in the nominal pattern *Miqṭāl*, like מְשַׁפֵּט from the verb שָׁפַט. For example, the Aramaic Targum to Song of Songs translates the pair of words שֶׁפְתוֹתַיִךְ/מִדְבָרְךָ as שֶׁפְתוֹ/מִלּוֹי.

5 See § 15 below.

6 This is apparent from the verse וַיְהִיג אֶת הַצֹּאן אַחֲרֵי הַמְדַבֵּר "He led the flock along the side of the *pasture*" (Exod. 3:1) and is reflected in the adjective מְדַבֵּרִי which appears, for example, in the Mishnah אין מִשְׁקוֹ וְשׁוֹחֲטִין אֶת הַמְדַבֵּרִיּוֹת, אֲבָל מִשְׁקוֹ וְשׁוֹחֲטִין אֶת הַבְּיָתוּיּוֹת. אֵלּוּ הֵן הַמְדַבֵּרִיּוֹת? הַלְנֹת בְּעֵיר; הַמְדַבֵּרִיּוֹת? הַלְנֹת בְּאֶפְרַיִם. הַבְּיָתוּיּוֹת? הַלְנֹת בְּעֵיר; הַמְדַבֵּרִיּוֹת? הַלְנֹת בְּאֶפְרַיִם. Which are deemed household animals? Such as spend the night in a town. And animals of the pasture? Such that spend the night in [more distant] pasturage." (mBets 5.6).

7 As is known, the verb דָּבַר (in the Qal stem) is attested in the Bible only in the participle (and once in the verbal noun), for example דַּבֵּר "[I] speak" (Exod. 6:29), דוֹבְרֵי שָׁקֶר "those telling lies" (Ps. 63:12), and in מִדְבָרְךָ "when you sentence" (Ps. 51:6). Forms such as דָּבַר, דְּבַר where switched in an ancient period to their parallel forms in the Pi'el stem (דָּבַר, דְּבַר), just as happened to other verbs which shifted from the Qal stem to the Pi'el stem during the period of the Second Temple and in Mishnaic Hebrew. When the Pi'el forms replaced the Qal forms, the Qal participle (דָּבַר) continued to be used in the Biblical text. This is because the use of the Pi'el participle would not only require changes in vocalization but also changes to the consonantal text: the addition of the letter *mem* – דָּבַר > דְּבַר; and also the removal of the *waw* when used as *mater lectionis* – דָּבַר > דְּבַר. Those who switched the first reading (דָּבַר) for the second reading (דְּבַר, דְּבַר), almost never touched the consonantal text.

Rashi also explains this way: "מדברך, דבורך"; as does Kaddari in his dictionary ("דיבור").⁸ (B) On the other hand, BDB⁹, HALOT¹⁰ and others explain it as "mouth."¹¹ It seems to me that from the parallel to שְׁפֹתֶיךָ (your lips) in the first hemistich, it would be more logical to assume that the noun מְדַבֵּר signifies "mouth" – מְדַבְּרֶךָ meaning "your mouth." In the two hemistiches there appear nouns which signify "speech organs."¹² As is well known, the nominal pattern *Miqṭāl* signifies various objects such as מְרִיק "basin" (Num. 7:13), מְקַמֵּר "net" (Isa. 51:20).¹³

6. There are also synonyms that do not appear in parallel hemistiches of one verse but rather in two parallel verses from different portions of the Bible while having an identical or very similar structure.

8 However he comments that one of the commentators explained this as "the point of the tongue" (see Kaddari 2006, 580). I will not deal with the question of the alternate orthographic form מדברך on which Kaddari bases his comment that this is a plural form (This orthographic form appears in the Leningrad [St. Petersburg] Ms. as it appears in Dotan TANAKH, but not in Breuer TANAKH). Even-Shoshan 2006–2009, 887, gives the definition דבור.

9 See Brown, Driver, and Briggs 1962, 184. BDB indicates the parallel to שְׁפֹתֶיךָ (your lips).

10 Köhler and Baumgartner 1994–2000, 2:547 (this dictionary also brings the orthographic form מדברך).

11 See n. 12.

12 Ben-Yehudah 1980, 2795, gives the definition דבור "speech" but comments "most of the new [scholars] explain this word to have the meaning 'speech organs' i.e. 'the mouth' but the editor rejects this explanation by means of a strange explanation "after describing the lips there is no need to describe the mouth." If that is the case, all parallels present difficulties. The editor ends his comment by saying that "the early [scholars] explain this word to have the meaning 'speech' and this [meaning] has spread throughout the literature."

13 Clearly, we need not take from parallelism more than it contains. For example, in the verse וְטַעַם זְקֵנִים יִקַּח מְסִיר שִׁפְהָ לְנַאֲמָנִים, "The confident he deprives of speech, takes away the reason of elders" (Job 12:20). Some explained this verse as referring to the removal of language, i.e. the power of speech from the נַאֲמָנִים "confident," the meaning here is that the נַאֲמָנִים (*ne^emānīm*) here are הַנוֹאֲמִים (*hannō^amīm*), i.e. "the speakers"; נַאֲמָן (*ne^emān*) here is a noun in the nominal pattern *pa'lān* with the root א-מ-ן and not the participle of the root א-מ-ן in the *Nifal* stem. If that is the case, this would be a new noun to add to the single noun in Biblical Hebrew in the nominal pattern *pa'lān* – רַחֲמָנִיּוֹת (*rah^amāniyyōt*) "kindly [women]" (Lam. 4:10). However, this sharp suggestion is not supported by the parallelism. While the verbs יִקַּח and מְסִיר in the parallel hemistiches are equivalent in meaning, this is not the case with the nouns נַאֲמָנִים (= speakers) and זְקֵנִים. In fact, this is an example of complimentary parallelism and not synonymous parallelism (See Hakham 1970, 95 n. 20b. He brings the traditional explanation for נַאֲמָנִים [the participle of the root א-מ-ן in the *Nifal* stem] and mentions [in n. 20b] the second explanation "masters of the art of [eloquent] speech" but rejects it. I am not convinced by the reasons given for his rejection but, as I have already said, we need not take from parallelism more than it contains).

Such a case is the verb *שָׁמַר* with the meaning "remember" in a few Biblical verses, for example in the fourth commandment in the two parallel versions of the Decalogue; *זָכוֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ* "Remember the Sabbath day to sanctify it" (Exod. 20:8) as opposed to *שְׁמֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ* "Observe the Sabbath day to keep it holy" (Deut. 5:12). The Rabbis gave a beautiful homiletic commentary to this parallel: "Remember" and "Observe" were both spoken at one utterance (Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, BaHodesh 7).¹⁴ However, the Biblical text is to be understood according to its plain meaning. From this parallelism we learn that there are verses in the Bible wherein the meaning of *שָׁמַר* is "remember" (namely: *שְׁמֹר אֶת יוֹם הַשַּׁבָּת לְקַדְּשׁוֹ* "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy"). From this we can understand the verse *וַאֲבִיו שָׁמַר אֶת הַדְּבָר* "and his father *שָׁמַר* the matter" (Gen. 37:11) which is said of Jacob after he hears Joseph's dreams, which should be understood as "his father remembered the dreams."¹⁵

7. As is well known, from two parallel verses not in the same context but expressing the same content and having a similar structure we can understand many words and expressions. For example, by comparing the two clauses *לֹא תַחְמַד בֵּית רֵעֶךָ* "don't covet your fellow's house" (Exod. 20:14) and *לֹא תַחְמַד בֵּית רֵעִי* "you shall not covet your neighbor's house" (Deut. 5:18), we can understand that from the point of view of the verse in Deuteronomy, *חָמַד* and *הַתְּחַמְדָּה* have the same meaning. From two verses with a similar structure and content we can understand that *שָׁמַר* and *נִשְׂאָה שֵׁם* have the same meaning. This is clear from the verses: *לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת שֵׁם ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשׂוֹן* "Don't raise God's name for nothing" (Exod. 20:7); *וְלֹא תִשָּׁבַע בְּשֵׁם ה' אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשָׁקֵר* "And you shall not swear falsely by my name" (Lev. 19:12). Onkelos, for example, translates *לֹא תִשָּׂא אֶת שֵׁם ה'* as *לֹא תִימִי* 'בְּשֵׁם דֵּה' ("Do not swear in the Lord's name"). This is similar to the translation *וְלֹא תִשָּׁבַע בְּשֵׁם ה'* of the words *בְּשֵׁם ה'* from the aforementioned verse in Leviticus.

14 See Horovitz and Rabin 1970, 229. Rashi quotes this homily but changes the order of the words in his commentary to Exod. 20:7; in his commentary to Deut. 5:19 he quotes from the original and adds: "both [words] were spoken in one utterance and in one word and were heard together." What did Rashi mean by his addition? Could he have meant that *זָכוֹר* and *שְׁמֹר* are two words that are one in respect of their meaning? It is hard to say.

15 Especially appropriate is Rashi's comment on this verse: "He awaited the matter with anticipation for when it would be fulfilled." Is it possible to understand from this comment that the verb *שָׁמַר* is to be understood "remembered the dream and awaited with anticipation its fulfillment?" If so, then my explanation has been anticipated by Rashi, but I fear that I may be looking in his words for what is missing.

8. Certainly, the use of different words, one Hebrew and one foreign, in parallel verses in contexts far removed from each other in the Biblical text is also a known phenomenon. For example, when the reader encounters the unusual word פָּדָן (*paddān*), like in the verse אֲשֶׁר רָכַשׁ אָרָם בְּפָדָן אָרָם "the property in his possession] that he had acquired in *Paddan-Aram*" (Gen. 31:18)¹⁶, the Bible provides the explanation in another context. The verses state וַיֵּלֶךְ פְּדָנָה אָרָם [...] וְשָׁלַח [...] "Go at once to *Paddan-Aram* ... and he went to *Paddan-aram*...he sent him to *Paddan-aram*" (Gen. 28:2, 5–6). Already at the beginning of this portion of the narrative, the action of "going" is called "flight": וַיִּפְּדֵם אֶת־לָבָן אֶת־יָקֹב לְבָרְהָהּ "flee at once to my brother Laban in Haran" (Gen. 27:43). The narrative of Jacob's flight is echoed in another story in the Bible: וַיִּבְרַח יַעֲקֹב שָׂדֵה אֲרָם "Jacob fled to the field of Aram" (Hos. 12:13). We learn from this that פָּדָן (אָרָם) in Genesis is expressed as שָׂדֵה (אָרָם) in the language of Hosea.¹⁷ Hence, שָׂדֵה (*śādē*) and פָּדָן are synonyms in Biblical Hebrew.¹⁸

B. The Explicit Suggestion of the Explanation

9. In addition to parallelism in the same verse or parallel verses in different contexts as already mentioned, sometimes two words appear in the same context – one word more common than the other, or a common word that appears in parallel to a common word with a rare meaning, or a Hebrew word or expression in parallel to a foreign word or expression – and from the parallelism in context the meaning becomes apparent without need of external commentary. I shall bring two examples and offer some short comments.

10. A well known example of this phenomenon is the explanation given for the two Aramaic words in Genesis וַיַּעֲשׂוּ אֲבָנִים וַיַּעֲשׂוּ גֹל [...] וַיִּקְרָא לוֹ "They got stones and made a mound ... La-

16 This noun occurs eleven times in the Bible – only in the book of Genesis. Ten times it comes in *status constructus* in the phrase פָּדָן אָרָם, including with *he locale* אָרָם פְּדָנָה, except in the final occurrence in Genesis. In this case without the *nomen rectum* (Gen. 48:7).

17 In cognate languages the noun פָּדָן has different meanings: "garden," "field," "yoke," "span of oxen" (see BDB and HALOT in this entry).

18 In Arabic the meaning of فدان is "a sown field." I wish to point out that the meaning "field" for the noun فدان is the meaning that I have known since my youth from both the Jewish and Muslim dialects of Moroccan Arabic. This noun signifies especially "a field for growing cereal grains." This meaning is brought by Georges Séraphin Colin in his dictionary (see Sinaceur 1993, 1431).

ban named it *Y^egar-sāh^adūtā*, but Jacob called it *Gal'ēd*." (Gen. 31:46–47). The Hebrew noun גַּלְעָד (which is a compound word based on two other words) clarifies the parallel Aramaic expression שְׁהִדְוִתָּא יִגְר. The Aramaic יִגְר (*y^egar*) is גַּל (*gal*) in Hebrew and שְׁהִדְוִתָּא (*śāh^adūtā*) is equivalent to עַד (*ēd*).

11. It is important to note that in Biblical Hebrew עַד signifies mostly "witness, one who gives testimony," for example in the verse עַד יְקוּם עַד אֶחָד בְּאִישׁ "A single witness may not validate against a person" (Deut. 19:15). It signifies also "testimony" itself, as the early scholars understood in some Biblical verses. For example, Onkelos translates the phrase עַד שְׁקָר in the verse לֹא תַעֲבֹד בְּרַעְדֵּךְ עַד שְׁקָר "Don't testify against your fellow as a false witness" (Exod. 20:13) as שְׁהִדְוִתָּא דְשְׁקָרָא (false testimony). The Peshitta also translates this way – דְגַלְתָּא סְהִדְוִתָּא. Other occurrences of the noun עַד are translated this way in the Peshitta: the expression יְבִאֵהוּ עַד "let him bring it, evidence" (Exod. 22:12) is translated into Syriac as וּנְיִתְהוּי לְסְהִדְוִתָּא. Also the verse צְבָאוֹת יְהוָה וְהָיָה לְאוֹת וּלְעֵד לַיהוָה "It will serve as a sign and testimony to the Lord of hosts" (Isa. 19:20), is translated in the Peshitta as וְתִהְיֶה לְאִתָּא וּלְסְהִדְוִתָּא לְמַרְיָא חִילְתָּנָא. Therefore, we should say that the phrase יִגְר שְׁהִדְוִתָּא should be understood as "The Hill of Testimony."¹⁹

12. Similarly, there is the case of a Hebrew word which is used in one chapter in the Bible with an unusual meaning. 1 Sam. 9:9 reads כֹּה אָמַר הָאִישׁ בְּלִכְתּוֹ לְדָרוֹשׁ אֶת אֱלֹהִים: 'לִכּוּ וְנִלְכְּהוּ עַד הָרְאָה' כִּי לִנְבִיא הָיִים יִקְרָא לְפָנָיִם הָרְאָה "Formerly in Israel when a man went to inquire of God," he said, "Come let us go to the seer! For someone who would be called today the prophet was formerly called the seer." The word הָרְאָה (*hā-rō'ē*) appears a number of times in this story (in vv. 11, 18 and 19 of this chapter) but since it is not used in its usual meaning, it is explained after the first occurrence in v. 9.

In these two examples the clarification of the word in question is explicit. The first example involves translation between two languages. In the second example the Bible gives the reader a diachronic lexical

19 There are other participial forms which function as verbal nouns or as abstract nouns. For example, the participle פִּיתָה (*pōtēah*) in the common Mishnaic phrase פִּיתָה טְפַח (for example in mShab 24.5; mOhal 3.7) means "the opening of one square handbreath." Another example would be the word עָז in the expression יִתַּר עָז וְיִתַּר "Exceeding in rank and exceeding in honor!" (Gen. 49:3); עָז is equivalent to עָז, in the same position as שָׂאת in the first portion of the expression. Similarly the form קַל (*qal*) in the expression קַל וְחוּמָר, which is equal to קַל like in the expression קוֹל וְחוּמָר which appears in reliable manuscripts of Mishnaic Hebrew (see Kutscher 1972, and see additional material and a short discussion of this phenomenon in Bar-Asher 2009, 169–170).

definition; a short lesson, as it was, in the history of the Hebrew language.

C. The Use of an Explanatory Word or Expression

13. I shall now present examples of a different kind and analyze them. I have already shown elsewhere that the Bible sometimes employs partially concealed explanatory language (or to be more exact: partially revealed explanatory language) while explaining itself in context. I am referring to my study of the meaning of the word יָדִיד (*yādīd*) in the Bible. In one place the Bible explains this word, without explicitly stating that it does so. When this noun appears in the context of Solomon's names, the author of the text shows from context that יָדִיד means "beloved."²⁰ The text explicitly states וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שְׁמוֹ יְדִידְיָהּ²¹ בְּעִבְרַת ה' "he was to be called Yedidyah by the grace of God" (2 Sam. 12:25). In the preceding verse, while presenting the other name – Solomon – which is the more common name of יְדִידְיָהּ, even before the less common name is mentioned, it states וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שְׁמוֹ שְׁלֹמֹה וְה' אָהֲבֵהוּ "He called him Solomon and God loved him" (ibid v. 24). The verse explicitly states that God loves him, implying that יְדִידְיָהּ is a child "beloved of God." Indeed in my study I showed that nearly all of the early commentators understood יָדִיד to mean "beloved."²²

14. A similar example to what has been said about יְדִידְיָהּ can be found in the chapter on sacrifices. The verse states זֹאת תֹּרַת הָעֹלָה הִיא הָעֹלָה "This is the ritual for the burnt offering – that is, the burnt offering which stays on the altar hearth all night until the morning, while the altar fire is kept burning on it." (Lev. 6:2). There is a difference of opinion as to the etymology of the noun עֹלָה²³ (*'ōlā*), which signifies the type of sacrifice. Some derive עֹלָה from the root ע-ל-י, with the basic meaning of "ascending" (which would be equivalent to the Aramaic root ס-ל-ק). BDB and HALOT state this explicitly.²⁴ However, some derive this noun from the root ע-ל-י

20 See Bar-Asher 2007.

21 The name יְדִידְיָהּ also appears without the *mappiq*: יְדִידְיָהּ (see ibid, 456 n. 40).

22 The authorities who explain יָדִיד to mean "beloved" appear on pp. 450–464 of the aforementioned study (It can be clearly seen that the number of authorities not explaining יָדִיד as "beloved" is negligible). In the discussion on pp. 464–471 I explain why I prefer to vocalize this word as יָדִיד (and not יְדִיד) in *status absolutus*.

23 Henceforth the noun עֹלָה will be written with *plene* spelling (עֹלָה).

24 See BDB, 750, which mentions explicitly the notion of "ascending." HALOT also derives עֹלָה from the root ע-ל-י and mentions as a possibility Koehler's opinion that

with the Hebrew consonant *'ayin* as representing a voiced velar fricative (ɣ) corresponding to the Arabic غ, with the meaning "cook, boil," like in the Arabic root غلى. This opinion was recently cited by Kaddari in his dictionary.²⁵ It is sufficient to note that in this context the Biblical text clarifies the meaning of עולה as "a sacrifice burnt on the altar throughout the night until entirely consumed." This is reflected in the verse concerning the sacrifice of Aaron and his sons, ²⁶ כָּלִיל תִּהְיֶה לֹא תֹאכְלֶנָּה, כָּלִיל תִּקְטָר, "it shall entirely go up in smoke...shall be a total offering; it shall not be eaten." (ibid 15–16). Even if the verse זאת תורת העולה היא העולה reflects popular etymology²⁷, the explanation offered here for the verse in question is still valid. Indeed, the following verse states explicitly וְהָרִים אֶת הַדָּשָׁן אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל הָאֵשׁ אֶת הָעוֹלָה עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (ibid 3).

15. À propos the aforementioned explanation, a study of synonyms that appear in succession in the same clause while in the same syntactic position and having the same syntactic function should be undertaken. This matter requires comprehensive study since the appearance of synonyms in pairs could be the result of various factors. For example,

עולה is "probably an abbreviation for מִנְחַת עוֹלָה 'tribute rising (in the fire).'" There is a similar, interesting remark in a homiletical interpretation of the Sages: "If the Altar has not acquired the right to the flesh of an offering the priests have not acquired the right to its hide, for it is written, *A man's whole offering* (Lev. 7:8) – a Whole-offering (עולה) that has been offered up (שָׁעֲלָתָה, in the printed editions שעלחה) for a man ... although it does not count (שֵׁלָא עֲלָתָה, in the printed editions שלא עלתה) to its owner" [in fulfillment of his obligation] (mZev 12.2). The Mishnah clearly states that the noun עולה is an inflected form of עָלָה ("to ascend"). I would also like to mention the statement in the Babylonian Talmud (bZev 27b) "From the phrase, 'the law of the burnt-offering,' which intimates one law for all burnt-offerings, [viz.:] that if they ascended, they do not descend." Rashi there comments "... because this verse comes to teach us that disqualified offerings, once they have ascended to the altar they do not descend. We derive this from the verse (Lev. 7:2) the burnt offering that stays on the altar hearth all night (implying) once it has ascended to the altar let it remain there all night." The Talmud follows the wording of the verse that the offering called עולה is called thus since it ascends (עולה) to the altar.

- 25 See Kaddari 2006, 801. He adds the definition "it ascends 'burnt by fire' as the burnt offering."
- 26 It is interesting to note that the two nouns עולה and כָּלִיל come together in the same syntactical position: 'offered it whole as a holocaust to God' (1 Sam. 7:9), או תחפץ זבחי צדק עולה וכליל, או יעלו על מזבחך פרים, "Then will you wish legitimate sacrifices, holocaust and whole offering; Then will young bulls mount your altar." (Ps. 51:21). See below in § 15.
- 27 If we accept Kaddari's opinion that the noun העולה and the participle העולה that qualifies it (in v. 2) are derived from two different roots, then the explanation seems to reflect popular etymology. However, if the noun and the participle are derived from the same root (ע-ל-י with the standard 'ayin having the connotation "ascend"), as brought in BDB and HALOT, then the verse does not reflect popular etymology.

when the author of the text chose the pairs of synonyms עולה and נָכַר, and עולה and כָּלִיל in the verses תִּשְׁמְדוּ וְלִזְכָּרְךָ תִּשְׁמְדוּ וְלִזְכָּרְךָ תִּשְׁמְדוּ נָכַשׁ "To invoke your name is the soul's desire." (Isa. 26:8)²⁸, אִם תִּתְפַּיֵן זְבָחִי צְדָקָה עוֹלָה וְכָלִיל "Then will you wish legitimate sacrifices, holocaust and whole offering" (Ps. 51:21), and chose to connect them by means of *wāw* consecutive, he probably intended to stress the meaning of one noun by having it appear together with its synonym. Perhaps this is also the case in the verse וַיַּעֲלֶהוּ עוֹלָה כָּלִיל "offered it whole as a holocaust to God" (1 Sam. 7:9) even though *wāw* consecutive is absent. On the other hand, in some instances one of the synonyms is in Aramaic or is a rare word. For example, in the verses בְּרִהְטִים בְּשִׁקְתוֹת הַמַּיִם "in troughs – the water receptacles" (Gen. 30:38), אִם תִּתְפַּיֵן זְבָחִי צְדָקָה עוֹלָה וְכָלִיל "then is the prey of a great spoil divided" (Isa. 33:23). One of the nouns in these pairs is probably an explanatory gloss. The first word of each pair is either in Aramaic (רִהְטִים – *r^lhāṭīm*) or is a rare Hebrew word (עַד – *ad*) while the second word is a common Hebrew word (שִׁקְתוֹת הַמַּיִם – *šiq^ltōt hammāyim*; שָׁלָל – *šālāl*). Other factors may have influenced the choice of words, but more study is needed.

D. Explanatory Words in Similar Structures

16. Another example of one word explaining another in the same context is evident in the case of a common word occurring in the same context with a rare synonym in similar or identical structures. I shall analyze three interesting examples.

17. The noun עֵלֶם (*elem*) is rare in the Bible, appearing only twice, and only in the book of Samuel: (A) וַיִּאֱמַר הַמֶּלֶךְ שְׂאֵל אֶת־הַ: בֶּן מִי זֶה הָעֵלֶם "Then inquire whose son the youth is" (1 Sam. 17:56); (B) וְאִם כִּי אֶמַר לְעֵלֶם: הֲיֵהָהּ הַחֲצִיִּים מִמֶּךָ וְהִלְאָהּ לְךָ "But if I say to the lad, The arrow is on the far side of you!" (ibid 20:22).³² In both of these instances appear verses parallel to

28 See above § 4.

29 As is well known, in the Blessings of Jacob the nouns עַד and שָׁלָל appear in parallel hemistiches of the same verse: וַיִּבְרַךְ יֶאֱכַל עַד וְלַעֲרִב יְחַלֵּק שָׁלָל "Mornings he devours the prey, And evenings he distributes the spoils." (Gen. 49:27).

30 רִהְטִים is a noun derived from the Aramaic root ט-ה-ר (cognate of the Hebrew ר-ו-ר), but its form –the plural pattern פְּעֻלִים – is Hebrew.

31 The noun עַד has been shown to have parallel forms in Targumic and Galilean Aramaic (see Kaddari 2006, 774, in entry עַד II).

32 Some claim to have recognized a third occurrence of the noun עֵלֶם in the narratives of David in the book of Samuel. I am referring to the sharp suggested reading of the word עַם in a verse which refers to David as a young man וְהוּא אֲדָמְנִי עִם זָפָה עֵינָיִם וְטוֹב רֵאֵי "he was ruddy and attractive, handsome to the eye and of good appearance" (1 Sam.

the aforementioned examples with nearly identical structures. (A) Before the verse containing the word עָלַם (1 Sam. 17:56) the text reads וַיִּכְרְאוּת וַיִּבְעַר "When Saul saw David...he said to Abner...Whose son is that lad?" (ibid 55). In a following verse the text reads וַיִּאמֶר אֵלָיו שְׂאוּל: בֶּן מִי אַתָּה הַבֶּעַר "Whose son are you, lad? Saul asked him." (ibid 58). In these three verses Saul poses the question, in the first two verses the questions are posed to Abner, in the third to David. In all three verses the questions are similar or identical in all respects, excluding the last word in the second question: בֶּן מִי זֶה הַבֶּעַר, בֶּן מִי זֶה הַנֶּעַר. The use of the word נֶעַר in v. 55 clarifies the word עָלַם in the following verse (56). The text then reverts to נֶעַר (*na'ar*). (B) Similarly in the second example: וְאִם כֹּה אֵמַר לְעֹלָם: הִנֵּה הַחֲצִיִּים מִמֶּךָ וְהַקֶּלֶחַ אִם אֵמַר אֵמַר לְנֶעַר, הִנֵּה הַחֲצִיִּים מִמֶּךָ "But if I say to the lad, The arrow is on the far side of you!" (ibid 20:22). Preceding this verse is a nearly identical one: אִם אֵמַר אֵמַר לְנֶעַר, הִנֵּה הַחֲצִיִּים מִמֶּךָ "if I say to him the arrow is on the near side of you!" (ibid 21). Here too the word לְנֶעַר in v. 21 comes to clarify the meaning of עָלַם in the following verse. Some may try to read into the thrice mentioned question in chap. 17 and into the parallelism of chap. 20 evidence for parallel versions which served as sources for the text's editor and not as statements pronounced multiple times from the outset. Even were one to make such a claim, justified or not, this does not take away from the fact that in the Biblical text, in its present form, common words clarify rare words.

18. This is also the case concerning the feminine form עֲלָמָה (*'almā*) in the narrative of Rebecca being taken by Abraham's servant to be his son's bride in Gen. 24. The noun עֲלָמָה is not a common word in the Bible. It occurs only seven times. Its synonym ³³נֶעְרָה (*na'arā*), however, occurs a total of sixty three times. In its first appearance in the singular form in the Bible, נֶעְרָה occurs four times in Gen. 24 (vv. 14, 16, 28, 55). In his prayer, Abraham's servant asks וְהִיא הַנֶּעְרָה אֲשֶׁר אֵמַר אֵלֶיךָ הַיּוֹם בְּנֵי כַדָּף וְאֲשֶׁתָּה "let the girl to whom I say 'Please lower your jug

16:12). The suggested reading is עָלַם זָפֵה עֵינָיִם וְטוֹב רָאִי (This appears in HALOT, 2:835, at the end of the entry עָלַם). While this reading is sharp, it remains a conjectural reading and not a linguistic fact.

33 As is well known, in most of its occurrences in the Pentateuch this word, in its singular form, is written defectively, without *he*: נֶעַר/הַנֶּעַר. This form reflects the ancient use of נֶעַר as referring to both masculine and feminine genders. In only one occurrence in the Pentateuch this word is written *plene* (נֶעֳרָה), in Deut. 22:19. The *plene* form is used throughout the rest of the Bible. However, there are distinct plural forms for the masculine and feminine, even in the Pentateuch; נְעָרִים for masculine: הַנְּעָרִים "the boys" (Gen. 14:24; 25:27), and נְעָרוֹת for feminine: וַנְּעָרֹתֶיהָ "and her maids" (Gen. 24:61; Exod. 2:5).

that I may drink' and who answers 'Drink, and I will also give water to your camels!' (Gen. 24:14). However, when he meets with her family and speaks with them he says *ה'שקיני נא וה'ה העלמה היצאת לשאב ואמרתי אליה: 'גם אתה שתה וגם לגמליך אשאב'.* "let the young woman who comes out to draw water, to whom I say, 'Please give me a little water from your jug,' and who answers, 'Not only may you drink, but I will also water your camels'" (ibid 43–44). Rebecca is referred to as *הנערה* three times in the narrative (in vv. 14, 15 and 28), but the fourth time as *העלמה* (in v. 43). Clearly, the meaning of the word *העלמה* is made plain from the context by the use of its more common synonym *הנערה* in parallel.

19. The third example that I wish to present is also from the book of Genesis. The text refers to Ishmael and states *ויהי אלהים את הנער ויגדל, וישב ויהי רבקה קשת במדבר ויהי רבקה קשת* "God was with the boy as he grew up. He lived in the desert and became a young man, an archer." (Gen. 21:20). In the first part of the verse (as in vv. 12, 17 [twice], 18 and 19) Ishmael is called *הנער* while in the second part he is called *רבקה* (*rōbē*).³⁴ *רבקה* is a *hapax legomenon* and appears only in this instance. In this case, the Biblical verse explains itself: Ishmael is first called *נער* and then afterwards *רבקה*. Thus, *נער* and *רבקה* have the same meaning.

20. Indeed, many of the early exegetes also understood *רבקה* in this way. For example, Onkelos translated *ויהי רבקה קשת* as *רבי (רבנא) קשתא*. The Aramaic words *רבי/רבנא* mean *נער*. Similarly Saadia Gaon translated *ראם*. The Vulgate gives the translation "iuvenis Sagittarius." This is also implied in the words of the Midrash in Bereshit Rabbah (53:15) "And became an archer... while a lad (*rōbē*), he trained himself in the use of the bow"; *מתלמד* meaning the lad who trained himself.

21. The word *רבקה* is rare not only in the Bible but also in the Mishnah. It occurs only once in the Mishnah as the plural form *רובים* (*rōbīm*): "and there the young men kept watch" (mTam. 1.1). The "young men" (*רובים*) mentioned in the Mishnah are young priests who have not yet begun to perform the sacrificial service in the Temple. However, they served in the capacity of watchmen. The meaning of the word *רבקה* is clear³⁵; this is the participle of the verb *רקה* which means

34 Henceforth I shall bring this word with *plene* spelling.

35 The feminine form *רבקה* (also *רובא*) has been preserved only in reliable manuscripts of Rabbinic literature. Less reliable manuscripts have the form *ריבה* which is a result of the *wāw* having been replaced by *yod* in error. See Bar-Asher [in print].

"grow." In other words רֹבֵה in Hebrew and רְבִי in Aramaic mean "a child who has already grown,"³⁶ that is a "youth."³⁷

22. One can not fail to notice the interesting phenomenon apparent from the three examples mentioned above. In all three narratives, the Biblical text initially employs a common word – נָעַר (1 Sam. 17:55), נְעָרָה (Gen. 24:14, 16, 28), נָעַר (Gen. 21:12, 17–20). In the following verses a less common word is employed – עָלַם (1 Sam 17:56), עֲלָמָה (Gen. 24:43), רֹבֵה (Gen. 21:20). In other words, once the reader knows who is the subject of the narrative, this character is first introduced in the text by a common and frequent word – נָעַר or נְעָרָה, afterwards, this same character is introduced in the text by a rare word – עָלַם, עֲלָמָה, רֹבֵה. The use of the rare word entails no difficulty because the subject of the narrative is known. Another linguistic point worthy of note is that in the first example, after the text uses the word עָלַם (1 Sam. 17:56) it reverts to the word נָעַר (1 Sam. 17:58). In the second example the text employs the word עֲלָמָה (Gen. 24:43) but then reverts to נְעָרָה (Gen. 24:55).

Conclusion

23. I shall summarize the main points of this study.

A. Certainly, exegesis of the Bible based on parallelism, whether in one verse or in verses appearing in different contexts or even in different Biblical books, is a well known phenomenon. This study offers some comments (presented above in sections A-B) that add to our understanding of this phenomenon and presents varied examples to show that the Bible interprets itself. These comments also serve as the basis for the exegetical remarks offered in the latter part of the study (sections C-D).

36 It should be noted that a נָעַר is sometimes called יָלֵד. For example, אֵל יָרַע בְּעֵינַיִךְ עַל הַנָּעַר, "Do not be distressed about the boy," וַיִּתֵּן אֵל הַגֵּר שָׁם עַל שִׁכְמָהּ וְאֵת הַיָּלֵד, "and he gave to Hagar. He placed them on her back...with the child," וַתַּשְׁלֵךְ אֵת הַיָּלֵד, "she left the child," וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת קוֹל הַנָּעַר [...] כִּי, "Let me not look on the child as he dies," וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת קוֹל הַנָּעַר, "God heard the boy's cry ... for God has heard the cry of the boy" (Gen. 21:12, 14–17).

37 Incidentally, some have interpreted the word רֹבֵה קִשָּׁת referring to Ishmael to mean "an archer shooting arrows." They understand the word רֹבֵה to be derived from the root ר-ב-ב, an alternate of the form derived from the root ר-ב-ב, also meaning "shoot." This meaning is reflected in the verse וַיִּמְרָרוּהוּ וַרְבוּ וַיִּשְׁטְמֵהוּ בַעֲלֵי הַצִּיָּים וַיַּרְבּוּ וַיִּשְׁטְמֵהוּ וַיִּשְׁטְמֵהוּ וַיִּשְׁטְמֵהוּ, "The archers have sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him" (Gen. 49:23). Based on this understanding of the form וַרְבוּ, the word רֹבֵה has come to mean a type of firearm in Modern Hebrew (see § 21 n. 35 in the aforementioned article).

B. Not in all places where I spoke of the act of explanation as an implicit action need we assume that this was the express intention of the author. The explanatory comment *וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שְׁמוֹ יְדִידְקָה ... הוּא* is not to be compared to the comment explaining the name *וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שְׁמוֹ יְדִידְקָה – אָהֳבוּ* in the same book. Neither are the clarified words in these verses to be compared to the use of the synonyms *נָעַר* and *עָלָם* which also appear in the very same book.³⁸ In the first example it is clear that when the text states that the *נְבִיא* was formerly referred to as *רוֹאֵה*, this is an intentional explanatory remark.³⁹ However, in the second example, the use of the expression *וְהוּא אָהֳבוּ* to clarify the name *יְדִידְקָה* is less direct yet still clear. In the third example, the positioning of *עָלָם* in parallel to *נָעַר* in similar or identical syntactical structures can be considered a stylistic device with the exegetical aspect expressed unintentionally. In our case, all of the types mentioned herein lead to one conclusion: the Bible interprets its own words and this phenomenon takes on different forms in the various books of the biblical canon. That is the main point that I wished to present in this study.

C. I have amassed additional information on this subject over the years. However, I have decided to limit the presentation to the examples brought here. The important point is not the number of examples but rather the phenomenon itself. My intention in this study was to present the phenomenon by means of various examples and to provide a short discussion of those examples. The many additional examples that I have amassed reflect different aspects of this phenomenon⁴⁰ that

38 It should be noted that many important and interesting linguistic issues lie hidden in the Book of Samuel.

39 This can also be said of parallel hemistiches in the same verse. Similarly, the use of a pair of synonyms, with one appearing in the first hemistich and the other in the second, can be considered an intentional explanatory note.

40 One of the additional aspects of the Bible interpreting its own words is when the meaning of words in context is expressed implicitly, or nearly explicitly, and the Biblical text uses two or three times a word with two meanings or uses two homonyms. In this case, the Biblical text will sometimes employ explanatory words to clarify the uncommon word or meaning. A well known example of this aspect is from the book of Numbers (15:38–39). The Biblical text employs the word *צִיצִית* (*tsitsit*) with two different meanings: (A) tassel: *וְנָתְנוּ עַל צִיצִית הַקַּנֵּף ... וְנִקְהַנּוּ בְּגָדֵיהֶם* "when they fashion tassels for themselves on the corner of their garments...they must join...to the tassels, at each corner.", similarly, *וַיִּקְהַנּוּ בְּצִיצִית רֹאשִׁי* "seized me by a lock of my hair" (Ezek. 8:3); (B) something that protrudes and is visible: *וְהָיָה לְכֶם לְצִיצִית וְרָאִיתֶם אוֹתוֹ*: "It shall serve you as a visible garment, and when you see it..." The text in Num. 15 employs *צִיצִית* twice with one meaning (tassel), and afterwards employs the word with its other meaning (something visible). Having done so, the text adds an explanatory gloss to the second meaning – *וְרָאִיתֶם אוֹתוֹ*. This gloss draws the reader's attention to the new meaning (see the commentaries of Rashi and Rashbam loc. cit.). This

are worthy of discussion in their own right. I hope to present these at a later occasion. In conclusion, I wish to state that not every comment on a Biblical word is linguistic in nature. Sometimes the clarification of a word comes to clarify the content of the text.⁴¹

Bibliography

Avishur, Yizhak. 1974. Pairs of Words in Biblical Literature and Their Parallels in Semitic Literature of the Ancient Near East. PhD diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

is also the case in the verse וְהָיָה לוֹ שְׁלֹשִׁים בָּנִים רֹכְבִים עַל שְׁלֹשִׁים עֲגִירִים; וְשְׁלֹשִׁים עֲגִירִים לָהֶם, לָהֶם יָקְרְאוּ הַיָּרֵי. "Now he had thirty 'sons' who rode thirty donkeys. Thirty towns belonged to them. Their towns are called Havvoth-Jair" (Judg. 10:4). The verse twice employs the word עֲגִירִים but these are two completely different words. In the first instance עֲגִירִים is the plural form of the word עֵיִר "male donkey"; in the second instance it is the plural form of the word עֵיר ("a small village." עֲגִירִים is an alternate form of עֵירִים in Biblical Hebrew and of עֲגִרוֹת in Rabbinic Hebrew). When the text employed the second meaning, it added an explanatory gloss (הוֹת יֵאִיר). These two examples were brought by David Yellin and explained by him (Yellin 1983): הַמְצִיּוֹד, example 17 on pages 280–281 deals with the pair of nouns צִיצֵת and צִיצִית, and example 19 on p. 282 is devoted to the nouns עֲגִירִים (we can also add additional examples, such as example 3 on pp. 272–273: the pair הַמּוֹר and example 18 on p. 281: the pair תָּרַם). These are only a few examples of another aspect of the Bible explaining itself. As stated, there are additional examples of additional aspects.

- 41 Even so, not included is another type that clarifies the content and even has a poetic element but does not include an explanation of a word or expression. I am referring to an interesting example brought by Luzzatto 1993, 361. The verse states כִּי יִבְעֵר אִישׁ אֶת שָׂדֵהוּ אוֹ אֶת שָׂדֵה רֵעֵהוּ וְשָׁלַח אֶת בְּעִירָהוּ וּבָעִיר אֶת אֲחֵרֵהוּ. "When a man clears a field or vineyard, and he releases his cattle and it clears in another's field" (Exod. 22:4). Luzzatto says that the clause וְשָׁלַח אֶת בְּעִירָהוּ וּבָעִיר אֶת אֲחֵרֵהוּ explains the general rule כִּי יִבְעֵר אִישׁ שָׂדֵהוּ אוֹ אֶת שָׂדֵה רֵעֵהוּ which appears at the beginning of the verse. The act of destruction which is stated generally is specified as having been carried out by an animal that performed the damage. Luzzatto explains that [the verse] "states בְּעִירוֹ to act as a pun with the expression כִּי יִבְעֵר and the expression וּבָעִיר and these verses were said as a kind of poem in order that they should be impressed upon the minds of simple people. Similarly, the text states below וְעָבַדְתָּ מְעֹבָד לֹ, עֹבַד תַּעֲזֹב עִמּוֹ "and [you] would refrain from leaving (it) to him, you must help, help (it) with him." (Exod. 23:5). Indeed, this comment does employ the use of two close roots: (A) בָּעַר-בָּעַר meaning "destruction," (B) בָּעִיר from which is derived the noun בְּעִיר (be'ir = an animal). While the clarification of the general rule by the detail explains the content of the verse, it does not explain any word and is only a stylistic device. Luzzatto correctly brought a similar example of this stylistic device: the use of the two verbs עָזַב, once meaning "to abandon" and once meaning "to aid" in Exod. 23:5. Here also, no word is explained. I also wish to mention again Kariv 1970, 239.

- . 2004. Publications of Prof. Yizhak Avishur. In *Teshûrôt LaAvishur: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, in Hebrew and Semitic Languages. Festschrift Presented to Prof. Yitzhak Avishur on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, eds. Michael Heltzer and Meir Malul, 15–37. Tel-Aviv: Archaeological Center Publications.
- Bar-Asher. Moshe. 2007. The Form and the Meaning of the Word יָדַד. In *Teshurah Le-'Amos: Collected Studies in Biblical Exegesis Presented to 'Amos Hakham*, eds. Moshe Bar-Asher, N. Hacham and Y. Ofer, 449–472. Alon Shevut: Tvunot.
- . 2009. *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew*. Vol. 1 of *Introductions and Linguistic Investigations*. Asupot 4. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute [Herbrew].
- . [in print]. On Words that Have Been Uprooted from Mishnaic Hebrew. In *The Festschrift in Honor of Dr. Yitzhak Sappir*, eds. Y. Rosanson et al., 16–23.
- Ben-Yehudah, Elieser. 1980. *A Complete Dictionary of Ancient and Modern Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Makor.
- Berlin, Adele. 1985. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Breuer, Mordekhay. *Tora, Nevi'im, Ketuvim* (= TANAKH). Jerusalem: Horev Press.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. 1962. *A Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dotan, Aron. *Tora, Nevi'im, Ketuvim* (= TANAKH). Tel-Aviv: 'Adi Press.
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham. 2006–2009. *Milon Even-Shoshan: mehudash u-me'udkan li-shenot ha-alpayim*. 6 vols. Tel-Aviv: ha-Milon.
- Fishbane, Michael A. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ginzberg, H. L. 1933. Mibba'ad la-Massoret. *Tarb.* 5:75–96 [Hebrew].
- Greenfield, Jonas C. 2001. Ugaritic *mdl* and Its Cognates. In vol. 2 of *'Al Kanfei Yonah: Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology*, eds. Shalom M. Paul, Michael E. Stone and Avital Pinnick, 847–854. Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press.
- Hakham, Amos. 1970. *Bible: Job*. Bible with the Jerusalem Commentary. Jerusalem: Mosad Harav Kook.
- Horovitz, Saul, and Yisrael A. Rabin, eds. 1970. *Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael cum variis lectionibus et adnotatiobus*. Jerusalem: Wahrman Books.

- Kaddari, Menahem T. 2006. *A Dictionary of Biblical Hebrew (Alef-Taw)*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press [Hebrew].
- Kariv, Abraham. 1970. *The Seven Pillars of the Bible: Essays of Biblical People and Biblical Ideas*. Tel Aviv: Am Oved.
- Köhler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. 1994–2000. HALOT. 5 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Kugel, James L. 1981. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Kutscher, Edward Y. 1972. Some Problems of the Lexicography of Mishnaic Hebrew and Its Comparison with Biblical Hebrew. In vol. 1 of *Archive of the New Dictionary of Rabbinical Literature*, 32–33. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press [Hebrew].
- Luzzatto, Samuel D. 1993. *Pêrûš Šda'': R' Šēmû'el Dāwid Lûṣaṭô 'al ḥāmīšā ḥūmmēšê tôrā*. Jerusalem: Horev Publishers.
- Rashi (Shelomoh Ben-Yitzhak). *Sefer Shemot*. Vol. 2 of *The Torah: with Rashi's Commentary*. Jerusalem 1954 [Hebrew].
- . *Sefer Devarim*. Vol. 5 of *The Torah: with Rashi's Commentary*. Jerusalem 1955 [Hebrew].
- Sinaceur, Zakia I. 1993. Vol. 2 of *Le Dictionnaire Colin de l'Arabe Dialectale Marocain*. Rabat: Al Manahil.
- Yellin, David. 1983. *The Writings of David Yellin*. Vol. 6 of *Biblical Investigations*. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass [Hebrew].
- Zakovitch, Yair. 1986. The Many Faces of Inner-Biblical Interpretation. *Tarb*. 56:136–143 [Hebrew].
- . 1992. *An Introduction to Inner-Biblical Interpretation*. Even Yehudah: Rekhes Press [Hebrew].

Textual Harmonization in the Stories of the Patriarchs

Emanuel Tov

The books of Hebrew-Aramaic Scripture developed in different ways regarding both their literary and textual content. Each book had its own story, and thus the quantity and nature of the variant readings in a particular book or segment resulted from the complexity of its literary development and textual transmission.¹ As a result, we cannot draw analogies between the literary and textual status of one book and that of another.²

Consequently, our limited knowledge should be taken into consideration when studying the patriarchal stories in the Qumran scrolls, MT+, SP+, and the LXX. We immediately add that, from a textual point of view, there is no difference between Gen. 1–11 and the patriarchal stories (Gen. 12–50), or between Genesis and the other books of the Torah.

We limit our remarks to the *last* stage of the development of the Torah as visible in the textual witnesses. As a first step in analyzing the textual features of the Torah, we turn to its sacred status³. The Torah has a distinctive, sacred status that could have influenced scribes to approach it with special care and a lower level of intervention than that applied to the other Scripture books. However, the evidence does not

1 When faced with differing patterns of textual variation in the biblical books, we do not know to what extent they should be ascribed to real differences between these books or segments in their literary development and textual transmission, or to imaginary differences created by the vicissitudes of the preservation of ancient sources. The differing data for each book may reflect the different activities of ancient editors and/or scribes, but often coincidence played a large role in determining the nature of the textual evidence. See Tov 2010.

2 For example, the extensive differences between MT and LXX in Jeremiah may not have existed in the other prophetic books because they were not submitted to such rewriting.

3 See Tov 2011.

support such an assumption.⁴ Paradoxically, due to its popularity, the Torah was rewritten and changed more extensively than the other biblical books in the Second Temple period, resulting in increased textual variation.

When focusing on possible *textual* features in the early Torah scrolls, one rarely recognizes in them textual features such as expansionistic or abbreviating characterizing textual witnesses as a whole.⁵ On the other hand, quite unexpectedly, the Torah is distinguished from the other biblical books by the occurrence of a large number of harmonizing changes, especially additions. These additions are found in differing numbers in the textual witnesses, most frequently in the LXX and secondly in the SP group. MT also contains some harmonizing changes, but it reflects a purer text than the other witnesses.

The mentioning of the LXX as the main source for harmonizing pluses in all Scripture books and not merely in the textual witnesses of the Torah, causes some surprise when viewed in light of previous discussions in which that feature was ascribed solely to the SP. However, the data are quite clear in this regard. By way of clarification, I immediately add that our analysis excludes the large additions in the SP-group in Exodus and Numbers because these are not harmonizing pluses. These large additions, sometimes involving as much as nine verses, are part of a special editorial reworking of the Torah not known from other books. This reworking is visible especially in Exod. 7–11 and the chapters in Exodus and Numbers that run parallel to Moses' speech in Deut. 1–3. These changes involve duplications of other Torah verses and a few rearrangements based on the inclination of the SP-group to improve the consistency of the divine message. Editorial changes are distinct from the small harmonizing alterations in SP. The principle and substance of the small harmonizing changes is shared with the LXX,

4 (1) The various witnesses of the Torah (MT, SP, Qumran scrolls, the *Vorlage* of the LXX) reflect the same degree of editorial intervention as the other books. (2) While the orthography of the Torah in MT is usually more conservative than that of the rest of the biblical books, the number of its textual variants is no smaller than that of the other books. (3) Several Torah scrolls are written carelessly and inconsistently in the so-called Qumran scribal practice (for example, 4QNum^b, 1QDeut², 4QDeut^{k2}, 4QDeut^m), involving adaptations of unusual forms to the context, frequent errors, numerous corrections, and sometimes, also, careless handwriting. (4) The LXX and the SP group are characterized by a large number of small harmonizations.

5 By way of clarification, I do not count the short LXX texts of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the story of David and Goliath as textual features, since they reflect literary activity.

while the editorial changes described above are characteristic of the SP-group only⁶.

Textual harmonization is visible throughout the Torah in the LXX and SP⁷, mainly in the non-legal segments but to a lesser extent also in the phraseology used in the verbalization of the laws. On the other hand, the substance of the laws is only rarely harmonized within a specific pericope or between parallel law codes.⁸ Textual harmonization features also in other sources, though far less prominently.⁹

From a textual point of view, harmonizing tendencies represent a secondary development. Harmonizing activity stems from a formalistic attempt to render all the details identical when the same elements are described twice or more using different words. The Torah offers several schematic descriptions that differ slightly, such as the creation account and the patriarchal stories.¹⁰ For example, we hear the story of Joseph's encounter with Potiphar's wife three times, as told by the narrator (39:7–13), by Potiphar's wife to the members of her household (39:14–15), and in her account to Potiphar (39:17–19). The dreams of Pharaoh's cupbearer (40:9–12) and the chief baker (40:16–17) are repeated in Jo-

6 The scribes of this group were especially attentive to what they considered to be discrepancies within and between stories in Scripture. Particular attention was paid to the presentation of the spoken word, especially that of God and Moses; it was duplicated from one context into another when the editor considered it lacking, differing, or incomplete. Ultimately, the editorial changes derive from theological concerns reflecting the wish to create narrative structures that present the stories of the sacred Torah in the most perfect way possible.

In a way, editorial changes perfect the system of small-scale harmonizations at a higher literary level. The small-scale harmonizations to be analyzed below present attempts to make the text more congruous. The large-scale editorial intervention visible in the SP-group reflects the next step on the ladder of perfecting the Torah. If my intuition is correct, the smaller harmonizations such as in the *Vorlage* of the LXX thus reflect a first step in the development of the free approach towards Scripture, while the editorial changes of the SP-group reflect a second stage.

7 The presence of harmonization in the LXX of the Torah was recognized long ago in scholarship, but it was not given the required attention since scholars did not have the broad textual outlook that characterizes modern scholarship. See Toepler 1830, 12–16; Frankel 1841, 79; Kohn 1865. The influential study of Gesenius 1815, 46–48, provides references to earlier scholarship on the relation between SP and LXX.

8 For an exceptional example of such an harmonization, see LXX-Deut. 16:7 adapted to Exod. 12:8.

9 For example, note 4QDeut^m as discussed by Eshel 1991, 117–154.

10 Likewise, in the Homeric epos, recurring events such as the beginning of the day, battle scenes, and descriptions of meals are described with exactly the same words. The patriarchal stories contain several scenes that are described in almost the same words, while harmonizing changes are often inserted when two descriptions differ in some details.

seph's interpretation (40:12–15, 18–19). The details of Pharaoh's dream (41:1–7) are repeated in its interpretation (41:25–36) and in the words of the narrator (41:47–57). Likewise, there is much repetition in the words of Abraham's senior servant at the well (24:10–14), the account of the senior servant and Rebekah at the well (24:15–27), and the former's account to Laban (24:33–49). The small differences between these multiple versions provide an opportunity for making harmonizing changes, as indeed often occurred in the *Vorlage* of the LXX. In some stories, harmonizing changes have been made at almost every possible occasion.

A similar type of harmonization was noticed by Hendel and myself in the stories and schematic accounts in Gen. 1–11¹¹, and by myself in the narrative framework and phraseology of the laws in Deuteronomy¹², in both cases primarily in the LXX and secondarily also in SP. A brief account of the LXX's harmonizations in Numbers is provided by Dorival and Rösel¹³. The fullest account of the data concerning the LXX and the SP in all five Torah books is found in Kyung-Rae Kim's dissertation¹⁴. A number of examples of harmonizing additions in the LXX were listed by Prijs and Cook¹⁵.

Within the Torah, these harmonizations are found more frequently in Genesis than in the other books, not only because its literary structure offers more opportunity for this feature, but also because the Torah was submitted to more rewriting activity than the other books.

In no other Scripture book does the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX present a similar degree/level of harmonization to that in LXX-Pentateuch.¹⁶ Opportunities for harmonization present themselves first and foremost in Samuel–Kings//Chronicles, but also in Joshua//Judges, within Jeremiah, between Jer. 52 and 2 Kgs. 24:18–25:30 and elsewhere, and further in Isa. 36:1–38:8//2 Kgs. 18:13–20:11, among the oracles against the foreign nations in the prophetic books, etc. Massive harmonization in Chronicles towards Samuel–Kings would have been counterproductive, because in that case the two books would have been identical. While there is always some harmonization in the mentioned parallel segments, basically they remain dissimilar.

11 Hendel 1998, 81–92; Tov 2014.

12 Tov 2008.

13 Dorival 1994, 42–43; Rösel 2001, 29–39.

14 Kim 1994.

15 Prijs 1948, 84–99; Cook 1985.

16 This pertains also to the harmonization detected in the other translations, but in those cases the harmonizing process, pertaining to small details only, is inner-translational. For some data, see Heller 1911, 21–25; Sperber 1968, 44–45.

Before turning to the evidence itself, we address three central issues: (1) the Greek translator's fidelity to his source; (2) the level at which the harmonization took place (Hebrew or Greek); and (3) the frequent agreement of SP with the LXX.

1. *The translator's fidelity.* If a translation was literal, by implication the harmonizations reflected in that translation took place in his *Vorlage*. In my view, the translation technique of LXX-Genesis was faithful to its source text from Gen. 1:1 onwards, but insufficient study of that translation technique has taken place so far. Previous studies by Hendel¹⁷ suggested that this translation was indeed literal. Likewise, Wevers and Rösel opined that this translation was basically literal, but both scholars struggled with the harmonizations, ascribing them to the translator.¹⁸ Likewise, Frankel and Skinner ascribed the harmonizing approach to the translator.¹⁹ Cook²⁰ and Brown²¹ were undecided.

2. *The level at which the harmonization took place.* If all instances of harmonization were created by the same hand, the changes must have taken place at the Hebrew level²² and were not created by the translator. This suggestion is based on the fact that in some cases the vocabulary of the two Greek texts — the text from which the harmonizing change was made and the presumed harmonization differs, making it highly unlikely that the translator himself was influenced by the Greek

17 Hendel 1998, 16–20; idem 1999.

18 Wevers 1993, xii; Rösel 1994, 248–250. Both scholars believed that the translation was made from a text close to MT: Wevers 1993, xiii: "These Notes are also based on the presupposition that the parent text being translated was in the main much like the consonantal text of MT." Likewise, on p. 289, Wevers ascribed the long addition in 20:2 to the translator: "Once again it illustrates the intelligent approach Gen took in interpreting his parent text; the text simply had to make sense." On p. 343, Wevers explained the plus in LXX of 24:4 as follows: "Specifically Abraam wants to ensure the purity of his genetic stock; the marriage must be endogamic." Since both scholars believed that the translation was made from a text close to MT, they must have felt the need to ascribe the harmonizations to the translator, but it seems difficult on the one hand to maintain the translator's faithfulness to his *Vorlage*, and on the other to assume his freedom in creating harmonizing renderings.

19 Frankel 1841, 78–80; Skinner 1930, 345, on Gen. 24.

20 Cook 2001 recognized the Hebrew background of some harmonizations, but also acknowledged the influence of exegesis. See also idem, 1982; idem, 1985.

21 Brown 1993, 128–132, 250, recognized harmonizing tendencies in the LXX at the Hebrew level, but in his view they are not consistent enough in order to be considered secondary. Therefore, in his view, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX has to be taken as more original than MT.

22 In his reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Gen. 28; 29; 48, Sperber indeed included these harmonizing pluses: Sperber 1929 referring to 28:15; 29:1, 12; 48:7, 13, 14.

context. In the discussion below, examples are provided of differences in vocabulary, construction, and Hebrew *Vorlage*:²³

different *Vorlage*: 18:17; 20:2 (1b)

vocabulary: 24:14; 24:43; 24:44; 27:6; 34:15; 41:3 (all: paragraph 1a); 12:19; 31:13; 35:3 (1b)

construction: 39:18 (1a)

The differences between elements in each pair of texts preclude inner-Greek activity. The same argument was used in a similar case in Gen. 1: the Greek harmonizing plus in Gen. 1:9b ("and the water that was under the sky was gathered into their gatherings, and the dry land appeared"), differing from the Greek text of v. 9a, must have been based on a Hebrew harmonizing text like 4QGen^{k24}.

While usually no judgment can be passed on the vocabulary of the two Greek texts because the two Greek renderings use common LXX vocabulary,²⁵ in the aforementioned cases a strong argument against inner-LXX harmonization may be made. Furthermore, I believe that Greek translators, certainly literal ones, did not consider it their task to harmonize scriptural verses, especially when dealing with remote contexts.

3. *The frequent agreement of SP with the LXX.* The fact that the LXX agrees with SP in so many harmonizations (53 [group 2 below]) strengthens the assumption of a Hebrew background for other harmonizations as well.

Turning now to the data themselves,²⁶ the definition of harmonization is as follows. Scribes adapted many elements in the text to other details appearing either in the same verse or in the immediate or remote context.

23 For similar suggestions in the case of harmonizing pluses, see Tov 1985, 20–21.

24 See my analysis in Tov 1985, 21–22.

25 For example, 31:10 LXX + והאילים + (καὶ οἱ κριοὶ) = 31:38 MT SP LXX ואילי צאנך (κριοὺς τῶν προβάτων σου);

32:2(1) LXX + מנהג + παραμβολήν = 32:3(2) MT SP LXX מנהג (Παραμβολή);

42:27 LXX + צרור + (τὸν δεσμὸν) = 42:35 MT SP LXX צררות (τοὺς δεσμούς).

26 Our analysis is based on a fresh examination of the data included in the critical editions. Earlier lists of agreements between SP and LXX, not limited to harmonizations, were provided by Walton, Castellus and Lightfoot 1657 on the basis of now outdated editions. After the 17th century, it was declared that 1900 of the assumed 6000 differences between MT and SP included in that list involved readings common to LXX and SP. Against the traditional number of 1900 agreements, Kim counts merely 493 instances of agreement between LXX and SP, 328 of which are harmonizations. Altogether, Kim 1994 located 1.441 harmonizations in LXX-Torah. The agreements between LXX and SP were collected also by Metal 1979 without reference to their harmonizing nature.

Below, we record the harmonizations in Gen. 12–50 in MT, LXX, and SP,²⁷ as recorded in their critical editions.²⁸ Harmonizations in individual manuscripts of these sources that are often prone to harmonizing, such as in codex A of the LXX, are not recorded.²⁹ Harmonization is recognized in the following clusters in which the change/addition is found in the witness(es) registered before the "≠" sign:

1. LXX ≠ MT SP (145)
2. SP LXX ≠ MT (53)
3. SP ≠ MT LXX (31)
4. MT SP ≠ LXX (36)

The examples listed below provide a *subjective* and probably exhaustive list of the harmonizing changes in Gen. 12–50. The first line records the base text, and the second one lists the assumed harmonizing change, usually an addition.

The data are listed according to the clustering of the textual witnesses. The largest group (1) includes harmonizations exclusive to LXX, while group (2) contains similar data taken jointly from LXX and SP. Far fewer harmonizations are exclusive to SP. MT contains virtually no harmonizing changes. In other instances, it is possible that all our witnesses contain early harmonizations, but such instances cannot be located any more.

We distinguish between harmonizations influenced by (a) the immediate context, (b) the remote context, and (c) the addition or expansion of the subject or object on the basis of the context. In the case of additions based on remote contexts, one usually recognizes the idea or phrase that triggered the harmonizing change, for example in the plus in Gen. 18:5 (§ 1a). We suggest that most harmonizations of groups (a) and (b) were conscious, while those of group (c) could have been unconscious. The harmonizations of groups (a) and (b) reflect a certain conception, almost ideology, that intertextual links should be added in

27 In addition, the text of the Qumran scrolls is quoted (rarely) when agreeing with one of these sources in their harmonizing readings. Usually, MT goes together with the Targumim, Peshitta, and Vulgate but the readings of these versions have not been recorded.

28 The following editions were used: BHS; Tal and Florentin 2010; Wevers 1974. No help was provided by the commentaries on the LXX by Brayford 2007 and Harl 1986. Wevers 1993 is of some help, but see n. 18 above. In the comparison, orthographic variants are disregarded (for example, 20:2 MT הוּא / SP הוּא). Likewise, presumed deviations of LXX due to translation technique are not taken into consideration (for example, 13:17 MT SP LXX לארכה ולרחבה where LXX leaves out the pronominal suffixes).

29 For example, Gen. 47:3 A M^{ms} 29–82 etc. ἐκ παιδός (Α παιδιόθεν) ἕως τοῦ νῦν, based on 46:34.

order to perfect the biblical stories (cf. n. 6). Harmonizations to remote contexts (for example, 15:13; 34:24 [both § 1b]; 17:14; 50:25 [§ 2b]) show how well the editor-scribe knew the biblical text.

We have not included other sources of differences between the various texts, such as non-harmonizing pluses of MT SP to the LXX (for example, 19:16; 47:24; 48:14; 50:12, 14), of LXX SP to MT (for example, 27:38), of LXX to MT SP (for example, 28:13; 29:1; 35:4; 46:20–21 [different redaction]), of SP to MT LXX (30:37; 42:16 [redaction]), and textual developments (for example, 26:8, 24; 43:14).

By definition, all harmonizing additions are secondary. They were made in order to adapt one context to another one. However, the fullness of the formulation is often somewhat artificial and, in some cases, the additions are clearly secondary: 21:17a; 32:20(19) in LXX and 20:14 in LXX SP (§ 2a).

1. LXX ≠ MT SP (104 + 22 + 19 = 145)

1a. Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (104x)

17:10 MT SP LXX אַחריִךְ; LXX + לדרתם + (εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν). Based on vv. 7, 9 MT SP LXX אַחריִךְ לדרתם.

18:5 MT SP LXX תעברו; LXX + לדרככם + (εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῶν). Based on 19:2 MT SP LXX והלכתם לדרככם.

After the stay of the two angels with Lot in chap. 19, Lot says "then you can rise early and go on your way" (19:2). Similarly, after the stay of the "two men" or "angels" with Abraham in chap. 18, he suggests to them: "afterwards you will pass on." On the basis of the similarity between the two chapters, the *Vorlage* of the LXX added the words "on their way."

18:9 MT SP LXX שָׂרָה אִשְׁתְּךָ; LXX + ויען + (ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς [εἶπεν]). Probably based on v. 27 MT SP LXX ויען אברהם ויאמר.

18:13 MT SP LXX צַחֲקָה; LXX + בקרבה + (ἐν ἑαυτῇ). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX ותצחק שָׂרָה בקרבה.

18:16 MT SP LXX סָדָם; LXX + ועמרה + (καὶ Γομόρρα). Based on v. 20 and *passim* MT SP LXX סָדָם ועמרה.

- 18:23 MT SP LXX רשע (האף תספה צדיק עם); LXX + והיה כצדיק כרשע + (καὶ ἔσται ὁ δίκαιος ὡς ὁ ἀσεβής). Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX להמית צדיק עם (רשע) והיה כצדיק כרשע.
- 19:10 MT SP והדלה; LXX דלת הבית (καὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ οἴκου). Based on the context MT SP LXX הביתה ואת הדלת סגרו.
- 19:16 MT SP והאנשים; LXX המלאכים. Based on v. 1 MT SP LXX המלאכים.
- 19:33b MT SP LXX אביה; LXX + בלילה + (τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνη). Based on v. 33a MT SP LXX בלילה.
- 21:12 MT SP LXX אַל ירע בעיניך; LXX + . Based on v. 11 MT SP LXX וירע הדבר.
- 21:17a MT SP LXX הנער; LXX + באשר הוא שם + (ἐκ τοῦ τόπου οὗ ἦν). Based on v. 17b MT SP LXX.
In v. 17b, the angel stresses the omnipotence of God who is able to hear the boy, Hagar's son, "where he is," but v. 17a records a simple act of hearing by God.³⁰ The phrase has been copied from the end to the beginning of the verse.
- 21:29 MT SP (האלה) שבע כבשת (SP הכבשות); LXX + הצאן + (τῶν προβάτων). Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX (צאן) שבע כבשת הצאן.
- 21:30 MT SP LXX (שבע הכבשות) את שבע כבשת (SP שבע הכבשות); LXX + האלה (שבע הכבשות) (ταύτας). Based on v. 29 MT SP LXX (שבע הכבשות) שבע כבשת האלה (SP שבע הכבשות) האלה; for LXX see above).
- 22:3 MT SP LXX (אל המקום) ויקם וילך; LXX + ויבא + (καὶ ἦλθεν). Based on v. 9 MT SP LXX ויבאו אל המקום.
- 23:6 MT SP LXX מקבר מתך; LXX + שמה + (ἐκεῖ). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX ואקברה את מתי שמה.
- 24:4 MT SP LXX (כי אם) ואל משפחתי + (καὶ εἰς τὴν φυλὴν μου). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX (כי אם) משפחתי ואל תלך ואל משפחתי.

30 Since the translation of this phrase in v. 17b is not literal, in this case the phrase in v. 17a may have been duplicated by the translator himself.

24:4 MT SP LXX לבני ליצחק; LXX + משם + (ἐκεῖθεν). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX ולקחת אשה לבני משם (LXX + Ἰσαάκ +).

24:7 MT SP LXX יהוה אלהי השמים; LXX + ואלהי הארץ + (καὶ ὁ θεὸς τῆς γῆς). Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX ביהוה אלהי השמים ואלהי הארץ .

24:8 MT SP LXX ללכת אחריך; LXX + אל הארץ הזאת + (εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην). Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX ללכת אחרי אל הארץ הזאת.

24:14 MT SP LXX אשקה; LXX + עד אם כלו לשתת + (ἕως ἂν παύσωνται πίνουσαι). Based on v. 19 MT SP LXX עד אם כלו לשתת (אשאב).
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ: the LXX in v. 19 probably reflects כל or כלם (ἕως ἂν πᾶσαι πῖωσιν) as opposed to v. 14 כלו.

24:23 MT SP LXX init. – ; LXX + וישאל אתה + (καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτήν). Based on v. 47 MT SP LXX ואשאל אתה ואמר.

24:43 MT SP LXX והיה העלמה היצאת. LXX + ובנות אנשי העיר יצאת + (καὶ αἰ θυγατέρες τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς πόλεως ἐξελεύσονται). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX ובנות אנשי העיר יצאת לשאב מים.
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ: for v. 43 τῶν ἀνθρώπων = אנשי, v. 13 reads οἰκούντων = ישרי.

24:44 MT SP LXX אשר הכיה יהוה לבן אדני
LXX + לעבדך ליצחק ובה אדע כי עשית חסד עם אדני אברהם + (τῷ ἑαυτοῦ θεράποντι Ἰσαάκ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκωμαι ὅτι πεποίηκας ἔλεος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Αβραάμ). Based on v. 14 MT SP LXX הכחת לעבדך ליצחק ובה אדע כי עשית חסד עם אדני אברהם.
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek equivalents differ: In v. 14 עבד is rendered with τῷ παιδί σου, and for πεποίηκας v. 14 has ἐποίησας. Further, only SP has אברהם.

24:47 MT SP LXX בת בתואל; LXX + אנכי + (εἰμι). Based on v. 24 MT SP LXX בת בתואל אנכי.

24:54 MT SP LXX שלחני; LXX + ואלכה + (ἵνα ἀπέλθω). Based on v. 56 MT SP LXX שלחוני ואלכה.

24:60 MT SP LXX את רבקה; LXX + אחתם + (τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῶν). Based on v. 59 MT SP LXX את רבקה אחתם.

25:10 MT SP LXX השדה; LXX + והמערה + (καὶ τὸ σπήλαιον). Based on v. 9 MT SP LXX מערת המכפלה and 23:20 השדה והמערה.

26:21 MT SP LXX init -- ; LXX + ויעתק משם + (ἀπάρας δὲ ἐκεῖθεν). Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX.

27:6 MT SP LXX יעקב בנה; LXX + הקטן + (τὸν ἐλάσσω). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX יעקב בנה הקטן.

The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek equivalents differ: for v. 6 τὸν ἐλάσσω, v. 15 reads τὸν νεώτερον.

27:36 MT SP LXX ברכה; LXX + אבי + (πάτερ). Based on v. 34 MT SP LXX.

27:43 MT SP LXX לך ברח; LXX + פדנה ארם + (εἰς τὴν Μεσοποταμίαν). Based on 28:2 MT SP LXX קום לך פדנה ארם.

28:15 MT SP LXX ושמרתיו; LXX + בדרך + (ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ). Based on v. 20 MT SP LXX ושמרני בדרך הזה.

29:1 MT SP LXX בני קדם

LXX + ועשו / אביהם / אביו + (πρὸς Λαβὰν τὸν υἱὸν Βαθουήλ τοῦ Σύρου ἀδελφὸν δὲ Πεβέκκακας μητρὸς Ἰακώβ καὶ Ησαΐ). Based on 28:5 MT SP LXX בני בתואל הארמי אחי רבקה אם יעקב ועשו.

29:9b MT SP LXX רעה הוא

LXX + אביה / את צאן אביה / את הצאן אשר לאביה + (τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς). Based on v. 9a MT SP LXX הצאן אשר לאביה (cf. also 37:12).

30:5 MT SP LXX בלהה; LXX + שפחת רחל + (ἡ παιδίσκη Παχήλ). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX בלהה שפחת רחל.

30:10 MT SP LXX init – . LXX + ויבא אליה יעקב ותהר + (εἰσηλθεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὴν Ἰακώβ καὶ συνέλαβεν). Based on vv. 4–5 MT SP LXX.

30:12 MT SP LXX init --

LXX + ותהר + (καὶ συνέλαβεν). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX ותהר עוד ותלד.

31:10 MT SP LXX והעדים; likewise v. 12; LXX + והאילים + (καὶ οἱ κριοί). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX ואילי צאנך.

- 31:10, 12 MT SP LXX; הצאן; LXX + והעזים + (καὶ τὰς αἰγᾶς). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX ועזיך ורחליך.
- 31:13 MT SP LXX; ארץ מולדתך; LXX + ואהיה עמך + (καὶ ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ). Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX ועמך ורחליך ואהיה עמך.
- 31:18 MT SP LXX; בפדן ארם; LXX + וכל אשר לו + (καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτοῦ); likewise v. 31. Based on v. 21 MT SP LXX וכל אשר לו.
- 31:22 MT SP LXX; ללבן; LXX + הארמי + (τῷ Σύρω). Based on v. 20 MT SP LXX לבן הארמי.
- 31:38 MT SP LXX; זה; עשרים שנה; LXX + לי + (μοι). Based on v. 41 MT SP LXX לי עשרים שנה.
- 31:41 MT SP LXX; שנה; LXX + אנכי + (ἐγὼ εἰμι). Based on v. 38 MT SP LXX.
- 32:2(1) MT SP LXX; לדרכו; LXX + מחנה אלהים חנה + (καὶ ἀναβλέψας εἶδεν παρεμβολὴν θεοῦ παρεμβεβληκυῖαν). Based on 33:1 MT SP LXX וירא מחנה אלהים and 32:3(2) MT SP LXX וירא עיניו יעקב וישא יעקב עיניו וירא מחנה אלהים.
- 32:20(19) MT SP LXX; ויצו (גם את השני גם את השלישי) LXX + את הראשון + (τῷ πρώτῳ). Based on v. 18(17) MT SP LXX את הראשון ויצו את הראשון.
This verse quotes Jacob's words to the second and third servants, but the Hebrew parent text of LXX found it necessary to complete the picture by adding the "first." However, the "first one" was already mentioned in v. 18(17), making this addition awkward.
- 32:29(28) MT SP LXX; כי אם ישראל; LXX + יהיה שמך + (ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου). Based on the preceding words in the verse: MT SP LXX לא יעקב יאמר ויהיה שמך and also on 35:10 MT SP LXX ויהיה שמך.
- 33:2 MT SP LXX; (השפחות) --- . LXX + שתי + (δύο). Based on v. 1 MT SP LXX שתי השפחות.
- 33:8 MT SP LXX; מי (לך); LXX + אלה + (ταῦτά). Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX מי אלה לך.
- 34:10 MT SP; (תהיה לפניכם); והארץ; LXX + הנה רחבת ידים + (ἰδοὺ πλατεῖα ἐναντίον ὑμῶν). Based on v. 21 MT SP LXX הנה רחבת ידים לפניכם.

- 34:14 MT SP LXX + (Συμμεών και Λευὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Δίνας υἱοὶ δὲ Λείας). Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX
שִׁמְעוֹן וְלוֹי אֲחֵי דִינָה וּבְנֵי לֵאָה + אֲלֵיהֶם; שִׁמְעוֹן וְלוֹי אֲחֵי דִינָה.
- 34:15 MT SP LXX + (καὶ κατοικήσομεν ἐν ὑμῖν). Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX + (καὶ οἰκήσομεν παρ' ὑμῖν).
לָכֵם; וְיִשְׁבְּנוּ אִתְּכֶם + וְיִשְׁבְּנוּ אִתְּכֶם (καὶ οἰκήσομεν παρ' ὑμῖν).
The condition put forward by Jacob's sons to Schechem in v. 16 is repeated in v. 15. The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek verbs differ slightly.
- 34:16 MT SP LXX + (γυναῖκας). Based on v. 21 MT SP LXX + (לְנָשִׁים).
נָשִׁים; לְנָשִׁים + נָשִׁים (γυναῖκας). Based on v. 21 MT SP LXX
נָשִׁים לְנָשִׁים.
- 34:23 MT SP LXX + (ἐν τούτῳ). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX + (בְּאֵךְ בּוֹזָאת נָאוֹת לָכֵם and v. 22).
אָךְ; בּוֹזָאת + (ἐν τούτῳ). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX
אָךְ בּוֹזָאת נָאוֹת לָכֵם and v. 22.
- 34:29 MT SP LXX + (ὅσα τε ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει). Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX + (וַיְבֹזּוּ).
וַיְבֹזּוּ; וַיְבֹזּוּ + וַיְבֹזּוּ (ὅσα τε ἦν ἐν τῇ πόλει).
Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX.
- 35:1 MT SP LXX + (εἰς τὸν τόπον Βαιθήλ). Based on v. 7 MT SP LXX + (בֵּית אֵל) and several additional verses:
וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֶת שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵתוֹ שֵׁם אֱלֹהִים בֵּית אֵל
וַיִּקְרָא אֶת שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם אֵל בֵּית אֵל
Cf. also 12:6 MT SP LXX + (בֵּית אֵל) and 28:18.
- 35:7 MT SP LXX + (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX + (וַיִּקְרָא לְמָקוֹם).
וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֶת שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX
וַיִּקְרָא יַעֲקֹב אֶת שֵׁם הַמָּקוֹם.
- 36:30 MT SP LXX + (Αἰὼν). Based on vv. 16, 17, 21, 31 MT SP LXX + (שְׁעִיר).
שְׁעִיר; אֵדוֹם. Based on vv. 16, 17, 21, 31 MT SP LXX.
- 36:39 MT SP LXX + (Ἀρὰδ υἱὸς Βαράδ). Based on v. 35 MT SP (LXX) + (בֶּן בַּדָּד).
בֶּן בַּדָּד; בֶּן בַּדָּד + (Ἀρὰδ υἱὸς Βαράδ). Based on v. 35 MT SP (LXX)
בֶּן בַּדָּד.
- 39:14 MT SP LXX + (παῖδα Ἐβραϊόν). Based on v. 17 MT SP LXX + (אִישׁ עִבְרִי).
עִבְדֵי עִבְרִי (παῖδα Ἐβραϊόν). Based on v. 17 MT SP LXX
עִבְדֵי עִבְרִי.
- 39:17 MT SP LXX + (καὶ εἶπέν μοι Κοιμηθήσομαι μετὰ σοῦ). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX + (בָּא אֵלַי לִישְׁכֵּב עִמִּי) and v. 14 MT SP LXX + (אֵלַי לִישְׁכֵּב עִמִּי).
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי לִישְׁכֵּב עִמָּךְ + (καὶ εἶπέν μοι Κοιμηθήσομαι μετὰ σοῦ). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי לִישְׁכֵּב עִמִּי and v. 14 MT SP LXX + (אֵלַי לִישְׁכֵּב עִמִּי).

- 39:18 MT SP (כהרימי קולי) ויהי; LXX + כשמעו כי + (ὡς δὲ ἤκουσεν ὅτι). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX קולי ויהי כשמעו כי הרימתי קולי (SP: הרימי).
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek constructions differ (39:15 ἐν δὲ τῷ ἀκοῦσαι αὐτόν).
- 39:18 MT SP LXX (החוצה) וינס; LXX + ויצא + (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν); cf. 39:13 (§ 2a).
Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX וינס ויצא החוצה.
- 39:23 MT SP ראה; LXX ידע (γινώσκων). Based on v. 8 MT SP LXX לא ידע
אתי מה בבית (SP: מאומה).
- 39:23 MT SP LXX מצליח; LXX T-Neoph + בידו + (ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ).
Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX-MSS יהוה מצליח בידו.
- 40:16 MT SP (בחלומי) אף אני; LXX + ראיתי + (εἶδον). Based on 41:22 MT SP
LXX וארא בחלמי.
- 41:3 MT SP (ותעמדה) ותרעינה; LXX (ἐνέμουντο). Based on v. 2 MT SP LXX
ותרעינה (καὶ ἐβόσασκοντο). Cf. also 41:18 MT SP LXX ותרעינה (καὶ ἐνέμουντο).
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ.
- 41:4 MT SP LXX (הפרות) ותאכלנה; LXX + שבע + (ἐπτά); likewise vv. 20, 23.
Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX ושבע פרות אחרות.
- 41:6 MT SP LXX שבע שבליים; LXX + אחרות + (ἄλλοι); likewise v. 23. Based
on v. 3 MT SP LXX ושבע פרות אחרות; cf. also v. 19.
- 41:7 MT SP LXX (השבליים) ותבלענה; LXX + שבע + (οἱ ἐπτά). Based on v. 27
MT SP LXX ושבע הפרות הרקות.
- 41:7 MT SP LXX (הדקות); LXX 4QGen^{c,e} + שדפות הקדים + (καὶ ἀνεμόφθοροι);
likewise v. 23. Based on v. 27 MT SP LXX ושבע השבליים הרקות שדפות
הקדים (SP: הרקות).
- 41:19 MT SP LXX (אחריהן) ואחריהן; LXX + מן היאר + (ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ). Based on v.
18 MT SP LXX והנה מן היאר עלת שבע פרות.
- 41:20 MT SP LXX (הבריאת) הראשנות; LXX + וטבות + (τὰς καλὰς).
Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX ובריאות וטבות.

41:21 MT SP LXX ואיקץ; LXX + ואישן + (ἐκοιμήθη). Based on v. 5 MT SP (ויישן ויחלם שנית).

The harmonizing plus added to v. 21 occurs at the end of the first dream, just before the second dream. It is based on the assumption that one cannot have a second dream without falling asleep after the first dream, as in vv. 4–5 (ויחלם שנית) in M and 4QGen^C, while ויישן is lacking in the OG (it is found only in the Hexapla, with a different verb, καὶ ὑπνωσεν). The plus was not influenced by the LXX of 41:5, since the word is lacking in that version.

41:24 MT SP LXX השבלים הטבות; LXX + והמלאה + (καὶ τοὺς πλήρεις). Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX טבות מלאה אחד בקנה עלת בקנה אחד מלאה וטבות.

41:39 MT SP LXX (נבון וחכם); אין; LXX + איש + (οὐκ ἔστιν) ἄνθρωπος (φρονιμώτερος καὶ συνετώτερός σου). Based on v. 33 MT SP LXX איש נבון וחכם.

42:2 MT SP LXX ושברו לנו משם; LXX + מעט אכל + (μικρὰ βρώματα). Based on 43:2 MT SP LXX ושברו לנו מעט אכל.

42:27 MT SP LXX (וירא) את (כספו); LXX + צרור + (τὸν δεσμὸν). Based on v. 35 MT SP LXX ויראו את צרות כספיהם.

42:30 MT SP LXX ויתן אתנו; LXX + אל משמר + (ἐν φυλακῆ). Based on v. 17 MT SP LXX ויאסף אתם אל משמר.

42:32 MT SP LXX והקטן את אבינו היום; LXX + והקטן את אבינו היום (ὁ δὲ μικρότερος μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σήμερον). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX והנה הקטן את אבינו היום.

Different sequence. The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ (for μικρότερος in v. 32, v. 13 has ὁ νεώτερος).

42:33 MT SP LXX (רעבון בתיכם); ואת; LXX + שבר + (τὸν δὲ ἀγορασμὸν). Based on v. 19 MT SP LXX שבר רעבון בתיכם.

43:3 MT SP LXX אחיכם; LXX + הקטן + (ὁ νεώτερος); likewise v. 5. Based on 42:15, 20, 34 MT SP LXX אחיכם הקטן.

43:5 MT SP LXX משלה; ואם אינך משלה; LXX + את אחינו אתנו + (τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν μεθ' ἡμῶν). Based on v. 4 MT SP LXX אתנו משלה את אחינו אתנו.

- 43:7 MT SP (את אחיכם); הורידו; LXX הביאו (ἀγάγετε). Based on 42:34 MT SP LXX והביאו את אחיכם הקטן and 42:20.
- 43:16 MT SP LXX בנימין; LXX + אחיו בן אמו + (τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ὁμομήτριον [most MSS]). Based on v. 29 MT SP LXX בנימין אחיו בן אמו.
- 43:26 MT SP (ארצה) לו (וישתחו); LXX + אפים + (ἐπὶ πρόσωπον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν). Based on 42:6 MT SP LXX וישתחו לו אפים ארצה.
- 44:5 MT SP LXX init; LXX + ואת גביעי הכסף (ἵνα τί ἐκλέψατέ μου τὸ κόνδυ τὸ ἀργυροῦν). Partially based on v. 2 MT SP LXX ואת גביעי הכסף.
- 44:32 MT SP LXX אליך; LXX + והצגתיו לפניך + (καὶ στήσω αὐτὸν ἐναντίον σου). Based on 43:9 MT SP LXX והצגתיו לפניך.
- 47:9 MT SP (מגורי); ימי שני חייך; LXX + חיי + (τῆς ζωῆς μου). Based on v. 8 MT SP LXX ימי שני חייך.
- 47:14 MT SP LXX שברים; LXX + ושבר אשר הם שברים; LXX + ויכלכל + (καὶ ἐσιτομέτρει αὐτοῖς). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX ויכלכל יוסף.
- 47:19a MT SP LXX (ואדמתנו); LXX + תשם + (ἐρημωθῆ). Based on v. 19b MT SP LXX והאדמה לא תשם.
- 47:19 MT SP LXX ותן זרע; LXX + ונזרע + (ἵνα σπείρωμεν). Based on v. 23 MT SP LXX ותן זרע וזרעתם.
- 47:20b MT SP LXX שדהו; LXX + לפרעה + (τῷ Φαραώ). Based on v. 20a MT SP LXX.
- 48:14 MT SP LXX (ימינו); את; SP LXX ימינו + את + יד + (τὴν χεῖρα τὴν δεξιάν). Based on v. 17 MT SP יד ימינו.

1b. Remote Context (22x)

- 12:6 MT SP LXX (עד מקום שכם); LXX + לארכה + (εἰς τὸ μῆκος αὐτῆς). Based on 13:17 MT SP LXX קום התהלך בארץ לארכה ולרחבה.

In 13:17, the phrase denotes the extensive wandering of Abraham in all directions in Canaan in accord with the divine promise made to him, while in 12:6 the text refers to Abraham's travel from point *a* to point *b*, until he reached Shechem. Since Abraham probably traveled from north to south, the addition makes appropriate use of 12:6.

12:19 MT SP LXX (קה ולך) הנה אשתך (קה ולך); LXX + לפניך + (ἐναντίον σου). Based on 24:51 MT SP LXX הנה רבקה לפניך קה ולך.

The situations are different, while the phrases are similar. In 12:19, Pharaoh utters these words to Abraham regarding Sarai, and in 24:51 they are Laban's words to Abraham's senior servant. The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ (24:51 ἐνώπιόν σου).

15:13 MT SP LXX (וענו אתם) ויעבדום; LXX + והרעו אתנו + (καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς). Based on Deut. 26:6 MT SP LXX וירעו אתנו המצרים ויענונו. Both texts speak about the slavery in Egypt.

18:17 MT SP LXX מאברהם (אני) (ויהוה אמר המכסה אני); LXX + עבדי + (τοῦ παιδός μου). Based on 26:24b MT SP עבדי אברהם (בעבור).

Elsewhere this phrase occurs only in Ps. 105:6, 42 (עבדו), making it likely that the wording of 18:17 was influenced by 26:24b. The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek words reflect slightly different Hebrew texts (LXX 26:24b Αβραάμ τὸν πατέρα σου = אברהם אביך).³¹

20:2 MT SP LXX (ויאמר אברהם אל שרה אשתו) אחתי הוא

LXX + (ἐφοβήθη γὰρ εἰπεῖν ὅτι θυγάτηρ μου ἐστὶν μήποτε ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τῆς πόλεως δι' αὐτήν). Based on 26:7 MT SP LXX (כי ירא לאמר אשתי פן יהרגני אנשי המקום על רבקה כי טובת מראה היא

The situations are similar: in 20:2, Abraham is afraid of Abimelech, while in 26:7 Isaac is afraid of the same king, both with regard to their wives. The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek texts reflect slightly different Hebrew texts (26:7 τοῦ τόπου = המקום as opposed to 20:2 τῆς πόλεως = העיר).

31 The phrase in LXX 26:24b is probably influenced by v. 24a Αβραάμ τὸν πατέρα σου.

- 21:19 MT SP LXX באר מים; LXX + חיים + ([φρέαρ ὕδατος] ζῶντος). Based on 26:19 MT SP LXX באר מים חיים.
- 21:22 MT SP LXX ואבימלך; LXX + ואחזת מרעהו + (καὶ Ὀχοζάθ ὁ συμφαγωγὸς αὐτοῦ); likewise 33:8. Based on 26:26 MT SP LXX ואבימלך הלך אליו מגרר ואחזת מרעהו ופיכל שר צבאו.
- 27:46 MT SP LXX (חת) בנות בחיי מפני; LXX + בני + (τῶν υἱῶν). Based on 25:10 MT SP LXX בני חת and *passim*.
If this plus is not a doublet, it represents a rather unthoughtful addition (חת בני חת), not matched by similar phrases in Hebrew or Greek Scripture.
- 29:12 MT SP LXX ותגד לאביה; LXX + כדברים האלה + (κατὰ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα). Based on 24:28 MT SP LXX ותגד לבית אמה כדברים האלה.
- 31:13 MT SP LXX (בית אל) האל; LXX + הנראה אליך + (ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι). Based on 35:1 MT SP LXX הנראה אליך ... בית אל.
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the Greek texts differ (31:13 ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ as opposed to 35:15 Βαιθήλα).
- 32:6(5) MT SP LXX (הן בעיניך) למצא; LXX + עבדך + (ὁ παῖς σου); likewise 33:8. Based on 19:19 MT SP LXX הן בעיניך מצא עבדך הן בעיניך.
- 34:24 MT SP LXX וימלו; LXX + את בשר ערלת + (τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν). Based on 17:14 MT SP LXX.
- 35:3 MT SP LXX (בדרך) ויהי עמדי; LXX + ושמרני + (καὶ διέσωσέν με). Based on 28:20 MT SP LXX ויהי אלהים עמדי ושמרני בדרך.
The influence took place at the Hebrew level since the two Greek texts differ (28:20: καὶ διαφυλάξῃ με).
- 35:4 MT SP LXX (אשר עם שכמ) ויאבדם עד היום הזה; LXX + (καὶ ἀπώλεσεν αὐτὰ ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας). Based on Deut. 11:4 MT SP LXX ויאבדם יהוה עד היום הזה.
- 35:27 MT SP LXX (הוא חברון) כנען; LXX + בארץ כנען + (ἐν γῆ Χανάαν). Based on 23:2 MT SP LXX הוא חברון בארץ כנען.
- 35:28 MT SP LXX (ימי יצחק) אשר חי; LXX + (ἄς ἔζησεν); likewise 5:27. Based on 5:5 MT SP LXX ימי אדם אשר חי and 25:7 MT SP LXX.

40:17 MT SP LXX (ו)העוף; LXX + השמים + (τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); likewise 40:19.
Based on 1:26, 28, 30 MT SP LXX ובעוף השמים.

44:29 MT SP LXX וקראהו אסון; LXX + בדרך + (ἐν τῇ ὁδῶ). Based on 42:38
MT SP LXX וקראהו אסון בדרך.

50:22 MT SP LXX (ובית אביו) הוא; LXX + ואחיו וכל + (καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ
καὶ παῖσα ...). Based on 47:12 MT SP LXX ואת אחיו ואת כל בית אביו.

1c. Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (19x)

14:14 MT SP LXX (אחיו); LXX + לוט + לוט. Based on v. 16 לוט אחיו.

16:8 MT SP LXX ויאמר; LXX + יהיה + (αὐτῆς ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου).
Based on vv. 7, 9 MT SP LXX.

19:35b MT SP LXX עמו; LXX את אביה (μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς). Based on
v. 35a MT SP LXX.

24:3 MT SP LXX לבני; LXX + ליצחק + לבני ליצחק. Based on 24:4 MT SP LXX לבני ליצחק.

21:26 MT SP LXX ויאמר; likewise 24:31; 43:23 MT SP LXX
LXX + אליו + (αὐτῶ). Based on the context.

24:67b MT SP LXX (אמו) אחרי; LXX + שרה + שרה. Based on the context. For the
reverse phenomenon, see v. 67a.

26:7 MT SP LXX על אשתו; LXX על רבקה אשתו (περὶ Ρεβέκκας τῆς
γυναίκος αὐτοῦ). Based on 25:21 MT SP LXX רבקה אשתו.

26:19 MT SP LXX בנחל; LXX + גרר + בנחל גרר. Based on v. 17 MT SP LXX בנחל גרר.

27:36 MT SP LXX ויאמר; LXX + עשו לאביו + (Ἦσαὺ τῶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ).
Based on 27:34 MT SP LXX ויאמר לאביו.

30:23 MT SP LXX ותלד; LXX + ליעקב + ותלד ליעקב. Based on v. 5 MT SP LXX ותלד
ליעקב.

32:30(29) MT SP LXX נא; LXX + לי + (μοι) = 4Q158. Based on the
context.

34:5 MT SP LXX טמא; LXX + בן חמור + (ὁ υἱὸς Εμμώου). Based on v. 2 MT SP LXX שכם בן חמור.

39:4 MT SP LXX בידו (נתן); LXX + ביד יוסף + (διὰ χειρὸς Ἰωσήφ). Based on v. 6 MT SP LXX ביד יוסף.

41:26 MT SP LXX הלום; LXX + פרעה + . Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX הלום פרעה.

44:9 MT SP LXX אוֹשֵׁר ימצא אתו; LXX + הגביע + (τὸ κόνδου). Partially based on v. 12 MT SP LXX הגביע.

44:13 MT SP LXX ויעמס איש; LXX + אמתחתו + (τὸν μάρσιππον αὐτοῦ). Based on the context.

48:13 MT SP LXX ויגש; LXX + אתם + (αὐτούς). Partially based on v. 10 MT SP LXX ויגש אתם אליו.

2. SP LXX ≠ MT (34 + 6 + 13 = 53)

2a. Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (34x)

12:20 MT SP LXX ואת אשר לו; SP LXX + ולוט עמו + (καὶ Λώτ μετ' αὐτοῦ). Based on 13:1 MT SP LXX עמו וכל אשר לו ולוט עמו.

14:10 MT SP LXX ומלך (ועמרה); SP LXX + מלך + (βασιλεύς). Based on the context.

15:10 MT SP LXX ואת הצפר; SP LXX + ואת הצפורים + (τὰ δὲ ὄρνεα). Based on v. 9 MT SP LXX ותר וגו'.

17:19 MT SP LXX ובהנה (שרה); SP LXX + הנה + (ἰδοῦ). Based on 18:10 MT SP LXX ובהנה בן לשרה אשתך.

18:29, 30 MT SP LXX לא אעשה; SP LXX + לא אשחית + (οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσω). Based on v. 28 MT SP LXX.

19:12 MT SP LXX והוצא מן המקום; SP LXX + הזה + (τούτου). Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX את המקום הזה.

19:30b MT SP LXX והוא ושתי בנתיו; SP LXX + עמו + (μετ' αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 30a MT SP LXX והשתי בנתיו עמו.

- 20:14 MT SP LXX (צאן ובקר ועבדים ושפחה) ויקח אבימלך (χίλια δίδραχμα). Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX.
 SP LXX + אלף כסף + (χίλια δίδραχμα). Based on v. 16 MT SP LXX.
 The harmonization in this verse reveals its secondary nature. According to v. 14 MT, Abimelech gave Abraham "sheep and oxen, and male and female slaves," but according to v. 16 MT SP LXX he told Sarah that he had given him "a thousand pieces of silver." That monetary unit may have been the value of the items he had given Abraham according to v. 14. However, the SP LXX version of v. 14 added this detail from v. 16, and thus according to that version Abraham received twice as much in reparation.
- 21:8 MT SP LXX יצחק; SP LXX + בנו + (ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ); likewise 25:5 based on v. 6 MT SP LXX. Based on vv. 4, 5 MT SP בנו יצחק.
- 21:13 MT SP LXX בן האמה; SP LXX (most MSS) + הזאת + (ταύτης). Based on v. 10 MT SP LXX האמה הזאת.
- 22:16 MT SP LXX את יחידך; SP LXX + ממני + (δι' ἐμέ). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX את יחידך ממני ולא חשכת את בנך את יחידך ממני.
- 23:17 MT (ממרא) לפני (במכפלה אשר); SP LXX על פני (κατὰ πρόσωπον). Based on v. 19 ממרא על פני ממרא המכפלה על פני ממרא.
- 24:15 MT SP LXX לדבר; SP LXX + אל לבו + (ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ). Based on v. 45 MT SP LXX אל לבו לדיבור.
- 26:5 MT SP LXX אברהם; SP LXX + אביך + (ὁ πατήρ σου); likewise 28:4. Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX אברהם אביך.
- 26:7 MT SP LXX אשתי; SP LXX + היא + (ἐστίν). Based on the context and 12:19, 20:2 MT SP LXX אחתי הוא.
- 31:33 MT SP LXX ויבא לבן; SP LXX + ויחפש + (ἠρξύνθησεν). Based on v. 35 MT SP LXX.
- 32:24(23) MT SP LXX (אשר לו) --- ; SP LXX + כל + (πάντα [τὰ αὐτοῦ]). Based on 31:21 MT SP LXX וכל אשר לו.
- 35:9b MT SP LXX ויברך אתו; SP LXX + אלהים + (ὁ θεός). Based on v. 9a MT SP LXX וירא אלהים.

- 38:13 MT SP LXX לתמר; SP LXX + כלתו + (τῆ νύμφη αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 11 MT SP LXX כלתו לתמר.
- 38:21 MT SP מקמה; SP LXX אנשי המקום (τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ τόπου). Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX.
- 38:25 MT SP והפתילים; SP LXX והפתיל (καὶ ὁ ὄρμισκος). Based on v. 18 MT SP LXX ופתילך.
- 39:8 MT SP מה; SP LXX מאומה (οὐδὲν). Based on v. 23 MT SP בידו את כל מאומה.
- 39:13 MT SP LXX וינס; SP LXX + ויצא + (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν); cf. 39:18 (§ 1a). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX וינס ויצא החוצה.
- 41:35 MT SP LXX (ה)אכל (השנים); SP LXX + שבע + (ἐπτά). Based on v. 29 MT SP LXX שבע שנים.
- 41:43 MT SP ויקראו (לפניו); SP LXX ויקרא (καὶ ἐκήρυσεν). Based on the preceding singular verbs in vv. 42–43.
- 41:48 MT SP LXX היו (שבע שנים אשר); SP LXX + היה + השבע (ἦν ἡ εὐθηρία). Based on v. 53 MT SP LXX שבע שני השבע.
- 42:28 MT SP LXX והנה; SP LXX + הוא + (τοῦτο). Based on v. 27 MT SP והנה הוא בפי אמתחתו.
- 43:18 MT SP LXX השב (הכסף); SP LXX המושב (τὸ ἀποστραφέν). Based on v. 12 MT SP LXX הכסף המושב.
- 44:24 MT SP LXX אבי; SP LXX אבינו (πατέρα δὲ ἡμῶν). Based on v. 25 MT SP LXX.
- 44:31 MT SP LXX הגער אין הגער; SP LXX + אתנו + (μεθ' ἡμῶν). Based on v. 30 MT LXX הגער איננו אתנו.
- 47:16 MT SP LXX ואתנה לכם; SP LXX + להם + (ἄρτους). Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX הבה לנו להם.
- 50:25 MT SP LXX מזה; SP LXX + אתכם + (μεθ' ὑμῶν). Based on the context.

2b. Remote Context (6x)

- 15:21 MT SP LXX וואת הכנעני; SP LXX + וואת החוי + (καὶ τοὺς Εὐαίους). Based on Exod. 23:23 MT והיבוסִי החוי והכנעני הפרזי והחתי והחתי והפרזי והכנעני החוי והיבוסִי (cf. SP LXX) and similar passages.
- 17:14 MT SP LXX ולא ימול את בשר ערלתו; SP LXX + ביום השמיני + (τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ὀγδόης). Based on Lev. 12:3 MT SP LXX.
- 21:13 MT SP LXX וגם את בן האמה לגוי (אשימנו); SP LXX + גדול + (μέγα). Based on v. 18 MT SP LXX לגוי גדול אשימנו.
- 24:60 MT SP LXX ושער שנאיו; SP LXX איביו (τῶν ὑπεναντίων). Based on 22:17 MT SP LXX ושער איביו.
- 25:8 MT SP LXX ושבע (זקן); SP LXX + ימים + ([πλήρης] ἡμερῶν). Based on 35:29 MT SP LXX זקן ושבע ימים.
- 50:25 MT SP LXX (והעלתם) את עצמתי (מזה); SP LXX + אתכם + (μεθ' ὑμῶν). Based on Exod. 13:19 MT SP LXX והעליתם את עצמתי מזה אתכם. This example shows how well the harmonizing scribe of Genesis knew the Scripture text. Joseph's words in Gen. 50:25 are quoted with a slight expansion in Exod. 13:19, and this text was in turn inserted in SP LXX in Genesis.

2c. Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (13x)

- 12:7 MT SP LXX ויאמר; SP LXX + לו + (αὐτῷ). Based on the context.
- 14:19a MT SP LXX ויברכהו; SP LXX את אברם ויברך (καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν Ἀβράμ). Based on v. 19b MT SP LXX.
- 21:30 MT SP LXX ויאמר; SP LXX + אברהם + ; likewise v. 33; 24:14. Based on the context.
- 29:23 MT SP LXX ויבא אליה; SP LXX + יעקב + . Based on the context.
- 37:36 MT SP LXX אתו (והמדנים מכרו); SP LXX את יוסף. Based on the context.
- 39:4 MT SP LXX בעיניו (ויוצא יוסף הן) בעיניו (ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ). Based on v. 2.

39:11 MT SP LXX ויבא; SP LXX + יוסף + . Based on the context.

43:22 MT SP LXX הורדנו (וכסף אחר) (והורדנו); SP LXX לקחנו (ἠνεγκάμεν). Based on 43:12 MT SP LXX וכסף משנה קחו בידכם.

47:3 MT SP LXX אחיו (אחי); SP LXX אחי יוסף (τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς Ἰωσήφ). Based on the context.

48:7 MT SP LXX רחל; SP LXX + אמך + (ἡ μήτηρ σου). Based on the context.

3. SP ≠ MT LXX (21 + 4 + 6 = 31)

3a. Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (21x)

12:16 MT SP LXX ובקר; SP + מקנה כבד מאד +
Based on 13:2 MT SP LXX ובקרה בכסף ובזהב.

16:14 MT SP LXX וקרא; SP וקרא; likewise 29:34, 38:3, 29, 30. Based on v. 13 MT SP LXX וקרא שם יהוה.

17:24 MT SP LXX (בשר ערלתו); SP + את + . Based on v. 14 MT SP LXX (בשר ערלתו).

18:20 MT SP LXX וזעקת; SP וזעקת. Based on v. 21 MT (SP) וזעקתה.

19:6 MT SP LXX ודלת; SP ודלת (πρῶτος); SP ודלת. Based on v. 10 MT SP LXX ודלת.

19:12 MT SP LXX ודלת; SP ודלת (οἱ ἄνδρες); SP ודלת. Based on v. 1 MT SP LXX ודלת; cf. also v. 15.

19:13b MT SP LXX ודלת; likewise 19:29; SP ודלת. Based on v. 13a MT SP LXX ודלת.

23:8 MT SP LXX ודלת; SP ודלת; likewise 19:29; SP ודלת. Based on v. 10 MT SP LXX ודלת.

24:20 MT SP LXX ודלת; SP ודלת (ἐξέκλινωσεν); SP ודלת. Based on 24:18 MT SP LXX ודלת.

24:22 MT SP LXX משקלו; SP + וישם על אפה . Based on 24:47 MT SP ואשם הנזם על אפה.

24:45 MT SP LXX השקיני נא; SP + מעט מים מכדיך . Based on 24:43 MT SP LXX.

26:22 MT LXX ויחפר; SP ויחפרו . Based on v. 19 MT SP LXX.

30:16 MT SP LXX תבוא; SP + הלילה . Based on v. 15 MT SP LXX לכן ישכב עמך הלילה.

31:33 MT LXX השפחות (שתי) האמהת (τῶν δύο παῖδων); SP השפחות
SP is based on the usual description of Zilpah and Bilha as השפחות.
The LXX does not differentiate between the two Hebrew words.

31:53b MT SP אלהי אביהם; SP אלהי אברהם . Based on v. 53a MT SP LXX.

39:23 MT SP LXX ואשר (הוא עשה יהוה מצליח); SP וכל אשר . Based on v. 3 MT SP LXX וכל אשר הוא עשה יהוה מצליח בידו.

3b. Remote Context (4x)

20:11 MT SP LXX ויאמר אברהם; SP + כי יראתי . Based on 26:7 MT SP LXX ויאמר אחתי הוא כי ירא לאמר. The situations are similar, cf. § 1b.

20:13 MT SP LXX מבית אבי; SP + ומארץ מולדתי . Based on 24:7 MT SP LXX מבית אבי ומארץ מולדתי and 12:1 MT SP LXX.

45:23 MT SP LXX מטוב (מצרים); SP + ארץ . Based on 45:18 MT SP טוב ארץ מצרים; cf. also v. 20.

50:5 MT SP LXX אבי השביעני; SP + לפני מותו . Based on 50:16 MT SP LXX אביך צוה לפני מותו.

3c. Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (6x)

18:19 MT SP LXX יצוה; likewise 24:27; SP + אברהם . Based on the context.

18:29 MT SP LXX ויֵאמֶר; likewise 29:7; 47:1; SP + אליו + . Based on the context.

47:2 MT SP LXX לִקְחָהּ; SP + עמו + . Based on the context.

4. MT SP ≠ LXX (17 + 3 + 16 = 36)

4a. Repetition of Details Found Elsewhere in the Context (17x)

19:3 MT SP LXX ויִפְצְרוּ בְּאִישׁ בְּלוֹשׁ 9; MT SP + מאד + . Based on v. 9 מאד.

21:4 MT SP LXX יִצְחָק; MT SP + בנו + . Based on 21:5 MT SP LXX יִצְחָק בנו.

24:67a MT SP LXX הָאֵלֶּה (εἰς τὸν οἶκον [τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ]); MT SP + שרה + . Based on the context. Reverse phenomenon in v. 67b (§ 1c).

30:28 MT SP LXX init ---; MT SP + ויֵאמֶר + . Based on MT SP LXX 30:27.

30:38 MT SP LXX (בבאן) ---. MT SP + ויִחַמְנָה + . Based on 30:39 (38) MT SP LXX ויִחַמוּ.

30:40a MT SP LXX בְּצִאָן; MT SP + לבן + . Based on v. 40b MT SP LXX צֵאן לבן.

31:24, 29 MT SP LXX יִעֲקֹב; MT SP + (רע) + מטוב עד (רע) . Based on 31:29 MT SP מטוב עד רע.

31:52a MT SP LXX לֹא תֵעָבֵר אֵלַיךְ; MT SP + את הגל הזה + . Based on v. 52b MT SP LXX לֹא תֵעָבֵר אֵלַי את הגל הזה.

34:15 MT SP LXX init (בזאת נאות) ---; MT SP + אך + . Based on v. 22 MT SP LXX אֵךְ בְּזֹאת יֵאָתוּ.

36:31 LXX אדום; MT SP בארץ אדום . Based on 35:16 MT SP LXX אדום and passim.

41:27 MT SP LXX הַפְּרוֹת הַרְקוֹת; MT SP + והרעת + . Based on v. 20 MT SP LXX הַפְּרוֹת הַרְקוֹת וְהַרְעוֹת.

42:2 MT SP LXX (הנה) --- ; MT SP + ויאמר . Based on v. 1b MT SP LXX.

42:2 MT SP LXX ;ושברו לנו MT SP + משם + . Based on the context.

42:13 MT SP LXX ;אנחנו MT SP + בני איש אחד + . Based on v. 11 MT SP LXX
בני איש אחד (א)נחנו

45:18 MT SP LXX (מצרים) --- (את טוב) ; MT SP + ארץ + . Based on v. 20 MT
SP טוב כל ארץ מצרים

50:12 MT SP LXX ;ויעשו בניו לו כן MT SP + כאשר צום + . Based on v. 16 MT
SP לXX אביך צוה לפני מותו

4b. Remote Context (3x)

18:4 MT SP LXX (מים) --- . MT SP + מעט + . Based on 24:17 MT SP LXX
השקיני נא מעט מים and 24:43 הגמיאני נא מעט מים

25:12 MT SP LXX ;הגר MT SP + המצרית + . Based on Gen. 16:3, 21:9 MT SP
LXX.

50:5 MT SP LXX ;ולאמר MT SP + הנה אנכי מת + . Based on 48:21 MT SP LXX.

4c. Addition/Expansion of Subject/Object, etc. (16x)

20:3 MT SP LXX ויאמר (καὶ εἶπεν); likewise 28:1; 34:11; 40:9; 42:10
MT SP + לו + . Based on the context.

26:15 MT SP LXX (אביו) --- (בימי) ; MT SP + אברהם + . Based on the context.

27:34 MT SP LXX ;ויאמר MT SP + לאביו + . Based on the context.

29:12 MT SP LXX ;ויגד MT SP + יעקב + . Based on the
context.

35:29 MT SP LXX ;ויגוע MT SP + יצחק + . Based on the context.

40:11b LXX ;הכוס MT SP + פרעה . Based on v. 11a.

42:18 MT SP LXX ;ויאמר אלהם MT SP + יוסף + . Based on the context.

43:14 MT SP LXX וְשָׁלוּחַ; MT SP + לַכֶּם + . Based on the context.

46:5 MT SP LXX בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; MT SP + אֵת יַעֲקֹב + . Based on the context.

5. Some Conclusions

1. *Statistics.* LXX contains by far the greatest number of unique harmonizations (145) in Gen. 12–50, with SP (31) and MT (1) trailing far behind. Since all three sources also share harmonizations with the other two, these instances have to be added to each source's unique features, in which case the numbers for the three sources are

LXX 198

SP 120

MT 36.

These numbers do not constitute the combined number of harmonizations in these chapters, since many instances are shared by two sources.

The following features are recognized:

a. When comparing the LXX of Gen. 12–50 with the other textual witnesses, by far the largest number of harmonizations is found in the LXX.

b. A similar picture was noticed for the first eleven chapters of Genesis, for Numbers, Deuteronomy, and for the Torah as a whole³².

c. In absolute terms, Genesis (especially LXX-Genesis) contains more harmonizations than the other books of the Torah, but it should be remembered that the book is longer³³. The frequent occurrence of harmonizations in Genesis was also noticed, without examples, by Frankel³⁴.

d. When including books beyond the Torah, LXX-Genesis still contains the largest number of harmonizations in any one Scripture book.

32 See notes 12–15 above. See Tov 2014: SP LXX ≠ MT 7; SP MT ≠ LXX 11; SP ≠ MT LXX 4; LXX ≠ MT SP 46. The combined figures for the individual witnesses in Genesis 1–11 are LXX 53, SP 22, MT 11. For Deuteronomy, Tov 2008 provides the following figures: MT SP ≠ LXX 44; LXX ≠ MT SP 99; SP LXX ≠ MT 27; SP ≠ MT LXX 22; MT ≠ SP LXX 2; MT LXX ≠ SP 8. The combined figures for the individual witnesses in Deuteronomy are LXX 134, SP 93, MT 54.

33 The five books in BHS contain respectively 85, 71, 50, 73, and 70 pages.

34 Frankel 1841 gives the figure of 270–280 instances for Genesis, 100 for Exodus, 70–80 for Leviticus, 50–60 for Numbers, and 60–70 for Deuteronomy, without precise references. Our figures are relatively close to those of Frankel.

This supposition cannot be proven in absolute terms, and is therefore based on a general impression of the textual evidence.

e. Insufficient material is available regarding harmonizations in pre-Samaritan sources in Genesis. On the other hand, in the other books of the Torah, these sources contain more harmonizations than the LXX and SP.³⁵

f. The LXX stands out not only regarding its number of harmonizations, but also in relation to their nature. The harmonizations in that source are more extensive than those in the SP and the MT. For example, most of the common harmonizations of the SP and MT consist of single words supplying a subject or object (§ 4c).

g. By definition, all harmonizing additions are secondary. Furthermore, the fullness of the formulation is slightly artificial and, in some cases, the additions are clearly secondary.

h. In my view, the harmonizing additions represent the most characteristic textual feature of LXX in the Torah.

i. The preponderance of harmonizations in the LXX of Genesis, especially in the patriarchal stories, provides food for thought on the general character of the LXX in the Torah. This type of analysis is beyond the topic of this study, and I will therefore be brief. The textual features discussed show that often within the Torah the LXX is far from being a good textual source. It shares its bad genes with the SP, as F.M. Cross would say. However, we should not forget that the LXX-Torah may reflect evidence of early literary features in the Tabernacle chapters. The discussion of the nature of the evidence for the Torah is open for further analysis.

The shared harmonizations of the LXX and SP display secondary features of these sources as compared with MT. These features are also reflected in the biblical quotations in 11QT^a.

Bibliography

Brayford, Susan. 2007. *Genesis*. Septuagint Commentary Series 5. Leiden: Brill.

Brown, William P. 1993. *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3*. SBL.DS 132. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

35 See my study "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Proximity of the Pre-Samaritan Qumran Scrolls to the SP," forthcoming.

- Cook, Johann. 1982. Genesis 1 in the Septuagint as Example of the Problem: Text and Tradition. *JNWSL* 10:25–36.
- . 1985. The Translator of the Greek Genesis. In *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea: V. Congreso de la IOSCS*, ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos, 169–182. TECC 34. Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano."
- . 2001. The Septuagint of Genesis: Text and/or Interpretation? In *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*, ed. A. Wénin, 315–329. BETHL 155. Leuven: University Press.
- Dorival, Gilles. 1994. *Les Nombres: Traduction du Texte Grec de la Septante: Introduction et Notes*. Vol. 4 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, ed. Marguerite Harl. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Eshel, Esther. 1991. 4QDeut^r: A Text That Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing. *HUCA* 62:117–154.
- Frankel, Zacharias. 1841. *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*. HKSS 1/1. Leipzig: Vogel (Repr., Farnborough: Gregg, 1972).
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1815. *De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine indole et auctoritate commentatio philologico-critica*. Halle: Bibliotheca Rengeriana.
- Harl, Marguerite. 1986. *La Genèse*. Vol. 1 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Traduction et Annotation des Livres de la Septante*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Heller, Chaim. 1911. *Untersuchungen über die Peschittâ zur gesamten hebräischen Bibel*. Berlin: Poppelauer.
- Hendel, Ronald S. 1998. *The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition*. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1999. On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel. *BIOSCS* 32:31–34.
- Kim, Kyung-Rae. 1994. *Studies in the Relationship between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint*. PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Kohn, Samuel. 1865. *De Pentateucho Samaritano: ejusque cum versionibus antiquis nexu*. Leipzig: Kreysing.
- Metal, Zelig. 1979. *The Samaritan Version of the Pentateuch in Jewish Sources*. Tel-Aviv: Don [Hebrew].

- Prijs, Leo. 1948. *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta: Die grammatikalische Terminologie des Abraham Ibn Esra*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill (Repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1987).
- Rösel, Martin. 1994. *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta*. BZAW 223. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2001. Die Septuaginta und der Kult: Interpretationen und Aktualisierungen im Buch Numeri. In *La double transmission du texte biblique: Études d'histoire du texte offertes en hommage à Adrian Schenker*, eds. Yohanan Goldman and Christoph Uehlinger, 25–40. OBO 179. Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Skinner, John. 1930. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*. ICC. 2nd edn. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Sperber, Alexander. 1929. Vol. 1 of *Septuagintaprobleme*. TUVMG 3; BWAT 3/13. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- . 1968. *The Hagiographa*. Vol. 4a of *The Bible in Aramaic: Based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tal, Abraham, and Moshe Florentin. 2010. *The Pentateuch: The Samaritan Version and the Masoretic Version*. Tel Aviv: Hayim Rubin; University Press [Hebrew].
- Toepler, Theophilus E. 1830. *De Pentateuchi interpretationis alexandrinae indole critica et hermeneutica*. Halle: Schwetschke.
- Tov, Emanuel. 1985. The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts. *JSOT* 31:3–29.
- . 2008. Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy. In *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, 271–282. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 121. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010. The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures. In *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*, ed. André Lemaire, 153–169. VT.S 133. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2012. The Scribal and Textual Transmission of the Torah Analyzed in Light of Its Sanctity. In *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007*, eds. Akio Moriya and Gohei Hata, 57–72. JSJ.S 158. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2014. The Harmonizing Character of the Septuagint of Genesis 1–11. forthcoming.

- Walton, Brian, Edmundus Castellus and John Lightfoot. 1657. In *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta: complectentia textus originales, Hebraicum, cum Pentateucho Samaritano, Chaldaicum, Graecum versionumque antiquarum, Samaritanae, Graecae LXXII Interpretum, Chaldaicae, Syriacae, Arabicae, Aethiopicae, Persicae, Vulg. Lat. quicquid comparari poterat*, ed. Brian Walton. London: Roycroft (Repr., Graz, 1965, VI, IV.19–34).
- Wevers, John W. 1974. *Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis, ed. Alfred Rahlfs. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. SCSt 35. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Where Are the Patriarchs in the Literature of Qumran?¹

Moshe J. Bernstein

The narratives of Genesis, from the end of chap. 11 through the end of the book, focus on the stories of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and their families. They are subsequently mentioned together as a triad as the forefathers or patriarchs of Israel in a narrow compass (within a range of ten words or so) a bit more than two dozen times in the Hebrew Bible. Those two phenomena, however, can only begin to define their significance in the Bible, and in Jewish thought in the post-biblical era as well. And just as they have an identity as individuals as well as a group of three in the Bible, their post-biblical *Nachleben* involve their appearances individually and together in later Jewish literature. This paper will attempt to survey all the appearances of the three classical patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob/Israel, together and separately, in the Dead Sea Scrolls and endeavor to respond to the following questions:

In which texts, and in what sort of texts, are they to be found most frequently?

Which narratives about the patriarchs are most prominent?

In what contexts are allusions to the patriarchs and their stories to be found most often?

Where do they appear together as a group of three, and where do they appear individually?

1 My thanks to Ms. Judith C. Bernstein, Dr. Ari Mermelstein, Dr. Michael Segal, and Dr. Shani Tzoref for their critical comments on a late draft of this essay. At the final stage of revision, I had a number of conversations with Dr. Segal that I believe considerably enhanced the quality of the final product. In an earlier article (Bernstein 2001) I approached the subjects of its title rather more schematically. The multidimensional progress of Qumran studies in the last decade that has generated more nuanced approaches to the way that we think about biblical interpretation at Qumran allows me to believe that some of the issues in that article are worthy of reconsideration from a somewhat different perspective in a paper with the more limited scope of this one.

What is the relative importance of the three patriarchs in the thought of the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls?

We shall consider all references to the patriarchs which appear in sufficient context in the fragments of the Scrolls to be interpreted meaningfully, beginning with their appearances as individuals and then moving to passages that treat them as a group. We make the following obvious exceptions: First, we shall discuss the so-called Reworked Pentateuch texts only briefly, because their additions to the Pentateuch are relatively minimal, and second, we shall exclude the book of Jubilees from our treatment completely both because it is built completely on a pentateuchal model and because its sheer size demands analysis unto itself.² We shall also, of course, omit consideration of the terms "Jacob" and "Israel" when they do not refer to the historical personage, but to the people often called "the children of Israel."

We begin our remarks with a significant negative observation: once we have excluded Jubilees from consideration, there are no substantial surviving narratives found at Qumran that involve all three patriarchs. This must remind us that any discussion of the ensuing type must constantly bear in mind the extremely fragmentary nature of the Qumran corpus. On the other hand, to cite the rabbinic idiom, אין לדיין אלא מה שעיניו רואות,³ we can only judge on the basis of the evidence that we can see, and patterns that emerge in the surviving texts may compensate, to a limited degree, for the paucity of data and of context.

The most logical place to look for descriptions of and references to the patriarchs would, of course, be in narratives that re-present the story of Genesis. Unfortunately, the only substantial surviving narrative involving one of the patriarchs at Qumran is the Genesis Apocryphon, col. 19–22, which retell the story of Gen. 12:7–15:3, more or less. This detailed version of the biblical story furnishes the most thorough portrayal of any of the three patriarchs that we find at Qum-

2 At the oral presentation of this paper, this omission was criticized by some members of the audience, but I still maintain that inclusion of Jubilees in this survey would skew the data more than a little because it would dominate the analysis due to its disproportionate relative size (and we should also recall that only fragments of Jubilees, and not the whole work, survive at Qumran). On the other hand, because so many works in the "Qumran" corpus are related to or connected with Jubilees in a variety of ways, it is necessary to make reference to that larger work in a number of places in this essay, albeit unsystematically. Ideally, the results of my discussion would need to be integrated with a comprehensive study of this issue in Jubilees in order to attain a broader overall picture. For the moment, see the brief survey of Hopkins 2009.

3 E.g., b. Bava Batra 13a; b. Sanh 6b.

ran, despite the fact that it covers only a fraction of the biblical narrative about Abram/Abraham, which itself extends from Gen. 11:26 to 25:9, birth to burial (from here on, I shall refer to the first patriarch as Abraham, regardless of the form of the name employed in the text under consideration). The scope of the Apocryphon allowed its author to develop the portrait of Abraham's character well beyond what is found in the Bible, and that, coupled with my own ongoing interest in that text, could easily skew my ensuing discussion. In order to avoid that as much as possible, I shall, perhaps counterintuitively, not begin with a treatment of this lengthy selection, but shall withhold my remarks on the Apocryphon until the end of my discussion of Abraham as he is portrayed in some other Qumran texts.

Beyond narratives retelling the biblical story, we can expect to find the patriarchs in commentaries or other works that focus on Genesis without telling its whole story, and it is to those works that we now turn. Abraham, needless to say, makes substantial appearances in several of them.⁴ In 4Q252, now known by the prosaic, but efficient, name "Commentary on Genesis A"⁵ (hereafter, CGA), several of the comments touch upon events in the life of the first patriarch. We must remember that a work like 4Q252, because it is selective and does not attempt to summarize or even touch upon all the events in the Genesis narrative, does give us insight into the interests of its author/compiler, but I am of the view, which is far from undebated in scholarly circles, that 4Q252 is not anthologized with specific *ideological* goals in mind.⁶ All attempts to ascertain a unifying factor for the units in 4Q252 have, in my opinion, failed.⁷ Since its principle of selectivity is not obvious, it

4 Earlier investigations of Abraham's presence in the Qumran scrolls include Evans 2001; Holst 2005 (for a copy of which article I thank Professor Holst); Kratz 2009b; idem 2009a. Whereas Kratz is concerned with the development of these portraits of Abraham from the Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls, I am focused almost completely on the diverse Qumran texts and how their treatment of the patriarchs may vary. Focusing on the absence of a particular Abrahamic motif is Popović 2010.

5 That was not always its official designation; cf. Alexander et al. 1999, 77, which identifies this text as "Commentary on Genesis A, formerly *Patriarchal Blessings* or *Pesher Genesis*."

6 George J. Brooke and I engaged in a vigorous debate on the nature of this text more than a decade and a half ago: for example, Brooke 1994a; idem 1994b; idem 1996; Bernstein 1994a; idem 1994b. More recently, Saukkonen 2009; Tzoref 2011; and eadem 2012 have made contributions to the discussion.

7 There is unfortunately no place here for further discussion of this important issue, but I hope to return to it in the very near future in an article tentatively titled "The Genre of 4Q252 Revisited."

may be difficult to decide why certain specific events in Abraham's life are noted in this commentary, while others are not.

In 24 lines of CGA (seven of them missing at the bottom of col. 2), we find comments on or allusions to the following events or phenomena in fairly rapid succession, sometimes even without any breaks in the line where we might expect them to be: the grant of the land to Abraham, who is referred to in this context as God's "friend" (אהב); a delineation of the chronology of Abraham's early life, leaving Ur Kasdim at 70 and living in Haran for five years before traveling to Canaan; a very fragmentary and puzzling reference to the covenant of Gen. 15; a mention of Sodom and Gomorrah, apparently comparing those destroyed cities to the condemned city of Deut. 13; and, finally, an allusion to the culminating moment of the Aqedah, combining Abraham's near-sacrifice of his son and God's acknowledgment that Abraham is a loyal God-fearer. The reference to Sodom and Gomorrah preserves nothing of Abraham's intercession on the behalf of the two sinful cities, and the mention of the Aqedah is almost nothing but a quote or paraphrase of a couple of lines of the Bible.

Whether or not we accept my hypothesis that the interests of the compiler of 4Q252 (and there is little doubt that he is a compiler rather than a composer) are diverse and not focused, the one passage in the Abraham material that stands out is the chronological calculation that as I demonstrated in 1994 is an attempt to resolve the contradiction between Gen. 15:13 (400 years) and Exod. 12:40 (430 years) regarding the length of the Israelites' stay in Egypt. By having Abraham leave Ur Kasdim at age seventy and reside in Haran for five years, the four hundred thirty years of Exodus are counted from Abraham's leaving home, and the four hundred of Genesis from the birth of Isaac.⁸ The fact that the resolution concerns itself with the chronology of *Abraham's* life is probably insignificant from the standpoint of the composer. Even in this important contribution to scriptural interpretation in antiquity, which demonstrates to us that at least this one reader at Qumran had thought about the contradiction and sought a solution to it, there is no interest in the biblical *story* or narrative of Abraham, just as there is not in any of the other comments, to the degree that we can analyze their fragmentary remains.

It is perhaps only the comment וּבֵּהָהָרִים יִשְׁכֹּן אֱלֹהֵי שֵׁם יִשְׁכֹּן אֱרֶץ נְתַן לְאַבְרָהָם אֱהָבֵהוּ (4Q252 II: 7–8), "and may He (God) dwell in the tents of Shem, the land that he gave to Abraham his friend," blending Gen. 9:27 and 2 Chron. 20:7, that allows us to sense, even remotely, how the creator of

8 Bernstein 1994a, 12–14.

4Q252 (or his source) is conceiving of Abraham. And we should keep in mind that those words are actually found in a portion of 4Q252 that is still dealing with the story of Noah, with the opening words being a paraphrase of the biblical *וישכון באהלי שם* (Gen. 9:27).⁹ The use of the term *אהב* to describe Abraham in 4Q252 is found earlier in the biblical texts of both Isa. 41:8 and 2 Chron. 20:7. It then recurs in Jub. 19:9. on the one hand, and in two other Oumran references: CD 3:2–3 *ויעל בה ה' לא אברהם לא ה' ולא אברהם בשמרו מצות אל ולא בהר ברצון רוחו וימסור לישחק וליעקב וישמרו ויכתבו אוהבים לאל אהב* and 4Q176 (Tanḥumim) 1–2 i 9–10, which is merely an excerpt from the text of Isa. 41:8. Michael Segal has suggested that the term *אהב* in Jubilees and CD is to be understood as a covenantal term "with the 'meaning loyalty to the covenant,'" and I believe that the same interpretation is appropriate in CGA as well.¹⁰ Although the reason for 4Q252's employment of this particular title for Abraham here seems to be the verse in Chronicles, as George Brooke has pointed out, where the reference to the gift of the land (note the use of the root *נתן* in both passages) is coupled with the title, the semantic usage in 4Q252 is likely to be the same as that in Jubilees and CD.¹¹

In every other detail in the composition, Abraham is even less of a character than he would be in a terse biblical narrative. And if we reflect on the "depiction" of the Aqedah in particular, an event that overflows with drama in almost every one of its ancient portrayals, we are particularly struck by the complete flattening of the story into a bare allusion with no detail or emotion depicted. Compared with other Second Temple era versions – Jubilees, pseudo-Philo, Josephus, or even

9 Despite Kratz's assertion, 2009b, 80 (repeated 97–98), there is no combination of "Genesis 15, the 'faith' of Abraham, with the Aqeda in Genesis 22" here, nor is "the title itself ...related to the observance of the law" in 4Q252 since it is introduced only in relationship to exegesis of a verse dealing with Noah. The "faith" of Abraham, if the root *אמן* is intended, appears nowhere in 4Q252, and the Aqedah itself, as we shall see shortly, is barely mentioned in the text. It is only in CD and Jubilees that we find observance of the law highlighted in an Abraham context. Before we can establish overall patterns on any theme in Qumran literature, we must first establish the positions of each document individually. Likewise, we need not extrapolate, as do Brooke 1994b, 42; Falk 2007, 132; and Popović 2010, 84–85, that the author of 4Q252 chose to read the subject of Gen. 9:27 as God, rather than Japheth, out of exclusivist, anti-foreigner, motivations. Simple sense exegetical choices are not always made for ideological reasons, even in antiquity.

10 Segal 2007, 293, bases himself on the meaning of *אהב* in earlier Near Eastern treaty terminology demonstrated in the classic article by Moran 1963. Kratz might have done well, in support of his claim of Abraham's "faithfulness" in 4Q252, to consider Segal's suggestion regarding the meaning of *אהב*. On the significance of this term, see further below on 4Q225.

11 Brooke 1994b, 43.

Qumran's pseudo-Jubilees – this narrative has been reduced almost beyond imagination. There is no story of the Aqedah, no drama of the Aqedah, no characterization of Abraham (or, for that matter, Isaac) as an actor at the Aqedah. CGA is a series of comments or remarks that is not really interested in the Genesis narrative or its characters.

4Q225, which still goes by the nomenclature pseudo-Jubilees^a because no better title has been suggested for it, is not a commentary in the way that 4Q252 is, although it is equally difficult to characterize it, based on its limited remains, as a narrative retelling of Genesis.¹² It does, however, allude to several events in Abraham's life, with only one of them, the Aqedah, being treated at any length. From the standpoint of the biblical text, after a reference to someone living in Haran for 20 years,¹³ 4Q225 2 i 3ff. reflects the dialogue between Abraham and God in Gen. 15:2–6, when Abraham points out that he has no heir and that Eliezer stands to inherit him, and, after a *vacat* in the manuscript, God responds with the promise of descendants as numerous as the stars and the sand.¹⁴ There is no explicit mention of the covenant between the pieces, or of the prediction of 400 years of servitude. From there the text skips immediately (with no *vacat*) from the statement about Abraham's belief in God being reckoned as righteousness (parallel to Gen. 15:6)¹⁵ to the birth of Isaac, which is found in Gen. 21,¹⁶ and

12 This text has generated a bit less discussion than 4Q252. The treatments relevant to our discussion are Vermes 1996; VanderKam 1997; Kugler and VanderKam 2001; Fitzmyer 2002; García Martínez 2002; Kugler 2003; Kugel 2006. Atar Livneh's valuable article (Livneh 2010) came to my attention only in the final stages of the re-writing of this essay.

13 Livneh interprets 2 i 2 as referring to a twenty-year stay in Haran by Abram that she believes is part of an attempt to resolve the 400/430 year conundrum of Egyptian exile that we saw above in the context of 4Q252. She suggests, following a tentative suggestion made by Fidler 2007, 209–210, that the twenty years in Haran constitutes two-thirds of the 30 year difference between 430 years and 400 years. According to Livneh 2010, 202, the covenant between the pieces took place ten years after Abram left Haran, based on its juxtaposition to Gen. 16:3, "Sarai the wife of Abraham took Hagar her Egyptian maidservant, after ten years of Abram's living in the land of Canaan." The count of 430 then begins from when Abram arrives at Haran, while 400 reckons from the covenant itself.

14 I accept Kugler and VanderKam's re-reading of frg. 1 that makes it a reference to the Abrahamic covenant, but not in the context of the patriarchal narrative. It therefore probably follows frg. 2 in order. It should, however, be added to the various references to Abraham and covenant that we shall list below.

15 The treatment in 4Q225 of this verse, which is of great significance in Pauline theology (e.g., Rom. 4:9; Gal. 3:6), has engendered a number of discussions: Oeming 1998; Mosis 1999; Fitzmyer 2003; Ego and Lange 2003.

then to Mastemah's inciting God, as he does in Jubilees, to impose the test of the Aqedah on Abraham (Gen. 22).¹⁷ We should note what is omitted between the events of Gen. 15 and 21 that are alluded to in such a framework: Hagar and Ishmael, the covenant of circumcision, the visit of the three men to Abraham, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the adventures of Sarah and Abraham among the Philistines. The larger story of Abraham, as a story, is once again clearly not important.¹⁸

But in this section of 4Q225, unlike most of the "bare-bones" summaries of biblical events that will characterize our discussion, the story of the Aqedah is expanded in a way that we are familiar with from works that are often classified as "rewritten Bible," such as the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees. In fact, this retelling of the Aqedah seems to owe both something of its overall stance as well as specific details to the narrative in Jubilees. The focus of the story is on whether Abraham will remain faithful to God by carrying out the command to sacrifice his son. This is seen as a machination of Mastemah, who looks to triumph regardless of the result: either by the extirpation of the Abraham-ic line if Abraham follows God's command to sacrifice his son, or by Abraham's showing a lack of faith if he fails to adhere to God's command.¹⁹

Pseudo-Jubilees also adds to the biblical narrative two groups of angels who watch the trial from heaven, one weeping in fear for Abraham's failure, and the other gloating at its possibility (אם] ימצא כהז וואם) [לא ימצא נאמן אן] [אברהם] [ויא]מין) [אברהם] and its potential loss in the context of the Aqedah together point up even more strongly the relationship of 4Q225 with the book of Jubilees, especially in light of the language that is employed in 4Q225. We

16 The absence of a break between the sentence beginning ויא]מין אברהם] and the one reading לאברהם]ם [לאברהם]ן [לאברהם]ן might indicate that, for the author of 4Q225, the birth of Isaac was seen as a reward for Abraham's righteousness (so, too, already, Fidler 2007, 206). In fact, the absence of any break (in the surviving text, I should emphasize) from the beginning of God's response to Abraham's complaint through the Aqedah story may indicate that the author saw the promise, the birth of Isaac, and the test of the Aqedah as being a single unit.

17 For a discussion of one aspect of the Aqedah narratives, including 4Q225, in antiquity see Bernstein 2000.

18 The chronology of the Abraham story, on the other hand, is of interest to the author of 4Q225, especially if we accept Livneh's analysis of the text, as it is to the authors of 4Q252 and, of course, the book of Jubilees. For the purposes of this essay, that is a significant distinction.

19 4Q226, ps-Jub^b, adds nothing textual of substance to the story or depiction of Abraham that we see in 4Q225.

read in Jubilees that Abraham is described as "*faithful* in all that He told him, and that he *loved* the Lord, and that in every affliction he was *faithful*.... And in everything wherein He had tried him, he was found *faithful*, and his soul was not impatient, and he was not slow to act; for he was *faithful* and a *lover* of the Lord." (17:15–16, 18). It appears to me that אמן "to be faithful" and the Ethiopic equivalent of אהב, "to be loyal" (as Segal has suggested) are employed in juxtaposition in that passage because they verge on synonymity.²⁰ And this makes the contextually difficult phrase in 4Q225 2 ii 10 לא יהיה אהב, after the Aqedah has been stopped, stand out further; since it clearly must refer to Abraham and be part of a statement by God denying the truth of Mastemah's assertion, "he will not be loyal" is the equivalent of "he will not be found faithful."²¹ Pseudo-Jubilees thus employs separately the same two terms that Jubilees has juxtaposed.

What is quite striking according to the "official" edition of the text, which is followed by most subsequent scholars, is that Abraham does not speak a word that is not already found in Genesis.²² One bit of dialogue, beyond what is found in Genesis, is added to the narrative, although there is some dispute as to just what it contains; this will be discussed below when we look at the role of Isaac. But we should recall that this "expanded" story is surrounded by highly compressed narrative, perhaps making its "expansion" stand out even more. It is the Aqedah and its celestial and terrestrial tensions that attract the attention of the author, two groups of angels confronting each other on high, and Abraham confronting his dilemma on earth. If the author is interested in Abraham, it is only in the question of his faithfulness, not any-

20 Dr. Segal was kind enough to confirm that the Ethiopic employed for "love" is the regular equivalent of אהב in Hebrew.

21 The reconstruction in the official edition לא יהיה אהב [ויאמר ע[תה ידעתי כי is very difficult since it begins with God apparently speaking along the lines of Gen. 22:12, but continues with words that more suitably belong in the mouth of Mastemah. Kugel has pointed out the difficulty of that reading, but his restoration of the lacuna and emended reading of the final phrase, "He said, 'N[ow I have made known to everyone that] the one who loves <Me>' cannot be false" (2006, 95–96), is unlikely in my view. I propose for the required sense, *exempli gratia* only, something like "N[ow Mastemah will be ashamed, he who said] 'he will not be loyal,'" basing my suggestion on Jub. 18:11–12 "I have shown that you fear the Lord, and have not withheld your son, your first-born son, from me.' And the *prince Mastemah was put to shame*." Vermes 1996, 142 n. 19, likewise presumed that God is the speaker and suggested, "Now I know that you [Mastemah] have lied that he is not a lover (of God)."

22 According to the restoration by Kugel 2006, 89 and n. 33, Abraham tells Isaac explicitly that he is destined to be the lamb of sacrifice, anticipating, as it were, the reading of אלהים יראה לו השע לעלה בני that is found in the Palestinian targumim to Gen. 22:8.

thing else in his character or persona. We are certainly struck by the difference between this treatment, which evinces interest in certain aspects of the Aqedah, and the even sketchier treatment that we saw in CGA. On the other hand, these two texts have in common, but not in the context of the Aqedah, the designation of Abraham as אברהם that they also share with CD and Jubilees.

A work whose title puts it straight into our discussion is 4Q464, "Exposition on the Patriarchs," although I am not certain what "exposition" means or to what literary genre it might belong.²³ The remains of the text do not even allow us to determine whether it has a narrative frame or whether its piecemeal fragments point in the direction of a commentary, but, as in the case of all these texts, even a tabulation of the passages that are included is valuable in determining what about the patriarchs attracted the attention of the Qumran authors. Abraham, once again, is featured in several fragments, with the covenant of Gen. 15 being alluded to in one, and there is a clear reference to the Aqedah in frg. 6. The reference to Abraham in Haran in frg. 1 has no context, but frg. 3 i, associating Abraham with the "holy tongue" citing Zeph. 3:9, shows that 4Q464 is not merely a summary of biblical material. Here we see an extra-biblical expansion, albeit fragmentary, that connects Abraham, in some unknown way, with the Hebrew language. And those disparate factoids are all that we can note about Abraham in the "Exposition on the Patriarchs."

4Q180 ("Peshier on the Periods" or "Ages of Creation") and 4Q181 are Genesis-oriented works whose fragmentary nature has not allowed scholars to come to agreement regarding their interpretation.²⁴ Abraham is referred to as the parent of Isaac (although the position of this reference appears to be out of chronological order in one case) (4Q180 1

23 See the comments in Bernstein 2001, 72–74. I remarked there, 73, that this text "writes about its biblical figures narratively, with the dialogue omitted virtually completely." The latter point is certainly true, but calling 4Q464 a narrative may be an exaggeration. Furthermore, the fact that 4Q464 employs the citation formula כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר in 3 ii 3 points toward a work whose generic stance is not within the biblical story but outside it, like a commentary.

24 There is even still disagreement among scholars as to whether the two are copies of the same document or not. Allegro 1968 published them as separate texts, but Milik 1972, 110–124, asserted that they are two copies of the same work. Devorah Dimant, on the other hand, has continued to argue that they are distinct compositions, first in Dimant 1979, esp. 89–91, and, more recently, in Dimant 2009, esp. 83–84. In the re-edition of DJD 5 being prepared under the editorship of George J. Brooke and myself, they are identified as Peshier on the Periods A and B, indicating that they are taken to be related works, but not copies of the same work. For the purposes of this paper, their identity or non-identity is not significant.

5 and 4Q181 2 1), and the visit of the three men of Gen. 18, whom this text identifies as "angels," is followed by an allusion to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah (4Q180 2–4 ii 3–7). There is not much more that we can say about the references. The latter two (or three) documents, 4Q464 and 4Q180–181, are good examples of our ability to point to *where* Abraham is mentioned, without being able to expand very much on that simple observation.

The most extensive treatment of any of the patriarchs in any work at Qumran (excluding, of course, the book of Jubilees) is to be found, of course, in the final surviving four columns of the Genesis Apocryphon. In this work, the biblical narrative from approximately Gen. 12:7 through Gen. 15:4 is expanded in a variety of ways.²⁵ Many "non-biblical" details, large and small, are added to the story, and the characters of Abraham, Sarah, and Lot are all developed beyond what we see in the Bible. Abraham, in particular, is given a more three-dimensional persona than he has in Genesis, as the enhancement and expansion of the biblical narrative allows the author of the Apocryphon space and flexibility to exercise creativity in characterization as well as narrative. The very fact that the narrative of the Apocryphon is expanded beyond its biblical model gives us the sense that Abraham is a more substantial persona than he is in the Bible, even when he is doing nothing more than building another altar, giving thanks to God at greater length than the biblical idiom *וִיקְרָא בְשֵׁם ה'* "he called out in the name of the Lord,"²⁶ or circumambulating the Land of Israel. The continued employment of first-person narration in this section of the Apocryphon brings Abraham to life for the reader/listener.

The Abraham of the Genesis Apocryphon is a full-fledged character, whom we see in a variety of contexts, in grief and in victory. He exhibits fear when he has a symbolic dream in col. 19 warning him of the imminent danger facing him and his wife in Egypt. He displays his wisdom and knowledge of the book of Enoch before the courtiers of Pharaoh. Abraham weeps and prays when Sarai is taken from him, and

25 For an introduction to the method of the Genesis Apocryphon, see, most recently, Bernstein 2012.

26 Holst 2005, 181–182, observes that, whereas Abram in Genesis builds altars, he does not explicitly offer sacrifices upon them. In the surviving portion of the Apocryphon, on the other hand, he sacrifices at least twice (21:2, 20). Does the author simply assume that building an altar is automatically associated with sacrifice, or is he innovating vis-à-vis the story in Genesis? Holst further points out a number of other possible connections of Abraham with sacrifice in the Qumran references to him, but goes a bit too far, I believe, in suggesting that the Qumran authors have a particular interest in the connection between Abraham and the sacrificial cult.

the prayer indicates the same affection for his wife that his fear did when he dreamt the dream, "May he not be empowered this night to defile my wife from me!" He heals Pharaoh when he is asked to, as a condition for his being allowed to leave Egypt, but the author allows him to refer to the king with a derogatory comment, "I prayed for him, that blasphemer!" assuming that we can accept the somewhat debatable reading מַגְדִּיפָא at the end of 20:28.²⁷ Similarly, Abraham in the Apocryphon parts from Lot amicably, adding substantially to his nephew's wealth (21:6), and gets to editorialize about Lot's departure from him (21:7), indicating that he was unhappy about it. He shows concern for his household, noting that they were all well when he returned from his circumambulation of the land, and invites his treaty-partners Arnem, Eshkol and Mamre to eat and drink with him. The combination of these additions to the narrative and, very significantly, the employment of first-person narration, aids in the drawing of Abraham as a much fuller personality than he is in the biblical narrative.

But even after the Apocryphon shifts to third-person narration at 21:23, where the story of the war of the four kings vs. the five kings begins, the author continues to flesh out Abraham's character. When he hears that Lot has been taken captive, Abraham first weeps, and then pulls himself together (an idiomatic rendering of וַיִּתְחַלֵּם). It is these little details that are added to the spare biblical narrative that makes no attempt to portray any sort of emotions in Abraham. At the end of the Apocryphon parallel to the war of the kings in Gen. 14, Abraham sets free all of the captives who were from his land.²⁸

So there is one work whose Abraham is "bigger" than his biblical counterpart, and considering the way that Noah is treated in the Apocryphon, we would expect that Isaac and Jacob would have been treated the same way if the Apocryphon included their stories as well. But whoever wielded the sharp edge in antiquity and cut off everything in the scroll after col. 22 has prevented us from finding out. Elsewhere, other than the Aqedah in pseudo-Jubilees, we have only allusions to events in Abraham's life, not descriptions of them, and even if we were to put them all on a single list, we would still not have even an outline of all the Abraham stories told in Genesis.

27 The reading, suggested originally by Fitzmyer 1960, 289, is found in the CD-Rom edition by Abegg and Wise 2006, and is accepted by Machiela 2009. If the reading is accurate, it is the only occurrence of the verbal root גִּדַף in Qumran Aramaic. Fitzmyer himself now prefers מַרְדִּיפָא, "persecutor," while others read a word from the root רָפָא.

28 The biblical text never says what Abraham did with the captives.

When we turn from Abraham to Isaac, we observe that there is far more attention paid to the father than to the son, but must temper that point with the further observation that the pattern in the Qumran scrolls does not differ much from that in the Pentateuch.²⁹ In Genesis, Abraham is the central figure from chap. 12 through half of chap. 25, while Isaac may be said to dominate from that point only through the beginning of chap. 28, where Jacob takes center stage.³⁰ But when Isaac does appear in the Qumran texts, of whatever sort, it is almost always in the context of his father or as part of the triad of the patriarchs.³¹ Thus there is a mere allusion to his birth in 4Q180–181, and the surviving Aqedah references in both 4Q252 (CGA) col. iii 6–9 and 4Q464 (Exposition on the Patriarchs) frg. 6 do not even mention him by name.³²

In the slightly more expanded Aqedah treatment in 4Q225 (ps-Jub.^a) 2 i 8–14 and ii 1–10, Isaac plays a larger role.³³ Not only is he mentioned by name, but he apparently speaks words that are not found in the biblical text. After an exchange between Abraham and Isaac, reflecting the question and answer regarding the sacrificial lamb found in Gen. 22:7–8, which, as far as we can tell, basically reflected the language of the biblical text, Isaac speaks again, but, as so often happens with our fragmentary corpus, only the tantalizing opening letter of his speech is preserved. The lonely letter *kaph* is expanded in two different ways by recent students of the text. VanderKam in the DJD edition, followed by

-
- 29 Florentino García Martínez puts it quite bluntly, "We do not often encounter the name of the Patriarch Isaac in the non-Biblical manuscripts from Qumran...The name of Isaac is usually part of the classical list of Patriarchs" (2002, 131). A survey of the material referring to Isaac in the Scrolls can be found in Fabry 2006. He makes the astute observation, 88, that, while Abraham and Jacob receive entries of 3.5 and 2 columns, respectively, in *EDSS*, Isaac is not deemed worthy of an entry at all. Furthermore, his name appears in the *DSS Concordance* barely half as much as Abraham's and less than one-third as frequently as Jacob's.
- 30 It is quite significant, but slightly outside the purview of our survey, that Jubilees gives Isaac a somewhat greater role than does Genesis as well as the rest of the Qumran literature.
- 31 An exception to this might be the difficult to read passage in 4Q185 1–2 ii 4, where Isaac's name appears subsequent to Jacob's, but is not followed by Abraham. The text has not yet been satisfactorily interpreted.
- 32 Fabry 2006, 88, writes that "4Q252 must have commented on the offering of Isaac in frg. 1 iii," based on the surviving material in lines 6–7, but the Aqedah reference does not seem to have enough space for any commentary.
- 33 Betsy Halpern-Amaru 2006, 132, has suggested, that the omission of the story of Ishmael from the version of the story in 4Q225 is significant and is meant to underline Isaac's status as *דן*, "only son." But since that is the term employed in the Genesis narrative, and since there are other significant incidents omitted from 4Q225, this strikes me as an overreading.

many others, reads כַּפּוֹת אוֹתֵי יִפֶּה, "tie me down well," retrojecting to Qumran a request by Isaac, which is found in later targumic and midrashic literature, that Abraham take extra care in the binding so that Isaac cannot move about and perhaps disqualify the sacrifice. The very word that is employed in the restoration, כַּפּוֹת, is the one found in the Palestinian targum tradition and in Genesis Rabbah.³⁴ Despite the apparent attractiveness of this reading, and the commonality that it would establish between Qumran and rabbinic readings of the Aqedah, I have always found this reconstruction unacceptable. Since the Hebrew root כָּפַת is not attested anywhere before this text, and does not appear after it before the mishnah, I believe that from a methodological standpoint the suggested restoration of this word is far too aggressive, and is based, in effect, on a sort of circular reasoning.

A somewhat more attractive, although equally far from certain, reconstruction was suggested by James Kugel.³⁵ Rejecting the restoration of Abraham's answer to Isaac's query in 4Q225 2 ii 3 along the lines of the biblical text and having it refer to the sacrificial lamb, Kugel reconstructs the line with Abraham telling Isaac that he is going to be the sacrifice.³⁶ Isaac's words in response to being informed of that destiny, according to Kugel, are כַּוֹל אֲשֶׁר אָמַר לְכֹה אֱלֹהִים עֲשֵׂהָ, "do whatever God says to you."³⁷ In the case of either reconstruction, the author of 4Q225 allots to Isaac a few key words in the story of the Aqedah, with both versions indicating the commitment of Isaac to his father's following God's command, which, apparently appearing here for the first time,

34 The word appears in Isaac's speech in the targumic expansion across the Palestinian targumic tradition (Neofiti; Fragment Targum MSS V and P; pseudo-Jonathan) to Gen. 22:10. Pseudo-Jonathan, although not Neofiti, employs it for יִעַקֵּב in Gen. 22:9. It is also used in the parallel material in Gen. Rab. 56. Fitzmyer's (2002, 218–219 n. 16) strong language, "In either case, the restoration must be right," in accepting this reading or the similar restoration, כַּפּוֹת אֵת יָדַי, proposed by Vermes 1996, 142 n. 12, is a bit surprising in light of his well-known view that it is not methodologically sound to restore a word whose existence is only known from later texts, especially since he presents that very argument in the next few words "even if כָּפַת is a rare word, not appearing in Biblical Hebrew or, otherwise, it seems, in Qumran Hebrew texts; it occurs often in *later Talmudic texts and rabbinic writings*" (italics mine, MJB). Fabry 2006, 99 and n. 32, notes in defense of the reading that the identical Aramaic verb occurs three times in Dan. 3:21–23 in the story of the young men thrown into the fire.

35 Kugel 2006, 86–91. On p. 88, he notes a series of scholars who have endorsed VanderKam's reading with more or less enthusiasm. He presents several other arguments, beyond the one that I have made, for rejection of that reading.

36 I cannot accept the text of Kugel's specific restoration וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם אֶל־יִצְחָק אָמַר כִּי אֶתָּה, תִּהְיֶה הַשֶּׁה אֲשֶׁר לִי, but the overall sense of the restoration is quite plausible.

37 If this is the correct approach, I should prefer reading כַּוֹל אֲשֶׁר אָמַר אֱלֹהִים אֲלֵיכֶה עֲשֵׂהָ, with the same meaning, but following the model of Gen. 31:16.

becomes a fairly common theme in Second Temple and later Jewish literature. It is interesting that, although the Aqedah is mentioned, summarized, or alluded to in several other Qumran texts, pseudo-Jubilees is the only one to give Isaac any role at all in its surviving fragments, a feature that has been noticed by most scholars who have commented on this text.

The one other striking, and perhaps unexpected, reference to Isaac in the Qumran scrolls is the one in 4Q364 3 ii 1–6, in a hitherto unattested passage inserted into the biblical narrative before Gen. 28:6. The DJD editors, Emanuel Tov and Sidnie White Crawford, reconstructed the passage on the basis of its being partially related to Rebecca's farewell to Jacob and partially words of Isaac consoling her when they send Jacob to Paddan Aram.³⁸ I prefer, however, a reading that interprets these words in the text to be the content of a divine or angelic revelation to Isaac, which he then relates to Rebecca in the surviving material in 4Q364.³⁹ In response to Isaac's worry about Jacob going off to Aram, God (or an angel) has told him not to be concerned because Jacob will return in good health and will be able to be present with Isaac when he dies. Isaac then relates this prediction to Rebecca.⁴⁰ If my reading is correct, then the significance of this expansion is less in its specific assignment to Isaac as speaker to magnify his role in the narrative, than in its mere presence in the text for the purpose of enhancing that narrative.

It would appear then that, from the standpoint of the Qumran authors, Isaac is simply a link, on the whole, between the more significant patriarchs, Abraham and Jacob. He is born; he is almost sacrificed, and he has a son Jacob. The same could almost, but not quite, be said of his adventures in the Pentateuch. And indeed, in both 4Q225 and 4Q226, after the description of Abraham's being found faithful at the Aqedah, we read a compression of the next two generations, "the Lord blessed

38 Tov and White 1994, 206–207.

39 Having arrived at this interpretation, I discussed it by email with Michael Segal, and he informed me that he, too, had adopted this reading in a soon to be published paper, and that it had first been suggested by Falk 2007, 116. Part of my suggested textual reconstruction of the passage, Segal informs me, has been anticipated in unpublished work by Elisha Qimron, and the remainder of his reconstruction is considerably superior to what I had had in mind. I have not seen Tervanotko 2012, which, I have been informed, deals with this issue but comes to different conclusions from mine.

40 This reading of 4Q364 would make the scene resemble those in Jub. 27:13–18 and Tob. 5:18–21, where husbands reassure wives that sons who are leaving on a journey will return safely. The question of the possible relationship between either of those passages and the Reworked Pentateuch passage is, of course, an open one.

Isaac all the days of his life and he begat Jacob, and Jacob begat Levi, a third generation." And in this passage, even Jacob appears to be merely a step on the way to Levi, who, in the world of Qumran, could very well be adjudged as a patriarch for this priestly community.

Jacob does, however, receive a bit more allusive attention than Isaac, although certainly not as much as Abraham. Very few events in his life are deemed worthy of mention or expansion in the surviving fragments of the Qumran scrolls. The struggle of Jacob and the "man" at Jabbok is inserted into 4Q158, which is fundamentally a text of Exodus, apparently as a parallel to the attack on Moses at the inn. The version in 4Q158 is expanded from the story in the Masoretic Text, particularly with the specification of the blessing Jacob receives, which in Genesis is expressed only with the words ויברך אתו שם (Gen. 32:30).⁴¹ This is a not atypical gap-filling device in a "reworked" biblical text of the sort that 4Q158 appears to be, but the content of the blessing is particularly interesting. In addition to the characteristically patriarchal blessing language of "fruitfulness and increase," it contains some typically Qumranic terminology, דעת ובינה ויצילכה מכול חמס ... [עד היום הזה ועד דורות, עולמ[ים], "knowledge and understanding, and may he save you from all violence...until this day and until generations of eternity" (4Q158 1-2 8-9).⁴²

The difficult-to-categorize "Exposition on the Patriarchs" (4Q464) frg. 7 appears to allude in a very sketchy fashion to several incidents in Jacob's life: something which occurs when he and Esau were both fifteen years old (l. 1), his travel to Haran and God's promising the Land to him (ll. 2-3), something having to do with Esau (l. 5), his purchase of land near Shechem for one hundred sheep (ll. 6-7) and a reference to the "daughters of Shechem," perhaps the "daughters of the land" of Gen. 34:1.⁴³ But note that all of those allusions, even if we accept my unpacking them as I have done, occur in seven lines; there seems to be no story at all, perhaps at best an incomplete outline of events.

41 There is also an expansion in the halakha of the prohibition of the sciatic nerve in this section. The reference to Jacob in frg. 3 1 of 4Q158 does not furnish sufficient context to interpret.

42 Michael Segal (1998, 59-60) de-emphasizes any Qumranic connections of the language, claiming that the idioms are to be found already in the Hebrew Bible, but I believe that these roots are all particularly at home in a Qumran milieu.

43 I have interpreted parts of this section based on the analysis in Bernstein 1995. The reference to Esau and Jacob at fifteen may have some association with the death of Abraham, which happens when his twin grandchildren are that age. Rabbinic tradition builds a number of midrashim around that date and event.

Jacob is also more fortunate than his father and grandfather at Qumran because he is the father of twelve children, and especially Levi. In the Apocryphon of Joshua, Jacob is described as the father of the twelve tribes through whom God gladdened him (4Q379 1 1–6). The story of Levi in the Aramaic Levi Document, which is preserved in several copies at Qumran, quite naturally contains allusions to his father Jacob.⁴⁴ A significant addition to the Jacob story (found also in Jub. 32:1–8) is the text in which Levi indicates that Jacob tithed his offspring and that Levi himself was the tithe (4Q213b 4–5).⁴⁵ The so-called Testament of Joseph (4Q539) probably alludes to his weeping and mourning over Joseph when he disappeared into slavery (2–3 1–3), although its text is extremely fragmentary.⁴⁶

The final three columns of CGA (4Q252) contain a section headed ברכות יעקוב, the "blessings of Jacob" (iv 3). The surviving material is primarily interpretation of the blessings of Reuben (iv 3–7) and Judah (v 1–7). The former section renders explicit the relationship between Jacob's "blessing" of Reuben and the earlier event between Reuben and Bilhah, but it does not add anything to the story. The surviving portion of the blessing of Judah does not touch on Jacob's own life at all.

Thus it appears that the events of Jacob's life, which are more extensively described in Genesis than are Isaac's, are not of much more interest to the authors whose works were preserved at Qumran (outside of Jubilees, once again) than Isaac's were. Despite the few references that I've gathered in the last four paragraphs, the narrative of Jacob's life remains untold. We hear virtually nothing of his struggle with his brother, his receiving Isaac's blessing, his life with Laban – his four wives and twelve children, and his distress at the selling of Joseph (beyond the passing allusion in 4Q539). Interest in Jacob, as in Isaac, falls short of that in Abraham in Qumran narratives and commentaries.

Until this point, we have examined texts that relate directly to the Pentateuch, either by relating or summarizing its stories or by commenting on it, and we have been somewhat disappointed at not finding much in the way of extra-biblical treatment of the patriarchs. Let us now turn to non-narrative works where the three patriarchs appear, either side-by-side or separately, in Qumran texts. In these texts, we

44 Levi also mentions his following Abraham's practice in 4Q214 5–6 i 2–3.

45 For fuller discussion of this theme, see Kugel 1993, 2–17, and VanderKam 1996, 366–369.

46 Edited by Puech 2001, 204–208. 4Q537, published by Puech 2001, 171–190, with the name "4QTJacob? ar" does not have any explicit reference to Jacob. Cf. Devorah Dimant's (2003, 298–300) critical remarks on these identifications in her review of Puech's edition.

cannot expect to find the retelling of stories about the patriarchs, but it may nevertheless be enlightening to analyze the nature and location of other sorts of allusions to them.

Most of the references to the patriarchs outside works that focus on Genesis in some way are found in the context of covenant, sometimes grouping the three of them together, and sometimes pointing to one or two of them; the fragmentary nature of many of our texts often does not allow us to determine whether the omission of a name is original or due to a torn manuscript. The famous passage in CD 3:2–4 (whose Hebrew text was cited above, p. 55) links the three patriarchs in adherence to God's covenant, with Abraham, of course, being most prominent because the initial covenant was with him:

Abraham did not live by it [i.e., his own willfulness] and was considered God's friend, because he observed the commandments of God and he did not choose to follow the will of his own spirit; and he passed them on to Isaac and to Jacob and they too observed them. They too were recorded as friends of God and eternal partners in the covenant.⁴⁷

God's oath to Abraham, but not to the other patriarchs, is introduced into a description of the goodness of the land (Deut. 8) in 4Q378 11 3–7 (Apocryphon of Joshua^a),⁴⁸ and similar allusions to covenant are found in 4Q378 22 i 4, "...which you cut with Abraham," and in pseudo-Jub.^a 1 4 "which was cut with Abraham." The prohibition to sell to Gentiles slaves אברהם בברית אברהם, "who have entered with him into the covenant of Abraham" (CD 12:11), indicates that circumcision was unsurprisingly referred to with that nomenclature (as it is to this day in many Jewish circles).⁴⁹ In the prayer text 4Q393 3 7 (Communal Confession),

47 Cf. our earlier discussion of this passage with regard to Abraham, above, 55, especially regarding the covenantal overtones of אהב, which I continue to render "friend," for convenience's sake. The particular significance of this passage, if any, may lie in the fact that Isaac and Jacob are granted the title "friend of God," which in the Hebrew Bible is associated only with Abraham. It is perhaps significant, as Kratz 2009b, 80, points out, that in Jub. 30:20 Levi, a quasi-patriarch at Qumran, is also written down in the heavenly tablets as "a friend."

48 I wonder whether the singling out of Abraham in the context of the oath to give the land to his descendants might be linked to the divine commandment to him to view the land in all directions and then to "walk through the land by its length and its breadth," which accompanies the assertion that God will give it to them (Gen. 13:14–17).

49 Cf. the mishnaic use of the term בני ברית to refer to Jews (m. Bava Qamma 1:2–3), which becomes common in rabbinic literature, and, for comparison of Qumran and rabbinic treatment, see Schiffman 2004, 260–261. It is interesting that a reference to Abraham's circumcision is associated with repentance to return to the law in CD 16:6.

God is said to have established (a covenant term, but with no surviving grammatical object) with Abraham on behalf of Israel to give them the Land. The prominence given to Abraham in covenant passages is not surprising in light of his association with covenant in Genesis more frequently than his son and his grandson.

In Dibre Hame'orot (4Q505 124 4–7 [and parallel in 4Q504 frgs. 3 and 5]), a reference to a covenant is followed by an allusion to (Abraham,) Isaac and Jacob,⁵⁰ and in the Festival Prayers (4Q508 3 2) a clear reference to a covenant with Noah is followed by a treaty with Isaac and Jacob, most likely preceded in a lacuna by Abraham. The making of the covenant at Sinai in 4Q158 4 6, parallel to Exod. 24, should be restored, I believe, along the lines of "just as I revealed to Abraham and to [Isaac and to Jacob...to make my covenant] with them, to b[e] for them and for their descendants as God." In its violation, too, the covenant is also referred to as one made with the three patriarchs in two manuscripts of 4QapocrJer C (4Q388a 7 ii:1–3 and 4Q389 8 ii:6–9), "they shall violate the covenant that I made with Abraham, with Isaac and with Jacob."

There is one reference to Jacob alone in this area that is worthy of individual attention, and that is the famous passage in the Temple Scroll, col. 29 (11QT 29:9–10), where God declares that in the future He will create an eternal Temple, *according to the covenant that he made with Jacob at Bethel*. If the sentence ends at this point, what we have here is not the typical reference to the generic "covenant with the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," but a much narrower and specific one. For our purpose, and without getting involved in the broader debates regarding the interpretation of this passage and the Qumran or non-Qumran origin of the Temple Scroll, it is sufficient to note that the events that happened to Jacob at Bethel, in Gen. 28 and 35, played a particularly significant role in the thought of the Qumran group.⁵¹ It is striking that in 5Q13, a text summarizing "sacred history," and listing sequentially Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, and probably Aaron, the reference to Jacob (5Q13 2 6) reads "to Jacob You made Yourself

50 I believe that in line 4 לַיְהוָה, "with Noah" is to be read, parallel to his presence in 4Q508, rather than לָנוּ, "with us." The presence of Noah in this passage (and, in my view, in 4Q 508 as well) points to something of which I think that everyone participating in the Göttingen symposium was well aware, namely that the Qumran group did not think of itself as having only *three* patriarchs.

51 For discussion of this passage, see, in addition to Yadin's remarks *ad loc.*, Swanson 1994, esp. 279–280; and Wise 1989.

known at Bethel.⁵² The singling out of this covenant and its location in the context of what is likely to be an eschatological Temple would then point to an area where Jacob is not merely one of a set of three ancestors for the sect, but an individual whose actions in the past are linked to a significant event for them in the future.⁵³ On the other hand, if this sentence (which falls at the very end of col. 29) did not end with the words "at Bethel," but continued on to the next column with references to Isaac and Abraham, as is suggested by Wise and followed by Swanson, then the seemingly isolated reference to Jacob is a misleading result of the damage to the text of the Temple Scroll.⁵⁴

When considering the treatment of the patriarchs in covenant contexts in Qumran literature, we should probably note one other possible set of allusions to them, i.e., references to "forefathers" or "our forefathers" (אבות or אבותינו), in similar contexts. Although we cannot always know to whom such passages are referring, it is very likely that many of them were intended to bring to mind Abraham, Isaac and Jacob as a group.⁵⁵ Thus וברית [כ]רתה לאבותינו ותקימה לזרעם למועד[ד]י עולמים (1QM XIII:7–8) and השומר ברית לאבותינו (1QM XIV:8) may refer to the patriarchs, as may אהב את הבאים אחריהם כי להם ברית האבות (CD VIII:17–18).⁵⁶ In a very broken context ואי[] אבותינו תחת לנו] (4Q393 6–9 3) certainly recalls the biblical references to the patriarchs in idioms such as הארץ אשר נשבע ה' לתת לנו את הארץ אשר נשבע לאבותינו (Deut. 26:3) and לתת לנו את הארץ אשר נשבע לאבותינו (Deut. 6:23). These and similar passages, if our suggestion is correct,

52 This text has been explicated wonderfully by Kister 2001. I interpret according to Qimron's reading [נו]דעתה cited by Kister.

53 The focus on a covenant with Jacob alone may perhaps also be found in 4Q372 (4QNarr and Poetic Comp^b) 3:8–9 "For[] their [so]ns, which he cut with Jacob to be with him forever." According to Swanson 1994, 279 n. 13, my co-editor of 4Q372, Professor Eileen Schuller, already pointed out the similarity between the Temple Scroll passage and this one in response to his presentation of that paper orally in Paris in 1992.

54 Wise 1989, 57, suggests, *exempli gratia*, that the text might have continued with ועם אברהם בחרן ועם יצחק בגרר (although I seriously doubt the likelihood of חרן as the locus of an Abrahamic covenant and גרר of one with Isaac); Swanson 1994, 280, writes that Wise's "conjecture that the parallel is carried on in the missing lines of col. 30 is surely correct." Schiffman 2004, 278, rejects Wise's suggestion strongly, claiming that the covenant of this passage in the Temple Scroll is "to build the Temple," and not "a broad covenant with the Patriarchs."

55 References to ברית ראשונים (CD 1:4 and 6:2, and copies), on the other hand, even though they might have been intended to allude to the patriarchs, cannot be claimed to do so without some evidence, since the biblical usage of that term, Lev. 26:45, is modified by אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים, which refers to the generation of the Exodus.

56 The version of the latter text in CD 19:31 lacks the definite article.

indicate further the importance of the patriarchs in the covenant theology of Qumran.

In a non-covenant context, we read in the Testament of Qohath 1 i 7–8, addressed to his son Amram, "So hold firm to the command of Jacob your ancestor, grasp tightly the judgments of Abraham and the good deeds of Levi and myself." Note that Isaac has disappeared from the list, and not because of a lacuna. The "important" patriarchs are Jacob and Abraham, and, perhaps not surprisingly, Levi, especially in a speech uttered by Levi's son. The specific reference to the "judgments of Abraham" may be an echo of his tendency, "to perform righteousness and judgment" (Gen. 18:19) or of Jub. 41:28, "judgment of Abraham."⁵⁷ But a few lines later, Qohath continues,

And you will give me a good name among yourselves to Levi, joy to Jacob, celebration to Isaac, and praise to Abraham, because you have kept and passed on the inheritance that your ancestors left you.

In this formulaic sort of passage, Isaac reappears, but note, once again, that Levi is still there.

So, what, if anything, can we conclude from this somewhat unusual survey of the Qumran texts? I believe that the first thing that is clear is that the biblical adventures of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob and the interpretation of them were of very limited interest to the authors of the Scrolls. They were not interested in the patriarchs as historical figures. The major exception to this conclusion, as we expected, is the Genesis Apocryphon. Note how the Apocryphon (and the book of Jubilees) diverges from the rest of the literary treatments that we have reviewed. Now this particular observation may simply be another way of telling us that, despite what we often say and hear said, rewriting biblical narratives was not a prime concern of the Qumran authors, or at least the rewriting of patriarchal narratives was not. This may not exhibit the interest or lack thereof of the Qumran writers in the patriarchal stories, but rather their generic preferences. The same may be said of the patriarchs as characters beyond their biblical description. Abraham may be called God's "friend" (אָהַב), and we may find texts that call him נֶאֱמָן, "faithful," but other than the Genesis Apocryphon, once again, we are hard-pressed to find any characterization of a patriarch beyond the biblical one. We know that chronology is an interest of the Qumran group, but in the surviving fragments, outside of Jubilees once again, it is only aspects of the chronology of Abraham's life that are detailed in the Genesis Apocryphon, Commentary on Genesis A and pseudo-

⁵⁷ The latter possibility was pointed out to me by Dr. Michael Segal. He also reminded me of the discussion of the importance of Gen. 18:19 in "testaments" in Lambert 2004.

Jubilees^a, and some of those in an attempt to solve a chronological conundrum whose roots are partly in Exodus.

There is another aspect of the generic problem that is unfortunately also significant, but perhaps impenetrable, and that is simply the generic classification of the many very fragmentary works in which we have seen references to the patriarchs. We asked in what sorts of texts do they appear most frequently, and many of their appearances are in texts that are generically puzzling, but are related in some way to the Pentateuch. If they are not narratives and not commentaries, to take two obvious categories, then our ignorance of what they are is an obstacle to our learning what it is about the patriarchs that may have engendered their appearance in some of these texts. We have seen that the Aqedah is represented more than any other patriarchal event in the Scrolls, but we cannot easily explain the different ways in which it is handled in different documents. Concomitantly, we cannot understand why the other stories juxtaposed with the Aqedah are handled the way they are in the various texts. I keep coming back to the conclusion that neither the broad narratives about the patriarchs nor most of the specific events in their lives are important in the ideological world of Qumran. It may be that further reflection on the way that the patriarchs were dealt with will help us understand better the genre of some of these perplexing fragmentary works.

On the other hand, it would appear that the undetailed genealogy or tradition of the patriarchs is important to these authors, as we see it reflected in texts as different from one another as CD and pseudo-Jubilees and 5Q13 and the Testament of Qoath. In 5Q13, Qoath and the pseudo-Jubilees texts, Levi seems to be attached to the genealogical tradition quite naturally, as Noah may be, non-genealogically, in a couple of the prayer texts. Reference to the patriarchs in prayers is something that does not surprise us at all, and the references do not differ markedly from what we find in biblical or post-biblical Jewish prayer. The covenant with the three patriarchs, or with individual patriarchs is a datum which is also significant to these authors, not as part of any story or historical narrative, but as an important component of the way that the Jewish past and the Jewish relationship with God were conceived of. But, once again, it is not the personae or stories that are important.

So this study that started out with a variety of optimistic goals has turned out to be very disappointing in its final results: the patriarchs are not significant at Qumran in any notable fashion; their stories are not told; allusions to events in their lives tend to be almost trivial; there is almost no attempt to characterize them or develop their personalities

beyond the biblical descriptions. To the contrary, they are flattened, with the result that they are no longer seen as people, but have become virtual stereotypes to be introduced as needed in outlines of history or allusions to covenant. They are significant for what they represent, but their rich biblical stories play almost no role in the literature of Qumran.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Michael O., and Martin G. Wise. 2006. Genesis Apokryphon. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*, ed. Emanuel Tov. Rev. edn. CD-ROM. Leiden: Brill.
- Alexander, Patrick H., et al., eds. 1999. *The SBL Handbook of Style for Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Allegro, John M. 1968. *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 1994a. 4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary. *JJS* 45:1–27.
- . 1994b. 4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke. *JQR* 85:61–79.
- . 1995. Three Notes on 4Q464. *Tarb.* 65:29–32 [Hebrew].
- . 2000. Angels at the Aqedah: A Study in the Development of a Midrashic Motif. *DSD* 7:263–291.
- . 2001. Contours of Genesis Interpretation at Qumran: Contents, Contexts and Nomenclature. In *Studies in Ancient Midrash*, ed. James L. Kugel, 57–85. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Center for Jewish Studies; Harvard University Press.
- . 2012. The *Genesis Apocryphon*: Compositional and Interpretive Perspectives. In *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism*, ed. Matthias Henze, 157–179. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Brooke, George J. 1994a. The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet. *DSD* 1:160–179.
- . 1994b. The Thematic Content of 4Q252. *JQR* 85:33–59.
- . 1996. 4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary. *RdQ* 17:385–401.
- Dimant, Devorah. 1979. The "Peshet on the Periods" (4Q180) and 4Q181. *IOS* 9:77–102.

- . 2003. Review of *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie 4Q529–549*, by Émile Puech. *DJD* 31. *DSD* 10:292–304.
 - . 2009. On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered. In *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale: Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis*, eds. Christophe Batsch and Mădălina Vârtejanu-Joubert, 61–85. *JSJ.S* 134. Leiden: Brill.
- Ego, Beate, and Armin Lange. 2003. "Und es ward ihm zur Gerechtigkeit angerechnet": (4QpsJub(a)2 I 8). In *Der Mensch vor Gott: Forschungen zum Menschenbild in Bibel, antikem Judentum und Koran. Festschrift für Hermann Lichtenberger zum 60. Geburtstag*, eds. Ulrike Mittmann-Richert et al., 171–192. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Evans, Craig A. 2001. Abraham in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Man of Faith and Failure. In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W. Flint, 149–158. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. 2006. Isaak in den Handschriften von Qumran. In *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges Qumraniens en Hommage à Émile Puech*, eds. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 87–103. *StTDJ* 61. Leiden: Brill.
- Falk, Daniel K. 2007. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 8; Library of Second Temple Studies 63. London: T&T Clark.
- Fidler, Ruth. 2007. Circumcision in 4Q225? Notes on Sequential and Conceptual Shifts. *Meghillot* 5–6:197–219 [Hebrew].
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1960. Some Observations on the *Genesis Apocryphon*. *CBQ* 22:277–291.
- . 2002. The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran Literature. *Biblica* 83:211–229.
 - . 2003. The Interpretation of Genesis 15:6: Abraham's Faith and Righteousness in a Qumran Text. In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, eds. Shalom M. Paul et al., 257–268. *VT.S* 94. Leiden: Brill.
- García Martínez, Florentino. 2002. The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225. In *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and Its Interpretations*, eds. Ed Noort and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 44–57. Themes in Biblical Narrative 4. Leiden: Brill (= García Martínez, Florentino. 2007. *The-*

- matic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2 of *Qumranica Minora*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 131–143. StTDJ 64. Leiden: Brill).
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. 2006. A Note on Isaac as First-Born in *Jubilees* and Only Son in 4Q225. *DSD* 13:127–133.
- Holst, Søren. 2005. Abraham at Qumran. In *Historie og konstruktion: Festskrift til Niels Peter Lemche i anledning af 60 års fødselsdagen den 6. september 2005*, eds. Mogens Müller and Thomas L. Thompson, 180–191. Forum for Bibelsk Eksegese 14. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.
- Hopkins, Jamal-Dominique. 2009. Hebrew Patriarchs in the Book of *Jubilees*: A Descriptive Analysis as an Interpretative Methodology. In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, eds. Károly D. Dobos and Miklós Közeghy, 239–252. Hebrew Bible Monographs 21. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press.
- Kister, Menahem. 2001. 5Q13 and the *ʿAvodah*: A Historical Survey and Its Significance. *DSD* 8:136–148.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2009a. "Abraham, mein Freund": Das Verhältnis von inner- und außerbiblischer Schriftauslegung. In *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition: Festschrift für Matthias Köckert*, eds. Anselm C. Hagedorn and Henrik Pfeiffer, 115–136. BZAW 400. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2009b. Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac: Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran. In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, eds. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 79–105. FAT II/35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kugel, James L. 1993. Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings. *HThR* 86:1–64.
- . 2006. Exegetical Notes on 4Q225 "Pseudo-Jubilees." *DSD* 13:73–98.
- Kugler, Robert A. 2003. Hearing 4Q225: A Case Study in Reconstructing the Religious Imagination of the Qumran Community. *DSD* 10:81–103.
- Kugler, Robert A., and James C. VanderKam. 2001. A Note on 4Q225 (*4QPseudo-Jubilees*). *RdQ* 20/77:109–116.
- Lambert, David. 2004. Last Testaments in the Book of *Jubilees*. *DSD* 11:82–107.

- Livneh, Atar. 2010. How Many Years Did Abraham Remain in Haran? Traditions on the Patriarch in Compositions from Qumran. *Meghillot* 8–9:193–209 [Hebrew].
- Machiela, Daniel A. 2009. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. StTDJ 79. Leiden: Brill.
- Milik, Józef T. 1972. *Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša'* dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens. *JJS* 23:95–144.
- Moran, William L. 1963. Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy. *CBQ* 25:77–87.
- Mosis, Rudolf. 1999. Gen 15,6 in Qumran und in der Septuaginta. In *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*, 95–118. fzb 93. Würzburg: Echter.
- Oeming, Manfred. 1998. Der Glaube Abrahams: Zur Rezeptionsgeschichte von Gen 15,6 in der Zeit des zweiten Tempels. *ZAW* 110:16–33.
- Popović, Mladen. 2010. Abraham and the Nations in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Exclusivism and Inclusivism in the Texts from Qumran and the Absence of a Reception History for Gen 12:3. In *Abraham, the Nations, and the Hagarites: Jewish, Christian, and Islamic Perspectives on Kinship with Abraham*, eds. Martin Goodman, George H. van Kooten and Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, 77–103. Themes in Biblical Narrative 13. Leiden: Brill.
- Puech, Émile. 2001. 4QTestament de Joseph ar. In *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes Araméens, première partie 4Q529–549*, 201–211. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Saukkonen, Juhana M. 2009. Selection, Election, and Rejection: Interpretation of Genesis in 4Q252. In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, eds. Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al., 63–81. StTDJ 80. Leiden: Brill.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 2004. The Concept of Covenant in the Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature. In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, 257–278. JSJ.S 83. Leiden: Brill.
- Segal, Michael. 1998. Biblical Exegesis in 4Q158: Techniques and Genre. *Textus* 19:45–62.

- . 2007. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. JSJ.S 117. Leiden: Brill.
- Swanson, Dwight D. 1994. "A Covenant Just Like Jacob's": The Covenant of 11QT 29 and Jeremiah's New Covenant. In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke, 273–286. StTDJ 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Tervanotko, Hanna. 2012. "You shall see": Rebekah's Farewell Address in 4Q364 3 ii 1–6. In *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Nóra Dávid et al., 413–426. FRLANT 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Tov, Emanuel, and Sidnie White. 1994. 4QReworked Pentateuch^{b-e}. In *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. Harold Attridge et al., 187–351. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Tzoref, Shani. 2011. Covenantal Election in 4Q252 and *Jubilees'* Heavenly Tablets. *DSD* 18:74–89.
- . 2012. 4Q252: *Listenwissenschaft* and Covenantal Patriarchal Blessings. In "Go Out and Study the Land" (Judges 18:2): *Archaeological, Historical, and Textual Studies in Honor of Hanan Eshel*, eds. Aren M. Maeir, Jodi Magness and Lawrence H. Schiffman, 335–357. JSJ.S 148. Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C. 1996. *Jubilees'* Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest. *RdQ* 17/65–68:359–373.
- . 1997. The *Aqedah*, *Jubilees* and PseudoJubilees. In *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*, eds. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon, 241–261. Biblical Interpretation Series 28. Leiden: Brill.
- Vermes, Geza. 1996. New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225. *JJS* 47:140–146.
- Wise, Michael O. 1989. The Covenant of Temple Scroll XXIX, 3–10. *RdQ* 14/53:49–60.

The First Patriarchs: Law and Narrative in the Garden of Eden Story

Michael Segal

The title of this volume refers to the Patriarchal traditions, and it therefore might seem out of place to present a study of Adam and Eve. However, this study will suggest that the nature of this story, the first in the Hebrew Bible, and its subsequent literary developments in the Dead Sea Scrolls and related literature, make it highly relevant for this theme. I will begin by discussing the story in Gen. 2–3 as the first example of law and narrative within the Hebrew Bible, after which I will discuss the further development of law (or perhaps more properly *halakhah*) integrated within narrative in subsequent interpretation of this story. It is precisely this combination of law and narrative, and more specifically, the observance of law by Adam and Eve, that leads to the conclusion that they can be conceived of as patriarchs of the Jewish people, at least according to the worldview of some Jewish authors in Antiquity. Furthermore, it will be suggested that according to the conception of works such as Jubilees, Adam (and perhaps Eve) stood at the head of a longer patriarchal line, which began from the dawn of creation, twenty generations before the arrival of Abraham onto the biblical stage.¹

Law and Narrative in the Garden of Eden Story

The well-known story of the Garden of Eden in Gen. 2–3 follows on the heels of the Creation account in chap. 1 (until 2:4a), and has been the source of intensive interpretation and analysis for over two thousand years. The question of the meaning and purpose of this story has been

1 It can perhaps be further proposed that these are two broader competing theological-historical paradigms: according to the first Israel was chosen at the dawn of time, while according to the other this election took place at some subsequent point in history. For the discussion of the first approach, see Segal 2007, 238–240, 273–282.

discussed extensively by scholars.² The story can stand completely on its own, although like any biblical narrative, it has localized interpretive questions that need to be, and were, addressed by Jewish and Christian exegetes in Antiquity.³ One can and should distinguish between the story as an independent literary unit, which can be analyzed as having its own discrete meaning and purpose, and the relationship of this story both to its immediate context, and to the larger work in which it is found, namely the Torah. In this broader context, the story allows for additional layers of meaning and interpretation. Among the many aspects worthy of consideration in this story, it is our purpose here to investigate the fundamental emphasis within this narrative on God as the giver of law, on man's ability to choose to obey or not to obey the divine command, and the consequences for the lack of obedience. This story hinges on the first divine commandment or prohibition in history, and thus serves as the most ancient of antecedents for the observance of all the laws and commands. Fealty to the divine directive leads to reward, while infidelity brings punishment. The story of the Garden therefore functions as a fitting narrative introduction to the Torah as a law book, and serves as a constant literary reminder of the potential benefits and costs of one's behavior.

The realization of this function for the Garden of Eden story in the canonical form of the Pentateuch can also be found in the context of a wisdom composition from the Second Temple period. Ben Sira 15:14–17 reads:⁴

-
- 2 An analysis of the pre-history of this story is beyond the scope of the current volume in general, and this contribution in particular, as they address the interpretative traditions related to the patriarchs in the Second Temple period. For a discussion and summary of some of these themes, see e.g. the critical commentaries on Genesis, especially Westermann 1984, 178–278; Sarna 1966, 23–28; Wallace 1985, and the summary of scholarly research that preceded him; Ska 2008.
 - 3 See Levison 1988; Morris and Sawyer 1992; Kugel 1998, 94–144; Luttikhuisen 1999; Anderson 2001; Schmid and Riedweg 2008; Bockmuehl and Stroumsa 2010; Elior 2010.
 - 4 The Hebrew text of the passage here is according to ms A. The text is also preserved in ms B with some differences. In particular, the allusion to Gen. 1:1 is less pronounced in v. 14a, where ms B reads: הוא מראש ברא אדם, with a marginal gloss [א]ל[ה]י[ה]י[ה] identical to ms A (the readings here are based upon the edition of the Academy of the Hebrew Language 1973, 21. However, as noted by Aitken 2002, 289–290, the allusion to the creation story is present in ms B as well, through the reference to the יצר, which combines the Hebrew verb יצר (Gen. 2:7, 8, 19) with the nominal form (first found in Gen. 6:5). The choice of ms A here does not intend to imply certainty regarding the originality of its text, and it is possible that it in fact reflects harmonization with Gen. 1:1 in this detail; cf. Aitken 2002, *ibid.*; Marböck 2010, 199. The translation is my own.

(14) אלהים מבראשית ברא אדם (וישיתהו ביד חותפו) ויתנהו ביד יצרו: (15) אם תחפץ תשמר מצוה ותבונה לעשות רצונו אם תאמין בו גם אתה תחיה: (16) מוצק לפניך אש ומים באשר תחפץ שלה ידיך: (17) לפני אדם חיים ומוות אשר יחפץ יתן לו:

(14) God from the beginning created humankind [or: Adam], (and he placed him in the hand of his adversary,⁵ and he gave him into the hand of his inclination. (15) If you choose you can keep the commandment(s), and wisdom⁶ (is) to do his will. If you are faithful, you too will live.⁷ (16) Fire and water are presented before you; stretch out your hand for whichever you choose. (17) Before each person (אדם) are life and death, and whichever one chooses will be given to him.

This passage appears in the context of a longer polemic against those who posit a deterministic worldview. According to the opposing approach, man cannot be blamed for sin, for this inappropriate behavior was predetermined by God. One does not have to work very hard to identify some potential interlocutors in the second century B.C.E, such as the authors of the sectarian texts from Qumran. In contrast to this worldview, Ben Sira posits that human beings are endowed with free will and therefore cannot be absolved of responsibility for actions that they themselves chose to perform. His argument is not limited in time or context – he refers to the fundamental nature of man and his role in the world from the time of creation. The formulation of this argument is based upon two biblical passages, Gen. 1–3 and Deut. 30. In v. 17, we can identify the explicit use of the latter, as part of the call to observe the commandments:⁸

(15) רָאָה נְתַתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ הַיּוֹם אֶת־הַחַיִּים וְאֶת־הַטּוֹב וְאֶת־הַמָּוֶת וְאֶת־הָרָע ... (19) הַעֲדַתִּי בְכֶם הַיּוֹם אֶת־הַשְּׂמִים וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַחַיִּים וְהַמָּוֶת נְתַתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ הַבְּרָכָה וְהַקְּלָלָה וּבְחַרְתָּ בְּחַיִּים לְמַעַן תַּחֲיֶה אִתָּה וְיָרְעֶד: (20) לְאֶהְבָּה אֶת־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לְשִׂמְעַ בְּקִלּוֹ וּלְדַבְּקָה־בּוֹ ...

-
- 5 This colon is not present in either the Greek or Syriac translations, and it has been plausibly suggested that it is a gloss or doublet of the following colon. As noted by scholars, this secondary reading presents man's predilection for sin as "his adversary" (וחותפו), as opposed to the more neutral "inclination" (יצרו) in the parallel colon, which is more appropriate to the context of this passage; cf. Segal 1958, 97; Skehan and di Lella 1987, 269.
- 6 Ms B reads אמונה (ו), which is equivalent to the LXX reading: πίστιν. This reading is adopted by Skehan and di Lella 1987; and Marböck 2010.
- 7 This colon is absent from LXX, and both Segal 1958, 97; Skehan and di Lella 1987, 269, suggest that it has been added in the Hebrew manuscripts based upon the influence of Hab. 2:4. While this is plausible, it does not seem like a necessary conclusion.
- 8 Segal 1958, 98; Skehan and di Lella 1987, 272; Aitken 2002, 289–290; Marböck 2010, 201–202.

(15) See, I set before you this day life and prosperity, death and adversity... (19) I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day: I have put before you life and death, blessing and curse. Choose life – if you and your offspring would live – (20) by loving the Lord your God, heeding His commands, and holding fast to Him ...

These verses explicitly refer to the choice of life (ובהרת בחיים) through observance, implying that man has the free will to accomplish this (vv. 19–20). V. 14 in Ben Sira refers to the creation of man at the beginning of time. The word אדם in Ben Sira can be interpreted in one of two ways. First, it can be understood as a reference to all humanity; thus, for example, the Septuagint translates it here using the common noun ἄνθρωπον. However, the formulation of this expression, clearly using the language of the opening of the creation story from Gen. 1, is suggestive of an association specifically with the first man created, which in the combined reading of Gen. 1–3 is undoubtedly Adam as a proper noun. Ben Sira alludes to the story of Adam's creation, since that pericope reflects a paradigm for the receiving of a divine commandment, its subsequent violation and consequent punishment. There was no room for Adam to transfer the blame for his misbehavior to God since the latter had explicitly prohibited these actions, placing the choice of observance or non-observance in Adam's hands. If he had been divinely forced to behave in this manner, then any resultant punishment would have been unjust. Ben Sira draws a connection between the Garden story and the Deuteronomistic call to observance, and thereby offers a lens through which to read the entire Torah as framed by an *inclusio* of these two passages. While this is plausibly the intent of Ben Sira in integrating these two biblical pericopes into one central theme, we can perhaps identify this idea already embedded in the language of Deut. 30 – note the constellation of terms טוב and רע, חיים and מות – all of which also appear in the Garden of Eden story, in the expressions עץ ורע עץ הדעת טוב ורע, החיים, and the threat of death if Adam ate from the tree: כי ביום אכלך ממנו מות תמות (Gen. 2:17).⁹ Perhaps then Ben Sira's identification of this connection allows us to reconstruct the literary intent expressed in the Pentateuch itself. The Bible's earliest interpreters are the direct descendants of the biblical authors, and it is therefore not surprising to be able to trace a trajectory from the latest stages of the composition of the Bible to these early exegetes.

9 This intertextual relationship was mentioned briefly by David Cohen-Zemach in Weinfeld 1994, 224–225, in the introductory remarks to his commentary on Deut. 30:15–20.

The Garden of Eden in the Book of Jubilees

Subsequent to Gen. 2–3, the story of the Garden of Eden continued to be developed by Jewish authors, at times further expanding motifs which are already present in the biblical source, while in other instances, new traditions and ideas were incorporated therein.¹⁰ With regard to the combination of law and narrative, no Jewish composition from Antiquity better demonstrates this than the book of Jubilees. One of the primary characteristics of Jubilees is the addition of legal material into narratives of the patriarchal period.¹¹ The case of the story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden is no exception, as there are some significant new legal passages that have been inserted into the narrative. The first addition relates to Adam's entry into the Garden (3:8–14), and the second (and third) to his departure from the same Garden at the end of this story (3:26–31). The first is found in 3:8–14 (with a parallel [albeit not identical] passage in 4Q265, frg. 7):

(3:8) In the first week Adam and his wife – the rib – were created, and in the second week he showed her to him. Therefore, a commandment was given to keep (women) in their defilement seven days for a male (child) and for a female two (units) of seven days. (3:9) After 40 days had come to an end for Adam in the land where he had been created, we brought him into the Garden of Eden to work and keep it. His wife was brought (there) on the eightieth day. After this she entered the Garden of Eden. (3:10) 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. She is not to touch any sacred thing nor to enter the sanctuary until she completes these days for a male. (3:11) 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 her purification. Their total is 80 days. (3:12) After she had completed these 80 days, we brought her into the Garden of Eden because it is the holiest in the entire earth, and every tree which is planted in it is holy. (3:13) For this reason the law of these days has been ordained for the one who gives birth to a male or a female. She is not to touch any sacred thing nor to enter the sanctuary until the time when those days for a male or a female are completed. (3:14) These are the law and testimony that were written for Israel to keep for all times.

¹⁰ See n. 3 above.

¹¹ Cf. Segal 2007, 6–7, 45–82, 273–282.

I have analyzed this addition extensively elsewhere,¹² so I will only discuss it briefly here. According to this passage, the law of the parturient mother from Lev. 12, and specifically the different time periods of impurity for the births of male and female offspring, originates in the story of the entrance to the Garden. This is the earliest known attempt to explain this distinction between the sexes, a distinction which has yet to be explained satisfactorily. The exegetical connection between the Eden story and this law is twofold: First, the link to this specific cultic law is due to the view of the creation of the first male and female as a paradigm for the creation of each and every infant. While they were created and not "born" in the regular sense of the word, the analogy between this original pair and subsequent births is readily apparent. Second, the derivation of the law from the narrative is based upon the thematic identification of the Garden of Eden with the Temple. This equivalence is found explicitly in Jubilees itself:

(8:19) He knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies and is the residence of the Lord...

(4:26)¹³ For there are four places on earth that belong to the Lord: the Garden of Eden, the mountain of the east, this mountain on which you are today – Mt. Sinai – and Mt. Zion (which) will be sanctified in the new creation for the sanctification of the whole earth.

This is the implication of 3:12 ("the Garden of Eden, because it is the holiest in the entire earth, and every tree which is planted in it is holy"), which appears within the context of the narrative background of the legal derivation in this instance. However, the notion of the Garden as a reflection of the Temple (and vice versa) has much earlier roots and is reflected already in biblical (cf. especially Ezek. 28; 47) and postbiblical literature.¹⁴ This identification is the missing link between the Garden of Eden narrative and the law of Lev. 12, according to which the post-partum mother was prohibited to touch sancta or enter the Temple precinct for the 40 or 80 day periods.

12 First in Segal 2003; subsequently in revised form in Segal 2007, 47–58. These analyses include a comparison of this legal section in Jub. 3 to the parallel passage in 4Q265, frg. 7.

13 Jub. 4:17–26 is probably part of an earlier source that has been incorporated into Jubilees; Dimant 1983, 21 esp. n. 17; Segal 2007, 16–17. However, the widespread circulation of the motif of Eden as Temple in Antiquity, plus its presence in Jub. 8 make it likely that this was the position of the author of Jub. 3.

14 Levenson 1976, 7–36; idem 1985, 128–134; Anderson 1989, 129–130; Himmelfarb 1991; Baumgarten 1994; Ego 1997, 211–215; van Ruiten 1999a, 75–79; idem 1999b; idem 2000, 86–89; Brooke 1999; Anderson 2001, 46–47; Mazor 2002; VanderKam 2007; Stordalen 2008; Elior 2010.

In this article I would like to investigate more extensively the second and third additions to the narrative, which appear at the end of the Garden of Eden story, after the sin and God's announcement of the punishments for man, woman and the snake. Jub. 3:26 parallels Gen. 3:21 in describing how God prepared clothes made from skins, a more permanent material than the fig leaves described earlier in the story. Following this, one finds in Jubilees a number of verses that seemingly have no parallel in Genesis:¹⁵

(3:26) He made clothing out of skins for them, clothed them, and dismissed them from the Garden of Eden.

(3:27) On that day, as he was leaving the Garden of Eden, he burned incense as a pleasing fragrance – frankincense, galbanum, stacte, and aromatic spices – in the early morning when the sun rose at the time when he covered his shame.

(3:28) On that day the mouths of all the animals, the cattle, the birds, everything that walks and everything that moves about were made incapable of speaking because all of them used to converse with one another in one language and one tongue. (3:29) He dismissed from the Garden of Eden all the animate beings that were in the Garden of Eden. All animate beings were dispersed – each by its kind and each by its nature – into the place(s) which had been created for them.

(3:30) But of all the animals and cattle he permitted Adam alone to cover his shame. (3:31) For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.

V. 27 describes Adam as offering incense on the day that he departed from the Garden. Here too, scholars have identified some components of this addition's exegetical background. In particular, the basis for the connection between the Garden of Eden narrative and the burning of incense is similar to that of the previous passage, namely the identification of the Garden with the Temple. An exegetical source for this tradition is perhaps already embedded in the biblical story, according to which Adam was placed in the Garden *לעבדה ולשמרה* "to till it and to keep it" (Gen. 2:15). The verb *עבד* is the standard one used for priestly service in the Temple, and perhaps this was a trigger for interpreters to understand that Adam was placed in the Garden/Temple to perform the priestly duties.¹⁶

15 Vv. 28–29 address a purely narrative issue, and are therefore beyond the scope of the discussion here. They have therefore been printed in a smaller font.

16 This interpretation is found explicitly in Gen. Rab. 16:5 (cf. the explanatory notes in Theodor and Albeck 1996, 149) and the Syriac Cave of Treasures (according to Bezold 1888, 20, 22 [Syriac], 5* [German]). See the discussions of Anderson 1988,

In the context of incense in the Garden of Eden, the description found in the Book of Watchers in 1 En. 24–25; 29–32 is particularly noteworthy.¹⁷ During Enoch's tour of heaven and earth, he sees a garden or orchard filled with aromatic trees. Both the Trees of Life and Knowledge and the rest of the trees throughout this heavenly garden, are described as fragrant, including the pleasant odors that combined to make the Temple incense. The angel Michael explains to Enoch that the high mountain that he sees, on which the Tree of Life is found, is none other than the throne of God:¹⁸

(24:3) And the seventh mountain (was) in the midst of these, and it rose above them in height, like the seat of a throne. And fragrant trees encircled it. (24:4) Among them was a tree such as I had never smelled, and among them was no other like it. It had a fragrance sweeter smelling than all spices. And its leaves and its blossom and the tree never wither. Its fruit is beautiful, like dates of the palm trees. (24:5) Then I said: 'How beautiful is this tree and fragrant, and its leaves are lovely, and its blossoms are lovely to behold.' (24:6) Then Michael answered me, one of the holy angels who was with me, and was their leader, (25:1) and he said to me, 'Enoch, why do you inquire and why do you marvel about the fragrance of this tree, and why do you wish to learn the truth?' (25:2) Then I answered him – I, Enoch – and said, 'Concerning all things I wish to know, but especially concerning this tree.' (25:3) And he answered me and said, 'This high mountain that you saw, whose peak is like the throne of God, is the seat where the Great Holy One, the Lord of glory, the King of eternity, will sit, when he descends to visit the earth in goodness. (25:4) And (as for) this fragrant tree, no flesh has the right to touch it until the great judgment, in which there will be vengeance on all and a consummation forever. Then it will be given to the righteous and the pious, (25:5) and its fruit will be as food for the chosen. And it will be transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God, the King of eternity.'

He subsequently is shown another tree-lined area to the East, containing the Tree of Wisdom:

(29:1) From there I went to another place in the desert, and I departed to the east of this mountain range. (29:2) I saw trees <of the field> breathing fragrances of frankincense and myrrh, and their trees were like nut trees. (30:1) Beyond these I departed far to the east. And I saw another vast place, valleys of water, (30:2) in which were aromatic cane like reeds. (30:3) On

205–208; Levison 1988, 92–95; Kugel 1998, 110 (also pp. 120–121 with reference to general study and observance of the Torah); VanderKam 2007, *148; Kister 2010.

17 For an analysis of the motif of Edenesque groves of aromatic incense trees in 1 Enoch, see Grelot 1958; Milik 1958; Tigchelaar 1999, 38–49; Elior 2010, 118–123.

18 The translation of these two passages from 1 Enoch is taken from the base text and translation provided by Nickelsburg 2001, 312, 320.

the banks of these valleys I saw the fragrant cinnamon. (31:1) Beyond these valleys, I departed to the east. And I saw other mountains, and also on them I saw trees, from which flowed the nectar called storax and galbanum. (31:2) Beyond these mountains I was shown another mountain, and on it were aloe-trees. All the trees were full of ..., and it was like the bark of the almond tree. (31:3) When they grind this bark, it is sweeter than any perfume. (32:1) Beyond these mountains, approximately to the north on their east side I saw other mountains, filled with choice nard and spr and cardamom and pepper. (32:2) From there I proceeded to the east of all these mountains, far from them to the east of the earth. And I passed over the Red Sea and departed far from it. And I crossed over the darkness, far from it. (32:3) I passed by the paradise of righteousness, and I saw from afar trees more plentiful and larger than these trees, differing from those – very large <and> beautiful and glorious and magnificent – and the tree of wisdom, whose fruit the holy ones eat and learn great wisdom. (32:4) That tree is in height like the fir, and its leaves, like (those of) the carob, and its fruit like the clusters of the vine –, very cheerful; and its fragrance penetrates far beyond the tree. (32:5) Then I said, 'How beautiful is the tree and how pleasing in appearance.' (32:6) Then <Gabriel>, the holy angel who was with me, answered, 'This is the tree of wisdom from which your father of old and your mother (of old), who were before you, ate and learned wisdom. And their eyes were opened, and they knew that they were naked and they were driven from the garden.'

The foliage in this description, which is explicitly connected to the Garden of Eden, provides the ingredients for the Temple incense offering. The tradition connecting the Garden and the incense is therefore well-developed at least a century before Jubilees.

The incense altar was among the Tabernacle and Temple furnishings in the Bible (Exod. 30; 31:8; 35:15; 37:25; 40:5; 1 Chron. 6:34; 28:18; 2 Chron. 26:16, 19); and Exod. 30:7 specifically describes that Aaron the High Priest offered the incense each morning (and afternoon):

Aaron shall burn on it aromatic incense: he shall burn it every morning when he tends the lamps.

While in 3:8–14 Adam and Eve served as a legal precedent for all future Israelites, Adam's offering of incense is a different type of legal transformation of the narrative. By attributing this act to Adam, it succeeds in transforming him into the first priest in history, a forerunner of Aaron the High Priest. The priestly lineage is thus retrojected back to the dawn of time. In this sense, Adam is the first of the line of priestly Patriarchs in Jubilees, which can be traced from the dawn of time until

Levi himself.¹⁹ The attribution of observance of the commandments to this early period in Jubilees extends the patriarchal period of Israel all the way back to creation.

The transformation of Adam into a priest is delayed until the end of his stay in the Garden, since it is only then, following his transgression but prior to his expulsion, that he is clothed by עור ("garments of skins") and covers his nakedness.²⁰ The כְּתֹנֶת ("tunic") was one of the priestly garments (Exod. 28:4, 40; Lev. 8:13), although this is admittedly a general term for a common article of clothing, and not unique to priests. The concern for covering nakedness, mentioned in Jub. 3:27, relates in Pentateuchal legislation specifically to the priestly, cultic functions within the sacred precinct or at the altar:

Exod. 28:42–43:

You shall also make for them linen breeches to cover their nakedness; they shall extend from the hips to the thighs. They shall be worn by Aaron and his sons when they enter the Tent of Meeting or when they approach the altar to officiate in the sanctuary, so that they do not incur punishment and die. It shall be a law for all time for him and for his offspring to come.

Exod. 20:23:

Do not ascend My altar by steps, that your nakedness may not be exposed upon it.

It is therefore only after Adam covers his nakedness that he can act as a priest in the Garden. In my understanding of the passage in Jubilees, the incense offering of v. 27 must have taken place prior to his expulsion, which is described at the end of v. 26. This is emphasized by the chronological detail that it took place at sunrise on the day of his exit from the Garden, at the time when he covered his nakedness.²¹ Moreo-

19 See Kugel 1993, 17–19. The same historical pattern has been identified in the convincing reconstruction of 5Q13 proposed by Kister 2001. Kister demonstrated that the same historical pattern continued in later `Avodah poems, a conclusion which would significantly weaken the claim put forth by Elior 2010, 125–130, that this reflects a competing model of priestly origins somehow associated with the solar calendar. For the general priestly outlook of Jubilees, see Charles 1902, 73; Testuz 1960, 29–30; Berger 1981, 298; Schwarz 1982, 108–111, 127–129; Wintermute 1985, 45; Endres 1987, 238–249; VanderKam 1997, 19; Halpern-Amaru 1999, 149–159; VanderKam 2001, 141–142; Segal 2007, 10–11.

20 The motif of divinely prepared garments for Adam and Eve, and specifically priestly garments for Adam, continued to develop and play a prominent role in postbiblical literature; cf. Lambden 1992 (with a discussion of Jub. 3 on pp. 82–83); Ego 1997, 215–216; van Ruiten 2000, 88; Anderson 2001, 117–134; VanderKam 2007, *146–*148.

21 The apparent contradiction regarding the date of the departure from the Garden of Eden, between Jub. 3:27 (which implies that the expulsion from the Garden took place on the seventeenth of the second month when combined with 3:17) and 3:32

ver, the ascribing of the incense offering to Adam only makes sense in the Garden itself, since as already noted, it is identified with the Temple, the location of Aaron's twice-daily incense offering. Elsewhere in Jubilees, one finds similar activity ascribed to Enoch in the Garden:²²

(4:23) He was taken from human society, and we led him into the Garden of Eden... (4:25) He burned the evening incense of the sanctuary which is acceptable before the Lord on the mountain of incense.

Enoch also functioned in Eden as a priest offering incense, doing so in the evening, complementing Adam's offering of incense in the morning.²³ This behavior is in line with the continuation of the description of Aaron's responsibilities in Exod. 30:8:

And Aaron shall burn it *at twilight* when he lights the lamps – a regular incense offering before the Lord throughout the ages.

These motifs have been noted previously; I would like to suggest however that the full significance of this verse in Jubilees has not been appreciated by interpreters, and in fact, there is a further exegetical motivation for ascribing the offering of incense in the Garden to Adam. Returning now to a synoptic reading of Jubilees and Genesis, it is noteworthy that Jub. 3:26 appears parallel to Gen. 3:22:

And the Lord God said, 'Now that the man has become like one of us, knowing good and bad, what if he should stretch out his hand and take also from the tree of life and eat, and live forever!'

In its original context, this verse essentially confirms the words of the serpent (Gen. 3:5; Jub. 3:19), that eating from the עץ הדעת טוב ורע would somehow make Adam and his wife similar to divine beings. This verse has troubled interpreters throughout history. In what way did they become "like one of us?" What aspect of humanity changed to make them divine-like?²⁴ When reading Jub. 3 in the past, I assumed that the rewriter intentionally skipped this verse – perhaps to avoid the mythic notion that humanity could become divine-like by eating from the Tree of Knowledge, or perhaps to avoid the even more troubling notion that

(which dates the departure to the beginning of 4th month) is beyond the scope of this discussion; see Kister 2003.

- 22 The translation of Jubilees here, as elsewhere throughout this study, is taken from VanderKam 1989, 28–29. For a discussion of the textual crux and the minor emendation behind the translation "mountain of incense" (and a summary of scholarship on this issue), see the textual note in VanderKam's translation. This solution seems the most likely, although it is not necessary for the general argument proposed here.
- 23 Levison 1988, 93–94 (related to the acts of the Patriarchs as a group); van Ruiten 1999a, 78–79; idem 2000, 88–89, 106–107; VanderKam 2007, *155.
- 24 See most recently Kister 2010, 153–155.

had Adam and Eve succeeded in eating from the Tree of Life, they would have achieved this transformation completely.²⁵ This exegetical technique is a tried and true method to avoid troubling passages. However, I would like to suggest a new interpretation of Jub. 3:27, which also points to a "new" interpretation of Gen. 3:22. Note that according to the order in both passages, Adam's incense offering is located at the same point in the story as the God's statement that man (or "the Adam") has become "like one of us" – immediately prior to the expulsion. Both take place subsequent to Adam and Eve's sin and covering of nakedness, but prior to their departure. With this parallel in mind, I would like to suggest that in Jubilees, God's statement הן האדם היה כאהד מן מנו in Genesis is interpreted with specific reference to Adam's offering of incense (taking האדם as a reference to Adam and not humanity as a whole). How does the incense offering in the Garden make him "like one of us?" A number of texts from the Second Temple period describe angelic, heavenly incense offerings.²⁶ Thus for example, we find in Testament of Levi 3:5–6:²⁷

-
- 25 Kahana 1986, 504–515, reconstructed the complex textual transmission and development of a tannaitic dispute regarding the interpretation of Gen. 3:22, as preserved in Mek. R. Ism., Vayehi, 6, demonstrating the importance of a Genizah fragment for understanding this process. Kahana posits that in the putative original text of this midrash, Rabbi Pappias's interpretation of the verse was purposely omitted because it was considered overly bold, engendering R. Aqiva's sharp rebuke (see Kahana 1986, 508–510; note also Kister's [2010, 153 n. 70] important correction to the printing error in Kahana 1986, 508).
- 26 Elijah 2010, 123–125, draws a connection between the incense in Eden and its use by angels, but does not relate this to the interpretation of Gen. 3:22. She further suggests (125) that the 13th (and final) song of the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice also contains a reference to angelic incense offerings in the Heavenly Temple. However, there is insufficient evidence for this conclusion in the extant fragments. The most that can be concluded based upon the extant material is that the angels present some sort of offering in the Temple; see the recent discussion of Mizrahi 2011, 42–48.
- 27 The translation is taken from Hollander and de Jonge 1985, 136. De Jonge 1953, 48–49, originally posited that v. 6 reflects the view of the Christian author of the Testament of Levi, since the Greek expression behind "a pleasant odour, a reasonable and bloodless offering" $\text{ἀναιμακτος προσφορά}$, is a terminus technicus used by Christian authors. He (de Jonge 1975, 259 n. 42) subsequently modified this position, in light of the studies of Becker 1970, 267–268 n. 6, and Haupt 1969, 34 (this reference is taken from de Jonge), who demonstrated the Jewish background of this notion, now positing that T. Levi 3:4–8 in its current form is Christian but incorporates Hellenistic Jewish elements regarding sacrifice. See the nuanced discussion regarding this verse in Himmelfarb 1993, 33–35. The broader questions of the relationship between Testament of Levi and the Aramaic Levi Document and the origins of each one are beyond the scope of this discussion.

(3:5) In the (heaven) next to it there are the angels of the presence of the Lord, those who minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous, (3:6) and they offer to the Lord a pleasant odour, a reasonable and bloodless offering.

The Greek version of the Life of Adam and Eve (mistakenly labeled Apocalypse of Moses) 33:2–5 reads (cf. also 38:2):²⁸

(33:2) And she (Eve) gazed into heaven, and saw a chariot of light coming... and angels went before the chariot. (33:3) When they came to the place where your father Adam was lying, the chariot stood, and the seraphim (were) between (your) father and the chariot. (33:4) I myself saw golden censers and three bowls, and behold, all the angels with frankincense and the censers and the bowls came to the altar and breathed on them, and the fumes of the incense hid the sky. (33:5) And the angels fell down and worshipped God, crying out and saying, 'Holy Jael, forgive, for he is your image and the work of your (holy) hands.'

Similarly in Revelation 8:2–5 (NRSV):

(8:2) And I saw the seven angels who stand before God, and seven trumpets were given to them. (8:3) Another angel with a golden censer came and stood at the altar; he was given a great quantity of incense to offer with the prayers of all the saints on the golden altar that is before the throne. (8:4) And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, rose before God from the hand of the angel. (8:5) Then the angel took the censer and filled it with fire from the altar and threw it on the earth; and there were peals of thunder, rumblings, flashes of lightning, and an earthquake.

These independent sources confirm the broad diffusion of this tradition in Antiquity. The notion of angels offering incense is based upon the assumption that the heavenly and earthly realities mirror one another, a common notion in texts of the Second Temple period (particularly in apocalyptic literature). Both the heavenly and earthly priests serve God through offerings, although the heavenly offerings are limited to incense. The angels thus function as heavenly priests, and the earthly priests become like angels.

This idea of parallel earthly and heavenly priesthoods is a much broader notion in Second Temple literature, and is well-attested in

28 The translation here is taken from Johnson 1985, 2:287–289. There is no direct parallel in the Latin Vita. Doehorn 2005, 476, posits that the use of incense here (and in Apoc. Mos. 29) is the result of the limitation on animal slaughter and sacrifice in the antediluvian period. However, since this is one example of a broader motif, it is more likely that this is due to the heavenly location of the angelic service, which only allowed for the use of this more ethereal medium; cf. Himmelfarb 1993, 35.

Qumran compositions, especially the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.²⁹ The parallel of these two realms is also prominent in Jubilees:

(30:18) Levi's descendants were chosen for the priesthood and as levites to serve before the Lord as we (do) for all time. Levi and his sons will be blessed forever because he was eager to carry out justice, punishment, and revenge on all who rise against Israel.

(31:13) He turned to Levi first and began to bless him first. He said to him: 'May the Lord of everything – he is the Lord of all ages – bless you and your sons throughout all ages. (31:14) May the Lord give you and your descendants extremely great honor; may he make you and your descendants (alone) out of all humanity approach him to serve in his temple like the angels of the presence and like the holy ones. The descendants of your sons will be like them in honor, greatness, and holiness. May he make them great throughout all the ages.'

Returning now to the original context of Jub. 3, I suggest that the offering of incense by Adam in v. 27 is actually an interpretation of Gen. 3:22: *הָן הָאָדָם הָיָה כְּאֶחָד מֵאֲנָשֵׁי* – Adam has become like one of us, like one of the angels, by acting as a priest, offering incense within the confines of the Temple on Earth, the Garden of Eden. A similar situation obtains regarding Enoch, as already noted above – he was taken from human society and brought to the Garden, where he offers incense.³⁰ There too, I suggest that Enoch does not offer incense merely because he is a priest, but rather because he functions like an angel. It is a simple task to demonstrate that Enoch was angel-like – it is already hinted in Gen. 5:24, "Enoch walked with God; then he was no more, for God took him," and developed extensively and explicitly in subsequent Enochic literature.³¹ The difference between Enoch and Adam is that Enoch lived forever – Gen. 5 does not mention his death, but rather simply that God took him. According to Jub. 4:24, he remains in the Garden of Eden recording the behavior of humanity until the Great Day of Judgment, the eschatological turning point at which time the righteous are rewarded and the wicked punished. In contrast, Adam does not get to live forever, perhaps because he sinned and ate from the Tree of Knowledge despite God's warning that he would be punished by death. He is also therefore not allowed to eat from the Tree of Life, which would have transformed him into an eternal priest like his descendant Enoch. This would therefore reflect an alternative interpreta-

29 This motif has been discussed by many scholars; see most recently Angel 2010.

30 For a discussion of the portrayal of Enoch in Jub. 4:17–26, see Dimant 1983; VanderKam 1984, 179–188 (cf. pp. 185–186 regarding his offering of incense in Eden); van Ruiten 2000, 160–166.

31 Cf. the extensive treatments in VanderKam 1984; idem 1995.

tion of God's warning in Gen. 2:17: "for on the day that you eat from it" מות תמות ("you shall surely die"). This verse was the subject of intense interpretive activity in Antiquity, by those who wished to justify God's words as true, especially in light of the description of Gen. 2–3 according to which the serpent's reassurances to the woman that she will not die if she eats from the tree (3:4–5) are in fact more accurate than God's threat.³² According to this interpretation, on the day that Adam ate from the tree he became mortal.³³ If this interpretation of Jubilees interpreting Genesis is correct, then we have succeeded in identifying the textual trigger which led to the addition of the offering of incense into the rewritten Garden of Eden story.

Excursus: The Relationship between Jubilees and the Greek Life of Adam and Eve

I suggest that it can be demonstrated that the Greek Life of Adam and Eve (= Apocalypse of Moses) is literarily dependent upon Jubilees at this point.³⁴ In chap. 29 of the Greek version of that composition, it is recorded that Adam offered incense *after* his departure from the Garden:³⁵

(29:3) Your father answered and said to the angels, 'See, you are casting me out; I beg you, let me take fragrances from Paradise, so that after I have gone out, I might bring an offering to God so that God will hear me.' (29:4) And they came to God and said 'Jael, eternal king, command that fragrant incenses from Paradise be given to Adam.' (29:5) And God ordered Adam

32 For a summary of different approaches to this question among ancient Jewish interpreters, see Kugel 1998, 94–97.

33 See Kugel 1998, 96–97. If this verse reflects an interpretation of Gen. 2:17, then it offers a different approach than the one put forth in Jub. 4:29–30. For a discussion of Jub. 4:29–30, see Segal 2007, 310–311.

34 Doehorn 2005, 429–432, suggests the same literary relationship based upon other instances in Apoc. Mos. 15–30 which are dependent upon Jubilees, but without the argument presented here.

35 Johnson 1985, 285; cf. Latin Vita 43:5 (Johnson 1985, 274). This example has been discussed by de Jonge and Tromp 1997, 69–70, within the context of a discussion of the provenance of The Life of Adam and Eve, since chap. 29 is one of a number of instances in this composition in which incense accompanies the liturgy (cf. also 33:4; 38:2 above) as is characteristic of the Christian Church, while no other offerings are mentioned. They reject this possibility and instead suggest that the use of incense by Adam and the angels reflects an ancient Jewish tradition, as posited here: "The tradition that Adam was the first to offer incense probably originated in priestly circles, as may be concluded from its presence in Jub. 3.27."

to come that he might take aromatic fragrances out of Paradise for his sustenance. (29:6) When the angels allowed him, he gathered both kinds: crocus, nard, reed, cinnamon; and other seeds for his food. And he took these and went out of Paradise...

The order of events is similar to Jubilees, but with one fundamental difference. Instead of offering the incense within the Garden, which was based upon the notion that the Garden is a reflection of the Temple, and that Adam functions as a priest therein, this composition describes that he received the fragrances before being expelled, but only offered them later on.³⁶ The tradition in this form perhaps explains the origins of the incense in the Temple in Jerusalem, positing that its recipe and ingredients go all the way back to the Garden of Eden, and only departed from there when Adam was expelled. However, it misses the exegetical underpinnings of the tradition in its earliest form (Garden as Temple; Adam as Priest). The origins of the transformation can be explained rather simply as a misreading of the order of events in Jubilees. Returning to Jub. 3:26–27, I noted above that v. 27 should be understood as chronologically prior to the expulsion at the end of v. 26. However, if one reads these two verses as a chronological progression, then Adam first was expelled and then subsequently offered incense. This misinterpretation of Jubilees, however, betrays the literary dependence of the *Life of Adam and Eve* upon it.

Finally, I turn to briefly discuss the third addition to this chapter, which is also based upon the covering of nakedness:

(3:30) But of all the animals and cattle he permitted Adam alone to cover his shame. (3:31) For this reason it has been commanded in the tablets regarding all those who know the judgment of the law that they cover their shame and not uncover themselves as the nations uncover themselves.

V. 31 has been the focus of scholars of Jubilees, since it is often cited to offer historical background for the composition of the book, specifically as a polemic against nudity in the Hellenistic gymnasium.³⁷ For this discussion, I will limit myself to the observation that vv. 30–31, which are marked by the terminology of the legal passages throughout Jubilees, offer a completely different meaning for the significance of the covering of nakedness. In contrast to the rewritten narrative where it

36 VanderKam 2007, *154, correctly understands that according to Jubilees, Adam offered the incense before he departed from the Garden, "because, once he leaves Eden, Adam will not repeat the incense offering." In contrast, García Martínez 1999, 112, posits a sequential reading from v. 26 to v. 27: "Although Jubilees 3:27... explicitly locates the first sacrifice of Adam after his expulsion from Eden, there is no doubt the Garden is presented as a prototype of the temple."

37 Cf. Charles 1902, 29, and many subsequent scholars.

transformed Adam into an angelic priest, here it is used as a warning against adopting the behaviors of non-Jews. I have previously investigated many of the legal passages in Jubilees, and their relationship with the surrounding rewritten narratives, and due to contradictions and tensions between them, arrived at the conclusion that the passages marked by specific legal terminology belong to a layer of the book which I referred to as the "halakhic redaction" of Jubilees.³⁸ I did not previously address this specific case, but it was analyzed by James Kugel in his article on the "interpolations" in Jubilees, in which he concluded that vv. 29–31 were added to Jubilees at a secondary stage, since they offer a different explanation for the covering of Adam's nakedness.³⁹ While I agree with him that there is tension here between the two interpretations of the covering of the nakedness, I am not sure if they contradict each other to such an extent that is methodologically necessary to pronounce them the work of two separate authors.⁴⁰ I certainly have no issue with identifying multiple hands within Jubilees, specifically between the rewritten narratives and the passages marked with legal terminology (vv. 30–31 here), and would be happy to add this as another example. However, I do not feel comfortable claiming that it is a necessary conclusion of this analysis. Nevertheless, since it fits into the pattern previously identified, I would suggest that this case can be added as another potential instance of this same literary-redactional phenomenon.

The legal implications of the Garden of Eden story can be traced back to the Hebrew Bible, both within the story itself, and in its canonical Pentateuchal context. Ben Sira's subsequent identification of this broader contextual connection further uncovers the contours of this conception. This interplay between law and narrative continued to develop within the retelling of this story in Jubilees, through a series of halakhic additions to the rewritten narrative. Careful analysis of one of these additions, Adam's offering of incense on the morning of his departure from the Garden, has revealed traces of a lost exegetical motif. The sto-

38 Segal 2007, 45–82.

39 Kugel 2009, 228–230.

40 A number of scholars discuss the multiple aims of this narrative in Jubilees, without assuming any contradiction between them; cf. e.g. Levison 1988, 106–107 ("Some Final Statements").

ry of the Garden of Eden thus demonstrates the dynamics of composition and interpretation in biblical and postbiblical literature, and the identification of these processes offers a window onto the literary creativity and worldview of Jewish authors in Antiquity.

Bibliography

- Academy of the Hebrew Language, ed. 1973. *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary*. The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language. Jerusalem: Academy of the Hebrew Language [Hebrew].
- Aitken, James K. 2002. Divine Will and Providence. In *Ben Sira's God: Proceedings of the International Ben Sira Conference, Durham – Ushaw College 2001*, ed. Renate Egger-Wenzel, 282–301. BZAW 321. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Anderson, Gary A. 1988. The Cosmic Mountain: Eden and Its Early Interpreters in Syriac Christianity. In *Genesis 1–3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden*, ed. Gregory A. Robbins, 187–224. SWR 27. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
- . 1989. Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden. *HThR* 82:121–148.
- . 2001. *The Genesis of Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Angel, Joseph L. 2010. *Otherworldly and Eschatological Priesthood in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. StTDJ 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1994. Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees. In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, eds. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, 3–10. StTDJ 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Becker, Jürgen. 1970. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen*. AGJU 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Berger, Klaus. 1981. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*. JSRHZ 2/3. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- Bezold, Carl, ed. 1888. *Texte: Die Schatzhöhle nach dem syrischen Texte der Handschriften zu Berlin, London und Rom nebst einer arabischen Version*

- nach den Handschriften zu Rom, Paris und Oxford*. Vol. 1 of *Die Schatzhöhle*. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Bockmuehl, Markus, and Guy G. Stroumsa, eds. 2010. *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brooke, George J. 1999. Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community. In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*, eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer, 285–301. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Charles, Robert H. 1902. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: Black.
- De Jonge, Marinus. 1953. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. GTB 25. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- . 1975. Notes on Testament of Levi II–VII. In *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Text and Interpretation*, 247–260. SVTP 3. Leiden: Brill.
- De Jonge, Marinus, and Johannes Tromp. 1997. *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*. Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Dimant, Devorah. 1983. The Biography of Enoch and the Books of Enoch. VT 33:14–29.
- Dochhorn, Jan. 2005. *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. TSAJ 106. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Ego, Beate. 1997. Heilige Zeit – heiliger Raum – heiliger Mensch: Beobachtungen zur Struktur der Gesetzbegründung in der Schöpfungs- und Paradiesgeschichte des Jubiläenbuches. In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, eds. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, 207–219. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Elior, Rachel, ed. 2010. *A Garden Eastward in Eden: Traditions of Paradise, Changing Jewish Perspectives and Comparative Dimensions of Culture*. Jerusalem: Skholiyon.
- Endres, John C. 1987. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQ.MS 18. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- García Martínez, Florentino. 1999. Man and Woman: Halakhah Based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In *Paradise Interpreted: Representa-*

- tions of *Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, 95–115. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Grelot, Pierre. 1958. La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales. *RB* 65:33–69.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. 1999. *The Empowerment of Women in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJ.S 60. Leiden: Brill.
- Haupt, Detlev. 1969. Das Testament des Levi: Untersuchungen zu seiner Entstehung und Überlieferungsgeschichte. PhD diss., Martin-Luther-Universität Halle/Wittenberg.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. 1991. The Temple and the Garden of Eden in Ezekiel, the Book of the Watchers, and the Wisdom of Ben Sira. In *Sacred Places and Profane Spaces: Essays in the Geographics of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, eds. Jamie S. Scott and Paul Simpson-Housley, 63–78. CSRel 30. New York: Greenwood Press.
- . 1993. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hollander, Harm W., and Marinus de Jonge. 1985. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Johnson, M. D. 1985. Life of Adam and Eve: A New Translation and Introduction. In *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judaeo-Hellenistic Works*. Vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 249–295. New York: Doubleday.
- Kahana, Menahem. 1986. The Critical Edition of Mekilta De-Rabbi Ishmael in the Light of the Genizah Fragments. *Tarb.* 55:489–524 [Hebrew].
- Kister, Menahem. 2001. 5Q13 and the 'Avodah: A Historical Survey and Its Significance. *DSD* 8:136–148.
- . 2003. Syncellus and the Sources of Jubilees 3: A Note on M. Segal's Article. *Meghillot* 1:127–133 [Hebrew].
- . 2010. The Tree of Life and the Turning Sword: Jewish Biblical Interpretation, Symbols, and Theological Patterns and Their Christian Counterparts. In *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*, eds. Markus Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa, 138–155. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Kugel, James L. 1993. Levi's Elevation to Priesthood in Second Temple Writings. *HThR* 86:1–64.

- . 1998. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2009. On the Interpolations in the Book of Jubilees. *RdQ* 24:215–272.
- Lambden, Stephen N. 1992. From Fig Leaves to Fingernails: Some Notes on the Garments of Adam and Eve in the Hebrew Bible and Select Early Postbiblical Jewish Writings. In *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*, eds. Paul Morris and Deborah Sawyer, 74–90. JSOT.S 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Levenson, Jon D. 1976. *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48*. HSM 10. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- . 1985. *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible*. Minneapolis: Winston Press.
- Levison, John R. 1988. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism from Sirach to 2 Baruch*. JSPE.S 1. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Luttikhuisen, Gerard P., ed. 1999. *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Marböck, Johannes. 2010. *Jesus Sirach 1–23*. HThKAT. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.
- Mazor, Lea. 2002. The Correlation between the Garden of Eden and the Temple. *Shnaton* 13:5–42 [Hebrew].
- Milik, Józef T. 1958. Hénoch au pays des aromates (ch. xxvii à xxxii). *RB* 65:70–77.
- Mizrahi, Noam. 2011. The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Biblical Priestly Literature: A Linguistic Reconsideration. *HThR* 104:33–57.
- Morris, Paul, and Deborah Sawyer. 1992. *A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden*. JSOT.S 136. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2001. *Chapters 1–36, 81–108*. Vol. 1 of 1 *Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sarna, Nahum M. 1966. *Understanding Genesis*. HBI 1. New York: Schocken Books.
- Schmid, Konrad, and Christoph Riedweg, eds. 2008. *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*. FAT II/34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Schwarz, Eberhard. 1982. *Identität durch Abgrenzung: Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*. EHS.T 23/162. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Segal, Michael. 2003. Law and Narrative in Jubilees: The Story of the Entrance into the Garden of Eden Revisited. *Meghillot* 1:111–125 [Hebrew].
- . 2007. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. JSJ.S 117. Leiden: Brill.
- Segal, Moses H. 1958. *Sefer Ben Sira ha-Šalem*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institut [Hebrew].
- Ska, Jean-Louis. 2008. Genesis 2–3: Some Fundamental Questions. In *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*, eds. Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, 1–27. FAT II/34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. di Lella. 1987. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday.
- Stordalen, Terje. 2008. Heaven on Earth – Or Not? Jerusalem as Eden in Biblical Literature. In *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*, eds. Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, 28–57. FAT II/34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Testuz, Michel. 1960. *Les idées religieuses du livre des Jubilés*. Genève: Droz; Paris: Minard.
- Theodor, Julius, and Chanoch Albeck. 1996. *Parascha I–XLVII*. Vol. 1 of *Midrash Bereshit Rabba: Critical Edition with Notes and Commentary*. VAWJ. 2nd edn. Jerusalem: Shalem Books [Hebrew].
- Tigheelaar, Eibert J. C. 1999. Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and Other Texts Found at Qumran). In *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, 37–62. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Ruiten, Jacques T. 1999a. Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in the Book of Jubilees. In *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, 63–94. Themes in Biblical Narrative 2. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1999b. Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees. In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frü-*

- hen Christentum*, eds. Beate Ego, Armin Lange and Peter Pilhofer, 215–227. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2000. *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJ.S 66. Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C. 1984. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQ.MS 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- . 1989. *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO 510–511. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 1995. *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. Studies in Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- . 1997. The Origins and Purposes of the Book of Jubilees. In *Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, eds. Matthias Albani, Jörg Frey and Armin Lange, 3–24. TSAJ 65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2001. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2007. Adam's Incense Offering (Jubilees 3:27). *Meghillot* 5–6:*141–156.
- Wallace, Howard N. 1985. *The Eden Narrative*. HSM 32. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Weinfeld, Moshe, ed. 1994. *Deuteronomy*. Olam ha-Tanakh. Tel-Aviv: Davidzon-Itai [Hebrew].
- Westermann, Claus. 1984. *Genesis 1–11: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Wintermute, Orval S. 1985. Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2 of *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judaeo-Hellenistic Works*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 35–142. New York: Doubleday.

The Flood as a Preamble to the Lives of the Patriarchs: The Perspective of Qumran Hebrew Texts¹

Devorah Dimant

Two Genesis themes have drawn a remarkable number of comments and even entire compositions from the pens of authors whose works have been preserved in the Qumran library: the Flood and the lives of the patriarchs. The story of the Flood and its protagonists, Enoch and Noah, is reworked in a number of Aramaic compositions,² and is referred to by several Hebrew texts found among the Scrolls.³ No less popular have been the biographies of the biblical patriarchs, chiefly Abraham, Jacob, and Levi and his descendants. Several surveys that review this material from Genesis have been published,⁴ but they are general descriptions and most were published before the conclusion of the Dead Sea Scrolls publication process and therefore not all the material was available to their authors. In addition, previous surveys do not

-
- 1 Some of the research for the present article has been supported by the DFG in the framework of the Lichtenberg-Kolleg of the Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, during my 2010–2011 tenure there. I thank the Lichtenberg-Kolleg and its staff for providing exceptional conditions for scientific work.
 - 2 For Aramaic works concerning the Flood, see the compilation of Enochic writings in 1 Enoch, the Book of Giants and cols. I–X of the Genesis Apocryphon. On the Genesis Apocryphon, see Bernstein 1999, 206–210; idem 2005.
 - 3 Most of the short Hebrew texts are reviewed here, in as much as they are relevant to the transition from the Flood to the Patriarchs. Unless otherwise indicated, the textual editions and translations in the present article are taken from Parry and Tov 2004–2005, with occasional modifications of my own. Not included are Jubilees (see n. 4) and 1Q19, the surviving fragments of which treat only the Flood and birth of Noah but do not mention the patriarchs. A few isolated references that do not contribute to the present discussion are also excluded, as well as the work entitled Pseudo-Jubilees (4Q225–4Q227), the surviving fragments of which produce only sections about the patriarchs. See the surveys of Bernstein 2001; idem 1999. In addition, Jubilees is not systematically treated here because it requires a separate study. See the recent discussion of the Flood in Jubilees by Segal 2007, 103–137.
 - 4 Cf. Bernstein 1999; idem 2001; Eshel 1997; García Martínez 2007. See also Chazon 1997.

make distinction between Hebrew and Aramaic texts, nor between sectarian and non-sectarian works, in spite of the notable differences in language, style and purpose among these groups. So the subject has by no means been exhausted and specific aspects of it still await further research. The present article aims at analyzing the relationship of the Flood to the lives of the patriarchs, as reflected in the various Qumran texts, in order to better understand the context and meaning of these episodes and the purpose of the repeated reworking of their details. A thorough analysis of the subject should cover both Hebrew and Aramaic Qumran texts. However, to do so would far exceed the constraints of the present modest paper. It therefore focuses solely on Hebrew Qumran texts, keeping in mind the distinction between those sectarian and non-sectarian.⁵ It is hoped that the present discussion will contribute towards filling the void in the study of these subjects, and will encourage similar investigation of the Qumran Aramaic literature, thereby enabling an accurate comparison of the two.

A survey of the references to the Flood and the patriarchs in explicitly sectarian texts reveals very similar treatments related to generic choices. Thus, the references to the themes under discussion in the Damascus Document II, 14–21 are close to those in 5Q13. Both texts relate chiefly to sectarian rules for the life of their community and the references to episodes from Genesis are brought up as historical precedents for the purpose of admonition or the teaching of moral lessons.

The pericope from the Damascus Document is best known and most commented upon.

Damascus Document (Geniza Manuscript A)

II

(14) ועתה בנים שמעו לי ואגלה עיניכם לראות ולהבין במעשי (15) אל ולבחור את אשר רצה ולמאוס כאשר שנא להתהלך תמים (16) בכל דרכיו ולא לתור במחשבות יצר אשמה ועני זנות כי רבים (17) תעו במ וגבורי חיל נכשלו במ מלפנים ועד הנה.
 בלכתם בשרירות (18) לבם נפלו עירי השמים. בה נאחזו אשר לא שמרו מצות אל (19) ובניהם אשר כרום ארזים גבהם⁶ וכהרים גויותיהם כי נפלו. (20) כל בשר אשר היה בחרבה כי גוע⁷ ויהיו כלא היו בעשותם את (21) רצונם ולא שמרו את מצות עשיהם עד אשר חרה אפו במ.

5 For defining Qumran texts as sectarian, see the list of sectarian markers in Dimant 2011.

6 The formulation makes use of the biblical description of the giants as the primordial inhabitants of Canaan. Such a usage may allude to the tradition recorded in the Targumim and the rabbinic midrashim that Og king of Bashan, defeated by Moses

III

(1) בה תעי בני נח ומשפחותיהם בה הם נכרתים. (2) אברהם לא הלך בה ויעל אוהב בשמרו מצות אל ולא בחר (3) ברצון רוחו וימסור לישחק וליעקב וישמרו ויכתבו אוהבים (4) לאל ובעלי ברית לעולם.

II

(14) And now, O sons, hearken to me and I will uncover your eyes so you may see and understand the works of (15) God and choose that which he wants and despise that which he hates: to walk perfectly (16) in all his ways and not to stray in the thoughts of a guilty inclination and licentious eyes. For many (17) have failed due to them; mighty warriors have stumbled due to them, from the earliest times until today. Walking after the wantonness of (18) their heart(s), the Watchers of Heaven fell. They were ensnared by it, for they did not keep God's ordinances; (19) and their sons, who were as tall as the lofty cedars and whose corpses were as mountains as they fell. (20) All flesh on dry land expired and became as if they never existed, for they had done (21) their (own) will, and had not kept the ordinances of their Maker, until his wrath was kindled against them.⁸

III

(1) Through it strayed the sons of Noah and their families; through it they are cut off. (2) Abraham did not walk in it and he was accepted as a lover, for he kept God's ordinances and did not choose (3) (that which) his (own) spirit desired. And he transmitted (them) to Isaac and to Jacob; and they observed (them) and were registered as lovers (4) of God and parties to (his) covenant forever.

The Flood episode opens with a roster of sinful historical antecedents, arranged in biblical historical sequence. It identifies the sinners, describes their offenses and details their punishment. In producing this list, the author of the Damascus Document follows the model established in the Bible's poetic expositions, as seen in Ps. 78, thus adapting an existing form to its own ideological framework. The sectarian adaptation is discernable in the terminology of the admonitory introduction and the offences. The preface (CD II, 14–17) speaks of "straying in the thoughts of a guilty inclination and licentious eyes." This is a reference to the biblical exhortation of Num. 15:29, which is the Qumranite catchphrase for non-compliance with the Torah commandments as

and the Israelites (Deut. 1:4; 3:1–4, 13; Josh. 13:12), was one of the giants of old who survived the Flood. Cf. e.g. Tg. Ps.-J. to Gen. 14:13; Deut. 3:11; b. Nid. 61b.

7 The wording follows that of Gen. 7:21–22.

8 The translation, with slight alterations, is that of Baumgarten and Schwartz 1993, 15, 17.

practiced by the community.⁹ Yielding to one's own thoughts and desires is tantamount to going against the divine will as crystallized in the Torah precepts. Thus, the Watchers and their giant offspring were guilty of a comparable crime, for they acted according to "their own will,"¹⁰ disobeying "the ordinances of their Maker." Embedded here is the idea that God had established certain laws for the antediluvian world, but that they were disregarded by those sinful generations, an idea spelled out in 1 En. 106:13–14. Because of this, God in his anger annihilated them. The Damascus Document applies this definition of sin and punishment to all the figures named on its list. All sinned by following their own will in defiance of divine injunctions and were therefore condemned to annihilation: the Watchers and their giant offspring, the sons of Noah, the sons of Jacob in Egypt, the Israelites who grumbled in the desert, and the inhabitants of Judaea, and probably also those of the Israelite kingdom (CD III, 1–12).

The first group of sinners, the Watchers and their giant sons, presents a unique case. For the Damascus Document makes careful distinction between the sinful "Watchers of Heaven" (עירי השמים¹¹) and their gargantuan offspring. The Watchers, namely the sinful sons of God of Gen. 6:2, who mated unlawfully with the women and fathered monstrous children, "fell," whereas with the giants it was their corpses that "fell." The subtle distinction betrays the knowledge of the more elaborate legend detailed in 1 En. 6–11, according to which the Watchers were punished by being barred from the heavenly abode and imprisoned in the depths of the earth until the final judgment (1 En. 10:12–13; 14:5), whereas all the giants died. Thus, the sinners involved in the Flood episode are identified here only with the Watchers and their giant children, not with mankind. The Damascus Document therefore reflects the tradition, also attested by 1 En. 6–11, that it was not humans who sinned before the Flood but the Watchers and the giants. Different Enochic units present two versions of the manner in which the giants perished. In the Book of Watchers (1 En. 10:9, 12; 14:6), they died due to internal strife, whereas in the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 89:6), as well as other sources they met their death in the Flood.¹² The view of the Flood as being the giants' punishment seems to be based on applying

9 Compare e.g. CD III, 19; XIX, 33; 1QS I, 6; II, 26; V, 4; 1QH^a XII, 15–16.

10 Cf. e.g. 1QpHab V, 7; 1QS I, 6–7 (and the comments ad loc. in Licht 1965, 60).

11 The reading עירי (a construct plural of the singular עיר ["angel"; see Dan. 4:10, 20 in Aramaic]) is the correct one, attested by the corresponding Qumran copy, 4Q266 (4QD^a) 2 ii 18, and is probably also the correct reading of the Geniza manuscript A in II, 17.

12 See Sir 16:7; Wisd. 14:6–7; 3 Macc. 2:4. See the discussion in Dimant 1974, 69–71.

the word "flesh" (בשר) in Gen. 6:3, 13 to these huge beings and associating it with the demise of "all flesh" (כל בשר) in the Flood in Gen. 7:21–22. The passage in the Damascus Document advances the same interpretation, since immediately after the "fall of the giants" it quotes Gen. 7:21–22 (CD II, 19–20). 4Q252 I 1–3 and 4Q370 i 6 adopt the same interpretation (see below). It seems that the emphasis placed on the wicked in the Damascus Document list affected the description of Noah. He is not mentioned in his own right but only as the father of sinful sons. But when it comes to a list of righteous figures, he has a place of honor, as seen in 5Q13 1 (cf. below).

But the three patriarchs are patently the exception in the list of sinners compiled by the Damascus Document. In contrast to the destruction of the sinners, the patriarchs stand out as being righteous and partners in an eternal covenant with God. The wicked are punished for their stubbornness with eradication, whereas the patriarchs are rewarded for their faithfulness and love with an eternal close relationship with the Divine (CD III, 1–4¹³). So the list presents both the destruction of the wicked and the survival of the righteous. The real thrust of the roster emerges in its final component, which refers to the righteous, who are survivors of the elimination of the sinful generations of the two Israelite and Judean kingdoms. The wicked generation of the Flood and the just patriarchs thereby become prototypes of all subsequent sinners and righteous people.¹⁴ Another feature of this typology is the transition from the sons of Noah to the patriarchs. It conveys the narrowing down of the whole of humanity, which became sinful with Noah's descendents, into a single faithful family. However, the Damascus Document illustrates how this analogy is adduced to emphasize the dichotomy between the righteous Qumranites and their wicked contemporary rivals, both living, according to the sectaries' belief, at the dawn of the apocalyptic era.

A series of references to historical events is also found in frgs. 1–2 of 5Q13, a badly preserved sectarian text, first edited by Józef Milik.¹⁵

13 The author assigns the term "lover of" (אהב) to the three patriarchs whereas the biblical tradition applies it only to Abraham (Isa 51:2).

14 The analogy of the righteous Noah who was saved from the punishment of the wicked in the Flood to the righteous in the final eschatological age is well known and occurs in non-sectarian texts. Cf. e.g. Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:4, 9–10); Matt. 24:38–39; Luke 17:26–27.

15 Milik 1962 (It is re-edited by Schiffman 1994). Frgs. 1–2, analyzed here, have been re-edited by Kister 2001. As noted by Kister, the two fragments were assembled by Milik from more than twenty tiny fragments and Milik himself admits to some un-

As noted by Milik, these two fragments contain a prayer addressed to God that features a historical survey mentioning Noah, Abraham, Jacob and Levi;¹⁶ they differ in content and genre from the other fragments, which include references to community affairs, such as the annual covenant ceremony in frg. 4, or Belial, mentioned in frg. 5.¹⁷ As in the Damascus Document, 5Q13 also sets the historical events in the context of sectarian ideology. But in 5Q13 they are inserted into a prayer, while the Damascus Document reworks them into a wisdom admonition.

5Q13 (5QRule)

	Frg. 1
]°[1
]אלוהי הכול[2
]ה ויוסד ע[3
]° אוצרות:°[4

certainty in the combination. It is nevertheless the one used by all previous discussions.

- 16 Cf. Milik 1962, 182. Schiffman 1994, 132–133, defines this part as a confessional prayer.
- 17 Kister 2001 proposes taking the fragments as two parts of a single column. Frg. 2 does indeed preserve the left end of a column at the end of the sheet, since remains of the sewing thread that attached the sheet to the following one are still visible. Frg. 1 has not preserved a margin and therefore comes from the middle of a column. However, Qumran fragments rarely come from two parts of the same column. The similar shape of frgs. 1 and 2 and their identical liturgical style suggest that they originated in two adjoining columns, or perhaps from those in close proximity, depending upon the length of the original scroll and the way in which it was rolled. The hypothesis that frg. 2 should be fitted into the column of frg. 1 biased Kister's presentation in several points. Thus, in frg. 1 line 8, Kister reconstructs *את יצחק התמונה* and translates it as "Isaac you have selected out." However, the restoration of Isaac's name is hypothetical and rests on the questionable assumption that it follows the mentioning of Abraham in the attached frg. 2. Because of this problematic restoration, resting on a questionable join, Kister had difficulty in connecting the following verb *התמונה* to Isaac. While correctly proposing the *hif'il* of the root *חמם* (התמונה), he was compelled to advance the unusual meaning "to select out," which is inappropriate in the context. See Kister 2001, 139. However, by removing the restoration "Isaac" and keeping frg. 1 and 2 separate, the more usual translation of the verb *התמונה* "you brought to end" is appropriate (cf. Isa. 33:1). It is a sense suitable also for 1QS IV, 20 (להתם כול רוח עולה), cited by Kister. See Köhler and Baumgartner, 1754. This meaning fits very well with the context of the previous line 7, referring as it does to the survival of Noah. Accordingly, the verb must allude to the demise of the living in the Flood.

[לבדום כאשר עש]	5
[בחרתה מבני א]ם וי]	6
]ה ובנוח רציתה מ°]	7
]ק התמותה ות°]	8
]ל להבין במעש]י	9
]בת עבודת]	10
]° [להו]דיע נסתר]ות	11
]בשנה תצוהו להזוד]	12
]לכול איש ישראל]°	13
]ל עלי°]	14

Frg. 2

]כין	1
[2
[3
]לעד	4
]באברהם	5
]אל יעקוב ה[ו]דעתה בבית אל	6
]ואת לוי ה[]תה, ¹⁸ ותתן לו לאגוד	7
] בחרתה ¹⁹ [בני] ²⁰ לוי לצאת	8
]ברוחמה ²¹ לפניכה	9
]ה ואחר שני	10
]שבועה ²² על	11
]את	12

Frg. 3

]ה°]	1
] חנוך]	2
]°]	3

18 Kister restores ה[בדל]תה ("you separated").

19 This is Milik's original reading. Perhaps he was still able to read the entire word. However, Schiffman and Kister read בה[רתה], probably on the basis of the fragmentary and perhaps deteriorated state of the fragment.

20 Milik restored [בני], Schiffman [בבני], Kister [מן], related to his preceding restoration ומאהרון.

21 Kister reads ב[בריתמה] ("in their covenant").

22 Kister reads ש[בועה]ו ("his oath").

Frg. 1

2.]God of all[
3.] who establishes [
4.] treasures [
5.]by themselves, just as [
6.]you chose from among the sons of m[a]n and [
7.] and you preferred Noah [
8.] you brought to end and [
9.] to understand the works [of
10.] the service of[
11. [to make k]nown the hidden th[ings
12.]by year you shall command him to [
13.]for every Israelite man [

Frg. 2

4.]forever
5.]with Abraham
6.]you made k[n]own to Jacob at Bethel
7.]and Levi you [] and you appointed him to bind
8.] you chose [the sons of] Levi to go out
9.]by their spirit before you
10.] and after two
11.]oath concerning

Frg. 3

2.] Enoch [

As noted, frgs. 1–2 contain a prayer addressed to God, explicitly mentioned in frgs. 1 2. The surviving words mention God's great works in the past. After recalling the act of creation (1 3–4), Noah is named as the person selected to be preserved in the Flood (1 7). Perhaps also Enoch was named in this context.²³ Line 8 states that the addressee, namely

²³ Kister 2001, 139 n. 7, attached the name of Enoch, which appears in the separate frg. 3, to line 5 of frg. 1. However, this combination does not take into account the traces of characters in the lines preceding and following the mention of Enoch. The fragment should therefore be kept apart. Perhaps it comes from another part of this column, as suggested by the context.

God, wiped out an object whose name has not been preserved but, given the preceding mention of Noah, the verb seems to allude to the eradication of humanity and/or the giants in the Flood.²⁴ Frg. 2 names the patriarchs Abraham, Jacob and Levi.²⁵ In frg. 1, the mention of Noah is followed by a reference to the people of Israel (5Q13 1 7, 12). So, in spite of the fragmentary character of the text, we recognize the same pattern known from other Qumran texts, namely Noah and the patriarchs as the chosen genealogy, continued by the people of Israel. As a prayer, this section brings up historical precedents as a reminder of the great divine works of the past, as is the custom both in biblical texts and in other Qumran works. However, the sequence of generations seems to be construed as a narrowing down selection process. The family of Abraham is chosen from among the sons of the righteous Noah, whereas Levi is the preferred son of Jacob, Abraham's grandson (2 6–7). Perhaps a similar context is implied in another small Hebrew fragment:²⁶

4Q577 4

]מבול[1
]אדו[נ'י אשר מלטם]	2
כ]ל אשר היה חק[וק	3
א]ת הכול א]שר	4
]ה ויצו]	5
]לכול א]	6

1.]flood [
2. the Lor]d who rescued them [
3. al]l that was engr[aved
4.] all wh[ich
5.] and he commanded [
6.]according to all [

24 See n. 17 above.

25 The name of Aharon is restored by Kister in 5Q13 2 9; yet the restoration is superfluous since the passage refers only to the patriarchs and to Levi as Jacob's offspring, but not to the following generations.

26 See Puech 1998, 199.

It seems that also frg. 7 concerns the Flood since it mentions the "sons of man" (בְּנֵי הָאָדָם) – 4Q577 7 4) and in two places the *hif'il* of the verb שָׁחַת [השחיתו] שָׁחַת (4Q577 7 2, 5).²⁷ But the other small fragments yield no further details regarding this theme.

A Hebrew sectarian work, which has not been examined in this context, appears to present another reworking of this series of historical events. It is a passage from the Prayers for the Festivals, extant in two fragmentary copies, 1Q34bis and 4Q509 97–98 ii.²⁸ This pericope provides a liturgical adaptation of the historical precedents, and in this respect is akin to their reworking in the prayer of 5Q13. The passage is preserved in a fuller form in the cave 1 copy, which is cited here (partly overlapping 4Q509 97 + 98):

1Q34bis 3 ii 1–8

[מאור גדול] ל] למועד ה[1
[] ° [] ° ואין לעבור חוקיהם וכולם]	2
[] ° וממשלתם בכל תבל ולא הבין זרע האד[ם] בכל אשר הנחלתו ולא ידעוך	3
[בכ]ול דברך וירשיעו מכול ולא הבינו בכוחך הגדול ותמאס בם כי לא תחפץ	4
ב[ע]ול[ה] ורשע <i>vac?</i> לא יכון לפניך ותבחר לך עם בקץ רצונך כי זכרת ברייתך	5
ות[תנ]ם להבדל לך לקודש מכול העמים ותחדש ברייתך להם במראת כב[ו]ד ודברי	6
[רוח] קודשך במעשי ידיך וכתב ימינך להודיעם יסורי כבוד ומעשי עולם	7
[ל]ה[ה]ם רועה נאמן מ[] ש עני ור[] מים	8

1. [] a grea[t] luminary for the appointed time of [
2. [] and one must not transgress their laws, and all of them [
3. [] and their dominion is over all of the world. But the seed of ma[n] did not perceive all that you caused him to inherit, and they did not know you
4. [in a]ll your words, but they acted more wickedly than all (others) and they did not perceive your great might. Therefore you rejected them for you do not wish
5. iniq[uit]y, and wickedness *vac?* will not be established before you. And you chose a people for yourself in a period of your favor, because you remembered your covenant

²⁷ Similarly Puech 1998, 196.

²⁸ See Milik 1955, 154; Baillet 1982, 198–199, reconstructed the fragmentary cave 4 copy with the help of 1Q34bis.

6. and You [granted] them that they should be set apart for yourself as holy from all the peoples, and you renewed your covenant for them by a vision of gl[o]ry and words of
7. your [spirit] of holiness, by the works of your hands and the writing of your right hand, to make them know the glorious instructions and the eternal works.
8. [] for [th]em a faithful shepherd [] poor and []²⁹

This section forms part of the Qumranic collection of prayers for the festivals.³⁰ The historical allusions constitute element of the basic structure of these prayers.³¹ The passage probably belongs to the prayer for Shavuot, the Festival of Weeks, as suggested by the allusions to the Sinai covenant and to Moses in lines 6–8.³² In fact, two antipodes are outlined in the passage: there are allusions, on the one hand, to the primordial creative acts and the sin of mankind and, on the other, to the election of the people of Israel and the covenant made with them through the giving of the Torah. Here, too, dual manifestations are recorded: the sin of primeval generations and the election of Israel. Although the Flood is not mentioned explicitly, the entire depiction conjures it up. The first two broken lines obviously refer to one of the well-known acts of creation, namely the creation of the luminaries (Gen. 1:14–18). Perhaps the end of line 2, now missing, referred to the creation of man, whose mastery over the whole world may be alluded to at the beginning of line 3. That this dominance is attributed to man rather than to the luminaries is suggested by the following reference to mankind in the second part of line 3. The use of the general term "mankind" (זרע האדם) in this context shows that it designates a period preceding the existence of the people of Israel, who are first mentioned in line 5. Lines 2–4 speak of a time when mankind lacked an understanding of God's gifts and words, and acted wickedly thus causing God to reject them. The combination of motifs clearly points to the generation of the Flood. As in 4Q370 i 1–3, the prayer evokes perhaps the abundance granted to the generations before the Flood, who did not appreciate it

29 The translation, with a few changes, is that of Falk 1998, 179.

30 A general description of this collection is provided by Falk 1998, 155–199. For the place of these prayers in the liturgical literature of the Qumran community, see Nitzan 1994, 12–13, 23, 71.

31 Cf. the structural analysis of Nitzan 1994, 71.

32 Baillet 1982, 175–215, considered this pericope to be part of the prayer for the Day of Atonement. Nitzan 1994, 98 n. 33, follows this identification. However, based on both content and the sequence of fragments, Falk 1998, 162, 178–180, has shown convincingly that the passage belongs to the prayer for the Festival of Weeks.

(see below). Even though the patriarchs are not mentioned in this text, the juxtaposition of the wicked humans who preceded the Flood with the people of Israel conveys the same polarity as that evoked between the generation of the Flood and the patriarchs.

A more explicit sectarian perspective on the Flood and the patriarchs is presented by the so-called Peshar on the Periods (4Q180).³³ The peshar survived in a few fragments but frg. 1 preserves most of what is probably the opening column, since it gives the title of the work "peshar on the periods" and an introductory section that is appropriate at the beginning of a work. In addition, the upper right section of this piece displays a relatively large blank area that is suggestive of the wide right margin usually left at the beginning of a work. The text is unique in that it is a peshar on a theme rather than on a particular biblical passage. However, it seems to follow the generic style of a peshar by introducing various biblical quotations with the formula "the interpretation of" (פשר) as in frg. 1 7 and perhaps 2–4 ii 7, or with the phrase "and as for what is written" (ואשר כתוב) in frg. 5–6 2, 5.

4Q180

Frg. 1

top margin

פשר על הקצים אשר עשה אל קץ להתם [כול הויה]	1
ונהיה בטרם בראם הכין פעולות[יהם לפרוש קציהם]	2
קץ לקצו והוא חרות על לחות [השמים לבני איש]	3
[ל] קצי ממשלותם זה סרך ב[ני נוח משם לאברהם]	4
[ע] ה הוליד ישחק את עשרה ה[דורות]	5
<i>vacat</i>	6
[ו] פשר על עזזאל והמלאכים אש[ר באו אל בנות אדם]	7
[וי] לדו להם גברים ועל עזזאל]	8
[לאהבת] עולה ולהנחיל רשעה כל ק[צם לכלה]	9

33 The Peshar was first published by Allegro 1968, 77–79, and later re-edited by Milik 1972, 109–126. Milik considered 4Q180 and 4Q181 to be copies of the same work and published them as a single text. This erroneous view has unfortunately been accepted by many without taking into account the distinct character of each manuscript and of my criticism of the combination put forward by Milik. Cf. my re-edition and arguments in Dimant 1979. The text and translation cited below follow this edition. I subsequently re-edited 4Q181 separately and once again showed its distinct character. See Dimant 2009. 4Q180 is therefore treated here as a separate work.

[בקנא] ת משפטים ומשפט סוד] 10
bottom margin

Frg. 2-4 i

1
 2 ו[פול [אבר] ם על פניו
 3 *vacat*[
 4 ש[מכה אברים ם הוא
 5 ש[מכה אברה] ם ה[
 10 [אמר נוה]

Frg. 2-4 ii

1 [הר צ] יון הוא אשר שכן א [ל] על [ולם שם]
 2 אשר א [] ת יפה אל לוט ם לישת ם []
 3 ארץ [] *vacat*? שלושת האנשים [אשר]
 4 נרא [ו] אל [אברה] ם באלוני ממרה מלאכים המה [ואשר]
 5 [אמר זע] קת סדום ועמורה כי ר [בה] זחטאתמה כי
 6 כבדה מאדה ארדה נא ואראה הזעקתמה הבאה
 7 [אלי אע] שה כלה ואם לא אדע [ה פשר] הדבר [על כול]
 8 בשך אשר [] ו[על כול [פה]
 9 דובר [נבלה] [ואראה כיא הכול [חקוק לקצי]
 10 תע[ודתם כיא [בטרם בראם ידע מחשב[ותיהם]
bottom margin

Frg. 5-6

1 [לם *vacat*]
 2 ואשר כת[וב על הארץ]
 3 [דרך שני ימים]
 4 ה[א הר ציון ירושלי] ם
 5 ואש[ך כתוב על פרעה]
 6 [אשך]

Frg. 1

1. Interpretation concerning the Periods made by God, (each) Period in order to terminate [all that is]
2. and all that will be. Before he created them, he set up [their] activities [according to the exact meaning of the Periods]
3. one Period after another. And it is engraved on the Tablets [of heaven according to the sons of man,]
4. [according to] ^{all} the Periods of their dominions. This (is) the order of the so[ns of Noah from Shem to Abraham]
5. [unt]il he begat Isaac, the ten [generations]
6. *vacat*
7. [And] interpretation concerning 'Azaz'el and the angels wh[o went unto the daughters of men]
8. [and] they [b]ore unto them mighty giants. And concerning 'Azaz'el [who led them astray to deceit]
9. [to love] iniquity and to cause to inherit wickedness, all [their] Pe[riod for destruction]
10. [with zealous] judgments and the judgment of the assembly of []

Frgs. 2-4 i

3. And Abra]m fell on his face
4. y]our name Abram he
5.]your name Abraha]m
10.]said habitation

Frgs. 2-4 ii

1. [mount Zi]on which is [where] Go[d] of Et[ernity] abides []
2. what [] beautiful to Lot to possess []
3. land [] *vacat?* the three men [who]
4. appear[ed to [Abraha]m at the Oaks of Mamre were angels, [and as for what]
5. [he said, 'The out]cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is gr[eat] and their crime is
6. very grave; I will go down and see whether (according to) their outcry which has come
7. [to me I will inf]lict destruction or not, that I may know.' The interpretation] of this (is) [of all]
8. flesh which [] and] of every [mouth]

9. speaking [disgrace]'And I will see,' for everything [is engraved according to the Period of]
10. [their] desi[gnation for] before he created them he knew [their] plan[s]

Frgs. 5–6

1. [eter[nity] *vacat* []
2. [and as for what is wr]itten concerning the land []
3. [] a journey of two days []
4. [it i]s mount Zion, Jerusal[em]
5. [and (as for wha)t is written concerning Pharaoh []
6. [] which []

From the perspective of the present theme, the particular episodes commented upon in this peshet are significant: after a general introduction stating the character of the periods preordained by the Divine before creation (1 1–4), the text goes on to list specific periods. That it began with the Flood is evident from the fact that frg. 1, containing the pericope about the deluge, opens the work. In placing this primordial cataclysm at the beginning, the Peshet on the Periods resembles the roster of the Damascus Document and other ancient lists.³⁴ However, since all the surviving fragments produce episodes from the life of Abraham, this may have been the major concern of this peshet, as is also suggested by 1 4–5. However, unlike the lists in the Damascus Document and the Shavuot liturgy discussed above, these historical events are not catalogued in a concise series but in a sequence of predetermined periods. It appears that each period was introduced by the term "peshet concerning," as are the first period (1 7) and probably that of Sodom and Gomorrah (2–4 ii 7).³⁵ Yet, essentially the historical events are displayed in the same sequence in this list, with the Flood in the first period, and with the emphasis on events related to Abraham. The original work may have contained other episodes about Abraham's forefathers or earlier details of his life, such as the journey from Haran, referred to by the Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252 1–2 ii 8–10; cf. below) and Pseudo-Jubilees (4Q225 2 i 2). It is, however, worthwhile noting that the Flood is represented here in an unusual way. It does not

³⁴ See the sources cited in n. 12 above.

³⁵ See the formulation וְאֵשֶׁר כְּתוּב ("and as for wha)t (is) written" in 4Q180 5–6 5 and probably in 4Q180 5–6 2.

mention the deluge itself, but the evil wrought by the angels and the giants they fathered with the daughters of men. In fact, this is the only Qumran text that mentions 'Azaz'el together with these rebellious angels.³⁶ By introducing this name, the Peshet on the Periods evidences familiarity with the legend that interprets Gen. 6:1–4, according to which the angels who fathered giants were led by their chief, 'Azaz'el. The story is documented in 1 En. 6–11³⁷ and referred to in other Enochic works.³⁸ Interestingly, the present peshet chose the version of the legend that names 'Azaz'el as the leader of the angels rather than Shemihazah, who is attributed this function in 1 En. 6:3, 7.³⁹ In the composite sequence of 1 En. 6–11, 'Azaz'el, named Asael in the Aramaic version of Qumran, is one of the angels' chieftains (1 En. 8:1–2).⁴⁰ However, in this peshet, the sins of the angels are mentioned whereas their punishment is only hinted at (4Q180 1 9–10). It may consist of the punishments specified by the various Enochic sources: the giants perish by the sword or in the Flood, while the angels are to be imprisoned in the depths of the earth until their final judgment.⁴¹

The emphasis on the wickedness of the angels may be intended to enhance the parallelism with the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah, listed in frgs. 2–4 ii 5–9. For the angels of old as well as the inhabitants of these cities are guilty of sexual misconduct and both groups are condemned

36 'Azaz'el may have been mentioned also in 4Q181 2 1–2. This pericope is probably a reworked quotation from 4Q180 1 7–8, but the lines are fragmentary. See Dimant 1979, 99–100; eadem 2009, 65–66.

37 The name Asael (עסאל) occurs in one Aramaic copy of 1 Enoch (4Q201 [4QEn^a ar] 1 iii 9) and in another with the orthography עשאל (4Q204 [4QEn^c ar] 1 ii 25, doubtful). But later versions identify this angel by the name 'Azaz'el. On the various traditions regarding the angels and the women embedded in 1 En. 6–11, see Dimant 1974, 21–72; Nickelsburg 2001, 165–181; Bhayro 2005; idem 2006, 163–164; Segal 2007, 109–115.

38 The latest Enochic work, the Book of Parables (= 1 En. 37–71), produces various references to the two angels. In a list of the angels (69:2), which may represent a different source, Shemihazah opens the list, whereas 'Azaz'el closes it. But 54:5 and 55:4 depict the final judgment and punishment of the angels with 'Azaz'el as their leader. ל[ר]אזעל is mentioned in a copy of the Qumran Aramaic Book of Giants (4Q203 7a 6).

39 These references are taken from the oldest sources underlying 1 En. 6–11, chapters which in themselves form a distinct unit in the Book of Watchers (= 1 En. 1–36). Cf. the analysis of Dimant 2002.

40 See my detailed analysis of the two versions of the legend in Dimant 1974, 24–72. See also Segal 2007, 109–115.

41 For the giants dying as the result of internal strife, see 1 En. 10:9, 12. Their death in the Flood is suggested in 1 En. 89:6. The angels' imprisonment in the depths of the earth until their final judgment is mentioned in 1 En. 10:12–14; 21:10; 55:4; 88:3.

to total annihilation.⁴² In sharp contrast to these iniquitous ones stand the members of the righteous line, Noah's offspring (reconstructed in frg. 1 4). But it is chiefly Abraham who is portrayed as being perfect by way of events in his life: the change of his name (2-4 i), the partition of the land with Lot (2-4 ii 2-3) and perhaps the Aqedah (5-6 2-4). The uniqueness of 4Q180 lies in its stress on the predetermined and dualistic character of these events in the framework of the periods (4Q180 1 1-4; 2-4 ii 9-10). Thus dualism is projected here onto the early history of humanity and the patriarchs.

It is worthwhile noting that another text, 4Q464, which lacks sectarian markers, nevertheless shares several elements with the Peshier on the Periods.⁴³ Despite being quite fragmentary, which renders it difficult to establish the full sequence of the events, the references to the Flood (4Q464 5 ii⁴⁴), and to three events from the life of Abraham, Haran (4Q464 1 1-2), the Covenant of the Pieces (4Q464 3 ii) and the Aqedah (4Q464 6) are recognizable. Frgs. 7-9 deal with various scenes from the life of Jacob and frg. 10 probably referred to Joseph. The mention of the Flood in a text dealing with the patriarchs is relevant to the present discussion. Also of interest is the appearance in several Qumran texts of Haran, the Covenant of the Pieces and the Aqedah, all important events in Abraham's life. 4Q464 shares references to the Flood and the Aqedah with 4Q180, to Haran, the Covenant of the Pieces and the Aqedah with Pseudo-Jubilees (4Q225 2 i-ii), and to the Flood, Haran, and the Covenant of the Pieces with 4Q252.⁴⁵

A unique version of the relationship between the Flood and the lives of the patriarchs is presented by another Hebrew text, the Commentary on Genesis. It reworks and comments on various incidents from Gen. 6-49, thus covering the Flood and significant events in the lives of the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The work has survived in four fragmentary copies, 4Q252, 4Q253, 4Q254 and

42 The parallelism between the generation of the Flood and the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah is an old theme elaborated upon by numerous Jewish sources. Cf. e.g. Sir 16:7-8; Wisd. 10:4-5; Tosefta, Ta'an. 2:13; Mekhilta de Rabbi Shimon Bar Yohai 14. 1; Gen. Rab. 39. 6.

43 Published by Eshel and Stone 1995.

44 If the order of the events followed the biblical sequence, this fragment should have been the first in the series, since it contains the earliest episode.

45 Esther Eshel 1997, 8, also noticed the similar themes treated by these texts. She noted that 4Q464 and 4Q252 share expansions of topics from Genesis, such as the Flood, are both interested in chronology and use introductory formulae such as כִּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר in 4Q464a or כִּאֲשֶׁר כְּתוּב in 4Q252. She also observed some similarity between them and 4Q180.

4Q254a.⁴⁶ The largest sections is contained in frg. 1 of 4Q252, which preserves three consecutive columns, the first two of which are almost complete. They constitute the beginning of the text as the large margin preceding the first column is not inscribed.⁴⁷ The first two columns introduce the prelude to the Flood, the details of the Flood itself and its conclusion. The other copies, which survived in a few pieces, also yield small sections from the Flood story (4Q253 1, 4Q254 1 and 4Q254a 1–3).

4Q252 (4QCommGen A)

Col. I (Frgs. 1, 2)

top margin

[ב] שנת ארבע מאות ושמונים לחיי נוח בא קצם לנוח ואלוהים	1
אמר לא ידור רוחי באדם לעולם ויחתכו ימיהם מאה ועשרים	2
שנה עד קץ מי מכול ומי מכול היו על הארץ <i>vacat</i> בשנת שש מאות שנה	3
לחיי נוח בחודש השני באחד בשבת בשבעה עשר בו ביום ההוא	4
נבקעו כול מעינות תהום רבה וארבות השמים נפתחו ויהי הגשם על	5
הארץ ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה עד יום עשרים וששה בחודש	6
השלישי יום חמשה בשבת ויגברו המים על הארץ חמשים ומאת יום	7
עד יום ארבעה עשר בחודש השביעי בשלושה בשבת ובסוף חמשים	8
ומאת יום חסרו המים שני ימים יום ה'ביעי ויום החמישי ויום	9
הששי נחה התבה על הרי הוררט ה' [וא יו] ם שבעה עשר בחודש השביעי	10
והמים הי'ו [הלוך וחסרו עד החודש [הע] שירי באחד בו יום רביעי	11
לשבת נראו ראשי ההרים ויהי מלך ארבעים יום להראות ראשי	12
ההר'ים ויפ'תח נוח את חלון התבה יום אחד בשבת הוא יום עשרה	13
בעש'תי עשר] החודש וישלח את היונה לראות הקלו המים ולוא	14
מצאה מנוח ותבוא אליו [אל] התבה ויחל עוד שבעת ימים א' [חרים]	15
ויוסף לשלחה ותבוא אליו ועלי זית טרף בפייה [הוא יום עשרים]	16
וארבעה לעשתי עשר החודש באחד בשב' [ת וידע נוח כי קלו המים]	17
מעל הארץ <i>vacat</i> ומקץ שבעת ימים אחר'ים שלח א'ת היונה ולוא	18
יספה לשוב עוד הוא יום א'ח'ד [שנים עשר] החודש [באחד]	19
בשבת ומקץ שלוש'ים ואחד ימים משלח את היונ'ה אשר לוא יספ' [ה]	20
שוב עוד חרבו ה'מ'ים מעל הארץ ו'יסר נוח את מכסה התבה []	21

46 Cf. Brooke 1996b, 185–212, 217–236.

47 See the description of Brooke 1994a, 162–163.

וירא והגה [חרבו פני האדמה ברבי] עי באחד בחודש הראיש[ון]] 22
bottom margin

Col. II (Frgs. 1, 3)

top margin

באחת ושש מאות שנה לחיי נוח ובשבעה עשר יום לחודש השני	1
יבשה הארץ באחד בשבת ביום ההוא יצא נוח מן התבה לקץ שנה	2
תמימה לימים שלוש מאות ששים וארבעה באחד בשבת בשבעה	3
<i>vacat</i> אחת ושש <i>vacat</i> נוח מן התבה למועד שנה	4
תמימה <i>vacat</i> ויקץ נוח מיינו וידע את אשר עשה	5
לו בנו הקטן ויומר ארור כנען עבד עבדים יהייה לאחיו ולוא	6
קלל את חם כי אם בנו כי ברך אל את בני נוח וְבִאֵהֶלִי שֵׁם יִשְׁכֹּן	7
ארץ נתן לאברהם אהבו <i>vacat</i> בן מאה ואר[ב] עֵיִם שנה תרח בצאתו	8
מאור כשדיים ויבוא חֲרֹן ואב[רם] בן ש[בע] שנה וחמש שנים ישב	9
אברם בחרן ואחר יצא [] ארץ כנען שש[ים]]	10
העגלה והאיל והע[ז] [] אברם לא []	11
האש בעבר[ן] [] צֵה לקח לו []	12
לצאת אב[רם] [] לנעון ל []	13
[] <i>vacat</i>	14

Col. I

- [In] the four hundred and eightieth year of Noah's life their end came to Noah and God
- said, 'My spirit will not dwell among humanity forever'; and their days were determined at one hundred and twenty
- years until the time of (the) waters of (the) flood. And (the) waters of (the) flood were upon the earth *vacat* in the year of the six hundredth year
- of Noah's life, in the second month, on the first day of the week, on its seventeenth day, on that day
- all (the) fountains of (the) great deep burst forth and the windows of the heavens were opened and there was rain upon
- the earth for forty days and forty nights until the twenty-sixth day in the
- third month, the fifth day of the week. And the waters swelled upon the earth for one hundred and fifty days,
- until the fourteenth day in the seventh month on the third day of the week. And at the end of

9. one hundred and fifty days the waters decreased for two days, the fourth day and the fifth day, and on the
10. sixth day the ark came to rest on the mountains of Hurarat; i[t was the seventeenth [da]y in the seventh month.
11. And the waters continued to decrease until the [te]nth month. On its first day, the fourth day
12. of the week, the tops of the mountains were seen. And it was at the end of forty days when the tops of the mountain[s] were visible
13. [that] Noah [op]ened the window of the ark, on the first day of the week, that is, the tenth day
14. in the elev[enth] month. And he sent the dove to see whether the waters had abated but it did not
15. find a resting place and came back to him [to] the ark. And he again waited a[nother] seven days,
16. and he sent it out again and it came back to him and fresh leaves of an olive tree were in its beak. [This was the twenty-fourth]
17. day of the eleventh month, on the first day of the wee[k. And Noah knew that the waters had abated]
18. from upon the earth. *vacat* And at the end of seven fur[ther] days [he sent forth th]e [dove and it did not]
19. return again; it was the fi[rst] day [of the twelfth] month, [on the first day]
20. of the week. And at the end of thir[ty-one] days from sending forth the dov]e when it did not
21. return again, the wat[ers] dried up [from upon the earth and] Noah removed the covering of the ark
22. and looked and behold[the surface of the ground had dried up, on the four]th day [of the week] on the first day of the firs[t] month

Col. II (Frgs. 1, 3)

1. In the six hundred and first year of Noah's life, and on the seventeenth day of the second month
2. the earth dried up, on the first day of the week. On that day Noah went forth from the ark at the end of a
3. complete year of three hundred and sixty-four days, on the first day of the week, in the seven(th)
4. *vacat* one and six *vacat* Noah from the ark at the appointed time, a
5. complete year. *vacat* And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what

6. his youngest son had done to him. And he said, 'Cursed be Canaan! A slave of slaves will he be to his brothers.' But he did not
7. curse Ham, but his son, because God blessed the sons of Noah, and in the tents of Shem will he dwell, ;
8. a land He gave to Abraham his friend. *vacat* Terah was one hundred and fo[r]ty years old when he went forth
9. from Ur of the Chaldees and entered Haran. And Ab[ram was se]venty years old. And for five years
10. Abram stayed in Haran. And afterwards he left [] the land of Canaan, sixty[]
11. the heifer and the ram and the go[at] Abram []
12. the fire when it pass[ed]] he took []
13. at Ab[ram]'s departure []Canaan []
14. *vac[at*]

4Q252 is very different from the texts surveyed above. Compared to the concise references to past events that are inserted into admonitions, prayers or pesharim, the present text concerns the biblical text itself, which it quotes in relatively great detail. The genre of the text has been debated, with the main issue being how to define the compendium of seemingly disparate comments on various Genesis pericopae. George Brooke saw in the compilation a commentary with theological thrust, whereas Moshe Bernstein has defined it as purely exegetical commentary, aiming at clarifying difficult biblical passages.⁴⁸ However, close analysis shows that Brooke is essentially right in arguing that the overall idea of the commentary is the gift of the land to the patriarchs and, I may add, the assurance and protection of their progeny, namely the people of Israel. This is conveyed by the selection and reworking of the biblical sources commented upon, as shown below.

As noted by students of this compilation, the comments follow the biblical order. However in contrast, for instance, to 4Q422 (cf. below), nothing is said of creation, the Garden of Eden or Adam's genealogy. The text starts immediately with the prelude to the Flood, in itself an indication of its specific theological aim. This event is introduced by

48 Brooke has characterized the text as a commentary on Genesis "with paraenetic historical exegesis," and later as "excerpted commentary." See Brooke 1994a, 178–179; idem 1996a, 395. Bernstein claims that the comments are theologically neutral except for the pericopae concerning the Flood (4Q252 1 i–ii) and the peshar on Gen. 49:10 (4Q252 V 1–5). See Bernstein 1994a, 25–26; idem 1994b, 74–78. García Martínez 2007 also favors the view that the text has an overall agenda.

reworking Gen. 6:3 (4Q252 1 i 1–3). This verse is a traditional *crux interpretum* and commentators have debated whether the shortening of human life to 120 years stated therein is intended for humanity in general⁴⁹ or only for humans living before the Flood. Most ancient sources opt for the second option, as does 4Q252.⁵⁰ For it applies the number 120 to the years left for mankind until the Flood, as is clear from the information inserted regarding Noah's age: Noah is said to have been 480 years old when the divine decision to curtail human life was taken, precisely 120 years before the Flood (4Q252 1 i 1).⁵¹ That the Flood took place when Noah was 600 years of age is stated by Gen. 7:6. 4Q252 follows this by relating that Noah was 601 years old when he emerged from the ark following the Flood that lasted one year (4Q252 1 ii 1–5).⁵² The fact that the Flood eradicated all of humanity apart from Noah and his family is also clear in 4Q252 from its statement *בא קצם לנוח* ("their end came to Noah" – 4Q252 I 1), which reworks Gen. 6:13 *קץ כל בשר לפני* ("the end of all flesh came before me").⁵³ This association is based on the word *בשר* ("flesh"), occurring in both Gen. 6:3 and Gen. 6:13. In other words, 4Q252, as in other ancient sources, linked Gen. 6:3 with Gen. 6:13 and saw in them a reference to the annihilation of these early generations in the deluge. Here, 4Q252 clearly opts for the version of the legend that views the Flood as the punishment for human iniquity, rather than that of the Watchers and the giants. Thus, the juxtaposi-

49 Thus Philo, *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesim* I, 91.

50 Thus the Septuagint to Gen. 6:3 (see the comments of Harl 1986, 125–126); Jub. 5:8 (applying the number to the remaining years of the giants; see Segal 2007, 119–125), *Bib. Ant.* 3:2 (see the comments of Jacobson 1996, 1:309), and Josephus, *Ant.* I, 75. The same interpretation is advanced by the Targumim (Onqelos, Neofiti, Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. 6:3) and rabbinic midrashim (e.g. *Mekhilta*, *Beshalah* on Exod. 15:5 [cf. the edition of Horovitz-Rabin 1970, 133]; *Gen. Rab.* 26.3), which saw in the number 120 an extension of the time given to mankind before the Flood to repent of their sins.

51 This is observed by Lim 1992, 291; Bernstein 1994a, 6; García Martínez 2007, 50–51. However, they did not elucidate the implications of this observation for the meaning of the entire 4Q252 passage and its effect on the postdiluvian era. Brooke merely remarks that the information given regarding Noah's age reflects a concern for "dating by years." See Brooke 1994a, 166. In a separate article, Bernstein discusses the fact that 4Q252 replaces the Masoretic Text's *יודן* ("judge") of Gen. 6:3 with *יזור* ("abide"), and concludes that the change reflects a widely disseminated exegetical tradition rather than a textual variant. Cf. Bernstein 1994c. For other ancient witnesses that adopted this exegetical option, see the list and discussion in Dimant 1974, 96 n. 273.

52 Here, 4Q252 follows the textual tradition underlying the Septuagint to Gen. 8:13, which gives the number 601 as Noah's age when the land dried up. The parallel passage in the Masoretic Text (Gen. 6:13) has no mention of Noah's age.

53 As observed by Lim 1992, 291.

tion of the comments on Gen. 6:3 and the story of the Flood is intended not only to comment on a difficult biblical passage, but also to designate the Flood as the punishment on the human sinners of that generation.

The description of the Flood itself (4Q252 1 i 1–ii 5) follows the biblical account but retains only the portions relating to the timing of its various stages, supplying their precise dates and days according to the 364-day calendar.⁵⁴ The author's interest in chronology is further emphasized by the omission of all the details unrelated to dates, as observed by George Brooke. He also points out that none of the major stages of the Flood fall on Sabbaths or festivals.⁵⁵ Thus, the presentation of the chronology of the Flood in 4Q252 follows the course of time as measured in the postdiluvian world, regulated by the 364-day calendar. Just as a new and permanent natural order is established following the Flood (Gen. 8:21–22; 9:14–16), represented in 4Q252 by the 364-day calendar, so also is there a new human race, to be fathered by the righteous survivor, Noah. The biblical account records how this original divine plan is gradually reduced to the choice of a single genealogy, that of Shem, and to a single family, that of Abraham. According to this sequence, Noah's drunkenness, Ham's improper act and Canaan's curse signal the first signs of the deterioration of postdiluvian humanity, which resulted in the choice of Abraham's righteous genealogy. Although 4Q252 does not explicate all these biblical ideas, it clearly assumed them since it refers to Canaan's curse, which is incomprehensible without the biblical context.⁵⁶ However, by juxtaposing the conclusion of the Flood with the curse on Canaan, and leaving out the covenant with Noah and the planting of the vineyard (Gen. 8:20–9:24), the author of 4Q252 indicates that his main interest lies with the Canaan story. This particular concern is articulated by non-biblical additions and by exegetical traditions also known from non-Qumranic sources. Citing Gen. 9:24–25, the first part of the Qumranic comment (4Q252 II 6–7) explains why Ham's son Canaan is cursed for his father's misdeed. The explanation refers to the divine blessing of Noah's sons (Gen. 8:17), which cannot be undone.⁵⁷ But the second part of the pericope (4Q252 II 7) quotes only three words from the blessing that is at-

54 The author's efforts to resolve the difficulties created by imposing the 364-day calendar on the chronology of the Flood are surveyed by García Martínez 2007, 51–54.

55 See Brooke 1994b, 40; idem 1994a, 166–167.

56 Brooke notes correctly that the truncated biblical references suggest that the readers were familiar with the full biblical context. See Brooke 1994a, 165. Cf. n. 67 below.

57 The same explanation is offered, for instance, by Gen. Rab. 36.7, cited by Bernstein 1994a, 10.

tached to the curse: וישכן באהלי שם ("and He will dwell in the tents of Shem" – Gen. 9:27a). As noted by others, abbreviating the quotation by omitting the reference to Japhet renders God the subject of the verb ישכון ("will dwell") as well as of the two preceding verbs (ברך, קלל).⁵⁸ That God is the subject of this verb is also clear from the following phrase, of which God is the subject, נתן לאברהם אהבו ("a land he gave to Abraham his friend" – 4Q252 II 8, based on 2 Chron. 20:7⁵⁹). The syntactical connection of this phrase to the previous ובהאלי שם ישכון ("and in the tents of Shem he will abide") is rightly defined by Bernstein as standing in apposition and explain(s) the poetic idiom אהלי שם ("tents of Shem").⁶⁰ Thus the "tents of Shem" as a poetical reference to the abode of Abraham's forefather is equated with the "land given to Abraham," namely Canaan. In addition, the phrase ובהאלי שם ישכון ("and in the tents of Shem He will dwell") takes up Gen. 9:27 with a significant change. By placing the "tents of Shem" before the verb, the reverse order of the Masoretic Text, and by omitting the biblical reference to Japhet, the "tents of Shem" acquires a unique significance. Additionally, as noted, the verb ישכון "will dwell" is applied to God and not to Japhet. Thus, God himself is said to abide in Shem's tents, equated here with the land given to Abraham.

Applying Gen. 9:27 ישכן to God is not unique to 4Q252. It is found in other ancient witnesses, such as Jub. 7:12 as well as Tg. Onq. and Tg. Neof. to this verse.⁶¹ Perhaps 4Q252 saw in the verb ישכון a specific allusion to the future Tent of Meeting or temple, since the verb שכן is used in this context by various biblical passages.⁶² Of special interest in this connection is the blessing given to Benjamin in Deut. 33:12: ידיד ה' ישכן ("the friend of God dwells in security").⁶³ The similarity of several elements in Deut. 33:12 to the formulation of 4Q252 II 7–8 is notable: 'ה//ידיד; 'ה//ישכון; 'ה//אהבו//ידיד ה'.

58 Cf. Brooke 1994b, 41; Bernstein 1994a, 12.

59 ותתנה לזרע אברהם אהבו ("and You gave it [i.e. the land] to the progeny of Abraham your friend").

60 Cf. Bernstein 1994a, 11. García Martínez 2007, 54–55, argues that the only concern of the pericope is to equate the Tents of Shem with the land given to Abraham. But this equation has wider implications for the specific pericope and the text as a whole.

61 As noted by Bernstein 1994a, 12 n. 39.

62 Num. 35:34; Joel 4:17, 21; Ps. 135:21.

63 Later rabbinic commentaries understood this verse as an allusion to the fact that the Jerusalem temple was built within Benjamin's territory. Cf. e.g. Sifre Deut. § 352; b. Menah. 53b; Abot R. Nat. B, 43. This is probably the context also in 4Q522 9 ii 8, a fragment from the Apocryphon of Joshua citing Deut. 33:12. The fragment raises the question why Joshua did not install the Tent of Meeting in the proper place, namely Mount Zion in Jerusalem. Cf. Dimant 2003, 191–192.

allude to Deut. 33:12. If so, the syntactical equation of the "tents of Shem" with the land given to Abraham, connected as it is to the curse of Canaan, is intended to explain and justify the transference of this land from the wicked descendants of Noah to the righteous offspring of Shem, a land destined to become the sacred dwelling of God. Subsequent episodes mentioned in 4Q252 are also selected around the theme of the gift of the land and the promise of progeny to the patriarchs: the departure of Abraham from Ur to Canaan (4Q252 II 8–10), the Covenant of the Pieces (4Q252 II 11–12), the annihilation of the wicked Sodom (4Q252 III 1–6), the Aqedah (4Q252 III 6–9), Isaac's blessing to Jacob (4Q252 III 12–14), and the Jacob's final blessing to his sons (4Q252 IV–VI).

As noted above, some of the episodes match those selected by 4Q180. In both texts the wickedness preceding the Flood and the Flood itself are mentioned, together with a covenant with Abraham (4Q180 2–3 i), the sins of Sodom and Gomorrah (4Q180 2–3 ii) and probably the Aqedah (4Q180 5–6 1–4). So, as stated by Brooke for 4Q252 1–2, "while not overtly a moral exhortation, it provides the justification for those that use Noah and the flood typologically to exhort and admonish."⁶⁴

The foregoing survey reveals an interesting generic variety within sectarian texts that rework the theme under consideration. Admonitions and prayers formulate the biblical material in concise lists of historical events. The aim of such rosters is to introduce a sequence of sinners or righteous figures. All the lists discussed here record the circumstances of the Flood as the first instance, and most of them also include the events of the patriarchs' lives. This is the case in Damascus Document II, the Rule (5Q13), the Festival of Weeks liturgy (1Q34bis 3 ii), and the Peshar on the Periods (4Q180). While each text reworks the theme from its own particular perspective, all of them introduce mankind on the eve of the Flood as models of wickedness and the patriarchs as models of righteousness. It appears that, with slight variations, the same list underlies all the Qumranic texts, as well as other sources outside Qumran.⁶⁵ However, the unique aspect of the texts authored by the members of the Qumran community lies in their view that the wicked and righteous of ancient times prefigure the dichotomy between the evil and the just of their own era. In this way, the model of the primordial sinners and righteous forms part of the dualistic system that constitutes a major component of the sectarian ideology. This may account for the fact that all the lists begin with the Flood, rather than,

64 Thus Brooke 1994b, 40.

65 Cf. the list of sources in n. 12 above.

for instance, the sins of Adam or Cain. It may be due to the special interest evidenced by the Qumranites for this episode and its circumstances. However, an additional motive may be connected to the fact that the Flood was a cosmic catastrophe that affected a large group of humans. As such, it fitted the analogy to the wicked in later history, in particular to the final cataclysmic period at the end of history.

A different perspective is apparent in the Commentary on Genesis. As a compendium of biblical citations and comments, it reworks the biblical material through detailed quotations and notations, selected from a particular theological angle. On the whole, the Commentary on Genesis presents a neutral text, in which the notations on the 364-day calendar (4Q252 I) and the sectarian pesher of Gen. 49:10 (4Q252 V 1–5) are isolated sectarian features. It appears that this neutral stance is related to the commentary genre adopted by this work, in contradistinction to the paraenetic sectarian lists. Hence, the relationship between the Flood and the patriarchs as presented through the specific perspective of this work, namely that Abraham and his family are the righteous heirs of Noah in the renewed world.

It is therefore of interest to note the biblical reworking in another text that interprets biblical passages from Genesis but lacks sectarian markers. An example of this kind is offered by the Admonition Based on the Flood (4Q370).

4Q370 is a single fragment preserving parts of two consecutive columns that is dated to around the middle of the first century B.C.E.⁶⁶ Of the first column, only the section concerning the Flood has survived. The second column contains an admonitory homily, which suggests that the Flood is inserted into a paraenetic context. The text freely reworks the biblical story, and occasionally weaves specific biblical locutions into its fabric.⁶⁷

4Q370 i 1–9

1 [ו]יעטור הרים תנו[בה ו]שפך אכל על פניהם ופרי טוב השביעי כלנפש יכיל וישבעו כל אשר עשה רצוני אמר [ה]יה

66 Cf. Newsom 1995, 85–97. The edition below is that of Newsom with several readings from the edition of Feldman 2007, 58.

67 Feldman 2007, 72, proposes the following list of allusions: Gen. 6:5, 12; 7:11, 22–23; 9:12–15; Exod. 15:10; Deut. 8:10; Isa. 24:18–20; Jer. 48:6; Amos 2:14; Pss. 104:13, 28; 145:16; Ecclus. 11:3. García Martínez 2007, 43, remarks that the text is written for readers who are familiar with the biblical story. Note Brooke's similar comment in regards to 4Q252 (see n. 56 above).

2	ויברכו את שמ [קדש] והגני הם אז עשו הרע בעיני אמר יהוה ויאמרו אל במ[עלי]ליהם
3	וישפטם יהוה ז[כ]לדרכיהם זכמחשבות יצו לבם ה[רע] וירעם עליהם בכח[ו] ויזעו כל
4	מוסדי אר[ץ] ומ[ים] נבקעו מתהמוֹת כל ארבות השמים נפתחו ופצו כל תהמוֹת מ[מים] אֲדָרִי ^ב
5	וארבות השמים ה[ר]יקו סטר[ו] אֲבָדָם במבול[ו] ל[] ב[מים] כלם לִיעֵבֵר [] ה[]
6	עלכן נ[מחו] כלאש[ר] ב[ח]רבה וי[מ]ת האדם וה[בהמה] וכל [צפר] כל כנף והג[בור]ים לוא נמלטו
7	ו[] ב[נ]יזו בתב[ה] [] ויעש אל [] וא[ת] קשתו נתן[] בענן ל[מען] יזכור ברית
8	[] ולוא יהיה עוד [מי] המבול ל[שחת] ולוא יפ[תחו] המון מים
9	[] ה[עש]י ושחקים [] למים []
10	[] []

1. [And] he crowned the mountains with pro[duce and] poured out food upon them. And

'shall eat and be satisfied

(with) good fruit he satisfied everyone: whoever performs my will,' said G[o]d,

2. 'and let them bless my [holy] name. But look! they have done what is evil in my eyes,' said God. And they rebelled against God in their d[ee]ds.
3. And God judged them according to [al]l their ways and according to the thoughts of the [evil] inclination of their heart. And he thundered against them with [his] might. [And] all the
4. foundations of the ea[rth tr]embled, [and wa]ters broke forth from the depths. All the windows of the heavens were opened, and all the de[pths] overflowed [with] mighty waters.
5. And the windows of the heavens p[our]ed forth rain. [And] he made them perish in the flood [] all of them for it crossed over [].
6. Therefore everything whi[ch was on] dry ground was [wiped out,] and mankind, and [beast and all] birds, every winged thing, d[ie]d. And the gi[an]ts, too, did not escape.
7. And [] his [s]ons in the ar[k] and God made [] and [] his bow he set [in the cloud so] that he would remember the covenant
8. [] And never again would] the waters of the deluge [come (upon the earth)] for [destruction; and] the tumult of the waters [would not be lo]sed.
-]they made
9. [] and skies [] for waters []

The second half of this fragment, lines 4–10, offers a description of the Flood itself. But the first three lines deal with the type of sin that brought such a calamity upon humanity. The antediluvian age is characterized as having special natural bounty and affluence. This appears to be an interpretation of the biblical tradition that a close tie existed between man and the earth, which was severed by the sins of Adam and Cain. The same relationship is suggested by the Qumran passage, albeit developed in a different way. According to the present text, the earth before the Flood was blessed with special fertility, an idea that may be inferred from the story of Gen. 2.

Interestingly, the Qumran passage states that originally the overflowing natural bounty was given to כל נפש, an expression that, taken from the Biblical description of the creation, must designate all living beings. In contrast, the following phrase can refer only to mankind, since it avers that "whoever performs my will, will eat and be satisfied and let them bless my [holy] name." Since the phrase is a quotation of the divine directive, it presents a precept laid down by God for the entire creation. In other words, the bounty of the earth was given to every living being, but to mankind it was granted on condition of their compliance with God's will and the blessing of his name. The Flood generation did what was evil and spurned God's directive, revealing their rebellious nature and contempt for the divine precept.⁶⁸

Taking up the formulation of Gen. 7:22–23, line 6 depicts the Flood as the punishment on mankind for this sin, namely complete annihilation. Interestingly, in a non-biblical addition the same line specifies that the gibborim (הגבורים), the heroes of Gen. 6:4, also died in the cataclysm. The heroes are undoubtedly the giants, fathered by the angels, the Watchers who went to the daughters of men, the interpretation of Gen. 6:1–4 adopted by most of the ancient traditions, both Jewish and Christian. Although the text here does not mention the Watchers, the reference to the heroes is a clear allusion to the episode.⁶⁹ Here, the

68 A similar understanding of the sins committed by the Flood generation, with an emphasis on the fruitfulness of the earth at the time, is recorded in later rabbinic traditions. Cf. e.g. Mekhilta Beshalah, § 2, interpreting Job 21:10; Sifre Deut., § 43 on Deut. 11:15. Perhaps there is an allusion in 4Q370 to the later Jewish practice of reciting the blessing after meals in the superlinear words "they will eat and be satisfied," as well as the following line 2. For the wording evokes Deut. 8:10: "when you have eaten and been satisfied you must bless the Lord" (ואכלת ושבעת וברכת את ה' אלהיך), a verse that was taken to mandate blessing God after a meal (cf. e.g. Tosefta, Ber. 7:1; Mekhilta Bo, § 16), and Ps. 145:16, which was later incorporated into the formal blessing after the meal. See the comments of Feldman 2007, 74–79 esp. n. 258, with additional references.

69 Contra Bernstein 1999, 211, who claims that the Watchers are not referred to.

giants meet their end in the Flood, a tradition also shared by 4Q252 I 1–3 (see the discussion above). Of special interest is the fact that the description of the Flood in lines 3–5 uses terms taken from the future demise of the earth in Isa. 24:18–20. In fact, the Isaianic text itself borrows elements from the depiction of the Flood, suggesting that the nexus between the Flood and a final cataclysm is already established in this prophecy. If so, the reuse of these elements in 4Q370 attests an acquaintance with the parallelism between the Flood and the eschatological end, a recurring motif in Qumranic and other contemporary sources (cf. the discussion above).

Col. II of the fragment consists of an exhortation regarding the correct direction to take. Inserted into such a context, the story of the Flood in the first column seems to provide a negative example to be avoided. That an exhortation is indeed the main purpose of the text is also suggested by the great similarity between several lines of the second column (4Q370 II 5–9) and another text with admonitory overtones, 4Q185 1–2 i 13–ii 3.⁷⁰ Thus, 4Q370 introduces the Flood generation as the prototype of the wicked in the first column, and indicates the way of the righteous in the second column. Even though the Flood is not connected here with the patriarchs, the sharp contrast between the sinful and the righteous is apparent here.

The reworking of Gen. 6–9 in another Hebrew text, Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus (4Q422 1–7 i–ii), closely follows the biblical text albeit with considerable omissions.⁷¹ This text summarizes the biblical account of the creation, the Garden of Eden and the Flood. Since these events occupy the first three columns and, according to the first editors, there is only one column following, the selection is limited. In Esther Chazon's opinion, it is intended to stress the sin-punishment cycle. She observes a similarity between this selection with its theological thrust, to the first prayer in the work *Dibre Hamme'orot* (4Q504 8–9). In her judgement, the attribution of the evil inclination in the present text (4Q422 1 i 10–12) to the sin of Adam and Eve, juxtaposed as it is to the Flood, suggests that the antediluvian sins were also triggered by the same cause.⁷² But here, also, admonitory tones are clear.⁷³ However, the

70 See the comparison of Newsom 1995, 90; Feldman 2007, 89–90. Feldman suggests that the similar lines in 4Q370 and 4Q185 are best explained by assuming that the two reworked the same source, now lost. For a new edition of 4Q185, cf. Lichtenberger 2002.

71 Cf. Elgvin and Tov 1994. See also the analysis and comments of Feldman 2007, 96–146.

72 Cf. Chazon 1997, 15–17.

patriarchs are not included in the historical antecedents, probably because only sinful acts serve as examples.

In conclusion, the picture emerging from the above survey illuminates the close link between the Flood and the lives of the patriarchs. The patriarchs are presented as the righteous replacement for the wicked antediluvian humans and the sinful postdiluvian offspring of Noah. They also signal the narrowing down of righteousness and law to that abiding in a single family, and later to a single group of people, the Qumranites themselves.

Finally, it should be noted that the texts discussed above are decidedly different from the narrative depictions of the Flood in two other Hebrew texts, namely the Book of Jubilees and the so-called Book of Noah fragment (1Q19, 1Q19bis). Perhaps not by chance, both display a close connection to the narrative elaborations found in the Qumran Aramaic literature, namely the Genesis Apocryphon, 1 Enoch and the Book of Giants. These Aramaic texts elaborate on the biblical materials in great detail, in a manner known only in Jubilees and not in other Hebrew texts from Qumran. Clearly, the Aramaic texts draw on different literary traditions and genres, and therefore both Jubilees and the Book of Noah should be discussed together with the Aramaic narrative accounts. However, a detailed analysis of the themes of the Flood and the patriarchs in the Aramaic texts is beyond the scope of the present article; they merit examination independent of the Hebrew presentations of the same subject. Still, we may note that concerning the Flood the sectarian texts appear to have been influenced by the elaborate narrative reworking of the Aramaic texts, chiefly 1 Enoch and probably also the Book of Giants. The Genesis Apocryphon, Aramaic Levi Document, Visions of Amram and the Testament of Qohat all relate to the patriarchs, and such wide treatment necessitates a special analysis.

Another aspect that merits attention is the fact that the emphasis on both the Flood and the patriarchs has significant parallels in historical apocalypses such as the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En. 93:1–10; 91:11–17) and the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90), both written in Aramaic and forming part of the Enochic compendium, known from both Qumran and non-Qumranic evidence. These two works share many motifs with the sectarian literature, and thus should be added to the many links that connect these Aramaic works to the writings of the Qumran community.

73 Bernstein 2001, 75, stresses the clear "'wisdom' or didactic aspect." He sees a similarity between 4Q370 and 4Q422 I, for in both "man manifests ingratitude to divine blessing." Ibid, 76; Chazon 1997, 15–16.

This short survey is able to outline only a selection of the themes related to the Flood as a preamble to the lives of the patriarchs. Short as it is, it points to both the differences and the similarities between the various groups of works present in the Qumran library, and may thus teach us more about the genesis of the sectarian literature as well as that of non-Qumranic works, and their intimate relationship to the biblical corpus.

Bibliography

- Allegro, John M. 1968. The Ages of Creation. In *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*, 77–79. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baillet, Maurice. 1982. Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520). DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M., and Daniel R. Schwartz. 1993. Damascus Document (CD). In *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 4–57. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 1994a. 4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary. *JJS* 45:1–27.
- . 1994b. 4Q252: Method and Contexts, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke. *JQR* 85:61–79.
- . 1994c. 4Q252 i 2 לעולם ב'אדם רוחי ידור: Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation? *RdQ* 16:421–427.
- . 1999. Noah and the Flood at Qumran. In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich, 199–231. *StTDJ* 30. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2001. Contours of Genesis Interpretation at Qumran: Contents, Context, and Nomenclature. In *Studies in Ancient Midrash*, ed. James L. Kugel, 57–85. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- . 2005. From 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. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements, 39–63. *StTDJ* 58. Leiden: Brill.

- Bhayro, Siam. 2005. *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11*. AOAT 322. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- . 2006. Noah's Library: Sources for 1 Enoch 6–11. *JSPE* 15:163–177.
- Brooke, George J. 1994a. The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet. *DSD* 1:160–179.
- . 1994b. The Thematic Content of 4Q252. *JQR* 85:33–59.
- . 1996a. 4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary. *RdQ* 17:385–401.
- . 1996b. Commentaries on Genesis and Malachi. In *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, eds. George J. Brooke et al., 185–236. DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chazon, Esther G. 1997. Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays*, eds. Judith Frishman and Lucas van Rompay, 13–24. *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 5. Leuven: Peeters.
- Dimant, Devorah. 1974. The "Fallen Angels" in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Books Related to Them. PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem [Hebrew].
- . 1979. The "Peshet on the Periods" (4Q180) and 4Q181. *IOS* 9:77–102.
- . 2002. 1 Enoch 6–11: A Fragment of a Parabiblical Work. *JJS* 53:223–237.
- . 2003. The Apocryphon of Joshua – 4Q522 9 ii: A Reappraisal. In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, eds. Shalom M. Paul et al., 179–204. VT.S 94. Brill: Leiden.
- . 2009. On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered. In *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale: Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis*, eds. Christophe Batsch and Mădălina Vârtejanu-Joubert, 61–85. JSJ.S 134. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011. The Vocabulary of Qumran Sectarian Texts. In *Qumran und die Archäologie: Texte und Kontexte*, eds. Jörg Frey, Carsten Claußen and Nadine Kessler, 347–395. WUNT 278. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Elgvin, Torleif, and Emanuel Tov. 1994. 4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus. In *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. Harold Attridge et al., 417–441. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Eshel, Esther. 1997. Hermeneutical Approaches to Genesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian In-*

- terpretation: A Collection of Essays*, eds. Judith Frishman and Lucas van Rompay, 1–12. *Traditio Exegetica Graeca* 5. Leuven: Peeters.
- Eshel, Esther, and Michael E. Stone. 1995. 4QExposition on the Patriarchs. In *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, eds. Magen Broshi et al., 215–230. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Falk, Daniel K. 1998. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. StTDJ 27. Leiden: Brill.
- Feldman, Ariel. 2007. *The Story of the Flood in the Texts from Qumran (1Q19, 4Q370, 4Q422, 4Q464, 4Q577)*. PhD diss., Haifa University [Hebrew].
- García Martínez, Florentino. 2007. Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In *Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Vol. 2 of *Qumranica Minora*, ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 33–55. StTDJ 64. Leiden: Brill.
- Harl, Marguerite. 1986. *La Genèse*. Vol. 1 of *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Traduction et Annotation des Livres de la Septante*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Horovitz-Rabin, Hayim S., ed. 1970. *Mechilta d'Rabbi Ismael cum variis lectionibus et adnotatiobus*. Jerusalem: Wahrman Books.
- Jacobson, Howard. 1996. *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's 'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum': With Latin Text and English Translation*. 2 vols. AGSU 31. Leiden: Brill.
- Kister, Menahem. 2001. 5Q13 and the 'avodah: A Historical Survey and Its Significance. *DSD* 8:136–148.
- Köhler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. 1999. מַחֲמָה. Vol. 4 of *HALOT*, 1752–1754. Leiden: Brill.
- Licht, Jacob. 1965. *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from Wilderness of Judaea 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb: Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute [Hebrew].
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. 2002. Der Weisheitstext 4Q185: Eine neue Edition. In *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, eds. Charlotte Hempel, Armin Lange and Hermann Lichtenberger, 127–150. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lim, Timothy H. 1992. The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252). *JJS* 43:288–298.

- Milik, Józef T. 1955. Recueil de Prières Liturgiques. In *Qumran Cave 1*, eds. Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, 136. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1962. Une règle de la secte. In *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre*, eds. Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, 181–183. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1972. *Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens*. *JJS* 23:95–144.
- Newsom, Carol. 1995. 4QAdmonition Based on the Flood. In *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, eds. Magen Broshi et al., 85–97. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2001. *Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Vol. 1 of 1 *Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Nitzan, Bilhah. 1994. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. StTDJ 12. Leiden: Brill.
- Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. 2004–2005. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 vols. Leiden: Brill.
- Puech, Émile. 1998. 4QTexte mentionnant le Déluge. In *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*, 195–203. DJD XXV. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1994. Sectarian Rule (5Q13). In *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 132–143. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Segal, Michael. 2007. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJ.S 117. Leiden: Brill.

The Flood as a Preamble to the Lives of the Patriarchs: The Biblical Perspective¹

Reinhard G. Kratz

In the preceding paper Devorah Dimant presented the reception of the flood story in the Dead Sea Scrolls. One of the ideas behind our of our DFG-project 'The interpretation of the Book of Genesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' is to search for possible connections between the various text corpora (Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls) that go beyond the pure citation and can be discerned in the flow of the tradition and perhaps also within the biblical material itself. In this paper I will address two questions:

- 1) Are there similar interpretation processes in the biblical material itself?
- 2) Is there any relationships between the interpretation of the biblical material in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the interpretation within the biblical material itself to which the Scrolls refer?

The paper comprises two sections: In the first part, I will deal with the story of the flood itself; in the second part, I will consider its reception in the books of the Prophets. There is actually nothing new for me to present concerning the biblical texts themselves or the many problems they raise. Rather, I will attempt to look for features, expressions and concepts and ask whether there are perhaps certain tendencies and dynamics of interpretation within the biblical material that indicate how the biblical texts were received and interpreted in the Scrolls.

1. The Story of the Flood

It is well known that the story of the flood can be traced back to Mesopotamia. The Sumerian flood, Atra-Hasis and the eleventh tablet of the

¹ I would like to thank Anselm C. Hagedorn (Berlin) for the translation and Janice Karnis (Haifa) for the final editing of this article.

Gilgamesh epic testify to the precursors of the story.² Already here we can observe the first step in the interpretation or rewriting of the biblical material.³ What is particularly striking – apart from the different names of the heroes, number of gods and many other details – is the fact that the Mesopotamian versions provide only superficial reasons for the flood or no reasons at all. The noise of human beings irritated the gods, in particular the god Enlil, and led to the decision to destroy mankind. Accordingly, the Atra-Hasis epic provides certain measures for birth control following the flood: demons that increase infant mortality. In this way, the boundaries between humans and gods are redefined. Humans are created to serve the gods and should reproduce in order to do so, but they should not become so numerous that the rest of the gods is disturbed and the balance between the gods and humans is upset.

In some ways, the biblical version of the flood is a continuation, if not a "rewriting," of the Mesopotamian precursors since the themes in the Mesopotamian versions have undergone a certain transformation: God's "rest" (Gen. 1), the work of man, which here serves to provide sustenance for himself and not for the gods (Gen. 2–3), and the increase in population, which here is highly desirable (פרו ורבו ומלאו את הארץ). However, the reasons for the flood are also mentioned: the "wickedness" of mankind, the evil heart (רע כליהים) and the "violence" or bloodshed (המס). Thus, the responsibility for the flood is transferred from the gods to man. While in the Mesopotamian tradition the gods disagree regarding mankind's fate, the biblical tradition introduces an ethical distinction between the righteous man and the sinner, confronted by the one God. The biblical tradition thus highlights an aspect that is mentioned only briefly in the Mesopotamian parallels. Here, the god Enki raises the objection that the flood is affecting the sinners and the righteous alike (the problem of Gen. 18 is already here), and brings about its end. In the biblical story of the flood, it is the distinction between a righteous man and the rest of mankind that triggers the flood and presents the crucial factor that determines not only the biblical tradition, but also the postbiblical reception of the flood story.

The absorption and transformation of the Mesopotamian material in the biblical tradition is thus in itself part of the process of reception and interpretation. However, such a process can also be observed in the biblical material itself. Critical scholarship made a distinction between two literary layers in the biblical account, the so-called priestly and

2 Noort 1999.

3 Kratz [in print].

non-priestly versions. Depending upon which analytical model one takes, either we are dealing here with two originally separate sources (or documents), or with two literary layers, one of which is dependent upon or reacting to the other. I personally incline towards the second model and consider the priestly version of the flood to be the older text, which was supplemented by the non-priestly text.⁴ Whatever the case, the literary differentiation comes from the fact that we find various reasons for the flood and various ways in which the connection between primeval and patriarchal history is described. I would like to point out three main features that are important here.

The first aspect is contained in the stories of Adam and Eve (Gen. 2–3), Cain and Abel (Gen. 4) and the Tower of Babel (Gen. 10–11). In all of these stories, mankind's existence is presented in its ambivalence: the field work, reproduction, the tense relationship between two brothers and lifestyles and the division of mankind into various peoples with different languages. All this describes the world as it is, with all its cultural achievements and the hardships that these achievements bring with them. In Gen. 2–4, hardships are traced back to a curse of God (3:14, 17; 4:11: אָרַר) in response to man's transgressions. The various curses contrast with the blessing of Abraham (בָּרַךְ) with which the patriarchal history is initiated in Gen. 12 (vv. 1–3). The primeval history is here the preamble to the patriarchal history and expresses that life, as it is, is cursed and dependent upon the blessing of the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. This is probably the oldest concept and is, as far as I can see, rarely seen in postbiblical reception.

A second feature is found in the so-called priestly text. Here, God's blessing runs through the whole story from primeval history (in Gen. 1, 5 and 9) to Abraham's calling in the patriarchal history (in Gen. 17). The blessing applies equally to all mankind as well as to Abraham and his descendants. It seems that the priestly text is closely connected to the concept of cursing and blessing and adds a new category: God's covenant (בְּרִית). Postbiblical reception has heavily orientated itself on this concept (cf. 4Q370, 4Q252).

In the priestly text, however, the flood interrupts the story of the blessing; the reason for this is the phenomenon of חַמַּס "violence, bloodshed" that occurs suddenly and triggers the decision for a flood (Gen. 6:9–12). Instead of life's ambivalence under God's curse there is a contrast between the state of וְהָיָה טוֹב מְאֹד in Gen. 1 and the emergence or existence of חַמַּס in Gen. 6. Between these two opposing states, the population increase of Gen. 5 occurs, which is a consequence of the

4 Kratz 2005, 250–259. See also Bosshard-Nepustil 2005.

blessing in Gen. 1 (repeated in Gen. 5:2 *ויברך אתם*) but which has apparently led to massive bloodshed. After the flood, creation (Gen. 1) is confirmed in Gen. 9:1 with the blessing (*ויברך אלהים את-נה ואת-בניו*) as well as with the command to increase (*פרו ורבו ומלאו את-הארץ*). But in addition to this, the Noahide laws are issued, which seem to be in reaction to the *חמס* phenomenon and also alter the vegetarian rules listed in Gen. 1. The covenant with Noah, with the rainbow as its sign, seals this arrangement as everlasting. Of importance for postbiblical reception is the fact that a law existed for all mankind even before Mosaic times and the revelation of the law at Mount Sinai.

In the priestly writing, the covenant also forms the bridge between primeval and patriarchal history (Gen. 9 and 17), but the content differs. In addition to the promise of land and progeny, the covenant in Gen. 17 contains God's promise to be the God of Abraham and his descendants: *להיות לך לאלהים ולזרעך אחר-יך* (Gen. 17:7). The sign of the covenant is the circumcision, another law. At this point, it is again clear that the priestly text contrasts with the (older) non-priestly concept and reinterprets it. The relationship between primeval and patriarchal history is not characterised by the contrast between curse and blessing, but by continuity. Like Noah in Gen. 6:9, Gen. 17:1 states that Abraham should be "perfect" (*והיה תמים*) and walk "with" or "before" God (*התהלך לפני* Gen. 6:9; *התהלך לפני* Gen. 17:1), which was later interpreted as the observance of the law. In both cases (Gen. 9 and 17), blessing (*ברך*) and the promise of increase (*פרו ורבו*) appear, and in both cases a covenant is set up. Ishmael is also granted the blessing and the promise of increase in Gen. 17 (v. 20); even the promise of Gen. 12:2 (*ואעשך ואצא ממך גוים גדולים*) should be fulfilled in him (*ונתתי לך גוים גדולים*). However, the covenant applies solely to Isaac, Abraham's descendant from Sara.

The third feature is found in the non-priestly text of the flood story and, again, introduces a new category: the evil heart (*וכל-יצר מהשבת לבו רק* and *רע כל-היום*). The difference is seen most clearly in the prologue and epilogue to the flood in Gen. 6 and 8–9. While the priestly text reports on cause and outcome, the non-priestly framework allows an insight into the innermost reflections of God's heart, which lead to the flood. Here, man's evil heart is the cause of the flood (Gen. 6:5–8) as well as the reason for God's decision to never again stage a flood (Gen. 8:21–22). The flood story thus gains an anthropological dimension, which also changes the relationship to God: man is and remains incapable of being "perfect and righteous" and of "walking with God" as did Noah and Abraham. The evil heart in Gen. 6:5 is certainly a reflection of the knowledge of good and evil in Gen. 2–3 (*לדעת טוב ורע*) and was probably understood as the anthropological precondition for the transgressions

in Gen. 2–6, including the angel marriages in Gen. 6:1–4 and the bloodshed (זמם) in Gen. 6:11. It is this feature that almost regularly appears in the postbiblical interpretations presented in the preceding article by Devorah Dimant (CD II:16; 4Q370 I:4; 4Q422 1 I:12).

In summary: The story of the flood has gone through a long interpretation history. During the course of this history, various aspects were grafted onto the material; major influences on the interpretation of the story and the construction of the transition from primeval to patriarchal history were the curse and blessing, God's covenant and the evil heart. In particular, man's evil heart, which causes the sin, has occupied later traditions. It is, however, the drive and dynamics of interpretation within the biblical text itself that lead to the extrabiblical tradition.

2. The Reception of the Flood Story in the Prophets

In the Prophets, we encounter the name of Noah in two places: Ezek. 14 (vv. 14, 16, 18, 20) and Isa. 54 (v. 9). In Ezek. 14, Noah is mentioned as an example of a righteous man, along with Daniel and Job; only they escape judgement. However one explains this grouping together with Daniel and Job, with Noah there is a clear allusion to his being the hero of the flood, in which he was saved by his righteousness. Implicitly, therefore, the judgement mentioned in Ezek. 14 is paralleled with the flood.

This correspondence is made explicit in Isa. 54 (vv. 9–10): the turning from judgement to the salvation of Zion is compared to the days of Noah. The point of comparison is God's "oath" not to allow another flood (Gen. 8:21–22 and 9:8–17). The formulation recalls the making of the covenant in Gen. 9 (vv. 8–17): instead of the "waters of the flood" (מי המבול) in Gen. 9 (vv. 11, 15), Isa. 54 speaks of the "waters of Noah" (מי־יְנוֹחַ); instead of the "everlasting covenant" in Gen. 9:16 (ברית עולם), there is reference to a "covenant of my peace" (ברית שלומי). In changing the "everlasting covenant" to the "covenant of peace," it seems that Ezek. 37:26, in which the two designations appear side by side, was influential (see also Ezek. 34:25 and Num. 25:12).

Isa. 54:9–10 is an addition to the promise of salvation in vv. 7–8, which is connected by several keywords (קצף, חסד, רחם). The addition affirms the promise of the previous verses but changes the perspective slightly. Vv. 7–8 are stating that for Zion the (brief) period of anger is now over and the time of compassion and "everlasting grace" has begun. Recalling the days of Noah, however, is an assurance that God

will not be angry and withdraw his grace even if the "mountains may depart and the hills be removed." In this way, a future event is announced that is comparable to the flood and the wrath of God. The flood and wrath are thus paralleled.

Noah's name, therefore, stands on the one hand for righteousness and on the other for preservation in an upcoming judgement, which is more or less directly equated with the flood. Both these meanings are also frequently encountered in the Apocrypha (Tob. 4:12; Sir 44:17; Wisd. 10:4) and in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

In other places, the relationship between the flood and judgement is not connected to Noah's name but implied by a literary quotation. As my first example, I will refer to Amos 8:2 and Ezek. 7:2, 6. In both places, we encounter the phrase "the end has come" (בא הקץ), which reminds us of Gen. 6:13: "And God said to Noah: I have determined to make an end of all flesh" (ויאמר אלהים לנה קץ כל־בשר בא לפני) (other occurrences are Jer. 51:13 and Lam. 4:8 with a suffix).

Rudolf Smend has already surmised that in Gen. 6 the fourth vision of Amos is cited and the "end" of Israel announced by the prophet is transferred to "all flesh," i.e. the entire living world, and relocated in the past of the primeval history.⁵ If such a dependency exists, then there is much to be said for the direction proposed by Smend. In Amos 8, the "end" (קץ) results from a play on the words "summer harvest" (כליב קיץ) in the vision; here, we can observe the genesis of reference to the "end," while Gen. 6:13 uses the expression (בא ... קץ) as a matter of course.

Whether the visions of Amos in Amos 7–9 are authentic and dated to the 8th century BCE is a controversial issue in research. Some see this as a later supplement in which the earlier oracles in Amos 3–6 are radicalised.⁶ Whatever the case may be, the visions clearly present the prophecy of doom in its strongest form. Images of a catastrophe of cosmic proportions – locusts devouring the "primeval ocean" אֶת־הַיָּם (Amos 7:4) – are deployed in order to make clear that the time of forgiveness and God's regret concerning his decision to destroy everything is over and the time of the "end" for the people of Israel has come. For anyone with both Amos 8 and Gen. 6 in front of him, it was easy to conclude that the announcement of the "end" in Amos 8 had something to do with the "end" in the flood story, and thus flood and judgement correspond to one another.

That this was indeed the case and that someone reading both passages did relate them to each other can be seen in Ezek. 7. Here, the

5 Smend 2002.

6 Kratz 2011; different Hadjiev 2009.

expression "the end has come, it has come the end" (בא הקץ) is taken up and repeated in various ways. The text is very difficult and confusing and is probably not a literary unit. It starts with the introduction to an oracle "to the land of Israel" in v. 2a (לאדמת ישראל קץ) followed by an oracle on "the end of the four corners of the earth" in vv. 2b–4 (בא הקץ על-ארבעת [ארבע] כנפות הארץ) and an oracle on "the end of the inhabitants of the earth/the land" in vv. 5–9 (קץ בא ... אליד יושב הארץ). The two sections are full of repetitions; the second section apparently should clarify to whom the first section in vv. 2–4 is addressed (both are addressed to a 2nd pers. fem. sg.). However, the use of the word ארץ in conjunction with the expression בא הקץ or קץ בא is common to both sections. As with the "violence" (חמס) in Ezek. 7:11, 23, this seems to reflect the flood and Gen. 6:13, regardless of whether it refers only to the land and inhabitants of Israel or, as in the case of the flood, to the whole earth.

After all, one can conclude that already in the Bible the announcement of judgement is set in a relationship with the flood. If one asks how later readers interpreted this relationship and understood the juxtaposition of the "end" in the flood and in the Last Judgement, then there are two possible options: as an analogy between the primeval and the end times, or as successive epochs. Both options appear in postbiblical literature. The second option plays with the notion of the term "end" (קץ) and interprets it as a concept for "time, epoch." This understanding is already implied in Ezek. 7 and is found later in Daniel in its completed form. The first option, the analogy between the primeval and end times, necessitates similar details concerning the two disasters, which have not yet been observed in the examples discussed so far.

However, there are examples for this option that provide a connection between the two events. The best known is the adaption of the motives for the flood in Isa. 24–27.⁷ Here, the connection to the flood story is also made by literary allusion. The three most obvious allusions, mentioned in all commentaries, are:

1) the "everlasting covenant" (ברית עולם) in Isa. 24:5 from Gen. 9:8–17:

ההארץ חנפה תחת ישיביה כִּי־עברו תורת חלפו חק הפרו ברית עולם

For the earth was defiled under its inhabitants; because they transgressed teachings, violated laws, broke the ancient covenant.

7 Hibbard 2006, 56–69.

2) the "windows of heaven" (ארבות ממרום) in Isa. 24:18 from Gen. 7:11:

כִּי־אֲרַבּוֹת מִמְרוֹם נִפְתְּחוּ וַיִּרְעֲשׂוּ מוֹסְדֵי אָרֶץ

For sluices are opened on high, and earth's foundations tremble.

3) the "shutting of the door" (וסגר דלתוך בעדך) in Isa. 26:20 from Gen. 7:16:

לך עמי בא בחדריך וסגר דלתוך בעדך חבי כמעט־רגע עדי־עבור־יזעם

Go, my people, enter your chambers, and lock your doors behind you.
Hide but a little moment, until the indignation passes.

The abundance of more or less direct allusions suggests that the scenario of the eschatological judgement in Isa. 24–27 is patterned on the model of the flood story, or at least should be read in relationship to it. It begins with the rain (Isa. 24:18) and ends with the salvation of the righteous ones (Isa. 26:1–4) who have hidden themselves behind closed doors (Isa. 26:20). Even though the course of judgement differs in detail, the model of the flood story forms the framework.

So obviously here a correspondence or equivalence of primeval and end times is in mind. But the question arises of how, after the promise of the "never again" (לא עוד) in Gen. 8:21–22 and 9:11, 15, a repeat of the disaster can be at all possible? In Jer. 33:19–22, this "never again" of the primeval history is used in order to confirm the covenant with David and the Levites. Here, however, the catastrophe that occurred at the beginning of the world seems to be repeated at the end of days. Erich Bosshard, who investigated the reasons for the flood in Isa. 24–27, has set up an attractive hypothesis that suggests that this question is answered in Isa. 24 by a particular interpretation of Gen. 8:22.⁸

עד כִּלְיָמֵי הָאָרֶץ זֶרַע וְקָצִיר וְקָר וְחֶם וְקִיץ וְחֹרֶף וַיּוֹם וַלַּיְלָה לֹא יִשְׁבְּתוּ

So long as the earth endures, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, day and night shall not cease.

Bosshard believes that in Isa. 24 a seasonal cycle of a year, one which orientates itself on the seasonal data given in Gen. 8:22, will run from winter to winter. In the withering of the earth in Isa. 24:4(–6), he finds summer, in the grieving wine and the absent celebrations in v. 7–12, autumn, in the harvest of olives and the gleaning in v. 13, late autumn, and in the opened windows, the rain in v. 18, winter. From this, Bosshard concludes that in vv. 1–3 (scattering of the inhabitants, emptying of the earth) there is an allusion to the seeds in winter and the first harvest in spring. If Bosshard is correct, then the authors of Isa. 24

8 Bosshard-Nepustil 2005, 248–259.

have interpreted the promise in Gen. 8:22 in this way: although the yearly cycle, as promised and confirmed by Jer. 33:19–22, will not be suspended, it now has the purpose of bringing a cosmic disaster to mankind again, corresponding to the one-year flood in Gen. 6–9. Even the alternation between day and night, the last measurement of time in Gen. 8:22, is, in Isa. 24:23, considered with the polarity of that which is "white" (moon) and that which is "hot" (sun), and will be a witness of judgement.

In this way, the flood, as it were, recurs in the eschatological judgement, yet without nullifying the promise in Gen. 8:21–22. The reason for this is given in Isa. 24:5, again with a reference to the story of the flood: mankind has broken the "everlasting covenant" of Gen. 9 and violated the laws associated with it. By doing so, the basis for the promise of "never again" (לֹא עוֹד) in Gen. 9 (vv. 11–15) no longer exists. In Isa. 24:23, besides the breaking of Noah's covenant, there are allusions to the covenant of Moses in Exod. 24, which is conveyed as the prevailing standard for the period following the judgement on Mount Zion. In this way, the subject of the law plays a role in the reception of the flood story, and in the later traditions it features more and more prominently in the story of the flood itself (for instance in 4Q370, where Isa. 24 is cited in the context of the flood, like Amos 8:2 in Gen. 6:13).

3. Conclusion

I began by posing two questions. The first question can be answered clearly in the affirmative: even in the Bible itself we encounter the phenomenon of reception and interpretation, and in fact right from the beginning. Both the absorption and transformation of Mesopotamian traditions regarding the flood and the creation of the biblical version in Gen. 6–9, in which at least two literary layers and concepts can be discerned, are due to inner-biblical reception and interpretation. In addition, examples of this reception were also found in the books of the Prophets. The opposite case, in which the prophets act on the flood story, such as in the reference to Amos 8:2 in Gen. 6:13, can also be observed. In most cases, we encounter these inner-biblical references in literary supplements that align the traditions with one another or explain one tradition by using the other.

The second question posed at the beginning can also be answered in the affirmative, albeit with qualification. The process of the emergence and reception of the flood story in the Bible does not display uniform development, a fact that is evidenced in the Dead Sea Scrolls,

which display great diversity in their reception and interpretation of the biblical account. Rather, we encounter different starting points in the literary-historical development within the Bible, which influenced the Dead Sea Scrolls: the various reasons for the flood, which already assumes an inner-biblical discussion, the many attempts to pinpoint evil, the role of the law in antediluvian times, the relationship between primeval and patriarchal history and, not least, the relationship between the primeval flood and eschatological judgement. It is precisely these points that are absorbed into the Dead Sea Scrolls and considered further.

Of course, the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls certainly did not concern themselves with the literary-historical development of the Bible. They received the statements exactly as they had been handed down, and they had to make sense of them themselves. Nevertheless – and this is what concerns me here – the literary history shows the text-critical scholar that the Dead Sea Scrolls did not arrive at their interpretations by chance. Rather, the reception and interpretation of the biblical material in the Dead Sea Scrolls is from our perspective a further step along the path of interpretation that was already being followed in the Hebrew Bible itself. And this path was, in many cases, already leading in the same direction as that pursued by the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Bibliography

- Bosshard-Nepustil, Erich. 2005. *Vor uns die Sintflut: Studien zu Text, Kontexten und Rezeption der Fluterzählung Genesis 6–9*. BWANT 165. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Hadjiev, Tchavdar S. 2009. *The Composition and Redaction of the Book of Amos*. BZAW 393. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hibbard, James T. 2006. *Intertextuality in Isaiah 24–27: The Reuse and Evocation of Earlier Texts and Traditions*. FAT II/16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2005. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. Trans. John Bowden. London: T & T Clark (Original German version, *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000).
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2011. Die Worte des Amos von Tekoa. In *Prophetenstudien*. Vol. 2 of *Kleine Schriften*, 310–343. FAT 74. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Kratz, Reinhard G. [in print]. Der Mythos von der großen Flut. In *Arbeit am Mythos: Leistung und Grenze des Mythos in Antike und Gegenwart*, eds. Annette Zgoll and Reinhard G. Kratz. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Noort, Ed. 1999. The Stories of the Great Flood: Notes on Gen 6:5–9:17 in its Context of the Ancient Near East. In *Interpretations of the Flood*, eds. Florentino García Martínez and Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, 1–38. Themes in Biblical Narrative 1. Leiden: Brill.
- Smend, Rudolf. 2002. "Das Ende ist gekommen": Ein Amoswort in der Priesterschrift. In *Die Mitte des Alten Testaments: Exegetische Aufsätze*, 238–243. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Sodom and Gomorrah: From the Bible to Qumran¹

Roman Vielhauer

The biblical narrative of Sodom and Gomorrah in Gen. 18–19 has left but little trace in the Qumran manuscripts.² Of the twenty-three or twenty-four biblical manuscripts that, according to the *Revised Lists* provided by Emanuel Tov, offer passages from the book of Genesis,³ only two contain remnants of Gen. 18–19: 2QGen (2Q1) frg. 1 attests to several words and word fragments from Gen. 19:27–28, and 8QGen (8Q1) frgs. 2–3 present parts of Gen. 18:20–25.⁴ Both manuscripts are penned in accordance with the masoretic textual tradition,⁵ as far as might be deduced from the very fragmentary extant text.

-
- 1 I would like to thank Franziska Ede (Göttingen) for preparing the English version and Janice Karnis (Haifa) for the final editing of this article.
 - 2 Cf. the overview in Tigchelaar 2004.
 - 3 Tov 2010, 113–114; cf. idem 2002, 167–168; Lange 2009, 37–54; Ulrich 2010, 779. The difficulties with regard to determining the exact number of Genesis manuscripts attested at Qumran stem primarily from the uncertain evaluation of 4QGen^h (4QGen 8). In the initial edition by Davila 1994, 61, the four fragments combined under 4QGen^h were attributed to four different manuscripts: 4QGen^{h1}, 4QGen^{h2}, 4QGen^{h-para}, and 4QGen^{h-title}. The first two are still today considered discrete Genesis manuscripts. However, no consensus has been reached regarding 4QGen^{h-para} and 4QGen^{h-title}: Ulrich 2010, 779, considers 4QGen^{h-para} to be a Genesis manuscript, Tov 2010, 113, views 4QGen^{h-title} as such, while attributing 4QGen^{h-para} to a different work. Indeed (and probably more aptly), 4QGen^{h-para} has been republished in the DJD series (Eshel and Stone 1995, 217) as frg. 1 of 4Q464 (4QExposition on the Patriarchs). In his *Revised Lists*, Tov 2010, 113–114, – differing from the earlier version in DJD XXXIX (2002, 167–168) – also subsumes three of the so-called Reworked Pentateuch texts (4Q158, 4Q364, and 4Q365) under the Genesis manuscripts. Tov's evaluation, however, will most likely not represent the final statement on the issue; for this discussion, cf. Lange 2009, 37–43, and the literature indicated therein.
 - 4 First edition by Baillet 1962, 48–49, 147–148. The text is now readily available in the edition of Ulrich 2010, 9.
 - 5 The only deviation from the Masoretic Text is the supralinear addition of אֵת הַדָּבָר following מַעֲשֵׂוֹת (Gen. 18:25) in 8Q1 frgs. 2–3, 5.

In addition, references to the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition are encountered in 4Q172 (4QCommentaries on Unidentified Texts), 4Q177 (4QCatena A, 4QMidrash on Eschatology^b or 4QEschatological Commentary B), 4Q180 (4QAgnes of Creation A or 4QPesher on the Periods), and 4Q252 (4QCommentary on Genesis A).⁶ As a first step, these will be examined with regard to their understanding of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition (§§ 1–4). Thereafter, the aspects included in the biblical tradition that might have fostered the understanding provided in the above manuscripts will be verified (§ 5). We will commence with 4Q172.

1. Sodom and Gomorrah in 4Q172

John Allegro combined fourteen fragments under one siglum, 4Q172, the handwriting of which, according to him, showed similarities to 4QpIsa A, 4QpHos A and B, and 4QpP's A. However, as he was unable to directly identify these manuscripts with any of these pesharim, he chose to designate them as "Commentaries on Unidentified Texts."⁷ As this particular type of handwriting is not restricted only to the above texts in cave 4, the fragments combined under 4Q172 do not necessarily have to be ascribed to one of these pesharim, but could be part of a different work or of a different genre entirely.⁸

A reference to the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah is encountered in 4Q172 frg. 4:⁹

-
- 6 The names of Sodom and Gomorrah are further attested in 1QIsa^a (Isa. 1:9, 10; 3:9; 13:19 with minor textual variations), 3Q14 (3QUnclassified Frgs. ar) 8, 2 (only ן דר סדום is preserved), and 1QapGen ar. Within the Genesis Apocryphon, the reworking of Gen. 18–19 is missing. As the paraphrasing of the manuscript breaks off with Gen. 15:4, it is only speculative whether the narration represented in Gen. 18–19 was included in the missing sections or whether it was left out deliberately (as favored by Loader 1990, 124–125, with reference to the lack of anticipatory remarks on the wickedness and destruction of Sodom within the reworking of Gen. 13); for the discussion, cf. Tigchelaar 2004, 48–50.
- 7 Allegro 1968, 50–51, pl. XVIII, in the first edition of the fragments. Corrections and additions: Strugnell 1970, 218–219; cf., further, the editions by Horgan 1979, 263–266 (textbook, 59–60); Charlesworth and Elledge 2002.
- 8 Cf. already Strugnell 1970, 218.
- 9 Text and translation follow Tigchelaar 2004, 51, with slight modifications.

4Q172 (4QpUnid) 4, 1–6

[כן ויזנו] [ממנו]	1
[העול ברחו] [ב(ות)]	2
[פחו עמורה]	3
[בוערת וגם כֹּס]	4
[לבבם <i>vacat</i>]	5
[אייתי בה]	6

1.] thus, and they fornicated against him [
2.] of deceit in the squ[are(s)
3.] iniquity of Gomorrah [
4.] burning. And also [
5.] their heart. *vacat* [
6.]. *'ity bh*[

The fragment consists of six lines, each with only one or, at best, two legible words. In line 1, ויזנו can be detected with relative certainty, followed by either עמנו or, more likely, ממנו "and they fornicated against him."¹⁰ עול with the article (line 2) is attested solely within the S tradition, appearing in phrases such as רוחות האמת והעול "the spirits of truth and of deceit," תולדות העול "the generations of deceit" (both 1QS III, 19), or אנשי העול "the men of deceit" (1QS V, 2, 10; VIII, 13; XI, 17). The following word could be either derived from the verbal root of ברה "they fled," or be part of a construction with the preposition -ב. In the latter sense, Eibert Tigchelaar suggests reading ברחו]בות "on the squares."¹¹ The same preposition and noun combination, yet in the singular, is found in Gen. 19:2 in the context of the Sodom narrative. In line 3, the words פחו עמורה can clearly be identified. Whether פחו represents the feminine verbal form meaning "Gomorrah was insolent" or, more likely, the noun "iniquity" remains uncertain. Since Gomorrah is never encountered by itself, a parallel phrase including its counterpart Sodom

10 The last word can neither be עמנו (Allegro 1968, 50; Strugnell 1970, 218) nor כעם (Hasselbalch 2011, 112). PAM 40.579 clearly shows the last three letters to be מנו or מני, preceded maybe by ע or מ (cf. Tigchelaar 2004, 51). The reading ממנו is furthered by the observation that נה is never construed in connection with the preposition עם, and only once (Ps. 73:27) with the preposition מן.

11 Tigchelaar 2004, 51.

might have complemented the line.¹² The term בוערת "burning" in line 4 is reminiscent of the calamitous fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. Line 5 seems rather general and line 6 is just as difficult to identify.¹³

The only comprehensive interpretation of 4Q172 frg. 4 to be attempted so far is by Trine Hasselbalch. In her view, "frg. 4 could be some sort of paraphrasing interpretation of Hosea ..., utilizing a reference to Zephaniah for its own interpretative purposes."¹⁴ John Strugnell had already contemplated an interrelation of frg. 4 with the book of Hosea, if tagged with a question mark.¹⁵ In this regard, he referred to the accusation of harlotry, characteristic of Hosea, in line 1 and the "burning" in line 4, which evokes the image of the fiery oven in Hos. 7. Trine Hasselbalch further adduces the form לבבם "their heart," also encountered in Hos. 7.¹⁶ In addition, it might be pointed out that even the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah is of some importance in the book of Hosea: In chapter 11, Ephraim and Israel are compared to Admah and Zeboim, the two cities located at the Dead Sea, which according to Deut. 29:22 share the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah. The Hosean passage draws terminologically on the verb הפך (*nip'al*) "overthrow," which is encountered frequently within the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah.¹⁷ However, it is now used in a positive sense and related to God's change of heart, his renunciation of wrath.

What causes me to refrain from considering 4Q172 frg. 4 "some sort of paraphrasing interpretation of Hosea" is the fact that the book of Hosea is not necessarily the source of all the above references. It is true that the accusation of harlotry is a characteristic feature of Hosean theology, but it is also used in the book of Jeremiah and in Deuteronomistic theology in general. The lion's share of attestations is found in the book of Ezekiel, primarily in chapters 16 and 23.¹⁸ The form לבבם "their heart" is encountered only once in the book of Hosea, yet another twenty-four times within the Hebrew Bible and another twenty times within the Dead Sea Scrolls. Finally, the term בוערת "burning" in line 4 naturally could refer to the fiery oven in Hos. 7:4. However, it seems more likely to assume an affiliation of the term with

12 As an example, Tigchelaar 2004, 51, mentions חטאת סדם based on Lam. 4:6.

13 Tigchelaar 2004, 51, reads אֲרִיאֲתִי as the first word in line 6. The first letter, however, is very uncertain. The reading אֲיִתִּיבִי by Hasselbalch 2011, 112, is likely a misprint.

14 Hasselbalch 2011, 112–117, quotation p. 114.

15 Strugnell 1970, 218.

16 Hasselbalch 2011, 112.

17 Cf. e.g. Gen. 19:21, 25, 29; Deut. 29:22; Am. 4:11; further, Seybold 1977, 458.

18 Cf. Kühlewein 1971, 519–520.

the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition provided in the preceding line. Possible antecedents might then be אש "fire" or גפריית "brimstone" as a punishment for Gomorrah's iniquity.¹⁹

Similar arguments might be used against Trine Hasselbalch's suggestion that there is a reference within 4Q172 frg. 4 to the book of Zephaniah. According to Hasselbalch, the phrase פהו עמורה "the iniquity of Gomorrah" draws on Zeph. 3:4, a reproach against the prophets in Jerusalem, as only there within the Hebrew Bible is the uncommon root פהו²⁰ encountered in the – albeit broader – context of a statement on Gomorrah, which comes in the wake of the oracles on Moab and Ammon in Zeph. 2:8–11. With regard to content, Hasselbalch assesses the combination of allusions to the books of Hosea and Zephaniah as follows: "the negative qualities of Ephraim and the fate of Gomorrah were transferred to a particular group of people within contemporary Jewish society in Jerusalem."²¹ However, in my view, following this line of argument would lead to a different reference than Zeph. 3: in Jer. 23, the false prophets are – in a literal adoption of Hos. 6:10 – first compared to Sodom and Gomorrah in v. 14 and then, in v. 32, accused of פהו "iniquity". However, it might be worth considering whether the scanty data provided by the fragment allow for such far-reaching interpretive conclusions; in light of the extremely fragmentary character of the text, a more modest approach might be in order.

The only definite reference to Scripture within 4Q172 frg. 4 is the mentioning of Gomorrah in line 3. The "burning" in line 4 might also be understood within the context of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition as a reference to the destruction of both cities. Gomorrah's misconduct is described by the word פהו, the meaning of which cannot be determined unequivocally.²² Due to the massive loss of text, the iniquity being referred to cannot be ascertained. עיל "deceit" (line 2) and זנה "to fornicate" (line 1) are mentioned explicitly. The latter might indicate a sexual misconduct. Yet, the word also occurs in the figurative sense of "fornicating against God," which seems to be implied in 4Q172. However, an interrelation with the statement on Gomorrah in line 4 cannot be postulated

19 Cf. Tigchelaar 2004, 51. Regarding אש and גפריית in the context of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, cf. Gen. 19:24; Deut. 29:22. The verb בער referring to Sodom and Gomorrah is, however, not attested biblically. Yet it might be represented in Jub. 36:10, following the reconstruction of 4Q223–224 2 ii, 52–53, by VanderKam and Milik 1994, 107.

20 The root פהו is only attested in Gen. 49:4; Judg. 9:4; Zeph. 3:4, and Jer. 23:32 within the Hebrew Bible.

21 Hasselbalch 2011, 116–117.

22 Cf. the different suggestions by Greenfield 1978; Hoop 1997; Lange 2001.

with certainty. Thus, with regard to 4Q172 it can only be construed that the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah was indeed adopted. Exactly how it was understood remains obfuscated by the fragmentary nature of the text.

2. Sodom and Gomorrah in 4QCommentary on Genesis A

Six fragments have been preserved of 4QCommentary on Genesis A, 4Q252, which can be attributed to six consecutive columns. There is a high probability that this constitutes the overall number of columns included in the original scroll, which can be dated paleographically to the second half of the first century BCE.²³ The commentary deals with selected passages from the book of Genesis; it has been disputed among scholars whether the compilation consists of statements on a common theme, say the possession of land,²⁴ or simply a list of unconnected comments²⁵. Given the poor preservation of the scroll, a definite conclusion is unlikely ever to be reached.

A reworking of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition is encountered in 4Q252 III, lines 2–6:²⁶

4Q252 (4QCommGen A) III (1, 3, 4, 5), 2–6

עמו]רה וגם] עשר אנשים	2
צדיקים [] העיר הזאת	3
החט]אים לבדם יחרמו] אנוכ' [י] לא	4
וכל] הנמצא בה ושללה] ואם לוא ימצא שם	5
] עולם וישלח] וטפ'ה ושאר °	6

- | | |
|---|--|
| 2. ... [| Gomo]rrah and also |
| 3. this city[|] righteous ones |
| 4. <i>I [will] not [(Gen. 18:31?)
utterly destroyed (Deut. 13:16)</i> | the sinn]ers, they alone shall be <i>ut-</i> |

23 Cf. Brooke 1996 in the first edition of the entire text provided by him; cf., further, the edition by Trafton 2002.

24 Favored by Brooke 1994b; idem 1994c; cf. also Kister 1993, 287–289; Fröhlich 1994; Tzoref 2011.

25 Favored by Bernstein 1994a; idem 1994b.

26 Text and translation follow Brooke 1996, 201–202, with slight modifications.

5. and unless there *is found there* (Gen. 18:32)[*and all*] *which is found in it* (Deut. 20:11) and its *booty* (Deut. 13:17)
6. and its *little children* (Deut. 20:14), and the rest .[]forever
(Deut. 13:17). ...

Of the two chapters that constitute the narrative in Genesis, God's dialogue with Abraham discussing the fate of Sodom in Gen. 18:16–33 was singled out. In this regard, the phrase *אנוכי לא* "I [will] not" in line 4, which follows the mentioning of the *צדיקים* "righteous ones" at the end of line 3, likely assumes God's intention – repeatedly encountered in Gen. 18 – to spare Sodom, should there be found a certain number of righteous people. The conditional sentence "and unless there is found there" in line 5 serves as an introduction to the alternative intent to destroy the city should the minimum required number not be met. In contrast to the biblical depiction, which in multiple repetitions aims to gradually reduce the minimum number of righteous people, the author of 4Q252 seems to be interested solely in the outcome of the conversation: Should a minimum number of righteous people be found in the city, Sodom will survive (lines 3–4); if not, she will be destroyed (lines 5–6).

As Menahem Kister, Moshe Bernstein, and George Brooke have shown compellingly in a series of articles, the phrasing of the announcement of annihilation is based on Deut. 13:13–19, the law of the sacrificial ban for the idolatrous city.²⁷ The terms *הרם* "utterly destroy" at the end of line 4, *שלל* "booty" with a third person feminine singular suffix at the end of line 5, and *עולם* "forever" in line 6 are encountered tellingly in the same order in Deut. 13:16–17. In this regard, the reference to Deut. 13 is appropriate in the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah. In both texts, a differentiation among the town's population is addressed and in both texts a thorough examination serves to prove the entire population guilty. Accordingly, the annihilation has to be total. In both cases, it is expressed through the term *אש* "fire." Besides Deut. 13, Deut. 20:10–18, encountered within the context of the Deuteronomic laws of warfare, may have influenced 4Q252 (cf. the phrase *וכל הנמצא בה* "and all] which is found in it" in line 5 as well as the combination of *שלל* "booty" and *טף* "little children" in lines 5 and 6).²⁸ In both texts from Deuteronomy, the ban is considered only for those cities chosen as part of Israel's inheritance by the Deity. This might imply

27 Kister 1993, 288; Bernstein 1994a, 15; Brooke 1994a, 122–125; idem 1994c, 46–47.

28 Cf. Brooke 1994a, 123–124; idem 1994c, 46–47. The reception of Deut. 13 in 11QT^a LV might also show some influence from Deut. 20.

that the author of 4Q252 – in contrast to Gen. 10:19, but in line with Ezek. 47:15–20 – considered the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah to be a part of the territorial inheritance.²⁹ It is further remarkable that both Deut. 13 and 20 hold idolatry responsible for the imposition of destruction on the cities of the land. Did the author of 4Q252 consider Sodom and Gomorrah guilty of the same crime?³⁰ Did he apply the Deuteronomic laws regarding the ban on cities to Sodom and Gomorrah in order for their destruction to be understood as an act of purification of the land?³¹ Although no longer verifiable due to the poor preservation of 4Q252, this assumption seems quite plausible.

The one remaining word to be discussed, לבדם "they alone" in line 4, cannot be derived from any of the above biblical *Vorlage(n)*. The line itself is cryptic, as it cannot be easily understood how God's renunciation of wrath at the beginning of the line might be reconciled with the announced ban at its end. A compelling solution has, at least in my view, been introduced by Gabriel Barzilai.³² According to him, the use of לבדם indicates that the ban refers solely to the sinners in Sodom and Gomorrah. The word preceding לבדם might thence be construed as אִיִּים³³ "sinners" (cf. Gen. 13:13), the following verbal form of the root חרם "utterly destroy" be pointed as *hip'il*: "the sinn]ers, them alone one shall utterly destroy," or as *hop'al* "the sinn]ers, they alone shall be utterly destroyed." What is concerning the author of 4Q252 is the fate of the sinners. If ten righteous persons were to be found thereby causing the city to be spared, would the sinners also be delivered? It seems that the author of 4Q252 reached a negative conclusion: The city might have been saved on account of her righteous inhabitants; the sinners, however, will enter into judgment: "they alone shall be utterly destroyed!" In a way, the commentary is thus in line with the biblical text since, according to Gen. 18:26, God promised Abraham to spare the place, המקום, should it contain a minimum number of righteous people. The sinners remain unaddressed. And still, the change of emphasis from that of the biblical *Vorlage* is quite evident: In Gen. 18, God's concern is on not abandoning the righteous on account of the transgression of the sinners, while the emphasis in 4Q252 is on whether the sinners should

29 Cf. Brooke 1994a, 124–125; idem 1994b, 170.

30 Brooke 1994c, 47, thinks instead of a reference to "sexual misbehaviour."

31 Cf. Brooke 1994c, 46–47, and the issues raised by Bernstein 1994b, 69, which call for more caution regarding the matter.

32 Barzilai 1998.

33 With regard to the first only partially preserved letter, cf. Brooke 1996, 201: "Traces of two legs are visible, compatible with *he* or several other letters." *Aleph*, which is supported by Barzilai 1998, 325, is, hence, a possibility.

remain unpunished on account of the righteousness of the righteous inhabitants.

3. Sodom and Gomorrah in 4QEschatological Commentary B

One further reference to the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition is encountered in 4Q177, a work originally designated as "Catena A" and renamed "4QEschatological Commentary B" in the forthcoming new DJD V edition.³⁴ Following the reconstruction by Annette Steudel,³⁵ this "Eschatological Commentary" or "Midrash on Eschatology," as Steudel calls it, is preserved in two copies.³⁶ 4Q174 ("Eschatological Commentary A," olim "Florilegium") offers the beginning of the work (cols. I–VI), while 4Q177 ("Eschatological Commentary B") contains its central section (cols. VIII–XII).³⁷ According to paleographic evidence, 4Q174 needs to be dated to the last third of the first century BCE, while 4Q177 is somewhat later. The work itself was most likely composed between 71 and 63 BCE, probably during the reign of Salome Alexandra (76–67 BCE).³⁸ The work is concerned with אהרית הימים, the final calamitous period in history before the commencement of salvation. It can be divided into a twofold introduction (I, 1–III, 13), drawing on both the blessing of the tribes in Deut. 33 and Nathan's prophecy in 2 Sam. 7, and a main section (starting from III, 14), which grapples with eschatological issues while alluding to Psalms. The allusion to the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition is found within the context of an interpretation of Ps. 6 in col. XI:³⁹

34 For the renaming of this manuscript, cf. Brooke 2011.

35 Steudel 1994. First edition of the entire text: Allegro 1968, 53–57, pls. XIX–XX (4Q174), and 67–74, pls. XXIV–XXV (4Q177); corrections and additions: Strugnell 1970, 220–225, 236–248; cf. further the edition by Milgrom and Novakovic 2002.

36 Further copies might be represented in 4Q178 (Eschatological Commentary D), 4Q182 (Eschatological Commentary C) and 4Q183 (Eschatological Commentary E); cf. Steudel 1994, 152–157.

37 One column is missing between both textual blocks (col. VII); the same is true for the end of the work (cols. XIII–XVIII).

38 Cf. Steudel 1994, 202–210.

39 Text according to Steudel 1994, 74.

4Q177 (4QEschatological Commentary B) XI (19, 12, 13 i, 15), 7–10

- 7 [לאחרית הַ]מִּים אֲשֶׁר אָמַר דָּוִד יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּאִפְסָה תֹנִי כִּיחֲנִי חֲנִנֵי יְהוָה כִּי אֲנִי אִמְלֹל אֲנִי] 7
- 8 [וְנִפְשִׁי נִבְהֵלָה מֵאֲדָה וְעַתָּה יְהוָה עַד מָתַי חֲנִנֵי חֲלָצָה נַפְשִׁי] לְמִים עַל] 8
- 9 בְּנֵי בְּלִיעֵל לְהַאֲבִידָמָה בַּחֲרוֹנוֹ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יוֹתִיר לָּ] לֹא] יִזְוֶה לְבִלְעֵל] 9
- 10 אַבְרָהָם עַד עֶשְׂרֵה צְדִיקִים בְּעִיר כִּיָּא רֹחַ אֱמֶת הֵי־] כִּי אֵי אֵין] 10
7. []for the last [d]ays, as David said, 'YH[W]H, do not re[buke me] in your anger. [Have mercy on me YHWH, fo]r I am languishing' (Ps. 6:2a, 3a).
8. [] 'and my soul is very troubled; and now, YHWH, how long? Have mercy on me, save [my] li[fe]' (Ps. 6:4–5a).]lmym
over
9. [the children (?) of Belial, to destroy them in his wrath, whom he will not leave l[] he will [not] give rest to Belial
10. [Ab]raham, at least ten righteous men in the city, for the spirit of truth [] ...

This interpretation relates the psalm to the end of days (line 7) and depicts the ultimate destruction of Belial and his supporters, the בני בליעל (line 9),⁴⁰ the salvation of the sons of light (line 12), and the return of the righteous ones to Zion/Jerusalem (line 15). In line 10, the fragmentarily preserved name of Abraham before the mentioning of "at least ten righteous men in the city" is reminiscent of his discussion of the fate of Sodom with the Deity. However, it is quite possible that the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition was already the basis for the description of the destruction of Belial and his supporters in line 9. At least, the *hip'il* root יתר "to leave" is also encountered in Isa. 1:9, within the context of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.

As Eibert Tigchelaar has shown,⁴¹ the interrelation between 4Q177 and Gen. 18–19 is created through the term בני בליעל, "children of Belial." This exact term is not encountered within the Sodom and Gomorrah episode itself, but it occurs within the context of the cognate narrative in Judg. 19, which, in many instances, offers a literal parallel to the text

40 The plural suffix in להאבִידָמָה allows for the conclusion that בליעל is part of a genitive construction in the plural. The proposed reading of בני בליעל was suggested by Steudel 1994, 114.

41 Tigchelaar 2004, 60–61.

found in Gen. 19.⁴² For the context at hand, it shall suffice to point out the virtually identical phrases in Gen. 19:4 and Judg. 19:22, which help identify the inhabitants of Sodom as the בני בליעל, as intended by the author of 4Q177: in Gen. 19:4, the text says: אנשי העיר אנשי סדם נסבּו על הבית "the men of the city, the men of Sodom, surrounded the house." In Judg. 19:22, the assailants are referred to as בני בליעל בני: אנשי העיר אנשי בני בליעל "the men of the city, children of Belial, surrounded the house." In addition to Judg. 19, the law of the sacrificial ban for the idolatrous city in Deut. 13 might have some bearing on the identification of the inhabitants of Sodom as בני בליעל,⁴³ since that text, which, as previously mentioned, was already related to Sodom and Gomorrah in 4Q252, holds the בני בליעל responsible for leading the inhabitants of the city astray, thus provoking the execution of the judgment (Deut. 13:14) in the first place.

However, it cannot be assumed that by alluding to "at least ten righteous men in the city" the author intended an exemption of the wicked בני בליעל from divine judgment. Rather: הוא (God) "he (God) will not leave" (line 9); there will be no escape for Belial and his supporters, that is the sinners in Sodom, even if ten righteous inhabitants might be found in the city. Hence, this is an interpretation of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition or, more precisely, an interpretation of Abraham's discussion of the fate of Sodom with the Deity, which displays certain similarities to 4Q252 in content. However, beyond 4Q252, 4Q177 attempts to update and place an eschatological emphasis on the Sodom material, thus presenting an interpretation "for the latter days" (line 7). By identifying the sinners of Sodom as בני בליעל "children of Belial," they are portrayed as examples for contemporary opponents.⁴⁴ The mentioning of Jerusalem in the immediate context (XI, 15) as the future home of those who fear God might suggest that the author of 4Q177 wanted Sodom to be understood as a sobriquet for Jerusalem, an identification that is already attested in the Hebrew Bible (cf., for example, Isa. 1:9, 10). Hence, we might agree with Eibert Tigchelaar's assumption that by drawing on the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah 4Q177 is attempting to "express the idea that when the children of Belial will be annihilated, the city of Jerusalem will be saved on account of ten or more righteous

42 For a detailed list of the parallels between Gen. 19 and Judg. 19, cf. e.g. Burney 1920, 444; O'Connell 1996, 250–252; Hoop 2004, 21–22. For the interrelation of these texts, cf. Pfeiffer 2009.

43 Cf. Tigchelaar 2004, 60–61.

44 For בני בליעל as a designation for the adversaries of the Qumran community, cf. Steudel 1994, 167–168.

ones in the city."⁴⁵ However, it is debatable whether the same intent, as suggested by Tigchelaar,⁴⁶ underlies the Sodom interpretation encountered in 4Q252 since there, unlike in 4Q177, it does not show any particular signs of understanding the biblical text as alluding to the end of days. Yet, it is remarkable that in both 4Q177 and 4Q252, the interpretation of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition draws on Abraham's interlocution with the Deity in Gen. 18:16–33.

4. Sodom and Gomorrah in 4QPesher on the Periods

Lastly, a reference to the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah is encountered in 4Q180, a work named "Ages of Creation" by the original editor, John Allegro, but now also known as "Pesher on the Periods," which might be considered a more appropriate designation.⁴⁷

4Q180 consists of twelve mostly poorly preserved fragments,⁴⁸ only eight of which offer legible passages.⁴⁹ Based on paleographic evidence, the manuscript can be dated to the late Herodian period.⁵⁰ In agreement with the most comprehensive analysis of the text to date, carried out by Devorah Dimant, the title of the work is preserved in frg. 1, line 1: פֶּשֶׁר עַל הַקְּצִיִּים "Pesher on the Periods."⁵¹ What follows (lines 1–5) is a brief introduction to the nature of the work that emphasizes the preordained character of the periods and likely concluding with a reference to the ten generations from Shem to Abraham (cf. Gen. 11:10–26; 1 Chron. 1:24–26). The main body of the work draws on narratives from the book of Genesis, which are all thought to fall within the period of those ten generations, beginning with the fall of the angels and closing with the

45 Tigchelaar 2004, 62.

46 Tigchelaar 2004, 61–62.

47 Initial partial editions of the text were undertaken by Allegro 1964, 3–4 (frg. 1); idem 1968, 77–79, pl. XXVII (frgs. 1–6). Corrections and additions: Strugnell 1970, 252–254, pl. VI (frgs. 7–8). Cf., further, the editions by Milik 1972, 109–124; idem 1976, 248–252; Dimant 1979; Roberts 1995. For arguments against Milik's theory that 4Q181 represents a second copy of the work, cf. especially Dimant 1979, 99–101; eadem 2000, 12–13; eadem 2009, whose edition forms the basis of the following assumptions.

48 Cf. Dimant 2000, 11.

49 These include, in addition to the six fragments presented by Allegro 1968, 77–79, in DJD V, frgs. 7–8, which Strugnell 1970, 253–254, pl. VI, attributed to 4Q180.

50 Cf. Strugnell 1970, 252.

51 Dimant 1979; cf. eadem 2000. The assumption that frg. 1 represents the beginning of the work has already been expressed by Strugnell 1970, 252, and Milik 1976, 251.

punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah.⁵² However, the question remains as to why the pesher commences with the period of the second group of ten generations and not with the initial ten generations counting from Adam to Noah. Dimant assumes that

it too is interested in the Just and the Wicked. Thus the author begins the exposition with the first significant sin in human history, a sin which brought about the end of the first prediluvian era and the inauguration of a new era.⁵³

Should the above assumption be proved correct and should the pesher, as Dimant suggested, show interest in the fate of the righteous and the wicked, the interpretation of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition by the author of 4Q180 would have to be understood against that very backdrop. The only passage within Gen. 18–19 that reflects upon the destiny of the righteous and the wicked in Sodom is Abraham's interlocation with the Deity in Gen. 18:16–33. Hence, it might best be assumed that the author of 4Q180 perceived the tradition of Sodom and Gomorrah from this angle, rendering Abraham's interlocation with the Deity as the hermeneutic key to an understanding of the entire episode on Sodom and Gomorrah. It is thus not surprising that two verses from that dialogue between Abraham and the Deity, namely Gen. 18:20–21, are quoted with only minor textual variation in 4Q180 frgs. 2–4 + 8, col. ii:⁵⁴

52 The following references to episodes from Genesis might be identified with relative certainty: the fall of the angels (frg. 1, 7–8; cf. Gen. 6:1–4); the change of Abraham's name (frgs. 2–4 + 8 i, 3–5; cf. Gen. 17); Abraham's encounter with the three men at the Oaks of Mamre (frgs. 2–4 + 8 ii, 3–4; cf. Gen. 18:1–2); and the punishment of Sodom and Gomorrah (frgs. 2–4 + 8 ii, 5–7; cf. Gen. 18–19). Due to the poor preservation of the fragments, it can no longer be verified if there are any references in frgs. 5–6 and to what they might possibly refer. With regard to the mentioning of Pharaoh (frgs. 5–6, 5), the suggestion of a reference to Gen. 22, which has been repeatedly suggested since Milik 1972, 121–122, is not without problems (cf. Dimant 1979, 85; eadem 2000, 12).

53 Dimant 1979, 97.

54 Text and translation according to Dimant 1979, 82–83. The identification of the quotation was reached independently by Weiss 1969 and Strugnell 1970, 254. Apart from orthographic differences (מאדה/מאד; וחטאתמה/וחטאתם; עמורה/עמרה; סדום/סדם), two deviations from v. 21 are of special significance: 1) הועקתמה (l. 6) for MT והכצעקתה; and 2) שה (l. 7) for MT עשו. With regard to 1): Synonymous ועקתה as in v. 20, plural suffix in harmonization with חטאתמה in l. 5. The missing preposition -כ might be considered a scribal error, as it would render the syntax incomprehensible (cf. Strugnell 1970, 254; Dimant 1979, 84). With regard to 2): Strugnell 1970, 254, considers this variant to be another scribal mistake and conjectures [אלי ע]שה כלה at the beginning of l. 7 in accordance with MT. Milik 1972, 120, suggests that עשה be considered a *qal* infinitive construct. The suggestion made by Dimant 1979, 84, who reads אעשה based on Tg. Onq., seems less complicated. This would fill the gap more aptly. We might further

4Q180 (4QPesher on the Periods) 2–4 + 8 ii, 5–10

] זע[קת סדום ועמורה כי ר[בה] זחטאתמה כי	5
כבדה מאדה ארדה נא ואראה הזעקתמה הבאה	6
]אלי אע[שה כלה ואם לא אדע[ה פשר] הדבר [על כול]	7
]שור אשר[]ו[על כול [פה]	8
]דובר [נבלה [ואראה כיא הכול [חקוק לקצי]	9
]תע[ודתם]כיא [בטרם בראם ידע מחשב[ותיהם]	10

5. ['The out]cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is gr[eat] and their crime is
6. very grave; I will go down and see whether (according to) their outcry which has come
7. [*to me I will inflict destruction or not, that I may kno[w]* (Gen. 18:20–21). The explanation] of this (is) [of all]
8. flesh which [and] of every [mouth]
9. speaking [disgrace] '*and I will see,*' for everything [is engraved according to the Periods of]
10. [their] desi[gnation for] before he created them he knew [their] desig[ns.]

Due to the fragmentary preservation of this column, it is hard to discern exactly why the author of 4Q180 decided to adopt Gen. 18:16–33. In this context, text loss within the interpretation of the Genesis quotation is especially problematic. Have the verses been chosen because they are consistent with the "writer's interest in sin and punishment," as Dimant suggests?⁵⁵ Alternatively, have they been chosen because they seem to contradict the author's belief in predestination to some degree and might thus call for an explanation, as suggested by Eibert

want to mention the suggestion made by Lange 1993: כלה (l. 7), which he understands as a defective reading of כליל "whole offering" with a third person feminine singular suffix and which he interprets as an allusion to Deut. 13:13–19, the law of the sacrificial ban for the idolatrous city (cf. כליל in Deut. 13:17). Indeed, this would make for an appropriate and coherent context, especially when considering that this very law, as previously shown, is applied in 4Q252 and 4Q177 to interpret the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. However, the reading of two *lameds* is highly uncertain and has, consequently, not reached consensus among scholars; cf. the discussion in Tigchelaar 2004, 54.

55 Dimant 1979, 97.

Tigchelaar?⁵⁶ The text preserved in lines 9–10 might favor the latter assumption: וארֹאֶה "and I will see" might be interpreted as referring to the biblical quote, whereas the subsequent interpretation stresses: "before he created them he *knew* their designs." Given that the passage at hand is represented by a fragment, the exact position of which within the column is very uncertain,⁵⁷ no definite decision can be reached. However, as in the case of 4Q252 and 4Q177, it seems evident, that the interpretation of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition presented in 4Q180 draws on Abraham's interlocution with the Deity in Gen. 18:16–33.

5. Sodom and Gomorrah: From the Bible to Qumran

When considering the above analyses, it might be reasoned that Abraham's interlocution with the Deity in Gen. 18:16–33 is, apart from the obscure interpretation in 4Q172, of major importance with regard to the respective interpretations of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition provided by the manuscripts at hand. In order to clarify the reason for this conspicuous unanimity among the Dead Sea Scrolls, a look at the biblical narrative in Gen. 18–19 might be of help.

As is well known, the biblical tradition on Sodom and Gomorrah was subject to extensive traditional-historical development. Ideologically, three stages of development can be distinguished:⁵⁸

1) The first stage is represented by an originally independent narrative concerning Lot and Sodom in Gen. 19. It might be classified as an etiology of the desolation of the area surrounding the Dead Sea comprising the destruction of the city due to the lack of hospitality, Lot's miraculous deliverance, and his wife being turned into a pillar of salt.

2) In a second stage, the above discrete narrative was integrated into the stories of the patriarchs. In this context, the visit of the three men at Mamre, Gen. 18:1–15, and the etymological etiology on Moab and Ammon in Gen. 19:30–38 were added to frame the original story. Hence, the narrative on Sodom is rendered into the nativity story of these Transjordan neighbors, the incestuous conception of whom

56 Tigchelaar 2004, 57.

57 Cf. already Allegro 1968, 79 ("f. 4 placed only very tentatively here"), and more recently Dimant 2000, 12.

58 Cf. especially Gunkel 1910, 159–161, 193–220; Levin 1993, 159–170; Kratz 2000, 276–277.

serves as a contrast to the miraculous birth of Isaac-Israel. Traditionally, this context is attributed to the Yahwist.⁵⁹

3) Only in a third and final stage was Abraham's interlocution with the Deity in Gen. 18:16–33 added to the tradition.⁶⁰ The dialogue represents a theological reflection on how God's righteousness would be at stake should the judgment on the city of Sodom affect the righteous and wicked alike. The problem is made explicit in v. 25:

Far be it from You to do such a thing as this, to slay the righteous with the wicked, so that the righteous should be as the wicked; far be it from You! Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?

Hence, the narrative in Gen. 19 becomes a demonstration of both the iniquity of all of Sodom and God's righteousness expressed through his judgment on the city.

Relating this briefly described traditional-historical development of the Sodom and Gomorrah narrative to the results of our analyses on the Qumranic texts, it is remarkable that the Qumranic interpretation of the tradition draws unanimously on the latest stage of the aforementioned development, that is the issue of God's righteousness addressed in Abraham's interlocution with the Deity. Indeed, it is unlikely that the authors of the Qumran scrolls were as conscious of the genesis of the biblical texts, which we attempt to reconstruct hypothetically today by means of modern exegetical methodology. Undoubtedly, they consid-

59 It is disputed whether we have to reckon with older traditions in Gen. 18:1–15 and 19:30–38 (as suggested e.g. by Gunkel 1910, 159–160, 193–201, 217–220; Kilian 1966, 96–160; Loader 1990, 17–26, 44–48; Levin 1993, 159–170). In my opinion, however, Blum 1984, 273–282, has shown compellingly that the peculiar change between singular and plural forms, i.e. between YHWH and the three men, in Gen. 18:1–15 cannot be explained by means of literary criticism. Furthermore, a full understanding of Gen. 19:30–38 is entirely dependent on the preceding context and therefore neither Gen. 18:1–15 nor Gen. 19:30–38 is based on older traditions. The same is not true for Gen. 19:1–28, where a probably very old literary layer composed in the plural can be distinguished from a later textual layer composed in the singular (cf. Kilian 1966, 112–131; Levin 1993, 159–167; Kratz 2000, 276–277). Gen. 19:29, traditionally attributed to P, might be considered an addition (see Rendtorff 1977, 125–126; Blum 1984, 283; Kratz 2000, 240, and cf. already Vater 1802, 213).

60 The assumption that Abraham's dialogue with the Deity was composed by a later author goes back to Wellhausen 1963, 25–26. Upon Noth's (1948, 258–259) attribution of the passage to the Yahwist, Wellhausen's theory temporarily sank into oblivion before the detailed analysis of Schmidt 1976, 131–164, helped revive it among contemporary scholarship; cf., among the more recent publications, Rendtorff 1977, 104–107; Westermann 1981, 344–357; Blenkinsopp 1982; Blum 1984, 400–405; Ben Zvi 1992; Levin 1993, 168–170; idem 2001, 347–351; Soggin 1994; Carr 1996, 171; Seebass 1997, 114–135; Kratz 2000, 276; Ruppert 2002, 372–377; Noort 2004, 4–5; Köckert 2006, 126; Brueggemann 2010, 162–176; Mühling 2011, 59–61.

ered the biblical text to be a single unit. Nevertheless, it has to be taken into consideration that by complementing the biblical texts the editors influenced the overall meaning of the narrative, thereby providing a new reading perspective. With regard to the text at hand, this new perspective is determined by the issue of God's righteousness, which is addressed in Gen. 18:16–33, and defines the understanding of the entire episode on Sodom and Gomorrah in its final shape.⁶¹ Therefore, if the authors of the Qumran texts consider the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition from that particular angle, they do not only follow the reading perspective provided by the internal logic of the biblical text itself. In addition, they display a certain consistency with the interpretation history of inner-biblical reception processes, which are responsible for the final character of the Sodom and Gomorrah tradition.

Bibliography

- Allegro, John M. 1964. Some Unpublished Fragments of Pseudepigraphical Literature from Qumran's Fourth Cave. *ALUOS* 4:3–5.
- . 1968. *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Baillet, Maurice. 1962. Textes des Grottes 2Q, 3Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. In *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise, Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le rouleau de cuivre*, eds. Maurice Baillet, Józef T. Milik and Roland de Vaux, 45–168. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Barzilai, Gabriel. 1998. The Fate of the Wicked of Sodom and Gomorrah in an Ancient Interpretation from Qumran (4Q252 Col 3). *Beit Mikra* 154–155:323–331 [Hebrew]; 335 [English abstract].
- Ben Zvi, Ehud. 1992. The Dialogue between Abraham and Yhwh in Gen. 18:23–32: A Historical-Critical Analysis. *JSOT* 53:27–46.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. 1994a. 4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary. *JJS* 45:1–27.
- . 1994b. 4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke. *JQR* 85:61–79.

61 With regard to Abraham's dialogue with the Deity as a hermeneutical key for the understanding of the Sodom and Gomorrah narrative in its current form, cf. especially von Rad 1987, 169; Schmidt 1976, 131–164; Loader 1990, 47; Levin 2001, 347–351; Noort 2004.

- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. 1982. Abraham and the Righteous of Sodom. *JJS* 33:119–132.
- Blum, Erhard. 1984. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. WMANT 57. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Brooke, George J. 1994a. The Deuteronomic Character of 4Q252. In *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, eds. John C. Reeves and John Kampen, 121–135. JSOT.S 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 1994b. The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet. *DSD* 1:160–179.
- . 1994c. The Thematic Content of 4Q252. *JQR* 85:33–59.
- . 1996. 4QCommentary on Genesis A. In *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, eds. George J. Brooke et al., 185–207. DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2011. From Florilegium or Midrash to Commentary: The Problem of Re-naming an Adopted Manuscript. In *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*, eds. George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven, 129–150. StTDJ 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Brueggemann, Walter. 2010. *Genesis*. IBC. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Burney, Charles F. 1920. *The Book of Judges: With Introduction and Notes*. 2nd edn. London: Rivingtons.
- Carr, David M. 1996. *Reading the Fractures of Genesis: Historical and Literary Approaches*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Charlesworth, James H., and Casey D. Elledge. 2002. Unidentified Pesharim Fragments (4Q172 = 4QpUnid). In *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*. Vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 195–201. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Davila, James R. 1994. 4QGen^h. In *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers*, eds. Eugene Ulrich et al., 61–64. DJD XII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dimant, Devorah. 1979. The "Peshet on the Periods" (4Q180) and 4Q181. *IOS* 9:77–102.

- . 2000. Ages of Creation. In vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 11–13. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009. On Righteous and Sinners: 4Q181 Reconsidered. In *Manières de penser dans l'Antiquité méditerranéenne et orientale: Mélanges offerts à Francis Schmidt par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis*, eds. Christophe Batsch and Mădălina Vârtejanu-Joubert, 61–85. JSJ.S 134. Leiden: Brill.
- Eshel, Esther, and Michael Stone. 1995. 4QExposition on the Patriarchs. In *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, eds. Magen Broshi et al., 215–230. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fröhlich, Ida. 1994. Themes, Structure and Genre of Peshar Genesis. *JQR* 85:81–90.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. 1978. The Meaning of נִפְּ . In vol. 1 of *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East: Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on his Seventieth Birthday*, eds. Yitschak Avishur and Joshua Blau, 35–40. Jerusalem: Rubinstein's Publishing House.
- Gunkel, Hermann. 1910. *Genesis*. HK 1/1. 3rd edn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hasselbalch, Trine B. 2011. Two Approaches to the Study of Genre in 4Q172. In *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*, eds. George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven, 109–118. StTDJ 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Hoop, Raymond de. 1997. The Meaning of *phz** in Classical Hebrew. *ZAH* 10:16–26.
- . 2004. Saul the Sodomite: Genesis 18–19 as the Opening Panel of a Polemic Triptych on King Saul. In *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and its Interpretations*, eds. Ed Noort and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 17–26. Themes in Biblical Narrative 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Horgan, Maurya P. 1979. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. CBQ.MS 8. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Kilian, Rudolf. 1966. *Die vorpriesterlichen Abrahamsüberlieferungen: Literarkritisch und traditions-geschichtlich untersucht*. BBB 24. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag.
- Kister, Menahem. 1993. Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran. *JJS* 44:280–290.

- Köckert, Matthias. 2006. Die Geschichte der Abrahamüberlieferung. In *Congress Volume: Leiden 2004*, ed. André Lemaire, 103–128. VT.S 109. Leiden: Brill.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2000. *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kühlewein, Johannes. 1971. 𐤊𐤍. In vol. 1 of *THAT*, ed. Ernst Jenni with Claus Westermann, 518–520. München: Kaiser; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Lange, Armin. 1993. Eine neue Lesart zu 4Q180: *klh* vice *klh*: Die Vernichtung von Sodom und Gomorrha als Ganzopfer. *ZAH* 6:232–234.
- . 2001. Die Wurzel *phz* und ihre Konnotationen. *VT* 51:497–510.
- . 2009. *Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Vol. 1 of *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Levin, Christoph. 1993. *Der Jahwist*. FRLANT 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 2001. Gerechtigkeit Gottes in der Genesis. In *Studies in the Book of Genesis: Literature, Redaction and History*, ed. André Wénin, 347–357. BEThL 155. Leuven: University Press.
- Loader, James A. 1990. *A Tale of Two Cities: Sodom and Gomorrah in the Old Testament, Early Jewish and Early Christian Traditions*. CBET 1. Kampen: Kok.
- Milgrom, Jacob, with Lidija Novakovic. 2002. Catena A (4Q177 = 4QCat^a). In *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*. Vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 286–303. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Milik, Józef T. 1972. *Milkî-šedeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens*. *JJS* 23:95–144.
- . 1976. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mühling, Anke. 2011. "Blickt auf Abraham, euren Vater": Abraham als Identifikationsfigur des Judentums in der Zeit des Exils und des Zweiten Tempels. FRLANT 236. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Noort, Ed. 2004. For the Sake of Righteousness: Abraham's Negotiations with YHWH as Prologue to the Sodom Narrative: Genesis 18:16–33. In *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and its Interpretations*, eds. Ed Noort and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 3–15. Themes in Biblical Narrative 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Noth, Martin. 1948. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- O'Connell, Robert H. 1996. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. VT.S 63. Leiden: Brill.
- Pfeiffer, Henrik. 2009. Sodomie in Gibeä: Der kompositionsgeschichtliche Ort von Jdc 19. In *Die Erzväter in der biblischen Tradition: Festschrift für Matthias Köckert*, eds. Anselm C. Hagedorn and Henrik Pfeiffer, 267–289. BZAW 400. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. 1977. *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*. BZAW 147. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Roberts, Jimmy J. M. 1995. Wicked and Holy (4Q180–181). In *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 204–213. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Ruppert, Lothar. 2002. Gen 11,27–25,18. Vol. 2 of *Genesis: Ein kritischer und theologischer Kommentar*. fzb 98. Würzburg: Echter Verlag.
- Schmidt, Ludwig. 1976. "De Deo": Studien zur Literarkritik und Theologie des Buches Jona, des Gesprächs zwischen Abraham und Jahwe in Gen 18,22ff. und von Hi 1. BZAW 143. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Seebass, Horst. 1997. Vätergeschichte I (11,27–22,24). Vol. 2 of *Genesis*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.
- Seybold, Klaus. 1977. ךֿפֿה. In vol. 2 of *ThWAT*, eds. Gerhard J. Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren, 454–459. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Soggin, J. Alberto. 1994. Abraham hadert mit Gott: Beobachtungen zu Genesis 18,16–32. In "Wer ist wie du, HERR, unter den Göttern?": Studien zur Theologie und Religionsgeschichte Israels für Otto Kaiser zum 70. Geburtstag, eds. Ingo Kottsieper et al., 214–218. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Studel, Annette. 1994. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrargemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gat-*

- tung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden.* StTDJ 13. Leiden: Brill.
- Strugnell, John. 1970. Notes en marge du volume V des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan." *RdQ* 7:163–276.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J. C. 2004. Sodom and Gomorrah in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In *Sodom's Sin: Genesis 18–19 and its Interpretations*, eds. Ed Noort and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 47–62. Themes in Biblical Narrative 7. Leiden: Brill.
- Tov, Emanuel. 2002. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series.* DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2010. *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert.* Leiden: Brill.
- Trafton, Joseph L. 2002. Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252 = 4QCommGen A = 4QP Bless). In *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents.* Vol. 6B of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 203–219. The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Tzoref, Shani. 2011. Covenantal Election in 4Q252 and Jubilees' Heavenly Tablets. *DSD* 18:74–89.
- Ulrich, Eugene. 2010. *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants.* VT.S 134. Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C., and Józef T. Milik. 1994. Jubilees. In *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. Harold Attridge et al., 1–185. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Vater, Johann S. 1802. Vol. 1 of *Commentar über den Pentateuch: Mit Einleitungen zu den einzelnen Abschnitten, der eingeschalteten Übersetzung von Dr. Alexander Geddes's merkwürdigeren critischen und exegetischen Anmerkungen, und einer Abhandlung über Moses und die Verfasser des Pentateuchs.* Halle: Verlag der Waisenhaus-Buchhandlung.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. 1987. *Das 1. Buch Mose: Genesis.* ATD 2/4. 12th edn. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Weiss, Raphael. 1969. Fragments of a Midrash on Genesis from Qumran Cave 4. *Textus* 7:132–134.

- Wellhausen, Julius. 1963. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 4th edn. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Westermann, Claus. 1981. *Genesis 12–36*. BKAT 1/2. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Jacob and His House in the Scrolls from Qumran

George J. Brooke

1. Introduction

The purpose of this short essay is to describe some of the principal occurrences of Jacob traditions in the non-scriptural scrolls found in the eleven caves at and near Qumran and to suggest some explanation for their significance. Of the three great patriarchal figures it is Jacob whose name dominates the statistics. Word counts for non-scriptural compositions from the Qumran caves are notoriously problematic; in the first instance it is not clear whether one should include such authoritative compositions as the so-called Reworked Pentateuch, the Book of Jubilees, and other scriptural paraphrases and rewritings, and in second place it is difficult to know how to weigh the same or similar references in multiple copies, redactions or recensions of the same work. Nevertheless the raw data runs somewhat as follows across both the Hebrew and Aramaic compositions. For Abraham there are approximately 47 references (43 in Hebrew contexts; 4 in Aramaic), for Isaac 30 (26 in Hebrew contexts; 4 in Aramaic), but for Jacob 92 (82 in Hebrew contexts; 10 in Aramaic). In addition there are 31 occurrences of Abram (5 in Hebrew contexts and 26 in the Genesis Apocryphon).

No doubt part of the reason for Jacob's predominance in the non-scriptural scrolls is that such is also the case with scripture itself, not least inasmuch as Jacob and Israel occur in parallel not infrequently. However, as with the non-scriptural scrolls the distribution of Jacob is not even in all the scriptural compositions. For example the name Jacob is used in Deuteronomy not only seldom, but also almost exclusively in the distinctively Deuteronomic phrase "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."¹

¹ The only exceptions in Deuteronomy are in Deut. 32:9, 15 (the Song of Moses; the reference "Jacob ate his fill" in Deut. 32:15 is absent from MT) and in 33:4 and 10 (the Blessing of Moses). The standard Deuteronomic "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" is present in the quasi-authoritative Apocryphon of Joshua^b (4Q379) 17 4, and probably in the general allusions to the patriarchal covenant in 4Q388a 7 II, 2 and 4Q389 8 II, 8-9

This is intriguing for the purposes of this essay since Deuteronomy is regularly considered to be the touchstone for much of the sectarian reading of the other scriptural traditions, especially those with halakhic significance. This implies that something other than a straightforward rehearsal of Deuteronomic theology might be going on in the places where there is a preference for Jacob traditions in the non-scriptural scrolls found in the Qumran caves.²

A few other matters are worth noting at the outset. Within those compositions that are sometimes considered to be the basis of the sectarian self-understanding, even determinative of their self-identification, the patriarchs do not feature greatly, although it might be argued that where they do occur the lack of frequent mention might be especially indicative of their significance. For example, there is no mention of any of the patriarchs in any of the versions of the relatively well-preserved Rule of the Community or the Rule of the Congregation; nor is there any mention of them in *Miqṣat Ma'āse Ha-Torah*.

Some use of the patriarchs is found in the Damascus Document. In the Damascus Document III, 2–4, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are all referred to in turn as good examples of forefathers who have not followed the "guilty inclination" and "eyes of lust"; all three are described as friends of God and "party to the Covenant for ever (*b'ly bryt l'wlm*)."³ In a fragmentary passage of 4Q185 Jacob and Isaac, in that order, are mentioned as suitably commanded to walk on a particular path, as if by following their examples the wise reader will be able to discern "a path towards life" (4Q185 1–2 II, 1–2). Perhaps the kind of exhortatory use of the patriarchs evident in the Damascus Document is developed from traditions of wisdom instruction, such as that now found in 4Q185, which made appeal to patriarchal forefathers as positive examples for those under instruction.

Another important matter, which is largely an argument from silence, concerns the lack of certain Jacob traditions from the Qumran literature.⁴ It is quite clear that although Jacob is more widely men-

(see Dimant 2001, 137), in 4Q505 124 6 (cf. 4Q504 5 II, 1–2) which could even mention Horeb (see Baillet 1982, 169), and in 4Q508 3 3 (only Isaac and Jacob are extant; Baillet 1982, 179–180).

2 The predominance of references to Jacob over against references to Abraham and Isaac in the non-scriptural scrolls is brought into focus also by comparison with the New Testament, where the clear preference, especially in the letters of Paul, is for mention and discussion of Abraham.

3 Trans. Vermes 2004, 131.

4 On the possible development of the Jacob cycle within the text of Genesis itself in the post-exilic period, see Galvagno 2009; he argues that the final form of the text reflects

tioned than his father or grandfather, his representation is actually somewhat selective. Amongst the matters that do not seem to have survived in any extensive way in the use and re-use of Jacob traditions in the scrolls are matters to do with his deceits (Jacob as trickster⁵) and his wives. Furthermore, Jacob's relationship with Esau is barely apparent in the clearly sectarian compositions, though it naturally occurs in part at the appropriate places in the rewritings of Jubilees (notably 1Q18, 4Q215, 4Q222, and 4Q223–224), the Reworked Pentateuch (4Q364 3 II, 7), and the very fragmentary Exposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464 7 5); this means that there is little or no development of the figure of Jacob in terms of how he might represent good over against the bad that might be associated with his twin,⁶ or how he might be depicted as a figure of reconciliation. In all this, then, there is much that distinguishes the treatment of Jacob in the scrolls, especially the sectarian ones, from the presentation of him, for example, by Josephus; Josephus implicitly identified Esau with Rome and so spent many words expanding on the reconciliation between Jacob and Esau.⁷

Yet another matter of interest concerns the scholarly study of the Jacob traditions in the scrolls found in the caves at and near Qumran. While there is some extensive study of the figures of Abraham and Isaac,⁸ there is surprisingly little academic comment on Jacob, as is immediately apparent from a glance at the brief article on him in the Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁹ Interest in Abram/Abraham might have been provoked from relatively early in the history of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls by the extensive treatment of him in the Genesis Apocryphon. That has now been supplemented by several explicit matters as discussed in the Commentary on Genesis A: the dating of events concerning his life and migration, his covenantal role, his place in the narrative concerning Sodom and Gomorrah, and the obedience

hostilities between the returnees from the exile and those already in the land (the province of Yehud), although it also retains features of the earlier "priestly" editing of the text, such as the positive evaluation of the sanctuary at Bethel.

- 5 See, e.g., Niditch 1987, 93-125; Patterson 1999, 385–394; Anderson 2011.
- 6 Narrative developments concerning twin brothers are common from Plautus's *Menaechmi* through Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* to Lewis Carroll's *Tweedledum and Tweedledee* in *Alice in Wonderland*.
- 7 For detail on Josephus's treatment of Jacob, especially his stress on Jacob's virtues and his concern to avoid any indication that the Jews seek to convert others, see Feldman 1988–1989.
- 8 See, e.g., on Abraham: Evans 2001; Fitzmyer 2003; Kratz 2009; on Isaac: Fitzmyer 2002; García Martínez 2002; Halpern-Amaru 2006; Fabry 2006.
- 9 Good 2000, citing only two items of bibliography.

tested in the binding of Isaac. The presentation of Isaac's binding in 4Q225 has provoked a number of short studies too. Study of Jacob in the scrolls from Qumran is largely lacking.¹⁰ It is hoped that this short study can make up for that deficit in some small way.

2. Aramaic Jacob

As scholars have become increasingly sensitive to the similarities and differences between the Aramaic and Hebrew compositions found in the Qumran caves, it is appropriate to outline briefly the contents of the ten references to Jacob in the Aramaic compositions before cataloguing the references to him in the Hebrew sources. In the Aramaic Levi Document^b Levi offers an extensive prayer asking for wisdom and protection for himself and true judgement for himself and his children. After the prayer Levi embarks on a first person narrative describing a journey at the end of which he received visions. Apparently near the start of the narration of the journey "my father Jacob" is mentioned; however, it is also necessary to mention that in the prayer he has recalled before God how God had "blessed Abraham my father and Sarah my mother." Thus in this context Jacob is clearly named as Levi's father, whose genealogy is important for the narrator, but his great-grandparents are also named to provide a wider genealogical framework.

In the sole small six-line fragment assigned to Aramaic Levi Document^c (4Q213b), Jacob is mentioned in line 4: "wh]en Jacob my father tithed." There is some overlap here with Testament de Lévi 4 (1Q21), though with a variant.¹¹ Testament de Lévi (1Q21) does not read *'by* as is preserved in 4Q213b.¹² The issue of tithing is undoubtedly of significance for the priestly line and is traced back to Jacob.¹³ In 4Q213a 3–4 8 tithing is also mentioned as part of a positive prophecy about the Levitical line.

In the so-called Testament of Joseph (4Q539), Joseph speaks in the first person in frg. 2 of Jacob "my father" lamenting. Emile Puech com-

10 There is also only limited study of Jacob in other Second Temple period Jewish literature; for example, there is no chapter on Jacob in the collection of studies edited by Stone and Bergren 1998.

11 Jacob is mentioned in two other places in 1Q21, in frgs. 19 and 29. Frg. 19 has only the name and no other context; for a comment on frg. 29 see the following note.

12 However, 1Q21 29 1 seems to read: *y'qlb 'byl*, so the designation was indeed known also in that copy of the composition.

13 See Kugel 1993, 2–11.

compares the passage with the Testament of Joseph 15:1–2 in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs where Joseph recalls how Jacob mourned in sackcloth and ashes his loss of Joseph.¹⁴ In Jub. 34:18 the similar incident of mourning gives rise to the observance of the Day of Atonement:

Therefore it is decreed for the children of Israel that they mourn on the tenth (day) of the seventh month – on the day when that which caused him to weep for Joseph came to Jacob, his father – so that they might atone for them(selves).¹⁵

This is the key use of what Mary Douglas has described as Jacob's frequent tendency to weep.¹⁶ This juxtaposition of Jacob's mourning with the initiation of the Day of Atonement could be very significant for appreciating the specific ideology of priesthood that seems to be enshrined in certain Jacob traditions. With Jacob were associated certain major aspects of priestly prerogative and practice.

Something similar can be observed in the Aramaic Testament of Qahat (4Q542). In frg. 1, col. I, there are two references to Jacob, both in association with other patriarchs. However, in the first instance (4Q542 1 I, 7–9) Jacob is given pre-eminent priority:

Hold on to the word of Jacob, your father, and hold fast to the judgements of Abraham and to the righteous deeds of Levi and of me, and be holy and pure from all [min]gling, holding on to the truth.¹⁷

In the second instance (4Q542 1 I, 10–11) the patriarchs are named in reverse order:

And you will give me among you a good name, and joy to Levi and gladness to J[a]cob and rejoicing to Isaac and honour to Abraham.¹⁸

The matter of priestly lineage is also dominant in the papyrus fragments assigned to the Aramaic Chronologie biblique (4Q559). The name Jacob is preserved once and can probably be restored in several places. In frgs. 2 and 3 the priestly line is given: Nahor, Terah, Abram, Isaac, Jacob, Levi (to whom Jacob gave the books of Enoch), Qahat, Amram, Aaron.¹⁹

14 Puech 2001, 205. Puech also attempts to restore 4Q539 2 1 with *bk]h*, "wept," in the light of Gen. 37:35 and Jub. 34:13–17.

15 Trans. Wintermute 1985, 121. See also the discussion of this passage in Douglas 2004, 39–40.

16 Douglas 2004, 4 and 38–60.

17 Trans. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1083.

18 Ibid.

19 Puech 2009b, 271–274.

Thus in the Aramaic traditions where Jacob is mentioned there is a dominant place for the role of Jacob as father of Levi and as the anchorman of the priesthood which that particular act of parenting enshrines. Jacob seems to have developed or possessed particular priestly genes and those genes are most certainly Levi's.²⁰ This concern with the priestly aspects of Jacob are, however, not confined just to Aramaic sources; they are a dominant feature also of the Hebrew traditions that have survived in the Qumran caves, not least the traditions of the book of Jubilees.²¹ It must also be admitted, however, that part of Levi's status in Jubilees is represented and reinforced by the way it is not his father Jacob who blesses him, but his grandfather Isaac who blesses him in Jacob's presence (Jub. 31:15–17).²²

3. The Covenant with Jacob: Temple Scroll XXIX

The association of Jacob with the Temple (and its priesthood) is a striking feature of the Temple Scroll. Of the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Jacob is the only one to be named in the extant parts of the extensively preserved Temple Scroll. He features twice, once formulaically as the father of the twelve sons (11Q19 XXIII 7), and once in the editorial section at the end of the so-called "Sacrificial Festival Calendar" (11Q19 XIII–XXIX) that is an extensive reworking of material from Num. 28–29 and Lev. 23.

The redactional section at the end of the "Sacrificial Festival Calendar" concludes with the striking phrasing:

They shall be for me a people and I will be for them for ever; and I shall dwell with them for ever and always. I shall sanctify my [te]mple with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it until the day of creation

20 Levi is explicitly "son of Jacob" in CD IV, 15. 5Q13 also contains a review of sacred history with a particular concern for priesthood: the text has in sequence Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob ("at Bethel"), Levi and probably Aaron. On the significance of this sacred history as reflected in the 'Avodah see Kister 2001.

21 None of the passages of Jubilees that confirm Levi's priesthood are preserved in fragmentary manuscripts of Jubilees from the Qumran caves, but sufficient material remains from the immediate contexts of Jub. 30–32, especially in 4Q221 and 4Q223–224, to suggest strongly that they were indeed extant, at least in some of the manuscripts. For further detailed comment on the priestly investiture of Levi at Bethel according to Jubilees see Eshel 2004, 32–36.

22 I am grateful to Harald Samuel for commenting on this essay and making the observation that perhaps Levi depends on Isaac's blessing to confirm his priesthood, rather than on Jacob, because the tradition might reflect some concern that Jacob's blemished thigh somehow limited his priestly competence.

(*ywm hbryh*), when I shall create my temple, establishing it for myself for all days, according to the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel (*kbryt `sr krtv 'm y'qwb bbyt 'l*).²³

Although it is possible that there was more text on the same topic at the top of the following column, it is not clear what such text might have contained. While Yigael Yadin suggested that there could have been some specific comments about the building of the temple,²⁴ Michael Wise argued that the following column most likely began with some such formula as "and Isaac at Gerar and with Abraham at Haran," thus making for a broad allusion to the patriarchal covenant tradition.²⁵ Since the specific context of the last lines of col. XXIX concerns the eventual divine building of the eschatological temple, it seems preferable to understand that the reference to the covenant made with Jacob is not a general reference to the patriarchal covenant passed with renewal from father to son, as in Ben Sira 44:19–23,²⁶ or a more particular reference to that same covenant described in Abraham's blessing of Jacob in Jub. 22:15,²⁷ but rather that it is intended as a specific temple-building covenant made with Jacob alone.

As Lawrence Schiffman has pointed out, the author or redactor of the Temple Scroll seems to have understood Jacob's experiences at Bethel as concerned with the Jerusalem temple.²⁸ The starting point is Jacob's vision of the ladder (Gen. 28:10–22) that leads to the recognition that he has been in the house of God (*bt 'lhym*), and so the place is named Bethel.²⁹ As is well known, the word covenant is not used in the

23 Trans. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1251.

24 Yadin 1983, 2:130.

25 Wise 1989, 52.

26 Sir. 24:23 combines mention of the "covenant of the Most High God" with the "inheritance for the congregations of Jacob." The combination of Isa. 59:20–21 with 27:9 in Rom. 11:26–27 juxtaposes the one who will "banish ungodliness from Jacob" with explicit mention of the covenant. Thus Jacob and covenant do indeed belong together explicitly in some traditions.

27 Several features of Jub. 22:15 can be compared with Temple Scroll XXIX: the reference to the people in both contexts is striking.

28 Schiffman 2004, 263–264.

29 On the significance of Bethel for the cult, especially in Jubilees, see Eshel 2004. On Bethel and the sacred geography of the Jacob cycle in later Jewish and Christian traditions see Salvesen 2009, 216–217. That Gen. 28 should be kept in mind as the starting point in Genesis for the analysis of the Temple Scroll's covenant with Jacob is also confirmed indirectly by the Gospel of John. Before Jesus is portrayed in the Gospel as replacing the Jewish festivals, confirming him to be even a new Temple himself, there is deliberate mention of Jacob's dream (Gen. 28:10–22), "a cipher for

narrative, but the various covenantal promises of land and progeny associated with Abraham and Isaac are present. The same motifs occur again in Gen. 35 where the narrative seems to provide an aetiology of the name Bethel through an alternative description of God's interaction with Jacob.³⁰ Through comparison of the details of the language used in several differing contexts Hans Rapp has proposed that it is principally Gen. 35:1–15 that lies behind the covenant with Jacob that is mentioned in the Temple Scroll and is apparent in some parts of the Aramaic Levi Document.³¹ Whatever the case, it is clear from the Temple Scroll that Lev. 26:42 must be in mind as the scriptural base text that explicitly refers to the covenant with Jacob.³²

Three or four other compositions seem to confirm that Temple Scroll XXIX is referring to a particular aspect of covenant that involves the Temple. First, there is the distinct association of Levi with Jacob in Jub. 32 which is the counterpart to Gen. 35, when Jacob returns to Bethel: Levi has a dream that he is appointed to the eternal priesthood and with Jacob desires to sacrifice. In Jacob's subsequent dream he is told not to build a sanctuary where he had his dream, but to leave such activity for the future. This fits, but not precisely so, with the way in which the Temple Scroll itself does not contain the regulations for the eschatological sanctuary which God himself will build, but the rules for the sanctuary that should have been built but never was. Second, it is possible that the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C^a (4Q385a) 3a–c, line 4 ("as I told Jacob") refers to this specific covenant with Jacob since in the following lines the chief matter seems to be the breach of "the festivals of my covenant," the very subject matter that precedes the mention of the covenant with Jacob in the Temple Scroll. Although Devorah Dimant comments cautiously that this fragmentary section of the composition could be referring in general to the covenant with the three patriarchs, it is possible that in this place alone in the composition there is a refer-

the Temple (being the one place through which one may ascend to heaven)"; see Perin 2010, esp. 51.

30 Rapp 2001, 69–90, 120–127.

31 The same might be said for the mention of Jacob in what could well be a commentary on Ps. 118 and other texts in 4Q173a: see Holst 2011. Hamidović 2009, and Puech 2009a agree in seeing some aspects of the fragment of 4Q173a as part of a set of reproaches against the Levitical priesthood; Holst 2011 prefers to align the vocabulary and concerns of the fragment with similar motifs in 4Q174.

32 The same also seems to be the case in 4Q372 3 9 ("which he cut with Jacob to be with him for ever") where phraseology very similar to that of 11Q19 XXIX is found with explicit mention of Jacob.

ence only to the covenant with Jacob.³³ Third, it seems as if the very fragmentary 5Q13, a Sectarial Rule, refers to what was made known to Jacob at Bethel, a matter specified only with the brief mention of the appointment of Levi to the priesthood as in Jub. 32. Thus the indication is that the experience of Jacob at Bethel concerns priesthood and the cult rather than matters to do with covenantal progeny or the gift of the land. And fourth, 4Q174, Eschatological Commentary A, contains no mention of Jacob but a complex set of references to various temples, including the one that God himself will establish, as in the Temple Scroll.³⁴ The point is that when voicing such interests, it is the construction of the Temple and the ordering of its sacrificial system that is foremost in mind, not land or multiple descendants.³⁵

Another matter seems to confirm this close association of Jacob with the Temple. In 4Q372, a complicated narrative and poetic composition, of the sons of Jacob it is not Levi but Joseph who plays a leading role. Eileen Schuller and Moshe Bernstein have proposed that the interpretative premise for appreciating the most extensive fragment is that Joseph symbolizes the exiled northern tribes and their descendants. More importantly for our purposes,

there seems to be an anti-Samaritan polemic in the text, that is, a polemic directed against the Jewish community around Shechem with its cultic centre at Mount Gerizim. The designation of the group as *nbylm* (line 11; cf. 4Q371 1 10) and the charge of building a cultic place (line 12) are key factors in this identification.³⁶

At least part of what the text is about is the right place of worship.³⁷

All this seems to indicate that the covenant with Jacob is more than merely a confirmation of that with Abraham and Isaac; it has specifically to do with the building of the Temple, with right sacrifice, and with the establishment of the priesthood. These matters occur in pre-

33 Dimant 2001, 137, bases her more general suggestion on the allusions to the patriarchal covenant in 4Q388a 7 II, 2 and 4Q389 8 II, 8–9.

34 In Brooke 1985, 169–174, I suggested that 4Q174 might be based on scriptural passages that were in some way associated with Sukkot. The fact that Temple Scroll XXIX, 8–10, with some motifs shared later with 4Q174, comes at the end of the regulations for the sacrifices associated with Sukkot might seem to confirm such a proposal. Precise arguments for linking Sukkot with Bethel are adduced by Eshel 2004, 28–30.

35 In 4Q174 the priesthood may have become identified in some way with the whole sectarian community which is now portrayed as the "human sanctuary" or "sanctuary of Adam."

36 Schuller and Bernstein 2001, 171.

37 Similar issues might be at play in the story of the Samaritan woman in John 4; see Brooke 1989, 190–191.

sectarian compositions as well as more explicitly sectarian ones and they are topics that are found in both second and first century B.C.E. compositions; they seem to have been subjects of ongoing significance to the sectarian community and its forebears, although presented with varying nuances in each composition, depending upon its purposes, genre and date.

4. Blessing and Jacob

Jacob is one who is blessed and who also utters blessing. For the former, the blessing of Jacob by another, 4Q158 is especially interesting. 4Q158 is considered by some to be a version of the Reworked Pentateuch, known also in other manuscript copies from Cave 4 but by others as a separate paraphrase of at least part of the Torah. Whatever the case concerning the identification of the composition, in its representation of the struggle between the angel and Jacob there are some distinctive elements. Chief amongst them is an explicit description of the blessing that the angel gives Jacob:

[And he bless]ed him right there. And he said to him: May YH[WH] make you fertile and [make] you [numerous ... May he fill you with] [know]ledge and intelligence; may he free you from all violence and [...] until this day and for everlasting generations [...] and he walked on his way after having blessed him there.³⁸

Robert Hayward has commented that

[D]espite the brevity of the preserved text, it is not exceeding the evidence to suggest that the blessing granted to Jacob was seen by the compiler of 4Q158 as in some way central to the whole proceedings, since line 10 underlines the departure of Jacob's companion 'when he had blessed him there,' words not found in the Bible.³⁹

Although some elements of this blessing seem to reiterate the elements of covenantal continuity,⁴⁰ the interest in knowledge and understand-

38 Trans. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:305. With regard to the petition for freedom from violence for Jacob see in general the study on Jacob the warrior in Jubilees by Atar Livneh in this volume.

39 Hayward 2005, 34. Hayward (35) notes in addition that 4Q158 also reflects halakhic debates about whether one or two "hollows of the thigh" were prohibited, with Gen. 32:32 mentioning just one, whereas 4Q158 clearly refers to two.

40 As also in Ben Sira 44:22–23.

ing and freedom from violence are distinctive.⁴¹ Further research might reveal what they might signify about Jacob and in which tradition they might seek to locate him.

As for the blessings uttered by Jacob in Gen. 49, at least some of these are extant in the Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252) and are seen, in part at least, to require prophetic interpretation (*peshet*), perhaps because they are understood as still unfulfilled in some respect at least. The blessings of Jacob are also referred to in the so-called Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521) 8 7. In the light of the rest of the composition extant in that scroll Émile Puech has considered that there is an allusion particularly to the blessings for Judah and Levi as king messiah and high priest respectively.⁴² Both when blessed and as an agent of divine blessing Jacob seems to be associated with particular traditions, not just those concerning land and offspring as given to Abraham and Isaac.

5. "A Star Shall Come out of Jacob": The Use of Num. 24:17–18

In three sectarian compositions Num. 24:17, "a star shall come out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel," features as a mark of the anticipation of the eschatological era. In the War Rule XI, 6–8, the text is cited as proof that any military victory belongs to God himself. Intriguingly, the text is not given a singular messianic interpretation. It is well known that the individual messianism of the War Rule in all its recensions is extremely muted with only a single reference to the Prince of the Congregation. The star that will depart from Jacob and come down from Jacob is not given an individual messianic interpretation in the text that follows. Rather the text seems to prompt the compiler of the War Rule to reflect on the character of the seers of long ago, "your anointed ones" (*mšyhykh*): "By the hand of your anointed ones, seers of decrees, you taught us the times of the wars of your hands."⁴³ Balaam's oracle with its mention of Jacob and Israel in parallel is a point of eschatological reference.

Num. 24:15–17 is also cited in Testimonia (4Q175). The passage is difficult to interpret. On one reading the whole collection of four ex-

41 For further comments on how the deliverance from violence in the blessing in 4Q158 might reflect the situation between Edom and Yehud in the Second Temple period see Nitzan 2009, 294–297.

42 Puech 1998, 29.

43 Trans. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 1:131.

cerpts in the single-columned list seems to indicate that there will be three positive eschatological figures (prophet and two messiahs) to match three negative ones (a man of Belial and his two sons). On such a view the citation of Num. 24:15–17 would serve as a prediction of the messiah of Israel, with the star from Jacob and the sceptre from Israel as a neat parallelism, both referring to the messiah of Israel. However, the same text of Numbers is also cited in the Damascus Document VII, 18–21, where the star is identified with the "Interpreter of the Law who will come to Damascus" and the sceptre is "the prince of the whole congregation." If that understanding is transferred to the citation of Num. 24:17 in *Testimonia*, then it becomes a passage that seems to look backwards to the figure of the prophet like Moses of Exod. 20 (Sam.) who might be considered to be the same as the Interpreter of the Law, as well as making its own possible identification of the sceptre as the messiah of Israel. Nevertheless, once again as in the War Rule, Num. 24:17 is one of several key eschatological reference points.

6. Other Scriptural Echoes of Jacob

The relatively widespread use of parts of Isaiah, especially so-called Deutero-Isaiah, in the non-scriptural scrolls⁴⁴ corresponds with the appearance of several of the uses of Jacob which is a favourite designation in this part of Isaiah for the community of exiles that the text addresses.⁴⁵ In this way it seems as if Jacob becomes a particularly apposite description for the community of returning exiles that the audiences of many sectarian compositions envisaged themselves to be. For example, Isaianic material is used extensively in the consolations that make up 4Q176. In the passages used, such as Isa. 48:1 there is reference to "Israel, my servant, Jacob whom I chose" (4Q176 1–2 I, 9–11).

Several passages from Isaiah together with other scriptural echoes lie behind the fragmentary lines of Narrative C (4Q462) in which Jacob features three times. Mark Smith has summarized the text's viewpoint as follows:

The text announces the imminent restoration of the people of God. While under servitude for a long time, the people, under the figure of Jerusalem, will be restored by YHWH.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ See most recently Kratz 2011, 243–271.

⁴⁵ See McKenzie 2001, 355.

⁴⁶ Smith 1995, 205.

Israel, Jacob, and Jerusalem all feature in the text and seem to elide into one another as designations for what is restored: "The text culminates in the restoration of Israel/Jacob/Jerusalem."⁴⁷ Indeed the interwoven overlap between the designations is so tightly assembled that in 4Q462 1 19 the scribe seems to have begun to write "Israel" and then corrected it to "Jerusalem." There seems to be a similar corporate use of Jacob in Eschatological Commentary B (4Q177) 1–4 X, 15: the collective use of Jacob occurs in an interpretation which is given to a citation of Hos. 5:8. Jacob, perhaps the community addressed by the commentator, is described as standing at the winepress and rejoicing,⁴⁸ not because of drinking, but at the defeat of his enemies.

The collective or communal referent of Jacob is apparent also in the phrase "house of Jacob."⁴⁹ Although in the Temple Scroll in some way the covenant with Jacob is tied to the temple in Jerusalem, "house of Jacob" has another significance as it is preserved in a citation of Isa. 10:20–22 in Peshier Isaiah C (4Q163) 4–6 II, 8–11.⁵⁰ The brief and fragmentarily preserved interpretation of the passage offers little, but mentions the final days and captivity. Frgs. 18–19 of the same Peshier preserve a long citation of Isa. 29:18–23⁵¹ with its references to the "house of Jacob," "Jacob," and the "Holy One of Jacob." Even though there is no preserved interpretation, the selection of this Jacobite section of Isaiah might be suggestive of the interpreter's preferences for some reason.

Collective understandings of Jacob are extant elsewhere too. The prayers of the Words of the Luminaries are full of scriptural allusions, put together in a kind of pastiche or anthology. In 4Q504 1–2 V, 7 the prayer for Friday, the phrase "seed of Jacob" occurs, perhaps echoing Isa. 45:19. The passage is one that combines such idioms around the use of Lev. 26:32–33 and 44–45 as a base text.⁵²

47 Smith 1995, 207.

48 Steudel 1994, 110, has proposed several possible scriptural sources for the language used in the passage of interpretation: Num. 24:19; Joel 3:13; Isa. 63:1; Lam. 1:15. The context of Num. 24:15–19 seems particularly relevant, given its explicit mention of Jacob.

49 I am grateful to Devorah Dimant for the observation that it is striking, that the sectarian compositions from the Qumran caves do not use Abraham, Isaac or Jacob as sectarian sobriquets. Perhaps that observation explains why the phrase "house of Jacob" is used when it is important to designate a group.

50 Isa. 10:21 states that "the remnant will return, the remnant of Jacob," making Jacob particularly suitable as a designation for the community that believes itself to be coming out of exile.

51 Isa. 29:22 also mentions Abraham in a collective sense.

52 As noted for 4Q504 1–2 V, 3–4 (Lev. 26:32–33), 6–8 (Lev. 26:44) and 9–10 (Lev. 26:45) by Baillet 1982, 147.

But in spite of all of this you did not reject the descendants of Jacob, nor despise Israel to destruction, annulling the covenant with them. For you are a living God, you alone, and there is no other apart from you. You remembered your covenant, for you redeemed us in the sight of the nations and did not desert us amongst the nations.⁵³

In some ways indeed with this Friday prayer we have come full circle, since it seems that in a cultic context once again the recollection of Jacob/Israel has to do with the need to keep the covenant as it is described and endorsed in Lev. 26 so that the right place of sacrificial prayer for the right practice of prayer becomes an ongoing reality.

7. Conclusion

In this brief tour of the explicit occurrences of Jacob in the non-scriptural scrolls from Qumran, it seems that we have uncovered a particular frame of reference. Although Jacob is indeed sometimes associated with Abraham and Isaac in the Deuteronomic trio as the heir of the gift of the land and blessed offspring, nevertheless he is also especially associated with matters to do with the cult, with the temple and its sacrificial practices, and particularly with its priesthood that comes through his fatherhood of Levi. Such cultic particularity is found in both Aramaic and Hebrew sources, in both pre-sectarian and sectarian compositions. This particularity is played out in different ways in the various texts: sometimes there is concern with the specifics of priestly genealogy and lineage, sometimes there is concern with how those addressed should stay within the covenant made with Jacob, especially by keeping the calendar of sacrifices aright, sometimes with the help of Deutero-Isaiah Jacob becomes the name for the community that is brought out of exile with an eye on the reestablishment of a Jerusalem which one day will be the place where God himself will build his sanctuary and the blessings given and passed on by Jacob, not least with some special leaders in view for Levi and Judah, will become eschatological reality.

53 Trans. García Martínez and Tigchelaar 2000, 2:1015–1017.

Bibliography

- Anderson, John E. 2011. *Jacob and the Divine Trickster: A Theology of Deception and Yhwh's Fidelity to the Ancestral Promise in the Jacob Cycle*. Siphrut 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Baillet, Maurice. 1982. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brooke, George J. 1985. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. JSOT.S 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- . 1989. The Temple Scroll and the New Testament. In *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll, Manchester, December 1987*, ed. George J. Brooke, 181–199. JSPE.S 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press (Repr., George J. Brooke. 2005. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 97–114. London: SPCK; Minneapolis: Fortress Press).
- Dimant, Devorah. 2001. *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD XXX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Douglas, Mary. 2004. *Jacob's Tears: The Priestly Work of Reconciliation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eshel, Esther. 2004. Jubilees 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions in Second Temple Literature. In *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone*, eds. Esther G. Chazon, David Satran and Ruth A. Clements, 21–36. JSJ.S 89. Leiden: Brill.
- Evans, Craig A. 2001. Abraham in the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Man of Faith and Failure. In *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation*, ed. Peter W. Flint, 149–158. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Fabry, Heinz-Josef. 2006. Isaak in den Handschriften von Qumran. In *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech*, eds. Florentino García Martínez, Annette Steudel and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 87–103. StTDJ 61. Leiden: Brill.
- Feldman, Louis H. 1988–1989. Josephus' Portrait of Jacob. *JQR* 79:101–151.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 2002. The Sacrifice of Isaac in Qumran Literature. *Biblica* 83:211–229.

- . 2003. The Interpretation of Genesis 15:6: Abraham's Faith and Righteousness in a Qumran Text. In *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*, eds. Shalom M. Paul et al., 257–268. VT.S 94. Leiden: Brill.
- Galvagno, Germano. 2009. *Sulle vestigia di Giacobbe: Le riletture sacerdotali e post-sacerdotali dell'itinerario del patriarca*. AnBib 178. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press.
- García Martínez, Florentino. 2002. The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225. In *The Sacrifice of Isaac: The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and Its Interpretations*, eds. Ed Noort and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 44–57. Themes in Biblical Narrative 4. Leiden: Brill.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 2000. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill.
- Good, Roger. 2000. Jacob. In vol. 1 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 395–396. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. 2006. A Note on Isaac as First-Born in Jubilees and Only Son in 4Q225. *DSD* 13:127–133.
- Hamidović, David. 2009. Le retour au temple de Jérusalem (4Q173a olim 4Q173 5)? *RdQ* 24/94:283–286.
- Hayward, C. T. Robert. 2005. *Interpretations of the Name Israel in Ancient Judaism and Some Early Christian Writings: From Victorious Athlete to Heavenly Champion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holst, Søren. 2011. 4Q173a: A Fragment of an Eschatological Midrash? In *The Mermaid and the Partridge: Essays from the Copenhagen Conference on Revising Texts from Cave Four*, eds. George J. Brooke and Jesper Høgenhaven, 119–127. *StTDJ* 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Kister, Menahem. 2001. 5Q13 and the 'Avodah: A Historical Survey and Its Significance. *DSD* 8:136–148.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2009. Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac: Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran. In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, eds. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 79–105. *FAT* II/35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2011. *Prophetenstudien*. Vol. 2 of *Kleine Schriften*. *FAT* 74. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Kugel, James L. 1993. Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings. *HThR* 86:1–64.
- McKenzie, Stephen L. 2001. Jacob in the Prophets. In *Jacob: Commentaire à plusieurs voix de Gen. 25–36. Mélanges offerts à Albert de Pury*, eds. Jean-Daniel Macchi and Thomas Römer, 339–357. *Le Monde de la Bible* 44. Geneva: Labor et Fides.
- Niditch, Susan. 1987. *A Prelude to Biblical Folklore: Underdogs and Tricksters*. San Francisco: Harper & Row (Repr., Champaign: University of Illinois Press, 2000).
- Nitzan, Bilhah. 2009. Ancient Jewish Traditions of Biblical Commentary in Qumran Literature. In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, eds. Károly D. Dobos and Miklós Közeghy, 288–300. Hebrew Bible Monographs 21. Sheffield: Phoenix Press.
- Patterson, Richard D. 1999. The Old Testament Use of an Archetype: The Trickster. *JETS* 42:385–394.
- Perrin, Nicholas. 2010. *Jesus the Temple*. London: SPCK; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Puech, Émile. 1998. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. DJD XXV. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2001. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549*. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2009a. 4Q173a: Note épigraphique. *RdQ* 24/94:287–290.
- . 2009b. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes araméens deuxième partie. 4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587 et appendices*. DJD XXXVII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rapp, Hans A. 2001. *Jakob in Bet-El: Gen 35, 1–15 und die jüdische Literatur des 3. und 2. Jahrhunderts*. Herders Biblische Studien 29. Freiburg: Herder.
- Salvesen, Alison. 2009. Keeping It in the Family? Jacob and His Aramean Heritage According to Jewish and Christian Sources. In *The Exegetical Encounter Between Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity*, eds. Emmanouela Grypeou and Helen Spurling, 205–220. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 18. Leiden: Brill.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 2004. The Concept of Covenant in the Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature. In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation:*

- Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, 257–278. JSJ.S 83. Leiden: Brill.
- Schuller, Eileen, and Moshe J. Bernstein. 2001. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^b. In *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh, and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, eds. Douglas M. Gropp, Moshe Bernstein et al., 165–197. DJD XXVIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Smith, Mark. 1995. 4QNarrative C. In *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, eds. Magen Broshi et al., 195–209. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Steudel, Annette. 1994. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden*. StTDJ 13. Leiden: Brill.
- Stone, Michael E., and Theodore A. Bergren, eds. 1998. *Biblical Figures outside the Bible*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
- Vermes, Geza. 2004. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. London: Penguin Books.
- Wintermute, Orval S. 1985. Jubilees: A New Translation and Introduction. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Vol. 2 of *Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judaeo-Hellenistic Works*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 35–142. New York: Doubleday.
- Wise, Michael O. 1989. The Covenant of the Temple Scroll XXIX, 3–10. *RdQ* 14:49–60.
- Yadin, Yigael. 1983. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

With My Sword and Bow: Jacob as Warrior in *Jubilees*

Atar Livneh

Introduction

Since the inception of Jubilean studies, the aggadic material this book contains has garnered a large measure of scholarly attention.¹ These texts include two extra-biblical accounts of Jacob as warrior, combating first seven Amorite kings (Jub. 34:1–9) followed by his brother Esau (Jub. 37:1–38:14). The fact that parallels to these two narratives in other ancient texts exist (T. Judah, Midrash Wayyisa‘u, and Sefer Hayashar) has led to their scrutiny in the context of the development of the literary tradition of Jacob as warrior.² The suggestion that they reflect authentic historical events has also played a significant role in discussions regarding the date of Jubilees' composition.³ Although these two per-

-
- 1 Cf. Beer 1856; Rönsch 1874; Charles 1902; Ginzberg 1909–1938; and recently Kugel 1998. This article is a revised version of a paper originally read at the conference published in this volume and later presented at a research seminar at the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature (Hebrew University of Jerusalem). I am indebted to the participants of both sessions for their enlightening comments, and to Dr. Anja Klein who very kindly read an earlier draft.
 - 2 Beer 1856, 2–8; Rönsch 1874, 390–398; Bousset 1900, 202–205; Charles 1902, 200–204; Klein 1934; Ginzberg 1909–1938, 1:408–411; 5:315 n. 292; Jellinek 1938, 3:ix–xiv; Becker 1970, 114–125; de Jonge 1975, 60–66; VanderKam 1977, 217–254; Hultgård 1982, 123–127; Schmitt 1983; Hollander and Jonge 1985, 26–27, 185–186; Safrai 1987; Werman 1995, 11–22; Menn 1997, 123–135, 142–143; Kugel 1998, 369–373.
 - 3 Similarities between the account of Jacob's conflict with Esau and the Maccabean campaigns were recognized early on by Bousset 1900, 202–205; and Charles 1902, lxii–lxiii, 200–204. To date, however, no consensus has been reached in regard to the specific battles reflected in the story: see the various suggestions made by VanderKam 1977, 217–254; Mendels 1987, 70–82; Rappaport 1993, 227–228; Berger 1981, 511. Other scholars question the likelihood that Jub. 34:1–9 and/or 37:1–38:14 allude to specific Maccabean conflicts: Nickelsburg 1980, 83–84; Goldstein 1983; Schmitt 1983, 54–59; Doran 1989; Werman 1995, 11–22. Cf. also the discussions in VanderKam 1977, 229; idem 2001, 73–74, and Safrai 1987 concerning the narrative of

spectives have dominated the study of the conflict narratives in Jubilees, Doran – who commented briefly on these two passages – proposes they should be treated primarily as literary rather than historical sources.⁴

Despite this recognition, no detailed analysis of the literary devices and/or exegetical features of these texts has been undertaken, nor have the narratives been studied in their literary context – namely, the book of Jubilees as a whole. The following comments represent an effort to redress this circumstance by examining the literary and/or exegetical elements common to these depictions of "Jacob as warrior" and studying their affinities with themes and ideas central to Jubilees.⁵ Hereby, I hope to demonstrate that numerous details of the war accounts in Jubilees derive from literary and exegetical considerations rather than reflect actual historical campaigns.

Jub. 34:1–9 relates Jacob's war against seven Amorite kings in "the field of Shechem." Having sent his sons to Shechem to herd their flocks, Jacob remains in Hebron with Levi, Judah, and Joseph to tend the elderly Isaac. When the news reaches him that the herdsmen have been attacked by seven Amorite kings, Jacob sets out to the aid of his sons with Levi, Judah, and Joseph. Having killed six of the kings by the sword, he makes peace with the Amorites, subjecting them and imposing a tribute upon them.

The second narrative, coming three chapters later (Jub. 37:1–38:14), recounts the events following Isaac's death. On hearing that Isaac has given the birthright to Jacob instead of their father, Esau's sons deter-

Jacob's conflict with the Amorites. In a more recent comment, VanderKam 2001, 20 has suggested that Judas Maccabeus' battles may have "shaped or affected the way our [i.e., the Jubilean] author told a story about ancient times."

- 4 Doran 1989, 1–4, followed by Werman 1995, 14, points to the similarities between Jub. 34:1–9 and the story of Abraham and the five kings (Gen. 14). Although Goldstein's focus lies principally in the dating of Jubilees, he notes some of the biblical influences on Jub. 34:1–9; 37:1–38:14, remarking that: "... the story reflects no historical event whatever. Rather it is a demonstration that the fulfillment of the promises in Amos 9:12; Isa. 11:14, and Obadiah will merely reestablish the conquests of Jacob" (Goldstein 1983, 77).
- 5 The stress laid here upon the common features of the two conflict accounts, does not mean that they are identical. One of the most striking differences between them is their length. Whereas the narrative of Jacob's battle against the Amorites consists of nine verses (Jub. 34:1–9), that of his struggle against Esau extends over thirty-nine verses (Jub. 37:1–38:14). This circumstance is closely related, of course, to the divergent style employed in each account: while the former comprises a third-person narrative (cf. the detailed analysis of Jub. 34:1–9 in Livneh 2012), the latter combines third-person narrative with a dialogical scene, a monologue, and even a rhetorical speech.

mine to attack Jacob and his family. Esau, who is initially opposed to the plan, gives in to his sons' persuasion, later recalling "the bad things hidden in his heart" against his brother. Together, they fall upon Jacob with four thousand mercenaries while Jacob's family is mourning Leah in Hebron. Although surprised by the attack, Jacob repulses it, slaying Esau personally with his bow while his sons pursue and kill many of Esau's warriors. The remaining Edomites flee to Mount Seir, where they succumb to Jacob's sons. The latter make peace with the Edomites in accord with their father's command, subjugate them, and impose tribute upon them.⁶

1) Gen. 48:22 in Jubilees

It has long been noted that Jacob's belligerent activities as elaborated in the extra-biblical material are inspired by Gen. 48:22, a verse which presents Jacob's words to Joseph: "And now I assigned you one portion (שכם) more than to your brothers which I wrested from the Amorites with my sword and bow."⁷ Ancient translations and exegeses of this verse reflect two divergent understandings of the noun שכם. The first regards it as the name of a city, the second as signifying a "portion."⁸ These early sources also differ in their interpretation of the phrase "with my sword and bow." While some perceive it as referring to weapons, others read it figuratively as symbolizing "merit and good works" or "prayer and supplication."⁹ In the context of Jubilees, שכם is generally assumed to represent the name of the city, the expression "with my sword and bow" referring to weapons. This sense is evident in Jub. 34, which depicts Jacob fighting the Amorites in "the field of Shechem." The biblical verse also lies behind Jacob's last words in

6 Although fourteen Hebrew manuscripts of Jubilees were found at Qumran, the composition as a whole – including the full text of Jub. 34:1–9; 37:1–38:14 – has only been preserved in Ge'ez. As VanderKam 1977, 91–95, has demonstrated, this text closely reflects the Hebrew original. Herein, we rely primarily upon VanderKam's critical edition of the Ge'ez text (VanderKam 1989).

7 The significance of Gen. 48:22 for Jub. 34:1–9 was first noted by Beer 1856, 3. All biblical quotations cited here are taken from the NJPS, unless otherwise indicated.

8 LXX Gen. 48:22 translates שכם as Σίκμα (cf. Gen. Rab. 97:6), but Aquila, Tg. Neof., and the Vulgate understand שכם as "a portion." Tg. Ps.-J. combines both of these significations (... קרתא דשכם חולק חד).

9 Gen. Rab. 97:6 gives both options. For the literal translation, see Tg. Ps.-J.; for the figurative understanding, cf. Tg. Neof.; Mek. Beshallah 3, ll. 40–44; Mek. de R. Simeon bar Johai Beshallah to Exod. 14:10; b. B. Bat. 123a; and cf. Jerome, Qu. Hebr. Gen. to Gen. 48:22; and the surveys of Maher 1992, 156 n. 27, and Hayward 1995, 234–235.

Jub. 45:14, however: "He blessed them and gave Joseph *two shares* in the land."¹⁰ Since this verse assumes that שֶׁכֶם bears the sense of "portion," the Jubilean author clearly employs the noun in both the senses given above. Likewise, while the events depicted in the account of Jacob's war against the Amorites evidently derive from Gen. 48:22, the influence of this verse is specifically visible in the three-clause depiction of Jacob's defeat of the Amorite kings:

He killed them in the field of *Shechem*, and they pursued the ones who ran away.

He killed them with the blade of the *sword*.

He killed *Ares, Tafu, Saregan, Silo, Amanisakir, and Gagaas* (Jub. 34:7).

Each of these sentences commences with the words "He killed," the first indicating the *place* where the event occurred (Shechem), the second the *means* (by his sword), and the third the *object* (the six Amorite kings).¹¹ Jub. 34:7 thus contains an interpretation of the noun שֶׁכֶם, the phrase "sword and bow," and a reference to the Amorites. Since the description "with the blade of the sword" represents the biblical idiom "with my sword and bow," the Jubilean author obviously understands this phrase literally. The reason for the absence of the bow from this account can be explained by its transposition to the second narrative of Jacob as warrior: "[Then Jacob drew] his [bo]w, shot [the first arrow, hit] Esau [his brother on his right breast, and killed him]" (4Q223–224 2 IV 18–19 [= Jub. 38:2]).¹² The two Jubilean war passages thus provide an exegesis of the phrase "with my sword and bow."

2) Fighting for Shechem and Hebron

The author of Jubilees locates Jacob's war at two central sites, the war against the Amorites taking place in "the field of Shechem" and the

10 Unless otherwise notified, English citations follow VanderKam 1989. Italics in the citations from Jubilees have been added. The quotations from 4Q223–224 (4QpapJub^b) follow VanderKam and Milik 1994.

11 The clause "and they pursued the ones who ran away" deviates from the predominate theme of Jacob's slaying of his enemies. For the division of tasks between Jacob and his sons during the battle, see section 8 below.

12 Cf. Gen. Rab. 97:6 in which "the Amorite" in Gen. 48:22 is understood as a reference to Esau. My thanks to Prof. Menahem Kister for indicating this passage to me.

struggle with Esau at Hebron.¹³ The patriarch's victories over his enemies in these places establishes his descendants' right to this territory, the more so since Jacob serves in Jubilees as the prototype for the Israelites as a nation.¹⁴ In contrast to the Genesis account, the Jubilean author evidently regards the Israelites' right to Shechem as deriving solely from their military conquest of the land. Gen. 33:18–19 reports that Jacob purchased a field "before the city of Shechem" from Hamor the Hivite for a hundred *qesita*, the following chapter narrating Dinah's rape by Shechem and Simeon and Levi's "coming upon the town" (Gen. 34). Gen. 48:22 further possibly hints that Shechem was "wrested from the Amorites" by Jacob's "sword and bow" at some unknown point in time.¹⁵ While the Jubilean author refers to Gen. 34 and 48:22 – albeit presented as two different events occurring five years apart (cf. Jub. 30:1; 34:1) – he appears to have omitted the episode of Jacob's acquisition of the field from Hamor, possibly because in his view such a business relationship with Gentiles was improper.¹⁶ In the face of the lack of any indication regarding the purchase of the field near Shechem, the Jubilean expansion of Gen. 48:22 into a vivid narrative of Jacob fighting in "the field of Shechem" (Jub. 34:1–9) is especially striking.¹⁷

The Israelite right to Hebron is represented in similar fashion. According to Genesis, Abraham bought a field near Mamre/Hebron from Ephron the Hittite for four hundred shekels (Gen. 23). Jubilees represents this incident as the last in a series of ten trials with which God tests Abraham (Jub. 19:1–9), condensing the negotiation with the Hittites into two verses (Jub. 19:5–6).¹⁸ At the same time, the author inserts

13 According to the Hebrew Bible, these two cities, which served as the burial sites of the forefathers, were the only places purchased by the patriarchs for a price (cf. Gen. 23; 25:9–10; 33:18–19; 49:29–31; 50:12–14; Josh. 24:32).

14 Cf. Goldstein 1983, 85; Werman 1995, 16.

15 Cf. Gen. Rab. 97:6 which understands Gen. 34 and 48:22 as referring to a single event. The reworking of Gen. 34 in Jub. 30 has received much scholarly attention: see Endres 1987, 133–147; Werman 1997; Hayes 1999; Himmelfarb 1999; Kugel 2006, 36–80; Loader 2007, 165–175; Segal 2010.

16 Endres 1987, 122; Werman 1995, 9. Cf. Jub. 30 and Abraham's instruction to Jacob: "Separate from the nations, and do not eat with them. Do not act as they do, and do not become their companion ..." (Jub. 22:16). On this instruction and its parallels in other sources, see Schwarz 1982, 21–36; Shemesh 2011; and cf. Schiffman 1983.

17 For the phrase "the field of Shechem" in the account about Jacob's war against the Amorites, see Jub. 34:1, 7.

18 While the author omits the purchase of a field near Shechem from the Hivites (Gen. 33:18–19), he renders the acquisition of the cave of Machpelah from the Hittites (Gen. 23) as a "kosher deal" by representing it as part of the divine plan, paying significantly less attention to the negotiation itself (Jub. 19:1–9). While these two biblical

a thirty-nine-verse extra-biblical elaboration recounting Esau's warfare against Jacob in Hebron (Jub. 37:1–38:14).¹⁹ Thus, according to Jubilees, while the patriarchs initially acquired Hebron by a real-estate deal in line with the divine plan, Jacob re-establishes his possession of this land in an armed battle whose significance is reflected in the length of the narrative. Analysis of the two conflict accounts in their broader context consequently reveals that the Jubilean author downplays the two Genesis accounts which suggest that the right to the land of Israel was procured by purchase in favour of the view that its inheritance is based on occupation by force.²⁰

3) The Numerical Principle

Jub. 34:1–9 and 37:1–38:14 both employ a numerical principle, one based on "six," the other on "four." Jacob's war against the Amorites takes place in the sixth year of the sixth week (in the forty-fourth jubilee – Jub. 34:1), his army consisting of three of his sons and six thousand servants (Jub. 34:6) and six Amorite kings being killed in battle (Jub. 34:7). Virtually all the numerical data in the narrative regarding the hostilities between Jacob and Esau are likewise multiples of four.²¹

episodes thus pose a similar exegetical problem for the Jubilean author, he employed variant means to resolve each case.

- 19 The Hebrew Bible does not portray any of the patriarchs as fighting in Hebron. Joshua is depicted as battling the king of Hebron and its inhabitants in Josh. 10:23, 36–37, 39; 11:21; 12:10.
- 20 Endres 1987, 20, attentively notes that "the goal of the narration [concerning Sarah's burial] has shifted from ... establishing their [the patriarchs'] right to inhabit the land ... to the character of Abraham and his fidelity." His suggestion that the solidification of Israelite claims to the land was not "a pressing issue in the second century B.C.E." (Endres 1987, 122) is rather odd, however, in light of the prevailing historical circumstances from the Maccabean revolt onwards. See also n. 16 above.
- 21 While Sefer Hayashar also refers to seven Amorite kings, in similar fashion to Joshua and the conflict narrative in Jubilees, Midrash Wayyisa' u speaks only of five, probably under the influence of Josh. 10:1–27. As Becker 1970, 114–116, has suggested, however, the inconsistencies in the numerical data in the war account in Jub. 34:1–9, together with other discrepancies in the story, may indicate that Jub. 34:1–9 constitutes a reworking of an earlier tradition of Jacob as warrior. Other inner "tensions" in the narrative are visible in the fact that the names given refer both to the Amorite cities and kings (cf. Jub. 34:4 to v. 7) and Jacob's servants are said to be in Shechem according to Jub. 34:1 and Hebron according to Jub. 34:6 (cf. the wording of Jub. 34:1 in Mss 12; 21, however, according to which no disparity is evident). Several other details in Jub. 34:1–9 are based on passages from Joshua. The depiction of the Amorite kings' "gathering" (Jub. 34:2) resembles Josh. 9:1–2; 10:6, while Jub. 34:4 is an evident

The battle takes place in the fourth year of the second week (in the forty-fifth jubilee – Jub. 36:21, 37:14). Esau's troops number four thousand warriors, Jacob's men being two hundred in number (Jub. 38:5–8; cf. Gen. 33:1), and the balance of power between the two forces 1:20. In addition, although Joseph has already been sold into Egypt at this juncture in the story, the Jubilean author specifies that the full complement of Jacob's sons take part in the war, replacing Joseph with Reuben's firstborn (Jub. 38:5–8). In similar fashion, while the Genesis account identifies five of Esau's sons, Jubilees only refers to four (cf. Jub. 38:8 vis-à-vis Gen. 36:1-5, 10–14). Four hundred men from the Edomite troops are killed (Jub. 38:8), and the military tactic itself is structured on a quadruple principle: Jacob's men and Esau's soldiers are divided into four groups, facing the four points of the compass (Jub. 35:4–8; cf. Num. 2; Ezek. 48:31–34).²²

4) The Gentile Nations as Initiators of the Combat

Both conflict accounts ascribe the responsibility for the eruption of the hostilities to the gentile nations. Jub. 34:2 state that the Amorites "assembled against them [Jacob's sons] to kill them from their hiding place ..." – while Jub. 37 repeatedly reiterate that the Edomites – represented by Esau and his sons – initiated the hostilities (cf. esp. Jub. 37:1–13, 18–23). The assault of the former as well as of the latter is based on the element of surprise: the Amorites set an ambush for Jacob's sons who are innocently herding their flocks (Jub. 34:1–2) and Esau attacks Jacob as he is mourning for Leah:

During all this time, Jacob was unaware that they were coming to him for battle. He, for his part, was mourning for his wife Leah ..." (Jub. 37:14).²³

allusion to Josh. 17:18. As scholars have noted, some of the cities indicated in Jub. 34:1–9 also appear in Joshua: Tafu (תפוח) (cf. Josh. 12:17; 16:8; 17:8); Selo (שלה) (cf. Josh. 18:1; 1 Sam. 4:12; 1 Kgs. 14:2); Gaaz (געעז) (cf. Josh. 24:30; Judg. 2:9; 2 Sam. 23:30); Betoron (בית הריק) (cf. Josh. 10:10–11; 16:3; 18:13–14); and Tamnatares (תמנת חרס/טרח) (cf. Josh. 19:50; 24:30; Judg. 2:9). See VanderKam 1977, 218–229; Goldstein 1983, 83–85. The story of Joshua's battle against the seven Amorite kings (Josh. 10:28–43) – possibly the source of the figure seven in Jub. 34:2 – probably influenced the parallel accounts in T. Judah, Midrash Wayyisa' u, and Sefer Hayashar, which describe this incident as a series of battles in various Amorite cities on consecutive days. Cf. the temporal notations "on the second day" and "that day" (cf. Josh. 10:32, 35).

22 See below, section 6.

23 Jub. 34:2: "Seven Amorite kings assembled against them to kill them from their hiding place beneath the trees and to take their animals as booty." The military strat-

While shock attacks were a common military tactic in antiquity, in this context the element of surprise assigns responsibility for the hostilities unequivocally to the gentile nations, Jacob and his sons being taken completely unawares.²⁴ Both episodes also indicate that the principal objective is to slay the enemy. The Amorites "assembled against them to kill them" (Jub. 34:2), Esau's sons likewise declaring: "We will ... kill him [Jacob], and destroy his sons" (Jub. 37:5).²⁵ Both armies thus set out to violate the prohibition against shedding blood (Gen. 5–6; Jub. 6:8; 7:22–24, 28–33).²⁶ In Jubilees, bloodshed and warfare are both prohibited, as demonstrated in the author's account of the sins committed by Noah's sons:

... Noah's children began to fight one another, to take captives, and to kill one another; to shed human blood on the earth ... 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 (Jub. 11:2).²⁷

The portrayal of the Amorites and the Edomites as bloodthirsty and battle-hungry thus highlights their wickedness and corresponds to the general Jubilean emphasis of their evil nature.²⁸

agem – i.e., hiding underneath trees – is clarified by the later depiction of Shechem as a wooded area in Jub. 34:4 (cf. Josh. 17:18).

- 24 Cf. Josh. 8:1–23; 10:9; 11:7; Judg. 9:31–45; 1 Macc. 3:23; 4:1–27; 2 Macc. 8:5–7; Yadin 1963, 1:104–105, 110–111; 2:256–263. This specification also functions to magnify the scale of the victory won by Jacob and his sons who, although unprepared for battle, overcame their enemies. See section 9 B below.
- 25 While the two accounts share this feature, each also contains unique elements. Thus, according to Jub. 34:2 the Amorites' goal is to kill Jacob's sons and take their flock as booty. Likewise, Jacob's struggle with Esau distinctively associates the objective – the slaying of Jacob's sons – with the fear lest they grow stronger (Jub. 37:5–6; cf. Exod. 1:10). It is noteworthy that the consistent representation of the gentile nations as responsible for the eruption of the hostilities in these stories and their seeking to destroy "Jacob's sons" is also typical of the depiction of Judas Maccabeus' campaigns found in 1 Macc. 5. For a discussion of the portrayal of the Gentiles in 1 Macc. 5, see Schwartz 1991; Shatzman 2007, 240–242; Brutti 2010, 156–159. For other affinities between Jub. 37:1–38:14 and 1 Macc. 5, see VanderKam 1977, 230–238; VanderKam 2001, 20, 78.
- 26 For this ordinance in Jubilees, see van Ruiten 2000, 238, 300–301.
- 27 The positive portrayal of Jacob in the war narratives indicates that Jubilees regards self-defence as a legitimate act. Cf. the prohibitions against killing and plundering the Gentiles in CD 12:6–8. These injunctions are not absolute but are invalid under certain circumstances, thus indicating that "when necessary, the Jewish people could go to war" (Schiffman 1983, 385).
- 28 In the case of the Edomites, this detail is specifically related to the Jubilean specification that Esau learnt warfare (Jub. 19:14; cf. Gen. 27:40; Amos 1:11). For the link between Esau and military skills, cf. Tg. Ps.-J. to Gen. 25:27, 29; Philo, QG 4:235; Mek. Bachodesh 5, ll. 66–70; Gen. Rab. 63:12; Kugel 1998, 356–359. Jub. 29:11 portrays the

5) Jacob's Sons in Hebron

Both the story of Jacob's warfare with the Amorites and the account of his struggle against Esau indicate that at least some of Jacob's sons were residing in their father's house in Hebron when the attack occurred. The first narrative notes that while the remainder of Jacob's sons were herding their flocks in Shechem:

Jacob, Levi, Judah, and Joseph remained at home with their father Isaac because he was distressed and they were unable to leave him. Benjamin was the youngest, and for this reason he stayed with him (Jub. 34:3).

While the last clause reworks a verse from the biblical Joseph story: "... the youngest, however, is now with our father" (Gen. 42:13), in its new context in Jubilees, it corresponds to the chronological data in the book, which depicts Benjamin as five years old at the time of the Amorite ambush (see Jub. 32:33; 34:1).²⁹ In contrast, Levi, Judah, and Joseph's reason for remaining at home derives from their devotion to their aged and distressed ancestor, the Jubilean author hereby clearly proposing that in so doing they were fulfilling the commandment "Honour your father and your mother" (Exod. 20:12), this obedience enabling them to come to the aid of their ambushed brothers.³⁰ When Esau and his sons attack Jacob and his sons, the latter are *all* in their father's house in Hebron mourning Leah:

Amorites as "evil and sinful" (cf. Gen. 13:13), while his own parents assert that Esau had been "malicious since his youth" (Jub. 35:9; cf. Gen. 8:21) – "For the entire way he acts is (characterized by) injustice and violence and there is no justice about him" (Jub. 35:13). This image of Esau characterizes the Jubilean Jacob cycle (cf. Jub. 19:13–14; 29:14–20; 35:9–18). For the figure of Esau in Jubilees, see Endres 1987, 18–182; Werman 1995, 177–199.

- 29 The conflict story in Jub. 34 also contains other reworkings of the Joseph cycle. The reference in Jub. 34:1 to Jacob sending his sons to herd their flock in Shechem recalls Gen. 37:12–14, the tribute Jacob imposes on the Amorites – "five of their land's products" (Jub. 34:8) – possibly deriving from Gen. 47:24: "And when harvest comes, you shall give one fifth to Pharaoh" (cf. also Gen. 41:34; 47:26). For the former possibility, see VanderKam 1977, 218; Endres 1987, 171 n. 26. For Benjamin, see VanderKam 1977, 229.
- 30 Cf. Jub. 35:12: "He [Jacob] has not separated from us [i.e., his parents] from the day he came from Haran until today. He has continually been living with us at home (all the while) honoring us." Cf. also Jub. 27:6; 29:14–20; 35:10. A similar interpretation of the fifth commandment is attested in contemporary works: cf. Tob. 4:3 (G^{II}) and Sir 3:12 (Ms A).

And [all her sons and his sons] cam[e to weep with him for his wife Leah and to comfort him for her, because he was mourning] for [her (4Q223–224 2 III 17–18 [= Jub. 36:22]; cf. 37:14–17)].³¹

The performance of filial duty – mourning for their mother and consoling their distraught father – thus means that Jacob's family were together to present a united front against Esau's forces as they approached Jacob's house.

Although these two episodes differ in respect to the number and identity of Jacob's sons in Hebron, they both serve to explain how the latter were able to ally together against their enemies. Since Jacob's sons also represent the children of Israel, the Jubilean author also portray the Israelites as observing the fifth commandment. While this theme appears in both stories, it is particularly prominent in the second, which depicts Jacob's sons as acknowledging their father's authority and complying with his wishes:

[They sent word to their father, asking whether they should make peace with them or whether they should kill th]em. [Jacob] sent word [to his sons that they should make peace. So they made peace with them] (4Q223–224 2 IV 30–31 [= Jub. 38:11–12]; cf. also 38:1).³²

This conduct is reinforced by its contrast with Esau's sons' behavior. The latter quarrel with their father, disobey him, threaten to kill him if he does not submit to their will (Jub. 37:1–13), and ultimately leave his body unburied on the battlefield (Jub. 38:8). The depiction of Jacob's sons as observing the ordinance "Honour your father and your mother" is consistent with the Jubilean author's general attempt to represent the patriarchs as being law-abiders, and specifically as being dutiful sons.³³

31 Although Jubilees explicitly states that all of Jacob's sons came to comfort him, at this chronological juncture Joseph is already in Egypt (cf. Jub. 34:11).

32 Cf. Isaac's words in 4Q223–224 2 II 3–4 (= Jub. 35:13): "I, too, kno[w and see the conduct of Jacob who is with us, that with all his heart] he honours us and does our will" (גם אנוכי יוד[ע ורואה את מעשה יעקוב אשר אתנו כי בכל לבו] הוא מכבדנו ועושה רצוננו). The words "does our will" are missing in the Ge'ez of Jub. 35:13.

33 Cf. esp. Jub. 29:14–20; 35:9–18, and section 9 below. This tendency is also apparent in the Jubilean author's efforts to present the patriarchs in a favorable light even where the biblical text portrays them as failing to take care of their fathers: cf. Jub. 12:25–31 (Gen. 11:31–12:5); Jub. 22:1–2 (Gen. 24:62); Jub. 27:1 (Gen. 27:42–46). He likewise takes pains to assert that Jacob and his sons visited Isaac and Rebecca (Jub. 31; 33:1) and dwelt with them in the parental home in Hebron (Jub. 33:21–23; cf. Gen. 35:23–27).

6) Brotherly Love between Jacob's Sons

The two conflict accounts demonstrate the fraternal solidarity which characterizes Jacob's sons. In the war against the Amorites, Levi, Judah, and Joseph go to the aid of their brothers, thus fulfilling the instruction to practice brotherly love between themselves:

He [Abraham] ordered them ... that they should love one another; that they should be like this in every war so that they could go against each one (who was) against them" (Jub. 20:2).³⁴

The Jubilean author highlights the principle of fraternal unity fact by depicting Levi and Judah – Leah's sons – as joining forces with Rachel's son, Joseph. Since Jacob's sons represent the Israelite tribes, this portrayal also reflects the collaboration between the southern tribes (Judah and Levi) and northern tribes (Joseph).³⁵

In the narrative of Jacob's armed resistance to Esau this theme is exemplified by the division of Jacob's sons into four groups composed of brothers from different mothers:

[Then] the sons of Jacob [went out – they and their servants – divi]ded to the four [sides of the fortress.]

(A) [Judah went out] first and Naphtali and Gad [with him and their fifty with] them to the south [of the fortress. They killed everyone whom they found in front of them.] There did not escape from them [so much as one.]

(B) [Levi,] Dan, and Asher [went out to the east of the fortress and their fifty wi]th them. They killed the f[ighting men of Moab and Ammon.]

(C) Reuben went out [and Issachar and Zebulun to the north of the fortress and] their [fift]y with them. [They] k[illed the fighting men of] Philistia.

(D) [Simeon, Benjamin, and Enoch, Reuben's son, went out] to [the west of the fortress, and their fifty with them.] They killed from Ed[om and from the Horites four hundred fighting men, warriors, and six hundred fled]. (4Q223–224 2 IV 20–26 [= Jub. 38:4–8]; numbering added)

The motif of the compass points derives from the depiction of the tribes' encampment in Num. 2 and the "gates of the city" in Ezek. 48:31–34.³⁶ The author of Jubilees reworks this scheme in a unique

34 Cf. also Jub. 46:1; Lambert 2004, 88–90; Livneh 2011.

35 For Judah and Levi as representing the southern and Joseph represents the northern tribes, cf. 4Q372 1:13–15 ויסף זה יוסף בדבריהם ובכל זה יוסף [נתן] בידי בני נאכר [וכל] אמרי כוב ידברו להכעיס ללוי וליהודה ולבנימין בדבריהם ובכל זה יוסף [נתן] בידי בני נאכר; see Schuller and Bernstein 2001. The names "Judah" and "Joseph" as designating the southern/northern tribes respectively appear already in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Ezek. 37:15–22; Ps. 78:67–68; Zech. 10:6).

36 Caquot 1987, 780, notes that these two sources are also reworked in 11Q19 39:11–41:17. For the use of Ezek. 48:31–34 in the Temple Scroll, see Yadin 1983, 1:99–102;

manner, "mixing and matching" sons from different mothers in each group – wives vs. concubines and the Rachel/Bilhah vs. Leah/Zilpah line.³⁷ The homogenized character of the groups exemplifies the fraternal solidarity of Jacob's sons – and the Israelite tribes – paralleling the depiction of their alliance in the war against the Amorites.³⁸

7) The Roles Assigned to Judah and Levi

Levi, Judah, and Joseph possess a distinctive status in the battle against the Amorite kings. The three are referred to as a group, initially remaining at home with Isaac (Jub. 34:3) and subsequently joining Jacob in the combat and pursuing the fleeing Amorites (Jub. 34:6). In the first instance, the Jubilean author presents them as fulfilling the fifth commandment, in the second as practicing brotherly love.³⁹ Their participation in the battle also anticipates their future central role in Israelite history. Joseph is destined to rescue his family from the famine (cf. Gen. 45:7), his portrayal as a deliverer in a war which takes place at Shechem possibly also explaining the inheritance of this region by his clan (cf. Gen. 48:22; Josh. 16–17; 1 Chron. 7:20–28).⁴⁰ In line with the fact that Levi and Judah are the progenitors of the priestly and royal lines respectively, Judah is the only son presented independently of his brothers, being responsible at the eruption of the hostilities for exhorting his father to kill Esau:

2:116–124. A further reworking of this passage appears in 4Q554 1 I-II: see Puech 2009, 91–116.

- 37 In contrast, the organizing principle behind the units in Num. 2 and Ezek. 48:31–34, as well as 11Q19 39:11–41:17 and probably 4Q554 1 I-II, is based on the homogeneity of each group. See also below, section 7.
- 38 The alliance in war between the southern and northern tribes resembles the presentation of the conquest of the land of Israel in Josh. 1–12. Cf. also the similarly tendentious account of the Israelite/Judean wars given by the Chronicler: see Japhet 1989, 267–308.
- 39 See sections 5 and 6 above.
- 40 Although T. Judah, Midrash Wayyisa' u, and Sefer Hayashar all specify by name more than three of Jacob's sons who fought in this battle, Joseph is not included in this inventory. The attribution of a special role to Joseph in the conflict is thus unique to Jubilees, Joseph having already been sold into Egypt according to the biblical chronology when Esau and his sons initiate the attack. Judah's equal role with Levi is also a peculiar Jubilean feature, the parallel narratives all ascribing a much more prominent place in the battle to Judah.

After this Judah spoke to Jac[ob] his father [and said to him: 'Draw your bow, father, shoo]t your arrow, [fell the foe, and kill the ene]my' (4Q223–224 2 IV 15–16 [= Jub. 38:1]).⁴¹

The significant role assigned to Judah is also apparent in the division into four groups (Jub. 38:4–8). While each unit is headed by one of Jacob's four oldest sons, the Jubilean author does not list them in order of birth. Judah – the future king – comes first, his status also being reflected in the statement "[Judah went out] first" (4Q223–224 2 IV 21 [= Jub. 38:5]) and his military prowess highlighted by the words: "There did not escape from them [so much as one]" (4Q223–224 2 IV 22 [= Jub. 38:5]).⁴² The second group is headed by Levi, the inaugurator of the priestly line. Although he follows Judah in order, he is placed towards the east, the cardinal point towards which the Jubilean cartography is oriented.⁴³ Thus while the account of Jacob's war against the Amorites points to the special roles played by Levi, Judah, and Joseph, the narrative of his struggle against Esau highlights the prominence of Judah and Levi respectively. Favorable depictions of Levi and Judah, as well as Joseph, are not unique to the war narratives in Jubilees but also occur elsewhere in the book.⁴⁴

8) Jacob's Forces

Although each of the conflict accounts refers to a different number of Jacob's men – more than six thousand in his war against the Amorites (Jub. 34:6) and a mere two hundred in the combat with Esau (Jub.

41 In light of the above, Goldstein's claim that "Judah has no prominent role in Jubilees 38" cannot be entertained (Goldstein 1983, 79).

42 Cf. the depiction of Judah as going out first in Judg. 1:1–2; 20:18; and the statement "There did not escape from them [so much as one]" (4Q223–224 2 IV 22 [= Jub. 38:5]) to Judg. 3:29; 1 Sam. 30:17.

43 The preeminence of the east is also apparent in the account of the encampment in Num. 2 (cf. also 4Q554 1 I–II; 11Q19 39:11–41:17). For an analysis of the scheme in Num. 2, see, for example, Ashley 1993, 69–75; Levin 1993, 142–144. For a detailed discussion of the "Jubilean map," see especially Alexander 1982; VanderKam 1994.

44 For the positive portrayal of Levi in Jubilees, see Jub. 30; 31:5–23; 32:1–10; 38:6; Kugel 1993; Kugler 1996, 139–170; VanderKam 1996; idem 1999. For the affirmative description of Judah, see Jub. 31:5–23; 38:5; cf. also Jub. 41. For the latter text, see Segal 2007, 59–72; Shinan and Zakovitch 1992, 151. For the favorable depiction of Joseph in Jubilees, see Jub. 39–40; 42–43 (esp. Jub. 39:6–7; 40:8); Niehoff 1992, 41–46; Docherty 2002, 208–212. Cf. also the attribution of auspicious dates of birth (the "memorial days") to Levi, Judah, and Joseph (Jub. 28:14–15, 24). I am indebted to Prof. James L. Kugel for bringing the latter point to my attention.

38:4–8) – both forces consist of the same elements – namely, Jacob, his sons, and the family servants.⁴⁵ These three fighting units occur in both stories in the same order, apparently indicating their hierarchy:

He [Jacob] set out from his house – *he, his three sons, all his father's servants, and his servants* – and went against them with 6000 men who carried swords (Jub. 34:6); th[en] he told his sons [and his servants to attack him and all his companions] (4Q223–224 2 IV 14–15 [= Jub. 37:25]).

Jacob functions as commander-in-chief, both accounts ascribing the commencement of the counterattack and the peace treaty to his initiative (cf. Jub. 34:6, 8–9; 37:25; 38:11–12), as well as the slaying of the enemy commanders.⁴⁶ In the first battle, he kills six Amorite kings (Jub. 34:7), in the second Esau and his companion Aduram (Jub. 38:1–3), thus distinguishing himself from his sons and servants, who merely "pursue" the enemy and/or kill Esau's enlisted troops (Jub. 34:7; 38:4–9).⁴⁷

The description of Jacob and his household as fighting as a unit may derive from the biblical account of Abraham's war against the five kings (cf. Gen. 14:14–15).⁴⁸ As Doran notes, the Jubilean text depicts Jacob as following the footsteps of his grandfather, demonstrating simi-

45 While the large number in the Jubilean account of Jacob's war against the Amorites is possibly intended to demonstrate Isaac and Jacob's great wealth in consequence of the divine blessing (cf. Gen. 26:12–14; 30:43–31:1; 36:6–7), the small number of servants in the Jacob-Esau conflict – which stands in sharp contrast to Esau's large force – serves to magnify Jacob's against-all-odds victory over Esau. A variation also exists with respects to the servants' identity. Whereas in the first conflict Jacob pursues the Amorites with both Isaac's and his own servants, in his struggle against Esau, which occurs after Isaac's death (cf. Jub. 36:18), only his own servants take part in the fighting.

46 Cf. Menn 1997, 128. Jacob's portrayal as the central protagonist in the conflict stories is unique to Jubilees and corresponds to the key status of the patriarch in this book. T. Judah, *Midrash Wayyisa 'u*, and Sefer Hayashar all depict Judah as playing the most prominent role in the battles.

47 While Jacob's sons presumably function as his lieutenants in both campaigns, the servants serving under them, this detail is only implied in the depiction of the four companies in Jacob's army within the narrative of Jacob's self-defence against Esau (Jub. 38:4–8).

48 The first to note the similarities between Jub. 34:1–9 and Gen. 14 was Caquot 1987, 766. This association has been further elaborated by Doran 1989, 1–4, and Werman 1995, 14, who have demonstrated that both the biblical and Jubilean narratives recount the story of a group of kings taking Israelite family members captive and plundering their possessions, the patriarch concerned taking his servants and, pursuing the aggressors, defeating them, rescuing his relatives, and restoring their property.

lar military prowess when this is demanded by the circumstances.⁴⁹ In the context of the Jubilean war accounts, Jacob's victory over the Amorites and Edomites by means of an untrained force augments its dimensions. This is especially true with regard to the second battle, wherein Esau's recruits are consistently portrayed as "select men who are brave in battle" (Jub. 37:6), "select warriors/fighters," and "strong warriors" (Jub. 37:9–10, 14; 38:8). The Jubilean author's delineation of Jacob as supported by family and household members – rather than by professional soldiers – is likewise commensurate with the fact that he is attacked by surprise (Jub. 34:2; 37:14–17).⁵⁰ Together, these elements highlight the fact that Jacob was unsuspecting of and unprepared for either assault.

9) The Portrayal of Jacob

The two narratives we are discussing characterize Jacob as a family man *par excellence*, a distinguished warrior, and a pursuer of peace.

A. Jacob as Family Man

The narrative of the war against the Amorite kings depicts Jacob as both son and father. The former role is reflected in the fact that, while sending his sons to herd the flocks in Shechem (Jub. 37:1; cf. Gen. 37:12–14), he himself stays behind to take care of Isaac (Jub. 34:3). As I have noted above, in the context of Jubilees, Jacob's remaining at home with his aged father expresses his fulfillment of the commandment "Honour your father and your mother" (Exod. 20:12). As a parent, he promptly rises to his sons' aid on hearing that they have been attacked by the Amorites:

It was reported to Jacob: 'The Amorite kings have just surrounded your sons and have carried off their flocks by force.' He set out from his house ... and went against them (Jub. 34:5–6; cf. Gen. 14:13–14).

49 Doran (*ibid*), followed by Werman (*ibid*). Links between Jacob and Abraham also occur elsewhere in the book: cf. Jub. 19:15–31; 22:1–23:8; 25:5. The narrative of Abraham's war against the kings is reworked in Jub. 13:22–29, which interestingly omits the depiction of the actual battle and deliverance of Lot, a feature possibly deriving from the Jubilean author's discomfort with Abraham's intervention on behalf of the sinful ancestor of Moab and Ammon.

50 See section 4 above.

The account of Jacob's struggle against Esau also portrays Jacob as husband, primarily in his mourning for Leah (cf. Jub. 36:21–24; 37:14–17). Although only the latter passage occurs in the conflict narrative itself, the earlier reference immediately precedes this episode. Together, the two texts illustrate Jacob as dutifully burying Leah next to Sarah and Rebecca in the cave of Machpelah and mourning for her with all his sons (Jub. 36:21–22).⁵¹ The Jubilean author represents these ceremonial acts as exemplifying Jacob's love for Leah, whose depth makes him heedless of Esau's assault (cf. Jub. 37:14–17): "He greatly lamented her because he loved her with all his heart and with all his person" (Jub. 36:24).

This conflict account also gives a prominent place to the theme of brotherhood, the Jubilean author closely associating fraternal solidarity with the ordinance "Love your fellow as yourself" (Lev. 19:17–18). As I have noted elsewhere, the Jubilean author interprets the clause "You shall not hate your kinsfolk in your heart" (Lev. 19:17a) as referring to malicious intent, specifically the intent to murder, the reciprocal injunction – to "love your fellow as yourself" (Lev. 19:18b) – being represented as peaceful co-existence, including alliance during time of war. Conversely, the person who seeks to kill his brother will be slain by the brother whom he pursues (cf. esp. Jub. 36:8–11).⁵²

This relational configuration is central to the account of the conflict between Esau and Jacob, Esau being depicted as a law-breaker and Jacob as a law-abider. Thus, while Esau insists that peaceful relations between the brothers are impossible and attacks Jacob with four thousand armed men (cf. esp. Jub. 37:18–23), Jacob orders his men to resist only when he understands that he has no other recourse:

[When Jacob saw that Esau had inclined himself to evil against him from his mind and from his entire soul] to kill him [and] was coming and hurrying [like the pig which comes to the spear that pierces it and kills it but it does not pull back] from it, th[en] he told his sons [and his servants to attack him and all his companions] (4Q223–224 2 IV 13–15 [= Jub. 37:24–25]).

When Jacob eventually shoots his brother with his bow (Jub. 38:1–2), he is thus to be understood as executing righteous judgment against the transgressor of the precept "Love your fellow as yourself."⁵³ Likewise, he himself buries Esau's body and commands his sons to make peace with the Edomites (Jub. 38:9–12). Both in their own right, and most

51 Cf. Gen. 23; Jub. 19:3; 35:27.

52 See Livneh 2011.

53 VanderKam 1977, 230.

prominently in contrast with his brother's evil behavior, Jacob's deeds thus portray him as practicing brotherly love.

In presenting Jacob as a loving husband, dutiful son, dedicated father, and devoted brother the war narratives are consistent with Jubilees' overall emphasis on familial harmony, as well as the author's predisposition towards depicting Jacob in a positive light.

B. Jacob as Warrior

The Jubilean author's propensity towards representing Jacob favorably is also evident in his portrayal of Jacob as warrior. As remarked above, while Genesis gives little indication of Jacob's military prowess, Jubilees transforms him into the principal protagonist of two armed conflicts. According to both the Jubilean accounts under discussion here, although Jacob is taken by surprise by his enemies' assault (according to the second story, also being outnumbered by them), he is victorious in both battles. He slays six of the Amorite kings with the blade of his sword (Jub. 34:7) and kills both Esau and Aduram with his bow (Jub. 38:1–3). This triumph is due in large part to his warfaring skills, Jubilees representing him as such an accomplished marksman as to be capable of hitting Esau and Aduram with perfect symmetry:

Then Jacob drew] his [bo]w, shot [the first arrow, hit] Esau [his brother on his right breast, and killed him. He sh]ot a seco[nd] arrow, [hit Adurim the A]ramaeon on [his left breast, drove him back, and killed him (4Q223–224 2 IV 18–20 [= Jub. 38:2–3]).

Jacob's military skills are even more striking in light of the fact that, rather than learning the art of combat, he is said to have studied the far more valued craft of writing (Jub. 19:14).⁵⁴ The conflict narratives demonstrate that he proves equally adept at brandishing a sword as wielding a pen when circumstances demand.

C. Jacob as Peace-Seeker

Some of the details discussed above also serve to portray Jacob as pursuing peace. Thus although the Jubilean author attributes outstanding military capabilities to Jacob, he himself never initiates any of the conflicts, the account in Jub. 34 identifying the Amorites as opening hostilities, the second narrative ascribing responsibility for the launching of

⁵⁴ For the significance of writing in Jubilees, see Najman 1999.

the attack to Esau and his sons. Jacob's armed resistance is purely a matter of self-defence, the combat being forced upon him against his will.⁵⁵ Secondly, once he has defeated his enemies, Jacob makes peace with them (Jub. 34:9; 38:12).⁵⁶ This fact, prominently noted in both accounts, is preeminently highlighted in Jacob's warfare against Esau:

They sent word to their father, asking whether they should make peace with them or whether they should kill th]em. [Jacob] sent word [to his sons that they should make peace. So they made peace with them] (4Q223–224 2 IV 30–31 [= Jub. 38:11–12]).

Thus, although capable of slaying his foes, Jacob prefers to make peace with them. This conduct stands in sharp contrast to that of his adversaries, the Amorites and Edomites being depicted as battle hungry and bloodthirsty.⁵⁷ Since the Jubilean author regards both fighting and blood shedding as an abomination, Jacob's portrayal as a peace-seeker demonstrates his righteousness and augments his positive image.

10) The Narratival Conclusions

The affinities between the two conflict stories discussed thus far are reinforced by the striking similarity in their literary culmination. Both stories conclude with Jacob making peace with his enemies and imposing tribute and servitude upon them. While these three elements – peace-making, tribute, and vassalhood – are attested in the laws governing war in Deut. 20:10–11, Israelite subjection of the Edomites and Amorites also being known in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Judg. 1:35; 2 Sam. 8:14; 1 Kgs. 9:20–21), these texts do not constitute the only biblical sources of influence on the two conclusions. Two biblical curses –

55 These narratives resemble the biblical account of David's warfare against Ammon and Aram, wherein the Ammonites and the Arameans are portrayed as initiating the hostilities (2 Sam. 10:1–8; 15–17). Like David, Jacob is represented in Jubilees as a peace-seeker, the bellicosity of the Amorites and Edomites in the Jubilean conflict story similarly recalling the battle-hunger exhibited by the Ammonites and Arameans in 2 Sam. 10–12. My thanks to Prof. Reinhard G. Kratz for bringing this point to my attention. Significantly, this biblical episode may well be the source of other details in the Jubilean Jacob-Esau conflict narrative (cf. Jub. 37:9 / 2 Sam. 10:6; Jub. 37:14–17 / 2 Sam. 10:1–6).

56 Cf. Endres 1987, 171, 182. Jubilees is unique in presenting the peace-making as Jacob's initiative, the parallel narratives in T. Judah and the late midrashim describing the defeated peoples as pleading for peace.

57 See section 4 above. Cf. also Esau's sons' categorical refusal to make peace with Jacob (Jub. 37:6).

against Canaan and Esau respectively – also appear to lie behind the Jubilean texts. Canaan being condemned to be "the lowest of slaves to his brothers" (Gen. 9:25), the Jubilean author suggests that this destiny was fulfilled during the patriarchal period by stating that the Amorites "became his [Jacob's] servants."

Likewise, the verse "So they ... placed the yoke of servitude on them" (Jub. 38:12; cf. v. 14) is a reworking of Gen. 27:40: "And you shall serve your brother; but when you grow restive, you shall break his yoke from your neck." This clearly intimates that Jacob's defeat of Esau represents the realization of the curse against Esau.⁵⁸ Both war narratives in Jubilees therefore portray the curses against the gentile nations – as well as the blessing given to Jacob: "Let peoples serve you and nations bow to you" (Gen. 27:29) – as being fulfilled in Jacob's own lifetime.⁵⁹ They further imply that they will be realized by means of armed conflict between Jacob's sons – the Israelites – and the surrounding nations, climaxing in the subjugation of the latter, who will "became his [Jacob's/Israel's] servants until the day that he and his sons went down to Egypt" (Jub. 34:9; cf. 38:13).⁶⁰ Herein, the Jubilean author indicates his view that the curses and blessings can only be realized when the Israelites are living in the Land.⁶¹ The judgment of the surrounding nations is likewise not confined to these Jubilean texts but occurs elsewhere in the book (cf. Jub. 9:14–15; 10:29–34; 23:30; 24:28–33; 36:8–11).

Conclusion

The two Jubilean accounts of "Jacob as warrior" firstly against the Amorites and then against Esau closely correspond to one another. Both form an interpretation of the phrase "with my sword and bow" in Gen.

58 Kugel 1998, 371. Reworkings of the imprecation in Gen. 27:40 recur throughout the first section and the culmination of the conflict narrative (cf. Jub. 37:1–13; 38:10–14), thereby framing the passage as a whole.

59 Gen. 27:29 constitutes Isaac's blessing to Jacob. According to Jubilees, Jacob received this blessing first from Abraham (Jub. 22:1) and then from Isaac (Jub. 26:23–24).

60 While Jub. 38:13 states that the Edomites were Jacob's servants until he went down to Egypt, Jub. 38:14 indicates that these circumstances lasted "until this day." Kugel (*ibid.*), who notes the contradiction between Jub. 38:13 and 38:14, proposes that the latter is a secondary addition.

61 Kugel (1998, 371) suggests that the reference to the vassaldom of the Edomites as lasting until the Israelites "went down" to Egypt in the account about Jacob fighting Esau (Jub. 38:13) is based on an understanding of the phrase וְהָיָה כְּאִשֶּׁר תִּרְיַד (Gen. 27:40).

48:22, the first episode depicting Jacob as wielding his sword, the second his bow. Both narratives are organized according to a numerical principle, Jacob's battle against the Amorites around the figure six, that against Esau around the number four. Both are also located in the only two territories which according to Genesis were purchased by the patriarchs for the full price, thereby emphasizing the occupation of these sites by means of armed struggle. In both, Jacob's sons are resident in the family house in Hebron fulfilling their filial duties when the gentile nations/Esau launch a surprise attack, joining forces against the enemy under Jacob's command, with Jacob refusing to slaughter his foes and accepting their subservience instead.

The Israelites – represented by Jacob and his sons – are set against the gentile nations, represented by the Amorites and Edomites (Esau and his sons). Whereas the Israelites are law-abiders, the nations are lawbreakers. By attacking Jacob's sons in order to destroy them, the Amorites and Edomites transgress the prohibitions against bloodshed and warfare, in the case of Esau and his sons also violating the commandment to honour one's parents and the injunction to practice brotherly love. The Israelites, on the other hand, never initiate hostilities and, when presented with an alternative, refrain from killing and choose peace. When war is forced upon them, however, they prove to be excellent warriors, their victory stemming not only from their military skill but also from their internal solidarity. This unity is the fruit of their fulfilment of the same two ordinances: "Honour your father and your mother" and "Love your fellow as yourself." Their success in battle further signifies the fact that the blessing of superiority given to Jacob is realized in his own days, an exegesis conjoined an invocation of the curse of servitude imposed on Canaan and Esau. The Jubilean author interprets these as being realized via armed conflict, maintaining that their fulfilment is dependent upon the Israelites' residence in the Land of Israel.

While the Jubilean author thus regards bloodshed and warfare as abominable, certain forms of armed conflict are justified. These include the means whereby the right to the land is realized and the fulfilment of Isaac's blessing to Jacob. Jacob exemplifies this complex attitude, being praised both for his military skills and victories and for his peace-loving qualities. The tension between these two value sets is partially resolved by attributing blame for the outbreak of hostilities to the Amorites/Edomites, Jacob/Israel's armed response being purely an act of (legitimate) self-defence.

These findings clearly demonstrate that biblical texts, literary and/or ideological concerns are responsible for many of the details in the

two Jubilean conflict accounts, including such elements as the weapons and military tactics employed, the objectives of the battles, and the number of warriors. While we may consequently conclude that these texts do not reflect authentic historical events, this does not preclude the possibility of that the historical circumstances of the author's own days have exercised some influence. The stress placed on gaining the right to the Land of Israel and fulfilling the ancestral blessing through combat, as well as the emphasis upon Jacob-Israel's military prowess and successes, are thus generally commensurate with such a pugnacious time in Israelite history as the Maccabean period.

Bibliography

- Alexander, Philip S. 1982. Notes on the "Imago Mundi" of the Book of Jubilees. *JJS* 33:197–213.
- Ashley, Timothy R. 1993. *The Book of Numbers*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Becker, Jürgen. 1970. *Untersuchungen zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*. AGJU 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Beer, Bernhard. 1856. *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältnis zu den Midraschim: Ein Beitrag zur orientalischen Sagen und Altertumskunde*. Leipzig: Wolfgang Gerhard.
- Berger, Klaus. 1981. *Das Buch der Jubiläen*. JSRHZ 2/3. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. 1900. Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen, II. *ZNW* 1:187–209.
- Brutti, Maria. 2010. War in 1 Maccabees. In *Visions of Peace and Tales of War*, eds. Jan Liesen and Pancratius C. Beentjes, 147–172. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Caquot, A. 1987. Jubilés. In *La Bible: Écrits Intertestamentaires*, ed. André Dupont-Sommer, 627–810. Paris: Gallimard.
- Charles, Robert H. 1902. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis*. London: Adam and Charles Black.
- De Jonge, Marinus. 1975. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Study of their Text, Composition and Origin*. GTB 25. 2nd edn. Assen: van Gorcum.
- Docherty, S. 2002. Joseph the Patriarch: Representations of Joseph in Early Post-Biblical Literature. In *Borders, Boundaries and the Bible*, ed. M. O'Kane, 194–216. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

- Doran, Robert. 1989. The Non-Dating of Jubilees: Jub 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context. *JSJ* 20:1–11.
- Endres, John. 1987. *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees*. CBQ.MS 18. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Ginzberg, Louis. 1909–1938. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. 1983. The Date of the Book of Jubilees. *PAAJR* 50:63–86.
- Hayes, Christine. 1999. Intermarriage and Impurity in Ancient Jewish Sources. *HThR* 92:3–36.
- Hayward, C. T. Robert. 1995. *Saint Jerome's Hebrew Questions on Genesis*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. 1999. Sexual Relations and Purity in the Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees. *DSD* 6:11–36.
- Hollander Harm W., and Marinus de Jonge. 1985. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. SVTP 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Hultgård, Anders. 1982. *Composition de l'ouvrage textes et traductions*. Vol. 2 of *L'eschatologie des Testaments des Douze Patriarches*. AUU-HR 7. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Japhet, Sara. 1989. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Jellinek, Adolph. 1938. *Bet ha-Midrash: Sammlung kleiner Midraschim und vermischter Abhandlungen aus der älteren jüdischen Literatur*. 6 vols. 2nd edn. Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrmann [Hebrew].
- Klein, Samuel. 1934. Palästinisches im Jubiläenbuch. *ZDPV* 57:7–27.
- Kugel, James. 1993. Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings. *HThR* 86:1–64.
- . 1998. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2006. *The Ladder of Jacob: Ancient Interpretations of the Biblical Story of Jacob and his Children*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kugler, Robert A. 1996. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. Early Judaism and its Literature 9. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Lambert, David. 2004. Last Testaments in the Book of Jubilees. *DSD* 11:82–107.

- Levin, Baruch A. 1993. *Numbers 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AncB 4a. New York: Doubleday.
- Livneh, Atar. 2011. Love Your Fellow as Yourself: The Interpretation of Leviticus 19:17–18 in the Book of *Jubilees*. *DSD* 18:173–199.
- . 2012. *Jubilees* 34:1–9: Joseph, the "House of Joseph," and the Josephites' Portion. *JSJ* 43:22–41.
- Loader, William. 2007. *Enoch, Levi, and Jubilees on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in the Early Enoch Literature, the Aramaic Levi Document, and the Book of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Maher, Michael. 1992. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated with Introduction and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible: The Targums 1/B. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Mendels, Doron. 1987. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in 2. Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*. TSAJ 15. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Menn, Esther M. 1997. *Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38) in Ancient Jewish Exegesis: Studies in Literary Form and Hermeneutics*. JSJ.S 51. Leiden: Brill.
- Najman, Hindy. 1999. Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and its Authority Conferring Strategies. *JSJ* 29:379–410.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 1980. Review of *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*, by James C. VanderKam. *JAOS* 100:83–84.
- Niehoff, Maren. 1992. *The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. AGSU 16. Leiden: Brill.
- Puech, Émile. 2009. Jérusalem Nouvelle. In *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes Araméens Deuxième Partie, 4Q550–4Q575a, 4Q580–4Q587 et Appendices*, 91–152. DJD XXXVII. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rappaport, Uriel. 1993. *The Hellenistic Cities and the Judaization of Eretz Israel in the Hasmonean Period*. In *The Hasmonean State*, eds. Uriel Rappaport and Israel Ronen, 219–230. Yehuda we-Roma: ha-Universita hap-Petuha; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi [Hebrew].
- Rönsch, Hermann. 1874. *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis: Unter Beifügung des revidierten Textes der in der Ambrosiana aufgefundenen Lateinischen Fragmente sowie einer von Dr. August Dillmann aus zwei äthiopischen Handschriften gefertigten Lateinischen Übertragung*. Leipzig: Fues's Verlag.

- Safrai, Ze'ev. 1987. Midrash Wayyisa'u: The War of the Sons of Jacob in Southern Samaria. *Sinai* 100:613–627 [Hebrew].
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1983. Legislation Concerning Relations with Non-Jews in the *Zadokite Fragments* and in Tannaitic Literature. *RdQ* 11:379–389.
- Schmitt, Götz. 1983. *Ein indirektes Zeugnis der Makkabäerkämpfe: Testament Juda 3–7 und Parallelen*. BTA.VO.B 49. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schuller, Eileen, and Moshe Bernstein. 2001. 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^b. In *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri from Wadi Daliyeh and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2*, eds. Douglas M. Gropp et al., 165–197. DJD XXVIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schwartz, Seth. 1991. Israel and the Nations Roundabout: I Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion. *JJS* 42:16–38.
- Schwarz, Eberhard. 1982. *Identität durch Abgrenzung: Abgrenzungsprozesse in Israel im 2. vorchristlichen Jahrhundert und ihre traditionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen*. EHS.T 23/162. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Segal, Michael. 2007. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology and Theology*. JSJ.S 117. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. The Story of Shechem and Dinah in *Jubilees* 30. *Meghillot* 8–9:232–240 [Hebrew].
- Shatzman, Israel. 2007. Jews and Gentiles from Judas Maccabaeus to John Hyrcanus According to Contemporary Jewish Sources. In *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism*, eds. Shaye J. D. Cohen and Joshua J. Schwartz, 237–270. *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* 67. Leiden: Brill.
- Shemesh, Aharon. 2011. The Separatist Halakhot of the Dead Sea Community. In *Revealing the Hidden: Exegesis and Halakha in the Qumran Scrolls*, eds. Cana Werman and Aharon Shemesh, 246–254. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press [Hebrew].
- Shinan, Avigdor, and Yair Zakovitch. 1992. *The Story of Judah and Tamar: Genesis 38 in the Bible. The Old Versions and the Ancient Jewish Literature*. Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press.
- Van Ruiten, Jacques T. 2000. *Primaeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees*. JSJ.S 66. Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C. 1977. *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees*. HSM 14. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- . 1989. *The Book of Jubilees*. CSCO 510–511. Leuven: Peeters.

- . 1994. Putting Them in their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool. In *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, eds. John C. Reeves and John Kampen, 46–69. JSOT.S 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
 - . 1996. Jubilees' Exegetical Creation of Levi the Priest. *RdQ* 17:359–73.
 - . 1999. Isaac's Blessing of Levi and His Descendants in *Jubilees* 31. In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich, 497–519. StTDJ 30. Leiden: Brill.
 - . 2001. *The Book of Jubilees*. Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- VanderKam, James C., and Józef T. Milik. 1994. 4QpapJubilees^b. In *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. Harold Attridge et al., 95–140. DJD XIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Werman, Cana. 1995. The Attitude Towards Gentiles in the Book of Jubilees and Qumran Literature Compared with Early Tanaaic Halakha and Contemporary Pseudepigrapha. PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem [Hebrew].
- . 1997. *Jubilees* 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage. *HThR* 90:1–22.
- Yadin, Yigael. 1963. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Study*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- . 1983. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

Levi, the Levites, and the Law¹

Harald Samuel

The biblical Levi is a rather inconspicuous character. Following his birth and naming, he makes his appearance only in the story of Dinah in Gen. 34, together with his brother Simeon. The two receive their double blessing in Gen. 49 and from that point onwards we only hear of Levi's prominent offspring. This situation changes dramatically in the later Second Temple period. The book of Jubilees and the Aramaic Levi Document (henceforth ALD) in particular develop a fuller biography of Levi. Unlike the biblical character, the "extrabiblical Levi" observes the law painstakingly and instructs his children to do so. Therein, he does not differ significantly from the other patriarchs. However, Levi's relation to the law comprises a conspicuous facet: it is mutual. Not only does the law play a substantial role in Levi's extrabiblical life, but also Levi himself becomes a pivotal figure for the law. Among the many features his "magnetic personality" attracts outside the biblical literature,² that of a priest is certainly the most significant, though he likewise absorbs the characteristics of a king, sage and scribe, and Jubilees and ALD even make him the forefather of the judges. In this paper, I will thus try to illuminate the path that led from the biblical Levi who does not act as a judge, to the extrabiblical Levi who is the ancestor of the judges; in other words, I will trace the exegetical creation of Levi the judge.

However, as the biblical Levi is such an inconspicuous character, he can hardly serve as the appropriate starting point for such a search. It is my conviction that Levi's literary career began as the creation of ancient authors who wanted to comment on the Levites. Later on, his depiction developed in accordance with what mainly priestly authors wanted to

1 My thanks go to Paul M. Kurtz and Ruth Sauerwein for improving my English style and all corrections and also to Janice Karnis for the final editing of this article. Possible remaining mistakes and oddities are my own responsibility.

2 For a discussion of the "magnetic quality of priesthood in Second Temple Literature," see Stone 1987, 582–583; and Angel 2010, 32–52.

say (or not say) about Levitical priests, the priesthood and Levitism.³ Therefore, one cannot understand Levi's elevation to the position of archjudge without examining the role or roles of priests and Levites in the judiciary. A major part of the following pages is thus devoted to describing the developments in the biblical depiction of priestly and Levitical functions within the legal system.

1. Levitical Functions

As a starting point, I would like to consider Deut. 10:8. This verse features a reference to Levites – or better: the tribe of the Levites – followed by a summary of the tribe's functions. Since this reference is the first one in the book of Deuteronomy, it serves as a reading instruction for the whole book. It states:

בעת ההוא הבדיל יהוה את־שבט הלוי לשאת את־ארון ברית־יהוה
לעמד לפני יהוה לשרתו ולברך בשמו עד היום הזה

Three of the tribe's main duties are enumerated: carrying the ark of the covenant of YHWH, standing before YHWH to minister to him, and blessing in his name. All these are cultic in nature. It is noteworthy that other functions, such as instructing the people or the tasks of the Levites in court, do not play a role here. However, this does not necessarily mean that Levites could or did not perform other functions as well. This omission is all the more significant as this verse should be considered part of a late Deuteronomistic *Fortschreibung* with a distinct pro-Levitical stance. It places the (s)election of the whole tribe of the Levites at the Mountain of God and thus attributes to it a revelation-like character. This conception was only later on counteracted by priestly authors who introduced vv. 6–7 to Deut. 10 and thereby displaced the event to "Jotbath(ah), a region of running brooks."⁴ Presumably, we must conclude, therefore, that the author of v. 8 did not consider Levitical participation in court activities to be a characteristic of the Levites, unlike their cultic tasks, and, as such, not an essential part of the ongoing discussion about their status.

3 For details, see Samuel 2012.

4 See Dahmen 1996, 94–106. The ascription of both verses to the E source, popular among source critics, cannot explain the function of the verses in their context and unveils instead a certain helplessness in dealing with the phenomenon of late and latest *Fortschreibungen*.

2. The Blessing of Levi

The blessing of Moses in Deut. 33, too, has a signal function because of its position at the end of this book and at the end of the Pentateuch; last words, of course, always have special importance. Within the chapter, vv. 8–11 concern the blessing on Levi which is full of enigmatic allusions. Notwithstanding the partial incomprehensibility, the passage has been subject to literary-critical considerations. Some scholars assumed that 33:8–10 do not belong to the original poem,⁵ yet a more compelling argumentation leads to the conclusion that only vv. 9b–10 are a later insertion.⁶ This view is primarily based on the classic criterion of *Numeruswechsel*. There is further incoherence relating to the second person singular: in v. 8 it may originally have referred to Israel while in vv. 9b–10 it clearly relates to YHWH. Since the blessing of Moses in its present literary form is certainly not as old as frequently presumed⁷ and vv. 9b–10 are an even later addition, I regard v. 10 as late Deuteronomistic at the earliest; post-Deuteronomistic authorship (as in Deut. 10:6–7), however, appears more plausible.

Verse 10 again presents a task description and in doing so links back to Deut. 10:8. The functions of the Levites now comprise the "teaching of Your laws to Jacob and Your instructions to Israel" (יורו) (משפטיך ליעקב ותורתך לישראל), as well as the "offering of incense and whole offerings" (ישימו קטורה באפך וכליל עלי־מזבחך). The major difference compared with Deut. 10 is the task of teaching. The content of the teaching is the משפטים and the תורה according to the MT (the νόμος according to the LXX), but the תורות according to the Samaritan version and some Peshitta manuscripts. While משפטים are clearly connected to the legal sphere, תורות may rather involve priestly-cultic matters. The singular תורה instead probably refers to a corpus of משפטים and תורות. Since the double plural better fits the poetic parallelism and a change from the less common plural to the weightier singular is easily explicable as a type of interpretation, I tend to prefer the plural reading as being the original. However, even if the reverse is true, the overall picture does not change substantially. At any rate, the members of the tribe of Levi

5 See i.a. Cross and Freedman 1948, 203–204; Mayes and Hastings 1981, 402. Similarly Labuschagne 1974, 108–112, who, however, regards v. 11 as originally belonging to the blessing of Judah. For the text-critical problems and the Qumranic reception, see Fuller 1993.

6 The magnus consensus is to be found in Dahmen 1996, 198–199.

7 For a discussion of the place of chap. 33 within the redactional history of the book of Deuteronomy, see esp. the discussion in Pfeiffer 2005, 178–203.

teach the people משפטים, i.e. legal-judicial matters. This is significant as usually, when pedagogical functions are ascribed to the Levites, these (generally late) passages speak of the ספר התורה (e.g. Deut. 17:18; 2 Chron. 17:8–9) and not, in contrast, of juridical questions in particular.

Deut. 33 then offers one main question when compared with Deut. 10: What connection do the Levites have to the law? For the most part, answers are to be found in Deut. 17 and its redactional history.

3. Increasing Priestly Authority in the Judiciary

Subsequent to the commandment to install judges and officials (Deut. 16:18), Deut. 17:8–13 discusses the following procedure "if a case is too baffling for you to decide" (כי ימלא ממך דבר למשפט), that is, if the local courts are unable to reach a verdict. In such an instance, one has to appeal to the central court at the "chosen place." Since the installation of a central court is closely associated with the measures for cult centralisation, most scholars agree in assigning this passage to an Ur-Deuteronomy.⁸

There is substantially less unanimity concerning the question of how one should envisage the legal procedure itself. Part of the problem is the juxtaposition of the Levitical priests and the judge (v. 9) or the priest and the judge (v. 12). Is there a factual reason for that juxtaposition or does one have to take redactional reworking into account? The latter question has been the subject of considerable debate in literary-critical scholarship, and both parties have variously been declared a later addition.⁹ The argumentative problem is that no grave "fractures" emerge on the surface of the text. Therefore only the context and some general tendencies may, with all due cautiousness, deliver the criteria for the answer to that question.

With respect to context, one must recall the overall structure. The discussion of this particular case follows the general commandment to install judges. Without a judge in v. 9 and v. 12, the passage would be somewhat meaningless. Moreover, most commentators who opt for this solution fail to explain the meaning of the possible insertion of "the judge." A second point concerns the Levitical priests. Their participation is the main difference to the local courts, for their involvement constitutes the higher expertise of the central court in reaching a verdict. Accordingly, one has to take into account that v. 9 speaks of a

8 See Kratz 2000, 122.

9 See the overview in Dahmen 1996, 216–221.

group of Levitical priests as distinct from a single judge. By implication, the process still remains a juridical one insofar as the judge is the leading authority. The Levitical priests, rather, appear to be consultants or legal experts. Thus, I see no compelling reason to assume redactional reworking in this particular verse.

The case is different in v. 12. After the general description of the lawsuit in vv. 8–9 and the admonitions on obedience in vv. 10–11, v. 12 determines regulations in cases of disobedience. There, the text speaks of "the priest charged with serving there YHWH your God" (אֱלֹהֵיכֶם) "or the judge" (אוֹ אֱלֹהֵיכֶם) (הַעֲמִיד לְשֵׁרֵת שֵׁם אֱתֵיְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ). The phrase "Levitical priests" of v. 9 is not reiterated; instead, a single priest is awarded authority alongside the judge, something that obviously exceeds the tasks of the Levitical priests in the sense we have seen so far. Yet, the juxtaposition of two equal authorities contradicts the idea of centralisation, since authority would prove unclear! Insofar, the question of either/or indeed seems justified, and compared to v. 9, we must consider "the priest ..." in v. 12 to be an inserted element. An observation concerning the vocabulary may underpin this supposition: the formula "to stand (before YHWH) to minister" (לְעִמֵּד לְשֵׁרֵת) occurs elsewhere in the book of Deuteronomy only in later texts such as Deut. 10:8 and 18:5, and always in connection with *the tribe* of Levi. In my opinion, Deut. 17:12 is a case of that formula's reception. The verse reuses it and transfers it onto a single person, the priest, perhaps referring to the high priest.

With respect to general (redactional) tendencies, one can adduce further indications from all of the passages concerning priests in the book of Deuteronomy. Apart from those that speak of Levitical priests, none of them belongs to Ur-Deuteronomy; they all are the result of additions and amplifications. Particularly interesting is the law concerning witnesses in Deut. 19. Here again, we find the juxtaposition of priests and judges (v. 17). I am not certain whether there are enough reasons to assume a redactional addition in that verse, but evidently only the judges have a defined function while the role of the priests remains unclear. Thus, even if we have to refrain from literary-critical assumptions, it is still clear that the priests are an alien element to the juridical procedure. In any case, this law in its present form is heavily dependent upon Deut. 17 and may already presuppose the insertion of the priest there in v. 12.

To sum up, I believe the reference to both priest and judge in Deut. 17:12 may be the result of a redactional extension of the text. Originally, it would have only treated the case of obedience to the judge, with a later redactor interpolating "the priest charged with serving there

YHWH your God."¹⁰ If my explanations are correct, then the redactional history of Deut. 17 serves as the key to explaining the different models of Levitical/priestly participation in court proceedings. The starting point is the (subordinate) participation of Levitical priests in the central court as cultic-legal experts in certain cases that are too difficult to decide for the local courts. This is also the state of affairs reflected by Deut. 33: the members of the tribe *teach* the law to Israel. However, as seen in Deut. 10, this function was not considered to be one of the Levites' central tasks. Later additions enhanced the priestly authority and (literally) inscribed its responsibility even in the process of decision-making alongside the judges. Yet – and this is the crucial point – they do not refer to the whole tribe but only to the priests who are now seen as a distinct class within the tribe.

4. The Amplification of Priestly Jurisdiction

Of course, one may question this redactional-critical analysis and interpretation. After all, we are discussing a possible tiny addition, a carefully made insertion, and it would be hazardous to conclude from Deut. 17 (and 19) alone that there is an overall tendency to enhance priestly authority in juridical matters. Yet, as I already indicated, there are numerous examples of late additions related to priestly interests in the book of Deuteronomy.¹¹ Furthermore, some texts outside Deuteronomy demonstrate the tendency to amplify the priestly jurisdiction in a more obvious way. Nevertheless, I needed to dwell on Deut. 17, since this passage is the central text and starting point for the issue of the organisation of the judicial system.

Another important text within Deuteronomy is the end of פרשת שפיטת in Deut. 21:1–9. In case of a homicide by unknown persons, the elders and judges are to determine in which city's remit the corpse falls. After settling this question, the rite of the עגלה ערופה has to be performed. Somewhat surprisingly, in v. 5 the "priests, sons of Levi" enter the stage, though they have no part in the following ritual, and the elders technically manage all right without them:

10 A similar tendency to juxtapose priestly authority alongside that of the judiciary emerges in v. 10b and v. 11, which according to a broad consensus are also a later insertion. V. 11, in particular, parallels תורה ומשפט and תורה, the cultic and the legal realm, both terms elucidating the more neutral דבר המשפט (v. 9; דבר v. 10a). The Levitical priests and the judge thus likewise declare and take responsibility for their decision.

11 E.g. Deut. 21:5 and 26:3–4.

ונגשו הכהנים בני לוי כי במ בחר יהוה אלהיך לשרתו ולברך בשם יהוה
ועל־פיהם יהיה כל־ריב וכל־נגע

The language is conspicuous due to its use of late terminology. Since Wellhausen, it has been acknowledged that v. 5 is a later gloss depending on Deut. 17.¹² The reason for its insertion is immediately evident. According to the later (priestly) ideology, no ritual could be performed without priests at least attending the ceremony. This ideological position even takes precedence over the fact that the priests are officiating far from the temple! Crucial to our question is v. 5b, which states that *every* lawsuit is subject to the priest's ruling. For that reason, v. 5b also influences the understanding of vv. 2–4: without the priests, it cannot be decided which city is responsible for the dead. Hence, in the ritual of the עגלה ערופה the cult serves as the doorway to the expansion of the priestly competences within the judiciary.

Ezek. 44 points in a similar direction, as is particularly obvious when compared with Lev. 10 and Ezek. 22. The classic scope of priestly duties is formulated in Lev. 10:10–11:¹³

ולהבדיל בין הקדש ובין החל ובין הטמא ובין הטהור
ולהרות את־בני ישראל את כל־החקים אשר דבר יהוה אליהם ביד־משה

Ezek. 22:26 states a similar idea, yet as an accusation of what the priests wrongfully did *not* do:

כהניא חמסו תורתִי ויחללו קדשִי
בין־קדש לחל לא הבדילו ובין־הטמא לטהור לא הודיעו
ומשבתותִי העלימו עיניהם ואחל בתוכם

The utopia described in Ezek. 44:23–24 sounds like a direct response to Ezek. 22 but includes one remarkable addition:

ואת־עמי יורו בין קדש לחל ובין־טמא לטהור יודעם
ועל־ריב המה יעמדו למשפט במשפטי ישפטוהו¹⁴
ואת־תורתִי ואת־חקתי בכל־מועדי ישמרו ואת־שבתותִי יקדשו

The priestly responsibility in juridical matters is established in v. 24a, sandwiched between two statements on explicitly cultic matters (vv. 23, 24b). One may wonder if, besides questions of priestly authority, this Ezekielian arrangement suggests that courts are generally seen as a cultic issue. However, this passage is another example of priestly claims within the realm of the law. It is, as already suggested by the

12 Wellhausen 1899, 359, see now also the detailed treatment in Dietrich 2010, 82–83, 372–378.

13 See further Lev. 11:47 and Ezek. 42:20.

14 Wording according to the קרי.

comparison with Ezek. 22, part of a later substantial reworking of the book of Ezekiel and stems from the Persian period at the earliest.¹⁵

5. Genealogical Constructions in Chronicles

The concept of priests as judicial authorities is further developed in 2 Chron. 19:4–11. King Jehoshaphat lives up to his name and organises the courts with measures that closely resemble those in Deuteronomy. Jehoshaphat appoints judges in all the fortified towns of Judah (v. 4, cf. Deut. 16:18) and instructs them that there shall be "no injustice or favoritism or bribe-taking" (v. 7, cf. Deut. 16:19). Finally, he installs a special court in Jerusalem (v. 8):

וגם בירושלם העמיד יהושפט מן־הלויים והכהנים ומראשי האבות לישראל למשפט יהוה ולריבי יושבי ירושלם¹⁶

Then a dichotomy seems to arise: the chief priest has responsibility over the judges concerning "all matters of YHWH," while the commander of the house of Judah has responsibility concerning all the king's matters (v. 11aα):

והנה אמריהו כהן הראש עליכם לכל דברי־יהוה וזבדיהו ברי־שמעאל הנגיד לבית־יהודה לכל דברי־המלך

This doubling matches in some ways the mention of both priest and judge in Deut. 17:12. In both cases, Levitical officers *assist* (2 Chron. 19:11aβ: (ושטרים הלויים לפניכם). Unfortunately, the Chronicler does not tell us how he envisaged the distinction between "the matters of YHWH" and "the king's matters." It also remains an open question as to what function the "commander of the house of Judah" actually had besides the king. The Chronicler has, however, already informed us on his view of the judges. According to 1 Chron. 23, King David when he was "old and full of age made his son Solomon king over Israel (v. 1)." He then makes arrangements for the temple, which has yet to be built. The Levites are counted, and 6000 out of the total 38000 become "judges and officials" (v. 4). 1 Chron. 26:29 even mentions which family line of the Levites was appointed to be judges and officers, namely Chenaniah and his sons, who were Izharites.

Although it is not stated unequivocally in Chronicles that *all* judges have to be Levites, it would seem that six thousand should have been more than enough to satisfy all the juridical needs of the small political

¹⁵ See Rudnig 2000, esp. 358–359.

¹⁶ Wording emended according to the Septuagint.

entity of Judah and even of the Davidic kingdom of the size envisaged by the Chronicler. Therefore, it seems that at least implicitly every lawsuit would be headed by a person of Levitic origin, except perhaps lawsuits concerning the king's matters, which are judged by the somewhat enigmatic "commander of the house of Judah." With the aid of a genealogical fiction, the Chronicler is thus able to carry the idea of the hierocratisation of legal affairs to extremes. I see herein a clear line of development from the Deuteronomic Levitical priests as (subordinate) legal experts (Deut. 17*) via the late or post-Deuteronomistic equation of priests and judges (Deut. 17; 19) through to the Chronicler's incorporation of the judges into the Levitical lineage. Before turning to the consequences of this development for the depiction of Levi himself, we will explore how it is reflected in the Qumran texts.

6. Writings from Qumran

A most instructive insight into the interpretative reading of Deuteronomy at Qumran is given by the Temple Scroll. In col. 56, it repeats the Deuteronomic law on the central court with some variants.¹⁷ Though the beginning of the respective line is not well preserved, one can clearly recognise, in line with some manuscripts of the LXX and Deut. 17:12, the conjunction \aleph instead of the masoretic -ו . Unfortunately, the beginning of the paraphrase of Deut. 17:8–13 is not preserved and we can only surmise how Deut. 17:9 $\alpha\alpha$ was rendered. Also, regrettably, the other Deuteronomic occurrences of the expression "Levitical priests" have no equivalent or are not preserved in the Temple Scroll.¹⁸ But, notably, the paraphrase of the law on the false witness (Deut. 19:15–21) in col. 61 adds the Levites as a third group besides the priests and the judges, and thus differentiates between priests and Levites as two different groups. Though on the one hand one cannot rule out the possibility that already the Temple Scroll's *Vorlage* included the Levites, the

17 See Paganini 2009, 128–136.

18 Deut. 17:18 has its counterpart at the bottom of col. 56, which ends with הכֹּהֲנִים ; the upper margin of col. 57 is not preserved. Yadin 1983, 254 (followed by Paganini 2009, 147) thinks that הכֹּהֲנִים was deliberately written in larger letters in order to fill the last line, i.e. the Temple Scroll would have omitted the הַלְוִיִּם of its Deuteronomic *Vorlage*. This stretches the evidence too far; the first word of col. 57 may well have been הַלְוִיִּם . Col. 57 ll. 19–20, however, mention both priests and Levites, thereby distinguishing between the two groups. Deut. 18:1 was in all probability included at the beginning of col. 60. For Deut. 24:8 and 27:9 there is no equivalent in the Temple Scroll.

author may well have deduced this idea from his reading of Deut. 17:9.¹⁹ It could then be suggested that the two groups were likewise distinguished in the now lost part of col. 56 quoting Deut. 17:9.²⁰ Of course, this remains speculative. However, a court comprising priests, Levites, and judges fits very well with the Temple Scroll's concept of the king's legal advisory board consisting of twelve noble laymen, twelve priests, and twelve Levites (col. 57 ll. 11–14).²¹ Against this background, the addition of והלויים in col. 61 l. 8 appears more likely to be the genuine work of the Temple Scroll's author. Be that as it may, this tripartition leads to one obvious conclusion: Insofar as the Temple Scroll distinguishes between priests, Levites, and judges, it does not propose the idea that *all* judges were of Levitical origin. Nonetheless, if all courts consist of equal numbers of priests, Levites, and (lay-)judges, there is always a (genealogically) Levitical majority. Thus, the Temple Scroll also follows the above-described pattern of increasing priestly-Levitical authority in legal matters.

In both its paraphrasing (and thereby interpreting) of Deuteronomy and its conclusions concerning the question of priestly-Levitical participation in judicial processes, the Temple Scroll is a unique case within the Qumran library. Other texts which were formulated freely and which were concerned with the practical matters of the organisation of the courts within the community came to different conclusions. The Rule of the Congregation states clearly that judges and officials are picked from *all* tribes, not just from Levi (1QS*a* I:15, 24, 29), and this is confirmed in the סרך לשפטי העדה in the Damascus Document (CD X:4–5). According to that prescription, a board of judges shall consist of "four from the tribe of Levi *and* Aaron, and from Israel six men," i.e. six laymen. In contrast, 4Q159 frgs. 2–4 l. 3–4 envisages a court of ten laymen and only two priests.²²

However, the duties of these officials are insignificant when compared with the role of another character. The central figure concerned with legal aspects within the Qumran community is the "overseer" (המבקר) according to the D- and S-traditions (compare esp. CD XIII:7;

19 Thus Milgrom 1978, 501–502. Paganini 2009, 172 n. 573, misquotes Milgrom.

20 Cf. the Peshitta's variant reading in Deuteronomy, which always introduces "and" to the mentioned phrase.

21 According to Baumgarten 1976, 59, the idea of this board is "apparently" derived "from the model of Jehoshaphat's central tribunal (2 Chron. 19:5–11)."

22 On the court system(s) at Qumran, see Schiffman 1983, 23–54.

XIV:8). Among his multiple tasks, he is even to tutor the priests in questions of skin disease (CD XIII:4–5)!

ואם משפט לתורת נגע יהיה באיש ובא הכהן ועמד במחנה והבינו המבקר בפרוש התורה

The texts remain silent regarding the identity of this figure. We learn only that the overseer must be between thirty and fifty years of age (CD XIV:8–9), whereas the "priest who is in charge of the many" is to be aged between thirty and sixty years (CD XIV:6–7). The rules concerning the overseer are thus not only stricter than those for the priests, they also correspond to the prescribed age of service of the Levites according to Num. 4:3. Could this be a subtle hint that the overseer should be of Levitical origin? Is it possible to imagine that someone superior even to the priests should not be at least of Levitical origin himself, given that the Qumran community is usually exceptionally interested in priestly matters, descent and hierarchy? Though it cannot be more than a justifiable speculation, it seems reasonable to envision the overseer as a person of Levitical origin.²³ If this assumption is correct, the ultimate responsibility for the judicial branch would lie in Levitical hands.

The fact that the Qumran texts do not follow the Chronicler's lead in insinuating that all judges originate from the tribe of Levi may, at first glance, appear to be a counterargument against the aim of discovering lines of exegetical development. Yet the putative position of the Chronicler was indeed an extreme one. With a second look, however, it is nonetheless of interest that Levites and priests at all act as judges, respectively that some judges *must* stem from the tribe of Levi. This circumstance should not be seen as self-evident: it is one result of the inner-biblical development outlined above. Furthermore, one should take into account the difference between predominantly exegetical creations of an idealised past, such as Chronicles, and writings concerned with practical needs, like the Qumran texts. Bearing this differentiation in mind, the Qumran texts could serve as a welcome confirmation of our hypothesis, if even they claimed priestly-Levitical prerogatives within the judicial system, i.e. if the "overseer" were a person of Levitical origin.

7. Jubilees and ALD: Levi and his Offspring

Finally, how do all these developments relate to Levi the patriarch? How do the narrative texts in Second Temple literature adapt to these

23 Thus also Brooke 2005, 120–121, 124, and references there to Knibb and Vermes.

developments? As stated above, the figure of Levi receives extraordinarily limited attention in the biblical text, featuring only in the Dinah story in Gen. 34 and the blessing in Gen. 49.²⁴ Yet even in these texts he is not portrayed with particular favour: he does not display proper priestly or Levitical behaviour. Levi seems to be more interested in the executive branch than that of the judiciary; he displays no concern for defilement at all. In Second Temple literature, the situation changes for the most part. In particular, the story of Gen. 34 was of special interest and was frequently and in many different ways reworked.²⁵ It was used as the linchpin for portraying Levi as a priest and as a justification of his installation as such.²⁶

Without a doubt, the interest focuses on Levi specifically as a priest, yet in the wake of Levi's ascent to the priesthood, other features arise. Levi now teaches laws to his children and is depicted as the ancestor of the judges. Thus, the blessing of Levi in Jub. 31:13–17 states (v. 15):²⁷

They will be princes, judges, and leaders of all the descendants of Jacob's sons. They will declare the word of the Lord justly and will justly judge all his verdicts. They will tell my ways to Jacob and my paths to Israel.

Deut. 33 quickly comes to mind, a text which Jub. 31 adopts and expounds. Beyond Deut. 33, the descendants of Levi not only *teach* the law, but they even *judge!* In this respect, the book of Jubilees continues the above-sketched line of inner-biblical development. How this concept is realised in Jub. 30, the narrative elaboration of Gen. 34, remains an open question. Although we read much about justice, the Hebrew original is unfortunately lacking, so we are unable to detect any closer or clearer terminological parallels.

The most important Levi narrative is, of course, the Aramaic Levi Document. This composition ends with a long wisdom poem. Unfortunately, the manuscript (4Q213) shares the unpleasant habit of the Dead Sea fragments of always breaking off in the most interesting sections. Nevertheless, the extant parts resemble Isaac's blessing in Jub. 31: Levi announces he is willing to pass on his knowledge, he speaks about books, and one may decipher the words רֵאשִׁיז וְשֹׁפְטִין, "leaders and judg-

24 Mal. 2 is a special case. The often overlooked reading of the LXX in v. 4 points to an original הלוי also in the Masoretic Text, in accord with v. 8. The masoretic variant represents, thus, a personalisation with pointed emphasis on the role of the patriarch, and is in itself the result of the ongoing process of interpretation.

25 See i.a. Pummer 1982; Kugel 1992; Feldman 2004; and Kartveit 2009, 109–202.

26 See esp. Kugel 1993.

27 See VanderKam 1999.

es,"²⁸ as well as כהנין ומלכין, "priests and kings." It is these offices, then, that his descendants are presumably to hold.

Even before this passage, the Aramaic word דין appears several times: Levi prays that he may always "do true judgement" (דין קשט, 3:17); he is taught the "law of the priesthood" (דין כהונתא, 5:8); and his "judgement is greater than that of all flesh" (6:1). Whereas the "true law" is identified with the "law of the priesthood" (6:2), the word דין occurs once more at the very beginning of the composition in the phrase למעבד לדין, "to do according to the law," in the context of the story of Dinah. We may only speculate that, in this context, "to do according to the law" means to execute God's law on the Shekhemites, namely to execute them. In this case, Levi would stand as both judge and executioner. A regular trial, however, did not take place in the case of the people of Shekhem, unless one counts the counsel of the sons of Jacob as such.

8. Conclusion

As we have seen, Levi is only rarely portrayed as a judge. Although Gen. 34 could have delivered clues for portraying Levi as judge, he is nowhere explicitly depicted as acting in a court. Instead, his descendants are foreseen as future judges.²⁹ The law Levi speaks of in ALD is primarily the law of the priesthood, and more generally the cultic law, but one may wonder if there is any other type of law to be considered. And while the organisational texts from Qumran that include priests and Levites in their judicial boards are not interested in historicising reminiscences of Levi the patriarch, the narrative texts do not treat matters of the organisation of the judiciary. Obviously, Levi does not become the forefather of the judges based on his own merits as a judge; rather, this concept emerges as a by-product of Levi being the arch-priest. In other words, the priesthood is the "magnet" that attracts everything else.³⁰

One may thus state that Levi the judge results from a combination of two lines of development: the ascent of priests within the judiciary and Levi's ascent to the priesthood. We have seen that priestly partici-

28 Drawnel 2004 additionally reads דין in the next line; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004 have דיען, which they neither try to reconstruct nor explain.

29 This idea finally receives an eschatological overtone in the Testament of Qahat (4Q542 frg. 1 col. ii l. 5): Levi's descendants will one day "stand up to judge a judgement" (ותקומון למדן דין).

30 See Angel 2010, 32–52.

pation in the judiciary does not feature in Deut. 10 (probably because it was of minor importance); it was enhanced during the redactional history of Deut. 17, and was fundamentally reformulated in Deut. 19. Offshoots of that development can be found in Deut. 21:5 and Ezek. 44:24a; the genealogical speculations of the Chronicler mark the conceptual peak.

While emphasising the literary level, I do not deny the actual historical motivations behind the texts. The differing attitudes towards the topic undoubtedly reflect changing historical circumstances, yet we can grasp them – if at all – only in their literary, and sometimes historicising, guise. However, the more the corpus of the later biblical texts is growing, and the more authoritative it becomes, the more impenetrable becomes the literary barrier that obstructs the path to historical reconstructions, and purely exegetical issues develop. The creation of Levi as the ancestor of the judges is such a case; his ascent to the priesthood may reflect historical changes; the ascent of priests within the judiciary certainly does. A fuller description of the *historical* development of the judiciary in ancient Israel and Judah and the role of priests and Levites within it remains a future task. At this time, a consensus on the description of the *literary historical* development would already be a great achievement.

Bibliography

- Angel, Joseph L. 2010. The Traditional Roots of Priestly Messianism at Qumran. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls at 60: Scholarly Contributions of New York University Faculty and Alumni*, eds. Lawrence H. Schiffman and Shani Tzoref, 27–54. StTDJ 89. Leiden; Boston: Brill 2010.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1976. The Duodecimal Courts of Qumran, Revelation, and the Sanhedrin. *JBL* 95:59–78.
- Brooke, George J. 2005. Levi and the Levites in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. In *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination*, 115–139. London: SPCK.
- Cross, Frank M., and David N. Freedman. 1948. The Blessing of Moses: Deuteronomy 33. *JBL* 67:191–210.
- Dahmen, Ulrich. 1996. *Leviten und Priester im Deuteronomium: Literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien*. BBB 110. Bodenheim: Philo.

- Dietrich, Jan. 2010. *Kollektive Schuld und Haftung: Religions- und rechtsgeschichtliche Studien zum Sündenkuhritus des Deuteronomiums und zu verwandten Texten*. Orientalische Religionen in der Antike 4. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Drawnel, Henryk. 2004. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. JSJ.S 86. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Feldman, Louis H. 2004. Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus, and Theodotus on the Rape of Dinah. *JQR* 94:253–277.
- Fuller, Russell. 1993. The Blessing of Levi in Dtn 33, Mal 2, and Qumran. In *Konsequente Traditionsgeschichte. Festschrift für Klaus Baltzer zum 65. Geburtstag*, eds. Rüdiger Bartelmus, Thomas Krüger and Helmut Utzschneider, 31–44. OBO 126. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel. 2004. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Kartveit, Magnar. 2009. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. VT.S 128. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Kratz, Reinhard G. 2000. *Die Komposition der erzählenden Bücher des Alten Testaments: Grundwissen der Bibelkritik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kugel, James L. 1992. The Story of Dinah in the *Testament of Levi*. *HThR* 85:1–34.
- . 1993. Levi's Elevation to the Priesthood in Second Temple Writings. *HThR* 86:1–64.
- Labuschagne, Casper J. 1974. The Tribes in the Blessing of Moses. In *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at London 1973*, eds. James Barr et al., 97–112. OTS 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Mayes, Andrew, and David Hastings. 1981. *Deuteronomy: Based on the Revised Standard Version*. NCBC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Milgrom, Jacob. 1978. Studies in the Temple Scroll. *JBL* 97:501–523.
- Paganini, Simone. 2009. "Nicht darfst du zu diesen Wörtern etwas hinzufügen": Die Rezeption des Deuteronomiums in der Tempelrolle. *Sprache, Autoren und Hermeneutik*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte 11. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Pfeiffer, Henrik. 2005. *Jahwes Kommen von Süden: Jdc 5; Hab 3; Dtn 33 und Ps 68 in ihrem literatur- und theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld*. FRLANT 211. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Pummer, Reinhard. 1982. Genesis 34 in Jewish Writings of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. *HThR* 75:177–188.
- Rudnig, Thilo A. 2000. *Heilig und Profan: Redaktionskritische Studien zu Ez 40 – 48*. BZAW 287. Berlin; New York: de Gruyter.
- Samuel, Harald. 2012. Von Priestern zum Patriarchen: Redaktions- und traditions-geschichtliche Studien zu Levi und den Leviten in der Literatur des Zweiten Tempels. PhD. diss., Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (forthcoming in BZAW).
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1983. *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code*. BJSt 33. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.
- Stone, Michael E. 1987. Ideal Figures and Social Context: Priest and Sage in the Early Second Temple Age. In *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*, eds. Patrick D. Miller, Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride, 575–586. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- VanderKam, James C. 1999. Isaac's Blessing of Levi and His Descendants in Jubilees 31. In *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues*, eds. Donald W. Parry and Eugene C. Ulrich, 497–519. StTDJ 30. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill.
- Wellhausen, Julius. 1899. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. 3rd edn. Berlin: Reimer.
- Yadin, Yigael. 1983. *Text and Commentary*. Vol. 2 of *The Temple Scroll*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.

The Burial of the Fathers in the *Visions of Amram* from Qumran

Liora Goldman

The description of Amram's burial of his forefathers – Joseph's eleven brothers – in Canaan is one of the few relatively complete texts to have been preserved in the Aramaic testament known as the *Visions of Amram* (hereafter, VA).¹ The composition comprises the final will and testament of Amram, a Levite and the father of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses, delivered on his deathbed to his sons. Related in the first person singular, it recounts the events of his life, including the visions revealed to him regarding Aaron's and Moses' future role in delivering Israel from Egypt and founding the high priesthood.

In this article, I shall examine the burial account, identifying its features and character by comparing it with the parallel scene in Jub. 46 and the burial motif in the book of Tobit. I shall also investigate the significance of its placement in the overall context of VA and its relationship to the testamentary genre associated with the priestly lineage in general.

The depiction of Amram's journey to Canaan in order to bury his forefathers – and the war between Egypt and Canaan whose eruption delayed his return for forty-one years – has been preserved in five cop-

1 Early after the initial publication of the fragments, scholars drew attention to the fact that the composition belongs to the testamentary genre, exhibiting affinities with other Aramaic testaments from the priestly dynasty such as the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat: see, for example, Starcky 1956, 66–67; Milik 1972a, 77. See also the official edition by Puech 2001a, 283–285. Following Milik, Puech even suggested that the series of testaments constitutes a single work. In a recent comprehensive study, Frey 2010, 359–361, has adduced an array of evidence substantiating the claim that VA belongs to the testamentary genre. Drawnel 2010 opposes the definition and characterisation of the early documents from Qumran on the basis of the features of later testamentary compositions on methodological grounds, arguing that, like ALD and T. Qahat, VA comprises a priestly didactic text. Even if his methodological reservations are justified, however, they are insufficient to disprove the claim that VA is a testament whose didactic purpose is to deliver Amram's ideological testament to his sons and the Israelites in general.

ies of the scroll: 4Q543 3–4; 4Q544 1: 1–9; 4Q545 1a–b ii: 11–19; 4Q546 2; 4Q547 1–2: 1–9.² The fullest text is found in 4Q544. Together with its parallels in the four other copies, this provides a relatively comprehensive picture of the literary unit.

The depiction of the burial forms the third section of VA. This is clearly demonstrated by 4Q545, in which the first part – the framing narrative – is directly followed by the second (Amram's blessing of one of his sons), which in turn leads directly to the third unit, the burial scene.³ 4Q544 1 indicates that a textual sequence exists between the conclusion of the burial account and the fourth literary pericope – Amram's encounter with the two angels.⁴

The description of the burial is related in the first person by Amram, who recounts that a large delegation – including himself, his father Qahat, his cousins, and a group of slaves – set out for Canaan in order to dwell in the vicinity of Hebron and there erect tombs for their forefathers. The extant text does not delineate how or by what means the bones were transported, the implication being that the party carried them from Egypt. The fact that Amram appears to have headed the delegation is suggested by the expression ב[שנת] יישי ב[רשן]תי "in the first year of [my] authority" (4Q546 2: 1). While in Canaan, a rumour of war reaches the party, prompting a large portion of them to return to Egypt. Their mission not yet having been accomplished, Amram's father and wife plead with him to remain in order to fulfill the task.⁵ The ensuing

-
- 2 Although the overlap between these five copies has given rise to a general consensus that they form part of a single composition, scholars are divided with respect to the other copies. Puech 2001a, 283–284, regards seven manuscripts as belonging to 4Q543–4Q549. Trehuedic 2010, 207–208, is unsure whether 4Q548–4Q549 belong to VA. Duke 2010, 35–42, excludes 4Q548–4Q549. In my opinion, while 4Q548 does not belong to VA, 4Q549 should be regarded as a sixth copy, belonging to the end of the text. I hope to devote a separate article to this issue.
 - 3 A textual sequence has been preserved between the first and second sections in 4Q545 1a i. The sequence between the second and third sections is indicated by the two columns of 4Q545 1a: the opening of the blessing given to one of Amram's sons from the second pericope appears at the end of the first column, the bottom of the second column including the description of the expedition to bury the forefathers from the third unit. Lines 1–11 from the second column are missing, probably containing the conclusion of this blessing and perhaps also the blessing of the second son and the beginning of the burial-journey account.
 - 4 For a similar division of the three literary sections, see Duke 2010, 12–19. I differ from Duke in several details regarding the division of the remainder of the composition, which contains no textual continuity between the literary units.
 - 5 The extant fragments do not make it clear whether Jochebed accompanied Amram, returning to Egypt with the remainder of the delegation when rumours of the war

combat, in which the Philistines and Canaanites defeated the king of Egypt, led to the closing of the border. This prevented Amram and those accompanying him from returning to Egypt for forty-one years. Despite its length, Amram remains completely faithful to his wife during the whole period.

The text does not refer by name to the forefathers whom Amram brought to Canaan for burial. Scholars generally concur that they were Joseph's eleven brothers, whose demise in Egypt is related in Exod. 1:6 – which fails to specify where they were interred. Corroboration of this presumption can be found in the allusions to the burial of Joseph's brothers in Canaan shortly after their deaths in other extra-biblical sources. Thus Jub. 46:9, for example, explicitly states that those buried were all Jacob's sons except Joseph, Josephus reflecting the same tradition (Ant. 2.199–200). The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs speaks of the patriarchs as being laid in a coffin and/or their bones being interred in (the Cave of Machpelah in) Hebron by family members (cf. T. Sim. 8:1; T. Levi 19:1; T. Zeb. 10:7; T. Ben. 12:3). On occasion, these testaments expressly note that the burial took place several years following the patriarch's demise, the family continuing their residence in Egypt after his interment and leaving only when the remainder of the Israelites departed.⁶

The members of the large delegation which set out to bury Joseph's brothers are also not identified by name in VA – with the exception, of course, of Amram, the narrator, and his father, to whom he refers by name. Although Amram states that the party included his cousins, it is unclear whether the reference is to his immediate relatives – the sons of his father's brother, Gershon and Merari, each of whom had two sons (Exod. 6:16–18) – or to members of the families of Joseph's brothers, as the parallel in Jub. 46:9 intimates by naming the buriers the "children of Israel." The fact that the description in VA depicts Amram as the protagonist of the scene and intimates that he headed the delegation, everything recounted in the paragraph being associated with him and his family, suggests that the allusion is to members of his close family,

reached it. She could have pressed Amram to remain there even if she was not part of the delegation.

6 See T. Reu. 7:2; T. Sim. 8:2–4; T. Levi 19:5; T. Jud. 26:4; T. Iss. 7:8; T. Zeb. 6–7; T. Dan. 2; T. Naph. 9:1; T. Gad 8:5; T. Ash. 8:3; T. Benj. 12:3. It should be noted that, like VA and Jubilees, both T. Simeon and T. Benjamin associate the account of the burial with the war, T. Simeon referring to it as the "Egyptian war" and T. Benjamin as the "Canaanite war."

descendants of Levi – to whom the composition ascribes the responsibility for burying all Jacob's sons (except Joseph) in Canaan.⁷

The precise place of burial is also unclear in the extant text. Puech reconstructs the text by adducing the delegation's abode in Hebron: *ועמרנא בהברון* "and we dwelt in Hebron" (4Q544 1: 3; 4Q545 1a–b ii: 18), presuming this to be the site of the interment. This reconstruction is based on the status of the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron as the burial plot of the patriarchal family (cf. Gen. 23:19; 25:9; 49:30; 50:13) – together with the parallel references in Jub. 46:9 and Ant. 2.199.⁸

The Biblical Background

The early midrashic exegesis in VA and various other Jewish sources which specify that they were interred in Canaan appears to derive from the fact that the biblical text provides no precise notation of the place of interment of Joseph's brothers following their death in Egypt.⁹ The biblical reticence regarding the burial of Jacob's eleven sons is striking in light of the detailed account of the death and burial of Jacob and Joseph. Gen. 50:1–14 specifies that Jacob was embalmed and mourned over in Egypt, Joseph request's of Pharaoh that he be allowed to bury him in Canaan leading to the departure of a large party – including Pharaoh's slaves, the Egyptian elders under Joseph's direction, and Joseph's brothers – for the Cave of Machpelah, the patriarch being mourned over once again at the threshing floor of Atad. Jacob's request of his sons that they bury him in Canaan is reported in Gen. 49:29–31 and Joseph's in 50:25, Moses' transportation of Joseph's bones at the time of the Exodus being mentioned in Exod. 13:19 and his burial in Shechem recorded in Josh. 24:32.

7 See also VanderKam 2010, 152.

8 Duke 2010, 103–90, concurs that Puech's proposal that the text recounted the forefathers' burial in Hebron is the most plausible reconstruction, also pointing to the link between Genesis and Second Temple literature with respect to the identification of the Cave of Machpelah as the burial plot of the patriarchs – a tradition not adduced in any of the other biblical references to Hebron. Duke draws rather radical historical conclusions regarding the date and provenance of VA from this and the depictions of the war incorporated into the burial descriptions in VA and Jub. 46. Even if the date he suggests corresponds to the findings of Puech's linguistic analysis of VA, however, the premises upon which he bases his theory are unconvincing. Likewise, the development of the exegetical tradition regarding the burial of the patriarchs in the Cave of Machpelah in Hebron is in no need of any anchoring in a specific time or place.

9 Cf. Jub. 46; Josephus, Ant. 2.199–200; T. 12 Patriarchs: see VanderKam 2010, 146.

Jacob's and Joseph's entreaty to be buried in Canaan forms part of the testament they deliver on their deathbed – a significant fact in the context of VA. Part of the testamentary genre, VA constitutes an extensive refashioning and reworking of the biblical idea of the bequest of a worldview and a mandate to the sons.¹⁰

The burial description in VA is clearly based on the literary template of Jacob's interment in Gen. 50:1–14. In both texts, a large delegation headed by a prominent leader sets out from Egypt to bury the patriarch(s) in Canaan, thence returning to Egypt. In the biblical account, Joseph is the protagonist, appealing to Pharaoh for permission to bury his father in Canaan; in VA, Amram assumes this role.

The analogy with Joseph – the ruler and second-in-command to Pharaoh – helps us understand the rather strange notation "the first year of [my] authority" in 4Q546 2: 1. Amram's leadership of the Israelites in Egypt correlates with the biblical account of Joseph, the delegation in both accounts consisting of members of the family of its head – in Joseph's case, his brothers (accompanied by the elders of Pharaoh's house and Egypt and a group of slaves), in that of Amram, his father, possibly his wife, and his cousins. While the presence of the servants can be explained as reflecting Joseph's status, it is less intelligible in the context of VA. Herein, it appears to function as part of the author's endeavour to ennoble Amram by associating him with Joseph. Thus, for example, VA employs the adjective שׂגיא (many) twice in order to accentuate the party's dimensions in line with the expression "it was a very large troop" in Gen. 50:9.

The biblical account states that the embalming of Jacob's corpse lasted forty days, being performed by doctors in Joseph's service (Gen. 50:2–3), Joseph also being said to have been embalmed and placed in a coffin (Gen. 50:26). While the omission of these notations in VA may be due to the fact that they were of no interest to its author, it is also possible that he was uncomfortable with the use of Egyptian methods of preserving the body and its entombment.¹¹ Similarly, its author makes no mention of Jacob's sons' bones, including those of Joseph, being brought up for burial in Canaan in correspondence with Joseph's explicit request: "When God has taken notice of you, you shall carry up my bones from here" (Gen. 50:25; cf. Exod. 13:19; Jub. 46:9). He merely makes use of a verb derived from the root קבר and the noun

10 See below.

11 For embalming and coffins as reflecting Egyptian burial customs, see Shupak 2010. Cf. Gen.R. 100:3, which perceives Joseph's command to embalm Jacob as a sin, causing him to die before his brothers.

אבותנו (our fathers), without referring to the stages preceding their transportation to Canaan for interment. The absence of any reference to the patriarchs' bodies or bones may similarly reflect the author's concern over the problem of corpse-impurity – particularly in light of the fact that all the members of the delegation (with the exception of the slaves) are Levites.¹²

The Agendas behind Jub. 46 and VA

Scholars of VA and Jubilees have unanimously noted the close correspondence between the third section of VA and Jub. 46:6–47:1 – together with the disparities between the two texts. Puech, Halpern-Amaru, and Werman all suggest that the Jubilean author was familiar with the description of the war-time burial in VA, reworking it to suit his own purposes.¹³ VanderKam alternatively argues that, no clear evidence of such dependence existing, the two compositions rather drew on a common earlier source. Duke arrives at a similar conclusion in his analysis of VA.¹⁴ The question of whether or not Jubilees was influenced by VA is irrelevant to the present discussion. Since our focus lies on identifying the intention and function of VA we shall adduce comparisons with Jubilees solely in order to highlight the disparities between the texts. In this way we hope to elucidate the unique features and objectives of the depiction in VA.

-
- 12 In distinction to ALD, VA does not reflect the view that Levi and his sons were already high priests, rather ascribing the foundation of the high priesthood to the days of Aaron and making this detail part of the visions revealed to Amram concerning his sons' destinies (see esp. 4Q545 4 and 4Q547 9). Jubilees, which attributes the Sinaitic laws to the patriarchal period, significantly makes no reference to this issue.
- 13 See Puech 2001a, 285–287; Halpern-Amaru 2005, 136–137, 151–152; Werman 2010, 157. According to Puech, Jubilees' dependence on VA attests to the antecedence of VA, which he views as having been composed at the end of the third century B.C.E. Halpern-Amaru points to the confused text of Jubilees, which notes that some of the delegation remained in Hebron prior to relating the closure of the Egyptian border, for example, suggesting that the discrepancies demonstrate Jubilees' dependence upon a version of VA. Werman demonstrates the Jubilean author's familiarity with a wide and extensive literature (Hellenistic, Jewish, Aramaic, and Jewish Aramaic – such as VA and the Genesis Apocryphon), which he related to and reworked.
- 14 VanderKam 2010, 143, 158; Duke 2010, 100. VanderKam argues that Jubilees appears to have been familiar with the account in VA, despite the fact that no evidence exists that he took from it or was dependent upon it.

The principal elements in which the two accounts diverge are as follows:

a) VA uniquely depicts Amram as the head of the delegation, attributing a central role to him in it when the rumour of war reaches it and most of its members to return to Egypt. Amram remains, with a small group whose names and identities are not given, successfully completing the mission of erecting the forefathers' tombs and interring their remains. Jubilees merely mentions in passing that one of those who stayed in Canaan was Amram, Moses' father (Jub. 46:10).¹⁵

b) While Jubilees identifies the delegation as comprising all the Israelites, without a specific leader, VA portrays it as a Levitical delegation consisting of Amram, his father, his cousins (apparently including the sons of Gershon and Merari), the family slaves, and other family members who, while not being named, are identified by the general designation שגיא'ן מן בני דדי ("many of my cousins") (4Q545 1a–b ii: 14). Gershon and Merari each having two sons (Exod. 6:17, 19), as remarked above, and four undoubtedly not constituting a definition of "many," it is reasonable to assume that the delegation also contained additional men from his family.¹⁶

Halpern-Amaru suggests that the literary reworking of Gen. 50 in Jub. 46 diminishes Joseph's status as the "father of the nation" in favour of a pan-tribal and national tradition according to which all the Israelites participated in the delegation. She regards Jub. 46 as a bridge leading to the conclusion of the process – namely, the Levites' rise to prominence over the house of Joseph.¹⁷ In VA, however, Amram's replacement of Joseph – the person responsible for accomplishing the people's liberation from bondage to redemption in the biblical narrative – is already clear. Herein, the Levites in general, and Amram's family in particular, are represented as the clan which effects Israel's deliverance. Under Amram's leadership, together with the encouragement provided by his father and wife, a group of Levites undertake the task of burying all the patriarchs of the tribes. Despite the war which breaks out in the middle of the enterprise – and which could have easily thwarted its execution – Amram's leadership and dedication assure the accomplishment of the national mission. Likewise, rather than begin-

15 Werman 2010, 157–164, contends that the reference to Amram in Jub. 46:10 is evidence of Jubilees' dependence on VA, being preserved in the text despite the Jubilean author's tendency to minimize Amram's importance in his polemic against anti-Semitic Hellenistic traditions regarding the Exodus.

16 See above, pp. 235 for usage of the adjective שגיא'ן to create an analogy with Joseph's delegation.

17 Halpern-Amaru 2005, 135–140, 148, 152. Cf. van Ruiten 2007, 467–489.

ning his account to his sons on his deathbed with his journey to Canaan, Amram outlines for them the way they should follow – imitation of their father so that they may deliver their people. Thus rather than representing a transition from Joseph's leadership to that of the Levites, the burial expedition and war form constitutive elements of Amram's leadership.

c) The third disparity relates to the various stages of the war and their influence upon the burial of the forefathers, an element which has drawn the attention of numerous scholars.¹⁸ In Jubilees, the eruption of the conflict serves to explain why Joseph's burial was delayed until the Exodus – why he was not interred with his father immediately following his death in Egypt, or even in similar fashion to his brothers who died subsequently. According to Gen. 20:25, Joseph adjures his brothers to take his bones up to bury them "when God has taken notice of you." Like the biblical text itself, Jubilees interprets this phrase to signify the true redemption effected in/by the Exodus. The war and bondage which ensues in its wake is thus responsible for the prolonged postponement of Joseph's burial.¹⁹ The absence of Joseph's brothers' testaments from the biblical text and its silence regarding their fate following their death in Egypt permitted later authors to "fill in the gaps" with a description of their interment during the exile. They thus understood the notation "when God has taken notice of you" as referring to this period.

The story of the burial of Joseph's brothers in Canaan during the third phase of the Egyptian-Canaanite war also enabled the Jubilean author to interpret the verse in Exod. 1:10 – "... in the event of war they may join our enemies in fighting against us" – as intimating not only that the burial took place during the conflict but also that part of the delegation also remained in Canaan. In his eyes, this was proof of their unfaithfulness and treason.²⁰

These two usages of the war narrative in Jubilees are foreign to VA, whose author appears to have been interested in other questions entirely. The account of the combat rather primarily serves his purpose of developing the figure of Amram as the principal protagonist in the affair – and to accentuate his faithfulness to his wife Jochebed by refusing to entertain the possibility of marrying a Canaanite woman during the forty-one years he is detained in Canaan. In Vanderkam's opinion,

18 See Halpern-Amaru 2005, 145–152; Werman 2010, 158–160; VanderKam 2010, 154–155.

19 VanderKam 2010, 142–147.

20 Halpern-Amaru 2005, 144; Werman 2010, 158–159.

this reference is intended to explain his advanced age at the time of the birth of his offspring: Miriam was born when Amram was 106, Aaron when he was 116, and Moses when he was 119.²¹

Endogamous Marriage in VA

In addition to the chronological explanation of the late age in his life at which Amram's children were born to him, the text also appears to seek to stress the importance of Amram's marriage to Jochebed and his faithfulness to her in refraining from taking a wife from amongst the Canaanites, in whose midst he was forced to remain for forty-one years. The patriarchal marriages exemplify endogamy, the prohibition against marrying Canaanite women being repeatedly emphasized (cf. Gen. 24:3–4; 28:1–2). Amram resists taking a Canaanite wife for a long period, emphatically observing his family's marital principle by marrying Jochebed, the daughter of Levi (Exod. 2:1²²) – his aunt.²³ He also marries his own daughter, Miriam, to his brother Uziel – her uncle.²⁴

Although endogamy indubitably holds a notable place in the worldview of the author of VA, however, its precise significance in the composition must be examined. Does it represent a literary reworking of the patriarchal marital model found in Genesis, Amram being presented as their heir in this respect also? Or does it reflect historical cir-

21 VanderKam 2010, 155. Cf. the chronological details given at the beginning of the composition: Amram is 136 when he dies, Miriam at that point being 30 and Aaron 20 (4Q545 1a i: 2–3, 5–6, 8–9). Amram's age when Moses was born can be extrapolated from Exod. 7:7, Aaron's being 20 when Amram dies being Puech's 2001a, 333–334, correct reconstruction of the text: בר שנין [עשרין] (4Q545 1a i: 8–9) – emending Beyer 1994, 86.

22 Cf. the LXX of this verse, which reads "one of the daughters of Levi" – a version which indicates, of course, that Jochebed was not Amram's aunt but a Levite. In contrast, Exod. 6:20, explicitly identifies Jochebed as "his aunt," ALD 71 expressly stating that she was Levi's daughter: cf. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel 2004, 96; Drawnel 2004, 146.

23 The Greek text of T. Levi found in monastery at Athos states, however, that Levi married Milka (from Aram), the daughter of Bethuel and granddaughter of Laban – i.e., his cousin: cf. ALD 62; Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel 2004, 96; Drawnel 2004, 146.

24 The tradition regarding Miriam's marriage to Uziel is unique to VA. Josephus (Ant. 3.105) says that she was the wife of Hur from the tribe of Judah, the grandfather of Bezalel (cf. Exod. 31:2), she too being regarded as the grandmother of the builder of the Tabernacle. In rabbinic literature, Miriam is identified with Efrat, Caleb's second wife: cf. 1 Chron. 2:19; Ex. R. 1:17.

cumstances relating to a (separatist) priestly ideology at whose heart lies the principle of preserving the priestly lineage?

The suggestion that the marriages between aunt/nephew and uncle/niece portrayed in VA are not merely a literary model but an expression of a preferred lifestyle raises several problems.

Lev. 18:12–14 expressly prohibits such marital relationships. The Sages explain Amram's marriage to his aunt by maintaining that Jochebed was merely Qahat's half-sister, on his father's side, or by the fact that the laws given on Sinai were evidently later than the patriarchal period (cf. *bSot* 58b). Jubilees – which claims that the commandments of the Torah were known to the patriarchs – correspondingly makes no reference to the marriages.²⁵

Why were six copies of a composition condoning endogamous marriage preserved in the library of a community whose members denounced such an act (cf. *CD* 5:8–10; *11Q19* 66: 11–17; *4Q251* 17)?²⁶

How is it possible that the priestly circle responsible for VA promoted endogamous marriage in contravention of the Sadducean halakhah characteristic of Qumran, the polemic reflected in the scrolls suggesting that such a form of marriage was in fact practiced by the Pharisees?²⁷

Despite these difficulties, the textual witness indicates that endogamy constituted an important element within the Aramaic testaments belonging to the priestly dynasty. As noted above, despite its severity and separation of Amram from his wife, the war appears to serve the author of VA in developing the figure of Amram as both leader and head of the burial delegation – and, perhaps most significantly – to highlight his faithfulness to Jochebed. In light of the fact that Second Temple Judaism evidences a familiarity with other traditions which claim that Miriam married Hur or Caleb of the tribe of Judah, the author of VA appears to have deliberately chosen to represent her as marrying Uziel, her uncle.²⁸ The author of ALD explicitly refers to the marriage of Levi's daughter Jochebed to Amram and Levi's own marriage

25 White-Crawford 2003, 38–39.

26 *Ibid.*, 38–39. Cf. Werman and Shemesh 2011, 165–176.

27 See Schremer 1995, 18; *idem* 2000, 147–160; Werman and Shemesh 2011, 170–171. Schermer, followed by Shemesh, argues that the Qumran polemic reflected in these laws witnesses to the fact that the prohibition against incest – and marriage between sons and daughter/brother and sister in particular – did not form part of the early accepted Sadducean halakha, while rabbinic support for marriage with a niece being intended to prevent discrimination against the married sister and her expulsion from the family.

28 See above, n. 24.

to Milkah, the daughter of his aunt in Aram, as well as Qahat and Levi's express directives to their sons to preserve the family by refraining from mixing their blood with that of foreigners (cf. 4Q542 1 i: 4–5; ALD 17).²⁹ These factors all suggest that the circle responsible for the composition of the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, and VA practiced endogamy – perhaps in order to preserve the dynasty, its status, and estate, and maybe also its purity. In this light, Puech's proposal that these three texts were all composed within a pre-Essene/Qumran priestly circle is quite plausible.³⁰

The Affinities between VA and Tobit

Burial and endogamy also constitute central motifs in the apocryphal book of Tobit, thereby inviting an examination of its correspondence with VA in order to understand how each document employs these elements.³¹ An analysis of the two works reveals that, despite the striking divergence in literary styles, VA belonging to the testamentary genre and Tobit being a novella, they share several common features – more than have been identified by other scholars to date.

Both documents appear to have originally been written in Aramaic at the end of the third century/beginning of the second century B.C.E. Despite the fact that the early copies found at Qumran are generally dated to the middle/end of the second century B.C.E., the compositions themselves appears to have been penned prior to the sectarian litera-

29 In ALD, Jacob commands Levi to marry a woman from the daughters of his own family in order to preserve the "holy seed." This expression derives from Ezra 9:2, where it forms part of the diatribe against mixed marriages. The prohibition against mixing with foreigners is in fact linked to the issue of mixed marriages – which, while associated with is not identical with endogamy. Biblical exogamous marriages are not necessarily marriages with foreigners but can also be inter-tribal. Nor is the promotion of endogamy solely for the purposes of separation from non-Jews. While in Genesis, ALD, and the Testament of Qahat from Qumran the two ideas are closely related, the patriarchs' marriages with daughters from within the family in Aram being arranged in order to prevent their matrimony with Canaanite women, the two aspects must be discussed separately – a necessity which Duke 2010, 110–111, fails to observe.

30 Puech 2001b, 61; cf. Duke 2010, 110–111. Duke associates this circle with separatist priestly groups resident in Hebron who opposed the mixed marriages in which the high priesthood in Jerusalem was engaging in the second century B.C.E. Such an identification of the location of this group of priests in Hebron on the basis of the forefathers burial in VA – apparently in Hebron – is far from convincing, however.

31 See Trehuedic 2010, 207.

ture.³² The fact that five copies of Tobit were discovered at Qumran, one in Hebrew and the remainder in Aramaic, suggests that the text was composed in Aramaic and thence translated in Hebrew, its Aramaic also being very similar in form to that of VA.³³

The historical background of both texts is that of exile. VA identifies Amram's death as occurring in the one hundred and fifty-second year after the Israelites' descent to Egypt: *בשנת מאה] וחמשים וחרתיך לג[לות* (4Q545 1: 3–4). Tobit describes Israelite existence in Assyria, apparently in the wake of Shalmaneser V's conquest (Tob. 1:2). Whereas the future envisioned in the revelations given to Amram is that of the end of the exile, his sons being destined to lead the people out of Egypt, however, Tobit's horizon is limited to the present. While the book concludes on an optimistic note, Tobit learning of the fall of Nineveh before he dies (14:15), the redemption anticipated by the prophets remains a far-off dream, to be preceded by the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple (14:4–5).

The two documents are also characterised by the delivery of the family patriarch's final testament on his deathbed. While this element is incorporated into Tobit, however, it forms a constitutive part of the structure of VA, as the opening scene indicates. Aware of his imminent death, Tobit asks his son to bury him and his mother together in proper fashion (4:3–21). Towards the end of the book (14:3–11), he again calls his son Tobias to him, telling him to go to Media and predicting Israel's eschatological redemption.³⁴ While Tobit's testament combines the personal/familial with the far-distant national deliverance, however, Amram's is entirely national in character.

The burial of Israelites in exile in accordance with the Pentateuchal ordinances is also a recurrent motif in Tobit (cf. 1:18–20; 2:3–8), being responsible for the afflictions he suffers, imperial plots, blindness, and his wife's estrangement – the motive for the plot. Tobit is characterised

32 Although the three earliest copies of VA come from the second half of the second century B.C.E., Puech 2001a, 284–287, suggests – on the basis of the Aramaic and in line with his assumption that Jubilees 46 is familiar with VA – that the composition should be dated to the first half of the second century, perhaps even to the end of the third century B.C.E. He also notes the linguistic resemblance between the Aramaic of VA and that of Tobit, both being close to that in the book of Daniel. While the earliest copy of Tobit found at Qumran (4Q199) dates to 100 B.C.E., Fitzmyer 2003, 52, and other scholars argue for its composition between 225–177 B.C.E.

33 These texts (4Q196–4Q200) were published by Fitzmyer 1995; idem 2003, 22–25.

34 Moore 1996, 163–164, 293–294, considers both testaments to constitute literary imitations of Moses' two testaments in Deut. 31–33, the paragraph in chap. 14 more closely resembling the accepted testamentary style.

by his showing of compassion to the dead, including observance of the commandment not to leave a corpse unburied overnight (Deut. 21:23).³⁵ Seven references to burial occur in the book, including Tobit's testament to his son. The fact that Tobias ensures that not only his own parents but also his wife's are given a dignified burial suggests the idea of "imitatio patri":

and he buried him [Tobit] honourably. And when Anna his mother was dead, he buried her with his father. But Tobias departed with his wife and children to Ecbatane to Raguel his father in law, where he became old with honour (Tob. 14:12).

The repeated attention paid to the respectful interment of one's parents demonstrating that it was interpreted as constituting part of the injunction to "honour your father and your mother."³⁶ Tobit's burial of non-family members indicates that interment in accordance with the biblical ordinances also carries a national import.

This aspect is even clearer in VA, Amram and his family undertaking the task of bringing all the tribal forefathers for burial in their inheritance in the land. The symbolic status of burial in VA is also accentuated, the interment of the forefathers constituting an example of "the actions of the fathers serve as a sign for the sons": just as Amram returns the tribal ancestors to Canaan, so his sons will restore the whole nation.

Although both texts ascribe great importance to burial, each does so for its own purposes. In Tobit, the act serves to signify the possibility of exilic existence through performing the commandments – including that of honouring one's parents and burying the dead.³⁷ In VA, it constitutes the first step in bringing exilic life in Egypt to an end and the rise to prominence of Amram and his sons.

The principle of endogamy appears to be far more central and significant in Tobit than VA. In the former, it constitutes the ideal, non-endogamous marriage being regarded as dangerous and life-threatening. All the married couples who appear in Tobit are members of a single family, Tobias and Sarah's matrimony being accomplished through the aid of the angel Raphael and leading to a watershed in the

35 Bolyki 2005, 90–95.

36 Ibid.

37 The book dealing with performance of the commandments, it details matters relating to observance of the law, including the necessary time of burial and purity/impurity issues (Tob. 2:4–9). This contrasts with VA, which exhibits no interest in these elements. For the possibility that Tobit's acts of purification following his burial of the dead reflect the sectarian halakhah of "graded purity," see Eshel 1997, 9; Noam 2010, 218–219.

events described – Tobit's healing from blindness and Sarah's deliverance from destruction. All the relationships between the personages in Tobit being intra-familial, including social business ties, the view that this text represents endogamy as the optimal form of life for exilic existence appears to be correct.³⁸ In contrast, while this motif occurs in VA, it is not presented as an ideal but serves primarily to preserve the patriarchal marital model and to highlight Amram's morality in his faithfulness to Jochebed. As in Genesis, endogamous marriage make it clear who is the proper heir. Amram is thus the direct successor of Levi, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham.³⁹

The two texts also describe two opposing angelic figures.⁴⁰ Tobit identifies these as Raphael and Asmodeus, VA as Melkiresha (among other names) and his counterpart – who speaks with Amram but whose name has not been preserved in the extant text. Tobit portrays Raphael as bearing the likeness of a human being in the form of his nephew Azarias – under whose direction Tobias meets Sarah and subsequently marries her. Raphael-Azarias thus saves Sarah by liberating her from the power and influence of Asmodeus – as well as healing Tobit of his blindness. Asmodeus is the evil spirit responsible for killing all seven of Sarah's previous husbands on their wedding night – none of whom were from her family and thus inappropriate marital partners. Raphael is therefore the angel who heals and delivers and Asmodeus the spirit who kills.

The scene of the encounter between Amram and the two angels is one of the most well-known and familiar passages in VA.⁴¹ The angels are revealed to him in the first vision he is given and represent the "two ways" between which he must choose: life or death.⁴² Amram is apparently asked to whose domain he wishes to subjugate himself, his preference for the angel who speaks to him over the dark-countenanced

38 Dimant 2009; Hieke 2005, 12–13. Although the latter stresses that the importance of this motif in Tobit reflects the actual practice of this form of marriage, its primary purpose is literary, serving to demonstrate the possibility of Jews living in the exile who observed the commandments – including that of endogamy – gaining divine redemption.

39 For this understanding of endogamous marriage in Genesis, cf. Hieke 2005, 115–116.

40 Although Collins 2005, 37–40, notes the belief in angels and their prevalent mention as being widespread in Second Temple literature, this does prove that Tobit and the books of *Enoch* belong to a common milieu, as scholars have already pointed out. According to Collins, Tobit is an example of popular, pan-Jewish literature and not associated with the priestly literature of the Second Temple period.

41 For earlier studies, see, for example, Milik 1972b; Puech 2001a, 322–329; Goldman 2010.

42 See Goldman 2010, 426–432.

and intimidating Melkiresha representing his choice of life. Not only does this act affect Amram's own life but it also constitutes one of the principles he bequeaths to his sons in his final testament. In both texts, the protagonist(s)' encounter with the angels is close and intimate, the "good" angel embodying the force of life, healing, and redemption.

The numerous correspondences between Tobit and VA we have noted in this brief review help sharpen the divergences between the two texts with regard to their respective reworking of the motifs of burial and endogamous marriage. While in Tobit these two elements symbolize the proper way of life in exile, in VA they function to help develop the figure of Amram as the successor of the forefathers and the person who signifies the possibility of the end of bondage in Egypt.

Conclusions

In VA, Amram is transformed from the secondary character of the biblical text into the central protagonist. In contrast to the Hebrew Bible, where Amram is merely said to be "a certain man of the house of Levi" (Exod. 2:1), his significance deriving solely from the fact that he is Moses' father, in VA he becomes a key link in the Levitical dynasty and a central figure in his own right, to whom God reveals visions and whose acts serve as a sign for the future destiny of his sons.⁴³ The account of the burial of the forefathers in Canaan plays a key role in his portrayal as leader, successor of the patriarchs, and the bridge between the days of bondage in Egypt and the Exodus accomplished by his sons. In contrast to Jubilees, wherein the burial-enterprise is undertaken by all the people, Amram being one of those who remained in Hebron, the expedition in VA constitutes a Levitical "project" under Amram's direction. Although the mission originates with some of the members of his extended family, it is only through Amram's initiative that it actually sets forth – despite the outbreak of the Canaanite-Egyptian war. In and through it, Amram is portrayed as a devoted leader whose protracted separation from his wife and family is incapable of foiling his mission.

Amram's transformation into the patriarch's successor is achieved by means of a reworking of motifs from the biblical patriarchal narratives – preeminently reflected in his faithfulness to Jochebed, a daughter of the family. It is also embodied in the comprehensive reworking of the forefathers' interment on analogy with the story of Jacob's burial in

43 For Amram as a developed character with a voice and deeds in the para-biblical literature, see van der Horst 2007, 491–498.

Genesis. The principal reason behind the introduction of the idea of endogamy into the burial depiction thus appears to be literary – perhaps accompanied by the secondary rationale of preserving the distinctiveness of the Levitical lineage in the face of intermarriage. While this understanding of endogamy is not accentuated in VA it is clearly apparent in the Aramaic Levi Document and the Testament of Qahat, both of which appear to have been composed within the same circle as that responsible for VA.

The numerous affinities between Tobit and VA attest that the ideas of exile and redemption held a central place in compositions dating to the end of the third century–first half of the second century B.C.E., being shaped in diverse literary forms by various literary circles. The description of the forefathers' burial represents a significant symbolic theme in the testament, wherein Amram takes pains to inter not merely his own grandfather Levi but all the tribal forefathers, thereby demonstrating his commitment to the whole nation of Israel. Having blessed his sons, he follows his account of the burial of his forefathers with the angelic revelation regarding their destinies, thereby making the interment part of his bequest to them. His testament is thus transformed from a personal, familial will to his sons into one bearing significance for all the descendants of Jacob in analogous fashion to Jacob's testament to his sons.

Bibliography

- Beyer, K. 1994. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Bolyki, János. 2005. Burial as an Ethical Task in the Book of Tobit, in the Bible and in the Greek Tragedies. In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004*, eds. Géza György Xeravits and József Zsengellér, 89–101. JSJ.S 98. Brill; Boston: Leiden.
- Collins, John J. 2005. The Judaism of the Book of Tobit. In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004*,

- eds. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, 23–40. JSJ.S 98. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Dimant, Deborah. 2009. The Family of Tobit. In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, eds. Károly D. Dobos and Miklós Közeghy, 157–162. Hebrew Bible Monographs 21. Sheffield: Phoenix Press.
- Drawnel, Henryk. 2004. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text From Qumran: A New Interpretation of The Levi Document*. JSJ.S 86. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. The Initial Narrative of the *Visions of Amram* and Its Literary Characteristics. *RdQ* 96/24:517–554.
- Duke, Robert R. 2010. *The Social Location of the Visions of Amram (4Q543–547)*. Studies in Biblical Literature 135. New York: Peter Lang.
- Eshel, Esther. 1997. 4Q414 Fragment 2: Purification of a Corpse-Contaminated Person. In *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*, eds. Moshe Bernstein, Florentino García Martínez and John Kampen, 3–10. StTJD 23. Leiden: Brill.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1995. 4QpapTobit^a ar, 4QTobit^{b-d} ar, and 4QTobit^e. In *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*, eds. M. Broshi et al., 1–76. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2003. *Tobit*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Frey, Jörg. 2010. On the Origins of the Genre of the "Literary Testament": Farewell Discourses in the Qumran Library and Their Relevance for the History of the Genre. In *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-en-Provence, 30 June-2 July 2008*, eds. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, 345–375. StTJD 94. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Goldman, Liora. 2010. Dualism in the *Visions of Amram*. *RdQ* 95/24:421–432.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael Stone and Esther Eshel. 2004. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Halpern-Amaru, Betsy. 2005. Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in Jubilees 46. In *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by*

- the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002*, eds. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements, 135–152. StTDJ 58. Leiden: Brill.
- Hieke, Thomas. 2005. Endogamy in the Book of Tobit, Genesis and Ezra-Nehemiah. In *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pépa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004*, eds. Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, 103–120. JSJ.S 98. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Milik, Józef T. 1972a. 4QVisions de 'Amram et un citation d'Origène. *RB* 79:77–97.
- . 1972b. Milkî- edeq et Milkî-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens. *JJS* 23:95–144.
- Moore, Carey A. 1996. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 40A. New York: Doubleday.
- Noam, Vered. 2010. *From Qumran to the Rabbinic Revolution: Conceptions of Impurity*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi [Hebrew].
- Puech, Émilie. 2001a. 4QVisions de Amram^{a-s} ar. In *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549*, 283–405. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 2001b. 4QTestament de Qahat ar. In *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie, 4Q529–549*, 257–282. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schremer, Adiel. 1995. Kinship Terminology and Endogamous Marriage in the Mishnaic and Talmudic Periods. *Zion* 60:5–35 [Hebrew].
- . 2000. Qumran Polemic on Martial Law: CD 4:20–5:11 and Its Social Background. In *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*, eds. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick, 147–160. StTDJ 34. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill.
- Shupak, Nili. 2010. Funeral and Burial in the Story of Joseph. *Beit Mikra* 55/1:84–93 [Hebrew].
- Starcky, Jean. 1956. Le travail d'édition des manuscrits de Qumrân. *RB* 63:49–67.

- Trehuedic, Kévin. 2010. Les visions du testament d'Amram A–E; F (?); G (?): 4Q543 – 4Q544 – 4Q545 – 4Q546 – 4Q547 – 4Q548 (?) – 4Q549 (?). In *Torah: Exode, Lévitique, Nombres. Édition et traduction des manuscrits hébreux, araméens et grecs*. Vol 2 of *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân*, eds. Katell Berthelot and Thierry Legrand, 207–230. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Van der Horst, Pieter W. 2007. Moses' Father Speaks Out. In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 491–498. JSJ.S 122. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Ruiten, Jacques. 2007. Between Jacob's Death and Moses' Birth: The Intertextual Relationship between Genesis 50:15–Exodus 1:14 and Jubilees 46:1–16. In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, eds. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 467–489. JSJ.S 122. Leiden: Brill.
- VanderKam, James C. 2010. Jubilees 46:6–47:1 and 4QVisions of Amram. *DSD* 17:141–158.
- Werman, Cana. 2010. The Book of Jubilees and Its Aramaic Sources. *Meghillot* 8–9:135–174 [Hebrew].
- Werman, Cana, and Aharon Shemesh. 2011. *Revealing the Hidden: Exegesis and Halakha in the Qumran Scrolls*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute [Hebrew].
- White-Crawford, Sidnie. 2003. Traditions About Miriam in the Qumran Scrolls. In *Women and Judaism*. Vol. 14 of *Studies in Jewish Civilization*, eds. Leonard J. Greenspoon, Ronald A. Simkins, and Jean A. Cahan, 33–44. Omaha: Creighton University Press.

The Patriarchs and Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls¹

Lawrence H. Schiffman

The purpose of the following study is to examine an interesting and important contrast. Whereas the book of Jubilees associates the patriarchs – Abraham, Isaac and Jacob² – with observance of Jewish law, the rest of the Qumran corpus barely mentions them in this context. We must emphasize even at the outset the qualitative difference between what we will see in Jubilees and the other materials we will examine. In the book of Jubilees, we will observe the patriarchs fulfilling Jewish laws in detail. In the other materials, we will see general statements about the patriarchs' faithfulness to God's Torah and commandments. To the extent that more general statements of this nature appear in other works in the Qumran corpus, in fact, they are derived from the conceptual framework that underlies the detailed exposition in Jubilees. We should note also, giving away our conclusions in advance, that we see no distinction in this regard between texts authored by the Qumran sectarians and those brought into their library. The one exception to this, besides Jubilees, may be the Aramaic Levi Document (ALD).³

-
- 1 A. J. Berkovitz of Yeshiva University was of great assistance in preparing this manuscript for publication.
 - 2 This study limits itself to the classical three Jewish forefathers who are termed *'avot* by the rabbinic sages. While this term is usually translated by the English "patriarch," we recognize that its meaning in a non-rabbinic context was much wider. Some sources term some of the antediluvian figures as patriarchs. In addition, "The word occurs in the Septuagint for the chiefs of the tribes (e.g. 1 Chron. 24:31; 27:22, *patriarchai ton phylon*; cf. 2 Chron. 23:20 etc.); in the New Testament (Heb. 7:4) it is applied to Abraham as a version of his title 'father of many nations' (Gen. 17:4), to David (Acts 2:29), and to the twelve sons of Jacob (Acts 7:8–9). This last became the special meaning of the word when used of Scriptural characters. The heads of the tribes were the "Twelve Patriarchs" (Catholic Encyclopedia).
 - 3 In ALD, Isaac instructs Levi regarding the details of sacrificial procedure. See Schiffman 2005. However, at no point does this work describe observance of Jewish law in pre-Sinaitic times.

Because of the sheer volume of the material in Jubilees, it will be best to set out in summary what can be found regarding the link of the patriarchs to *halakhah* in other materials preserved at Qumran first. This paper will not deal with wide-ranging references to the covenant(s) with the patriarchs, a topic that we have dealt with elsewhere.⁴ Nonetheless, we should note two expressions that can refer to the patriarchs in some covenantal contexts: *rishonim*,⁵ "first or early ones," and *'avot*,⁶ literally "fathers," that is, patriarchs. These terms often appear with *berit*,⁷ "covenant," as they do in the Hebrew Bible. In virtually all usages of these terms, however, they do not specifically refer to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. It appears that the Scrolls had a wider definition of patriarchs.

Sectarian Texts

The Admonition at the beginning of the Zadokite Fragments puts forth the concept that the patriarchs did not go astray and violate the covenant. We learn in CD 3:2–5 that:

Abraham did not live by it (the idolatrous way of those who came before him) and was considered God's friend, because he observed the commandments of God and he did not choose to follow the will of his own spirit; and he passed them on to Isaac and to Jacob and they too observed them. They too were recorded as friends of God and eternal partners in the covenant. *vac* But the sons of Jacob went astray by them and were punished for their errors.⁸

This passage puts forward a general statement that Abraham was successful in passing on his unique relationship with God and his unique way of life to his son Isaac and his grandson Jacob, but makes no mention of Ishmael or Esau. Yet despite the continuity of the patriarchal tradition through Jacob, the passage makes clear that Jacob's sons transgressed, and his grandsons, in Egypt, committed terrible sins, including eating blood (lines 5–7).

4 See Schiffman 2004. On covenant in the Dead Sea Scrolls, see Hultgren 2007, 1–140, 409–492. See also Evans 2003; Abegg 2003. For covenants relating to Jacob see Swanson 1994. See also Najman 2003.

5 CD 1:4; 4:9; 6:2; 8:17; 19:29; 4Q267 2:7; 4Q268 1:12; 4Q269 2:5; 6Q15 3:5.

6 CD 8:15, 18; 19:28; 19:31; 1Q28b 2:1; 1QM 14:8 (?); 4Q385a 18a–b 1:9 (?); 4Q393 3:6.

7 With *'abot*: CD 8:18; 19:31; 1Q28b 2:1; 1QM 14:8 (?); 4Q385a 18a–b 1:9 (?). With *rishonim*: CD 1:4; 4:9; 6:2; 4Q267 2:7; 4Q268 1:12; 4Q269 2:5; 6Q15 3:5.

8 Unless otherwise noted, translations of Dead Sea Scrolls text come from Tov 2006.

Specific mention of Abraham's circumcision appears in CD 16:4–6 (4Q270 [4QDe]6ii:17–19):

On the day a man promises to return to the Law (Torah) of Moses the Angel of Obstruction (Mastema) will leave him, if he keeps His (God's) words. That is why Abraham was circumcised on the day he gained true knowledge.

This passage puts forward a very particular understanding of Abraham's rite of circumcision. According to this passage, it was a sign of Abraham's accepting the Torah of Moses. In other words, this passage assumes that part of Abraham's transition, evidenced by his circumcision, was a commitment to the observance of the not-yet-revealed Torah.⁹ The rite of circumcision, according to the passage, protected Abraham from the harmful angel Mastema. While we will be returning to this below, it is appropriate to note that we are clearly in the ideal world of Jubilees, which identifies Mastema as the arch force of evil, albeit under God's command.

Circumcision appears again in CD 12:11, a passage that prohibits an owner from selling a slave to non-Jews, "who have entered with him into the covenant of Abraham." This clearly refers to the legal institution referred to by the rabbis as the "Canaanite slave,"¹⁰ that is, a non-Jewish servant who is in the process of conversion to Judaism. For this reason, this servant has already been circumcised and has taken on some of the commandments, and may not, therefore, be sold to non-Jews. For our purposes here, the key point is that circumcision is linked directly to the patriarch Abraham, as is the case, of course, in Genesis and in Jubilees.

The Bible relates (Exod. 24) that after the revelation at Sinai, Moses sprinkled blood of the covenant on the children of Israel. 4Q158 (Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus) 4, adapting Exod. 24:4–6, then tells us that Moses sprinkled the rest of the blood "upon the altar which I had shown to Abraham..." Since the text refers specifically to "the mountain of the Lord" and Mount Sinai (vv. 13–14), the text intimates that Abraham had previously been shown an altar on Sinai.

4Q158 (Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus) 1–2 tells the story of Jacob's wrestling with the angel. While the text basically follows Gen. 32:25–32 (with a quotation afterwards of Exod. 4:27–28), it adds an interesting detail. In v. 33, the text substitutes "on the two hip sockets"

9 Our interpretation implicitly rejects the emendation from *nimmol*, "was circumcised," to *nišsal*, "was saved." See Ginzberg 1976, 95.

10 Schiffman 1985, 36–37.

for the biblical "the thigh muscle that is on the socket of the hip."¹¹ This passage makes the point that the sciatic nerve may not be eaten whether from the right or left leg of an otherwise kosher animal. This point accords with one of the two views debated by the rabbis,¹² and indeed was accepted as rabbinic halakhah.¹³ Although the Pentateuch associates the prohibition of the sciatic nerve with the patriarch, this text expressly projects back a specific legal ruling regarding the fulfillment of this commandment into the life of Jacob. It is unfortunate that the text is so fragmentary so that we cannot know if the angel injured both of Jacob's legs during the wrestling match.

Pre-Sectarian Texts

The patriarchs are sometimes associated with tithing. The Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20 22:17–18) relates that after his defeat of the kidnapers of his nephew Lot, Abraham came to Melchizedek at Salem:

Then he (Abram) gave him a tithe of all the property that had belonged to the king of Elam and his allies.

Aramaic Levi Document, 4Q213b 4–6,¹⁴ as restored according to the geniza manuscript (= 1Q27 4 1 that is very fragmentary), has Levi describe how Jacob fulfilled his promise, made after his vision of the ladder to heaven, to tithe all his possessions:

Then wh]en Jacob my father tithed [everything which he possessed in accordance with his vow, now I was first at the head of the priesthood] and to me of his sons he gave [a gift of [] to God, and he invested me in the priestly garb and he consecrated me and I became a priest of the G]od of eternity.¹⁵

Especially significant from our point of view is the fact that these texts are closely linked in their ideas with Jubilees and a variety of pre-Qumran texts. It is clear that these ideas of halakhic fealty on the part of the patriarchs, especially found in Jubilees, represent a distinct trend in Second Temple Judaism.

11 NJPS.

12 tHul 7:1. See Lieberman 1938, 2:237–238.

13 Rambam, *Hilkhot Ma'akhalot Asurot* 8:1. See also Shulkan Arukh Yoreh De'ah 65:5.

14 For other translations and further discussion see Kugler 1996, 88–93. Greenfield, Stone, and Eshel 2004, 70–71, 147–165. See also Drawnel 2004, 249–254, 359.

15 Brooke et al. 1996, 41.

Jubilees and the Patriarchs

The greatest bulk of material pertaining to the subject available in what we generally designate as the Dead Sea Scrolls comes from one work, the book of Jubilees. While Jubilees has survived in fragmentary manuscripts at Qumran, it is clear that the text as a whole was part of the Qumran library. Its quotation in the Zadokite Fragments (Damascus Document)¹⁶ indicates that the Qumran sectarians regarded it as authoritative,¹⁷ perhaps even canonical. It was not composed at Qumran, but constitutes part of the pre-Qumran textual heritage that helped to form the sect as we know it.

The sheer volume of material from Jubilees, which we will summarize topically below, will help to support our overall view that any and all passages at Qumran relating to the patriarchs and halakhah stem from the larger pre-Qumran sectarian tradition of which Jubilees is a major exemplar. However, one might argue that this prominence is simply due to the fact that we were able to make use of the full book of Jubilees, whereas other Qumran compositions are by and large fragmentary and might have contained much more material on this topic. Such an argument cannot be disproved. We should remember, however, that the one Qumran sectarian text that features this idea prominently is also the one text that explicitly quotes Jubilees by name. We would argue, therefore, that the source of these ideas – to the limited extent that they do appear in the scrolls – is the tradition of texts such as Jubilees and Aramaic Levi Document stemming from the pre-Maccabean period.¹⁸

Jubilees¹⁹ substantially stresses Abram's turn away from idolatry to the worship of the one God. "[Abram] separated himself from his father that he might not worship idols with him" (11:16). "And he began to pray to the Creator of all things that He might save him from the errors of the children of men" (11:17). In chap. 11, Abram argues with his father that idols are of no use, but Terah defends his manufacture of idols as his means of earning his livelihood (11:6–7). At the age of 60, Abram sets fire to the "house of the idols" and witnesses the death of Haran, his brother, who enters the flames to save the idols (11:14). Abram then observes the sun and moon and stars and realizes that God is in charge of them (12:16–17).

16 CD 16:3.

17 Schiffman 1994, 167.

18 Schiffman 2006. See also Wacholder 1990, 257–281.

19 Translating like Charles 1902, 118.

Abram then becomes a full-fledged worshipper of God. He prays to God, who directs him to leave Ur of the Chaldees and promises him that he would become a great and blessed nation (11:21–23). In his travels in Canaan, he builds an altar and offers a burnt sacrifice (13:4, 13:9, 13:16). God commands him to take various animals and sacrifice them, pouring the blood upon the altar. This is the covenant of the pieces, (14:9, 14:11) where Jubilees states "Abram renewed the festival and ordinance for himself forever" (14:20). The covenant of the pieces is the precursor of the covenant at Sinai, both of which take place on Shavuot according to the author's calendar.

He also observes some of the agricultural laws. Abram designates a tenth of his first-fruits to the Lord, "and the Lord ordained it as an ordinance for ever that they should give it to the priests" (13:25–26, cf. Lev. 14:20),

And to this law there is no limit of days; for He hath ordained it for the generations for ever that they should give to the Lord the tenth of everything, of the seed and of the wine and of the oil and of the cattle and of the sheep (cf. Gen. 14:20).

Abram celebrates the first fruits of the grain harvest (15:2) and thereafter acquires the name Abraham.

God commands Abraham to circumcise all males, infants on the eighth day (15:11–14), and changes Sarah's name as He promises her a son. After the birth of his son, Isaac, Abraham immediately circumcises himself, his son, all males born in the house, and all male servants that he had purchased (15:23–24). This "eternal ordinance," written on the "heavenly tables," is an assurance that Abraham and the children of Israel belong to the people of God and that "they will not be rooted out of the land" (15:28). "Sons of Beliar," who have not performed circumcision, incur God's wrath for having forsaken His covenant (15:33–34). Further, Lot's children, conceived through incest, would eventually be destroyed (16:9).

Isaac was born on the festival of the first fruits and was the first to be circumcised on the eighth day (16:13–14). Isaac would continue the Jewish line while any other progeny of Abraham would be Gentiles (16:17–18).

Abraham observes the Jewish festival of Sukkot. Abraham builds an altar and celebrates a "festival of joy" (16:20), which is identified in the next verse as the Feast of Tabernacles for which Abraham builds booths for himself and his servants, and makes elaborate sacrifices for seven days (16:21–25). The sacrifices include seven types of animals, seven of each, and seven spices on seven days. The festivities were limited to those who were circumcised. The festival that Abraham

called "The festival of the Lord," and which is ordained for all time, was observed by Abraham with "branches of palm trees, and the fruit of goodly trees, and every day going round the altar with the branches seven times [a day] in the morning" (16:31). V. 30 mentions "wreaths upon their heads," "leafy boughs," and "willows from the brook." It does not attribute their use directly to Abraham, but explains how the festival is observed in later times according to the "heavenly tables" (16:28).

After Abraham attempts the sacrifice of Isaac that God averted in favor of a ram, Abraham returns to Beersheba, a journey of seven days, and declares a seven-day joyous festival to be celebrated every year, also "ordained and written on the heavenly tables regarding Israel and its seed" to be observed throughout the generations (18:18–19). It is not certain, however, which festival this is.

Abraham calls together his entire family, his sons and grandsons by his three wives, and admonishes them to conduct themselves righteously, love their neighbors, do justice, circumcise all males, avoid fornication and uncleanness, avoid taking "wives from the daughters of Canaan" (20:2–4), "reject the pollution of sin," and never make "molten or graven gods" (20:7–8; 21:5). To Isaac he adds the prohibition on eating blood of the sacrifices, which he then outlines in detail (21:6–17), including the laws of eating the sacrifice within two days, using salt, bringing certain types of wood for the fire, washing of the hands and feet before approaching the altar, and covering the blood with dust. The mention of sacrificial blood brings Abraham to command that the blood of men must be submitted to judgment and no bribes can be countenanced, "for the earth cannot be cleansed from the blood of man save by the blood of him who shed it" (21:19).

For the last time in Abraham's life, he celebrates "the feast of weeks – that is, the feast of the first fruits of the harvest" in Beersheva with his sons, Isaac and Ishmael, and Jacob (22:1). "Isaac offered a sacrifice for a burnt-offering on the altar of his father" and "Rebecca made new cakes from the new grain" (22:3–4). In his blessing of Jacob, Abraham warns him not to eat with "the nations," that is non-kosher food, not to offer sacrifices to the dead, nor eat over their graves (22:16–17), and not to marry a Canaanite woman (22:20). All those who worship idols and perform abominable deeds, he predicts, will be destined for destruction; Jacob and his seed will be forever blessed and preserved.

We have already encountered the central theme of the prohibition of intermarriage. Rebecca makes Jacob promise not to marry a Canaanite woman, and he assures her that he had not touched any woman and would guard himself against fornication and lust (25:4–7). He plans to

marry a daughter of Laban, his uncle. On his way to Laban's house at Bethel, he vows to give one-tenth of all his possessions to God (27:27). When he intends to marry the younger of Laban's daughters, Rachel, before the older, Leah, and is tricked into marrying first Leah, then Rachel, Jubilees informs us that it is "wicked" to allow the younger to marry first, and the heavenly tables say that it is evil (28:6-7).

With the story of Dinah, who was raped by Shechem as "a little girl, a child of twelve years" (30:2), Jubilees reminds us that a man may not contract a marriage for his daughter or sister to a Gentile, and that the punishment for doing so is stoning (30:7). A woman who marries a Gentile should be burnt, and adultery will not be tolerated (30:7-8). All these things would constitute a profanation of the sanctuary (30:16). Simeon and Levi execute judgment on the Shechemites and are judged as righteous and rewarded (30:17-19).

Jacob makes everyone in his household give up their strange gods and idols, which he then destroys (31:2).

Isaac blesses Levi as the lineage that will produce princes, judges, and chiefs and "The blessing of the Lord will be given in their mouths to bless all the seed of the beloved" (31:15). To Judah he gave the throne (31:20). Jacob gave tithes of all his possessions (32:2, 5), and sacrificed on the altar one-tenth of his animals. He tithed all the clean animals (32:8), and established the second tithe from which nothing shall be left over from year to year. If it is left, it must be burnt. After the celebration of the feast for seven days, Jacob ordains an eighth day called "Addition" that he observed, namely Shemini Atzeret.

Reuben lay with Bilhah, Rachel's maid (33:10). The deed is so abominable that the heavenly tables ordain that both the man who lies with his father's wife and the woman shall be put to death, as it is a source of uncleanness, contamination, and pollution (33:19).

When Joseph's brothers sold him to Ishmaelite merchants and dipped his coat in animal's blood to suggest that a wild beast had devoured him, they showed Jacob the coat on the tenth day of the seventh month. This day is observed ever after as the Day of Atonement (34:18).

Joseph in Egypt, tempted by Potiphar's wife, remembers the words of Jacob, his father, who used to quote Abraham saying that no man should commit fornication with a woman who is married (39:6).

Conclusions

Our investigation has shown that the Qumran sectarians saw no links between the patriarchs and the observance of Jewish law except those

stated in the Bible, namely circumcision in the case of Abraham and the prohibition of the sciatic nerve (of both legs) in the case of Jacob. The extensive eisegesis, whereby the biblical narrative is read to make the claim that the patriarchs observed the Mosaic Law, is limited to Jubilees, Aramaic Levi Document and the Genesis Apocryphon, three closely related works of a pre-Qumran tradition. The full-fledged argument that Mosaic festivals and laws were observed in pre-Israelite times is, in fact, made only by Jubilees. We would argue that this is one of the main purposes of Jubilees, for which reason we cannot accept the notion that the *halakhic* material in that book constitutes a secondary addition to the storyline.²⁰

Our previous studies indicated that earlier scholars were correct in understanding Jubilees to belong to the Sadducee/Zadokite trend in Jewish law.²¹ Yet not all texts representing this strand have exactly the same legal rulings or ideology. Our study of the sacrificial halakhah of the Aramaic Levi Document²² found that among its rulings were views that we normally associate with the Pharisaic-rabbinic system in Jewish law. This study finds that the Aramaic Levi Document also shares the notion of connection between Jewish law and the patriarchs. It should not surprise us, therefore, to see that a similar idea has found its way into the rabbinic tradition.²³

In general terms, rabbinic aggadah seems to have absorbed quite a number of Second Temple traditions despite its rejection of the Sadducee/Zadokite approach to Jewish law. Numerous aggadic passages interpret the Pentateuch on the assumption that patriarchs observed Sinaitic law even before the giving of the Torah. Whereas in the case of Jubilees and the related literature it appears that this assumption was designed to push God's covenant with Israel further back into antiquity and to lend it greater authority, in the rabbinic passages, the purpose is often simply to justify actions recorded in the name of the patriarchs in light of later Jewish law. Nonetheless, some very similar details appear that lead us to the conclusion that these traditions derived from earlier Second Temple material. Further, we should note that the appearance of such traditions from the third century on fits a general trend in rabbinic literature whereby material from the Second Temple period seems to have somehow been "resuscitated" and begins to exercise a new influence on the rabbinic corpus. For this reason, similar aggadic details

20 Segal 2007, 45–46, 94, 317–322.

21 Albeck 1930, 36. See also Geiger 1949, 315.

22 Schiffman 2005, 177–202.

23 mQid 4:12 (late addition to Mishnah), bYoma 28b (early Babylonian amoraic).

to those in Jubilees begin to appear in Talmudic and midrashic literature.

To sum up, the notion found in Jubilees and in related literature according to which the patriarchs may be associated with observance of laws later given at Sinai is virtually nonexistent in the sectarian corpus from Qumran or in nonsectarian works beyond the Jubilees circle. It emerges only later to justify certain specific actions of the patriarchs, devoid of its original ideological purpose.

Bibliography

- Abegg, Martin. 2003. The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarials. In *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo, 81–98. JSJ.S 71. Leiden: Brill.
- Albeck, Chanoch. 1930. *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*. Hochschule für die Wissenschaft des Judentums 47. Berlin: Scholem.
- Brooke, Georg J., et al. 1996. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Catholic Encyclopedia. *Patriarch and Patriarchate*.
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11549a.htm>.
- Charles, Robert H. 1902. *The Book of Jubilees: Or the Little Genesis*. London: Black.
- Drawnel, Henryk. 2004. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. JSJ.S 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Evans, Craig A. 2003. Covenant in the Qumran Literature. In *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period*, eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo, 55–80. JSJ.S 71. Leiden: Brill.
- Geiger, A. 1949. *The Bible and its Translations: Connections to the Internal Development of Judaism*. Jerusalem: Bialik [Hebrew].
- Ginzberg, Louis. 1976. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. MorS 1. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel. 2004. *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary*. SVTP 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Hultgren, Stephen. 2007. *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. StTDJ 66. Leiden: Brill.

- Kugler, Robert. 1996. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. Early Judaism and its Literature 9. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Lieberman, S. 1938. *Tosefeth Rishonim, a Commentary Based on Manuscripts of the Tosefta and Works of the Rishonim and Midrashim in Manuscripts and Rare Editions*. 4 vols. Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann [Hebrew].
- Najman, Hindy. 2003. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJ.S 77. Leiden: Brill.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1985. *Who was a Jew: Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism*. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav Publication House.
- . 1994. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
- . 2004. The Concept of Covenant in Qumran Scrolls and Rabbinic Literature. In *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*, eds. Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman, 257–278. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2005. Sacrificial Halakhah in the Fragments of the Aramaic Levi Document from Qumran, the Cairo Genizah, and Mt. Athos Monastery. In *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran. Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Study Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002*, eds. Esther G. Chazon, Devorah Dimant and Ruth A. Clements, 177–202. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2006. Pre-Maccabean Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Biblical Tradition. *DSD* 13:348–361.
- Segal, Michael. 2007. *Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. JSJ.S 117. Leiden: Brill.
- Swanson, Dwight D. 1994. "A Covenant Just Like Jacob's": the Covenant of 11QT 29 and Jeremiah's New Covenant. In *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization of Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*, ed. George J. Brooke, 273–286. StTDJ 15. Leiden: Brill.

- Tov, Emanuel, ed. 2006. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library: Introduction, Texts and Images, English Translations, Hebrew Scripture*. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University; Leiden: Brill.
- Wacholder, Ben-Zion. 1990. The Ancient Judeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 B.C.E.): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts. In *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman, 257–281. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Shabbat, Circumcision and Circumcision on Shabbat in Jubilees and the Dead Sea Scrolls¹

Aharon Shemesh

Introduction

Several scholars have discussed the importance of the Sabbath and circumcision in the book of Jubilees. Both topics are associated with the election of Israel, and both are treated by Jubilees in a similar manner.²

In the description of the first Sabbath, the Angel of the Presence tells Moses that God commanded the two orders of greater angels – those of the presence, and those of the holiness – to rest with him on the Sabbath in both heaven and on earth.

[He said to us: I will now separate for myself] a people among my nations. And [they will keep the Sabbath. I will sanctify them as my people, and I will bless them. They will be my people and I will be their God.] And he chose the descendants of Jacob among [all of those whom I saw and I registered them for me as the first-born son and consecrated them to me] for ever and ever the [seventh] day [I will teach them so that they keep the Sabbath on it above all. For I blessed them and consecrated them as an exceptional people] among all the peoples so that together [with us] they keep [the Sabbath and he lifted up his statutes like a pleasant perfume which is acceptable in his presence] every day. [There are twenty-two patriarchs] from Adam to him and twenty <two> ki[nds of works were done up to the seventh day. One is blessed and holy and the other is blessed]

1 Translated by Amit Gvaryahu and final editing by Janice Karnis (Haifa). Translations of the Hebrew Bible are according to the Authorized Version, Jubilees according to Vanderkam 1989, and Maccabees according to Goldstein 1976, unless otherwise noted. The Dead Sea Scrolls are translated according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997, and Mekhilta according to Lauterbach 1923, with many modifications by the translator. All other translations are the translator's. Verses quoted in other sources are italicized.

2 Segal 2007, 238-239, and also n. 2 ad loc.

and holy. One and the other were made together for holiness [and for blessing. To this one was granted to be blessed and holy forever].³

The election of Israel is thus an integral part of creation. This is signified by the emphasis in Jubilees that twenty-two acts were included in creation before the Sabbath, which correspond in number to the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob, whose descendants are "the children of Israel," the elect, who are "holy and blessed," and were added by God to the two orders of greater angels who were to rest on the Sabbath with God.

Just like the Sabbath, circumcision is a sign, and Israel's adherence to this commandment makes them close to the angels:

For [circumcision] is what the nature of all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation (Jub. 16:27).

Circumcision as a sign that distinguishes between the elect and nonelect originates on the first day of creation, joined now by Israel, elected to be "with Him and his holy angels." Michael Segal emphasizes that the dualistic division between circumcised and uncircumcised angels anticipates the same division on earth between circumcised and uncircumcised people.⁴ Jubilees goes further and stresses:

This law is (valid) for all history forever. There is no circumcising of days,⁵ nor omitting any day of the eight days because it is an eternal ordinance ordained and written on the heavenly tablets. Anyone who is born, the flesh of whose private parts has not been circumcised by the eighth day does not belong to the people of the pact which the Lord made with Abraham but to the people (meant for) destruction. Moreover there is no sign on him that he belongs to the Lord, but (he is meant) for destruction, for being destroyed from the earth, and for being uprooted from the earth because he has violated the covenant of the Lord our God. For this is what the nature of all the angels of the presence and all the angels of holiness was like from the day of their creation. In front of the angels of the presence and the angels of holiness he sanctified Israel to be with him and his holy angels.⁶

The emphasis on the timing of the circumcision, no later than the eighth day, is especially important to Jubilees. This assertion is later used to explain why, of the two sons of Abraham, only Isaac is the bearer of the election, because "he was the first to be circumcised according to the covenant which was ordained forever" (Jub. 16:14). This

3 Jub. 2:19–23, according to 4Q216 (4QJub^a) VII:9–14, VanderKam and Milik 1994, 19. The Ethiopic offers a longer version of vv. 20–21. See Vanderkam 1989, 22.

4 Segal 2007, 239–240.

5 On this expression and its possible meanings, see Segal 2007, 233–236.

6 Jub. 15:25–28.

is also why Jubilees chooses the Festival of First Fruits to be Isaac's birthday, as it is the feast of the annual renewal of the covenant and, like the Sabbath, was celebrated in heaven at creation:

For this reason it has been ordained and written in the heavenly tablets that they should celebrate the festival of weeks during this month – once a year – to renew the covenant each and every year. This entire festival had been celebrated in heaven from the time of creation until the lifetime of Noah [...].⁷

Against this backdrop, the accusation:

I am telling you that the Israelites [...] will not circumcise their sons in accord with this entire law [...]. All the people of Belial will leave their sons uncircumcised just as they were born,

is best explained following Menahem Kister.⁸ The verse contains two accusations: the first, against the "sons of Israel," and the second, against all "sons of Belial." The latter are those who leave their children uncircumcised "as they were born," but the others are accused of circumcising "not in accord with this entire law." This may mean that they are not careful to circumcise on the eighth day. Jubilees is most likely criticizing the Pharisees who allowed the postponing of circumcision until after the eighth day in certain cases. This indeed is the halakhic tradition of the Mishnah:

A boy is circumcised on the eighth [day after birth], the ninth, the tenth, the eleventh, the twelfth. No less and no more. How so? In the usual manner, on the eighth. If he was born at twilight, he is circumcised on the ninth. At twilight on Friday, he is circumcised on the tenth. If there was a festival after the Sabbath (before which he was born), he is circumcised on the eleventh. [If there were] two days of the New Year (after the Sabbath before which he was born), he is circumcised on the twelfth.⁹

This law in the mishnah is based on two legal assumptions. The first is that a baby is never circumcised before the eighth day, and so if he is born at twilight his circumcision is postponed until the ninth day. And the second is that a timely circumcision overrides the Sabbath. These two assumptions come together to form the law that a baby born on

7 Jub. 16:17–18.

8 Jub. 15:33; Kister 1985, 7 n. 26. My remark here is only "following" Kister, and is not identical to his suggestion that there is one accusation here directed at those who do not circumcise properly. This reading is due to the later date Kister ascribes to Jubilees, according to which it is implausible that Jubilees is reacting against Hellenized Jews who did not circumcise their sons at all.

9 m. Šabb. 19:5.

twilight on Friday is circumcised on the tenth day, and on the eleventh or even the twelfth if the tenth/eleventh is a holiday.

The Sifra derives the law that circumcision overrides the Sabbath thus:

And on the eighth [day] the flesh of his foreskin will be circumcised. Even on the Sabbath. What do I uphold [The Sabbath's] desecrators will surely be put to death? – regarding all other work except circumcision. Or do I uphold Its desecrators will surely be put to death even concerning circumcision And thus I uphold (circumcised on the eighth day), except on the Sabbath? Scripture says on the day, even on the Sabbath.¹⁰

Did sectarian law agree with the assumption that circumcision overrides the Sabbath? The rest of this paper will demonstrate that the answer to this question is negative.

War and Saving Lives on the Sabbath

First Maccabees preserves the earliest known treatment of the question of observing the Sabbath when faced with other needs or issues. In chap. 2, about a thousand people, men, women and children (2:38) who fled to the desert, were killed by their pursuers because they refrained from defending themselves on the Sabbath (2:34). Matthias and his comrades considered thus:

If we all do as our brothers have done and do not fight against the gentiles for our lives and our laws, they will now quickly wipe us off the face of the earth. On that day, they came to a decision: If any man comes against us in battle on the Sabbath day, we shall fight against him and not all die as our brothers died in their hiding places.¹¹

Since the beginning of *Wissenschaft des Judentums*, scholars have ascribed the position of the refugees not to defend themselves in the desert to the "early" halakhah, in which the Sabbath laws were observed with the utmost stringency. The decision of Matthias and his men to fight back in the future reflects the beginning of a change in religious mores. Later on, offensive warfare would also be permitted, and this leniency would move into the private sphere as well, and allow for saving lives on the Sabbath. "These temporary decrees," writes I. H. Weiss, "sometimes created laws that became lawful and binding forever."

¹⁰ Sheratzim 11:2, ed. Weiss 1883, 58c.

¹¹ 1 Macc. 2:38–40. Cf. also Josephus, Ant. 12.6.2, and the similar story in 2 Macc. 2:29–37.

We have seen this in the most clear manner in the past prohibition against war on the Sabbath. The pious, at the beginning of the Hasmonean war, gave their lives for it, and then permitted it by means of a temporary decree, and in certain times went back to refraining from it, but after a time it was permitted completely. And from this permission was derived the rule that they instituted that the saving of a life overrides the Sabbath, and this became a stable law that all winds cannot move from its place.¹²

According to this, the following passage is a good example of the adherence of Jubilees to the "old halakhah":

Any man who does work; who goes on a trip; who works farmland whether at his home or in any (other) place; who lights a fire; who rides any animal; who travels the sea by ship; any man who beats or kills anything; who slits the throat of an animal or bird; who catches either a wild animal, a bird or a fish; who fasts and makes war on the Sabbath day – a man who does any of these things on the Sabbath day, so that the Israelites may continue observing the Sabbath in accord with the commandments for the Sabbaths of the land [...].¹³

This passage explicitly lists war among the actions forbidden on the Sabbath: The mention of war – an action not mentioned in the Bible regarding the Sabbath – is most probably a polemic against the new law of the Hasmoneans permitting war, at least defensive war, on the Sabbath.

That all war is forbidden on the Sabbath is also reflected in Peshet Habbakuk:

Woe to anyone making his companion drunk, spilling out his anger, or even making him drunk to look at their festivals (Hab. 2:15). Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to consume him with the heat of his anger in the place of his banishment. In festival time during the rest of the Day of Atonement, he appeared to them, to consume them and make them fall on the day of fasting, the Sabbath of their rest.¹⁴

12 Weiss 1883, 143. See also Krochmal 1923, 69. See the discussion in Herr 1961, 247 n. 28, and cf. Bar Kochba 1981, 331–342, app. 3 as well as Goodman and Holladay 1986. I tend to agree with Bar Kochba that the pre-Hasmonean tradition did not necessarily prohibit war on the Sabbath. Additionally, Bar Kochba's claim that refraining from war is connected to the martyrological nature of the Hasmonean revolt and their willingness to give up their lives for their religion means that it is not necessary to connect this behavior to an unwillingness to save lives on the Sabbath. It is more than plausible that the prevalent custom was to save lives on the Sabbath and the war, a public activity, became an exception to this that also led to a reform in private practice. I intend to discuss this issue at length in another article.

13 Jub. 50:12–13.

14 1QpHab XI:4–8.

The Wicked Priest took advantage of the gap between his calendar and that of the Teacher of Righteousness and attacked him on the Day of Atonement when it was forbidden for him to defend himself.

Qumranic law forbade not only waging war on the Sabbath, a collective enterprise, but also breaking the Sabbath in order to save an individual. Indeed, a connection between saving lives and war may also be hinted at in 4Q256.¹⁵ In frg. 6, lines 5–8 we read:¹⁶

אל יעל איש בהמה אשר תפול	5
אל המים ביום השבת ואם נפש אדם היא אשר תפול אל המים	6
[ביום] השבת ישלח לו את בגדו להעלותו בו וכלי לא ישא	7
[להעלותו ביום] השבת ואם צבא]	8

5. Let no man raise up an animal which falls
6. into the water on the Sabbath day. And if it is a human being that falls into the water
7. [on] the Sabbath [day], let him cast his garment to him to raise him up therewith, but an implement he may not carry
8. [to raise him up on] the Sabbath [day]. And if an army []

Lines 5–7 discuss saving an animal or person who fell into a well on the Sabbath. In the last two words of line 8, a new law begins: "and if an army." "And if" indicates that this law is connected to the preceding one: the first two discuss the saving of lives, and this one most likely discusses a war. It seems that this law was a prohibition on war on the Sabbath, like that in Jub. 50.

The law on saving lives on the Sabbath itself should be compared, as did several scholars before me, to CD XI:13–17:¹⁷

{אל} אל יילד איש בהמה ביום השבת <i>vacat</i> ואם תפיל <תפול> אל בור	13
ואל פחת אל יקימה בשבת <i>vacat</i> אל ישבית <ישבות> איש במקום קרוב	14
לגוים בשבת <i>vacat</i> אל יחל איש את השבת על הון ובצע בשבת	15
<i>vacat</i> וכל נפש אדם אשר תפול אל {מים} מקום מים ואל מקום	16
אל יעלה איש בסולם וחבל וכלי	17

15 On the connection between 4Q256 and Jubilees, see Shemesh 2009a.

16 Larson, Lehmann and Schiffman 1999, 68.

17 See Schiffman 1975, 125–128.

13. { } No one should help an animal give birth on the Sabbath; and if it <falls> into a well
14. or a pit, he may not lift it out on the Sabbath. No one should <rest> in a place near
15. to Gentiles on the Sabbath. No one should profane the Sabbath for wealth or spoil on the Sabbath.
16. Any living human who falls into {water} a body of water or a cistern
17. shall not be helped out with ladder, rope, or instrument.

Here, too, the saving of animal and human life is discussed in close proximity. Animals are treated almost identically in both texts: they may not be saved on the Sabbath. However, regarding humans, the texts diverge: CD only emphasizes that men may not be brought up from the well using "ladders, ropes or instrument." 4Q265 offers a positive practical solution: "he should send him his garment to bring him up."

From this difference between the treatment of humans and animals, Lawrence Schiffman adduced that sectarian law adheres to the later rabbinic principle that saving a human life overrides the Sabbath.¹⁸ The sectarians, however, insisted that it should be done as much as possible without using tools that are "set aside" (מִוִּקְצָה) and are not to be used on the Sabbath. I do not agree with him. Schiffman's interpretation assumes, as he himself writes, that sectarian law distinguished between the severity of biblical and rabbinic prohibitions, and between *a priori* legal demands (לְכַתְּחִילָה) and *post-factum* legal status (בְּדִיעֵבַר). These distinctions are, as I have emphasized elsewhere, foreign to the sect's legal conceptions, which hold all details of the law to be of equal status and unchangeable, even under special circumstances.¹⁹

The laws of the Damascus Document themselves are nevertheless quite simple to explain. Sectarian law does not accept the principle that saving a life overrides the Sabbath. 4Q265, despite its apparent leniency, does not in fact grant permission: the point is that only the use of tools is considered to be "work" and is therefore forbidden on the Sabbath. Clothing, however, is not a tool, and so may be used to help a person climb out of a well. Animals are not included in this "leniency," for the very simple reason that they cannot make use of the clothing.

The need to ground the innovative law that allows for the saving of lives on the Sabbath was of great interest to the Tannaim. The following

¹⁸ Schiffman 1975, 125–128.

¹⁹ See Shemesh 2009b, 70.

homily, from the Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, has no less than six homilies to answer the question: "How do we know that the saving of a life overrides the Sabbath?":

Once R. Ishmael, R. Eleazar b. Azaryah and R. Akiva were walking along the road followed by Levi the netmaker and Ishmael the son of R. Eleazar b. Azaryah. And the following question was discussed by them: Whence do we know that saving a life overrides the Sabbath laws?

R. Ishmael, answering the question, said: Behold it says *If a thief be found breaking in* etc. (Exod. 22:1). Now of what case does the law speak? Of a case when there is a doubt whether the burglar came merely to steal or even to kill. Now, by using the method of kal va-homer, it is to be reasoned: Even shedding of blood, which defiles the land and causes the Shekhinah to remove, is to override the Sabbath if it is to be done in protection of a life. How much more should saving a life supersede the Sabbath laws.

R. Eleazar b. Azaryah, answering the question, said: If circumcision, which affects only one member of the body, overrides the Sabbath, how much more should one do for the whole body when it is in danger. They said to him, according to you, just as there the Sabbath is overridden only in cases of certainty, so also here the Sabbath is overridden only in cases of certainty.

R. Akiva says: If murder sets aside even the Temple service, which overrides the Sabbath, how much more should saving a life override the Sabbath.

R. Jose the Galilean says: When it says, *But my Sabbath ye shall keep* (Exod. 31:13), *But* implies a distinction. There are Sabbaths that you override, and others on which you rest.

R. Shimon b. Menasiah says: Behold it says, *and ye shall keep the Sabbath for it is holy unto you* (Exod. 31:14). This means: The Sabbath is given to you but you are not given to the Sabbath.

R. Nathan says: Behold it says: *the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations* (Exod. 31:16). Violate one Sabbath for him, so that he may keep many Sabbaths.²⁰

The first three homilies in the pericope are attributed to the sages listed in the story at the beginning of the pericope, R. Ishmael, R. Eleazar b. Azaryah and R. Akiva. The first two homilies are presented as part of the story itself, in the perfect tense; R. Akiva's homily is presented using the participle (אומר), and it is unclear whether it was said at the same time or whether the redactor added it here together with the last

20 Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael, Shabata 1, edited by Horovitz and Rabin 1960, 340–341; Lauterbach 1923, 3:197–199. Cf. parallels in t. Sabb. 16, edited by Lieberman 1955, 73–74, and b. Yoma 85a–b.

three homilies of R. Jose the Galilean, R. Shimon b. Menasiah and R. Nathan.²¹

The amount of discussion is itself telling and is typical of Tannaitic literature regarding laws that stand at the center of the debate between the Tannaim and the tradition of the priestly Sadducean/sectarian law.²² Further, they all seem to be forced: those that reread verses did so in a manner that is unconvincing and those that are based on logical inferences suffer from faulty logic.²³ Nevertheless, at least three of these homilies were not created by these rabbis but are based on a longstanding tradition: they have parallels in the New Testament.

In an episode recorded in all three synoptic gospels (Matt. 12:1–8, Luke 6:1–5 and Mark 2:23–28), one Sabbath, Jesus was walking with his disciples through the grain fields and the disciples began to pluck heads of grain. The Pharisees criticized him for breaking the Sabbath. In both Mark and Luke, Jesus defends the disciples with two arguments:

Have ye never read what David did, when he had need, and was hungered, he, and they that were with him? How he went into the house of God in the days of Abiathar the high priest, and did eat the shewbread, which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to them which were with him? And he said unto them, The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath: Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.

This claim is virtually identical to R. Shimon b. Menasiah's answer in the Mekhilta: "the Sabbath is given to you, and you are not given to the Sabbath." This homily also indicates the source of Jesus' statement, a homily on Exod. 31:14: *and you shall keep the Sabbath, for it is holy to you*. In fact, Jesus' reading is more convincing than that of the Mekhilta. If the Torah says the Sabbath is holy *to you*, meaning that is given to men, then why is it overridden just to save a life? The disciples were hungry,

21 It stands to reason, at at least according to the Mekhilta, that R. Akiva's homily was part of the story. The change in tense for R. Akiva's homily is rhetorical, and is meant to point out that this is the end of the series of homilies.

22 Similarly, with regard to the timing of the *Omer* offering, the date of which was disputed by the Pharisees and Sadducees, the Sifra ('Emor 14:12, edited by Weiss 1883, 100c) introduces no less than four consecutive homilies to prove that the morrow of the Sabbath does not mean "Sunday," as the Boethusians held, but rather "the day after the festival."

23 See b. Šabb. 88b: "Rava said: all [these homilies] can be refuted, except Samuel's that cannot be refuted." Samuel's homily is "that he may live by them (Lev. 18:5), and not die by them."

and were justified in breaking the Sabbath in order to assuage their hunger.²⁴

In Matthew's account (Matt. 12:5–8) of the incident, Jesus has another claim.

Or have you not read in the law that on the Sabbath the priests in the Temple break the Sabbath and yet are guiltless? I tell you, something greater than the Temple is here. But if you had known what this means, *I desire mercy and not sacrifice* (Hos. 6:6), you would not have condemned the guiltless.

This claim is based on the fact that the temple continued to operate as usual on the Sabbath despite many of the necessary acts for the cult being forbidden on the Sabbath. Rabbi Akiva, in the Mekhilta, makes a similar claim. R. Akiva's homily also assumes that the temple worship overrides the Sabbath. The "murder" invoked by R. Akiva in his homily is a reference to Exod. 21:14, "But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbour, to slay him with guile; thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die." The rabbis understood this verse to mean that if the murderer is a priest he is to be taken to trial even while officiating at the altar.²⁵ However, the second half of the homily is puzzling: "all the more so the saving of a life should override the Sabbath." Does R. Akiva mean that saving a life is more important than the temple worship, which overrides the Sabbath, or perhaps that saving a life is more important than "murder," which overrides the Sabbath? Both possibilities are problematic. If the assumption that saving a life is more important than "murder" and "worship" is based merely on common sense and not legal precedent, why should just the saving of lives override the Sabbath, and not any other human need?²⁶

24 Hunger is presented as the motivation for the disciples' action in Matthew alone, not in Mark and Luke. Kister 1984, 358–359, suggested that this is a post-facto justification for a story that was originally intended to demonstrate that the Sabbath laws were not binding. Hunger is not yet a life-threatening situation, and the limits of the exception are wider in the New Testament than in rabbinic literature in any case.

25 Mek. Nezikin 4, ed. Horowitz-Rabin 1960, 263.

26 These problems could have led to the parallel tradition in t. Šabb. 15:16, edited by Lieberman 1955, 74. This homily constructs a symmetrical claim: "R. Akiva said: for what is more severe in the Torah, worship or the Sabbath? Worship is more severe than the Sabbath, for worship overrides the Sabbath and the Sabbath does not override it. And so matters are *a fortiori*: if the possibility of saving lives (ספק נפשות) overrides worship, the Sabbath, which is overridden by worship, should be (אינו דין) overridden by the possibility of saving lives." The entire argument is based on the rather dubious and undocumented claim that the possibility of saving a life overrides temple worship. This claim could however be just another way of expressing the law explicated in the Mekhilta, that a priest should be taken to a murder trial

It should be admitted that in both arguments, Jesus makes a better case than the rabbis.

Sacrifice Overrides the Sabbath

As we have just seen, the sole biblical precedent for overriding the Sabbath is the offering of the Sabbath sacrifices. The issue is also mentioned in the Damascus Document. The final instruction in the Sabbath rule in the Damascus Document is:

אל יעל איש למזבח בשבת כי אם עולת השבת כי כן כתוב מלבד שבתותיכם.

No one may offer any sacrifice on the Sabbath except the Sabbath burnt offering, for so it is written, *beside your Sabbaths* (Lev. 23:28).²⁷

The various interpretations offered for this law differ only on the question of the identity of the "Sabbath whole-burnt-offering," and thus on the exact kind of sacrifices that are forbidden on the Sabbath. Since the law itself is quite clear, the considerations supporting each interpretation are external and dependent, on the one hand, upon their plausibility and on the other hand upon their correlation with other sources that discuss sacrifices on the Sabbath.

while officiating at the altar. The change in the Toseftan tradition is simply a stylistic one. A similar move can be discerned in Mek. RS, edited by Epstein and Melammed 1955, 171: "R. Jose said: the matters are *a fortiori*: if worship overrides the Sabbath and a priest is taken away from it to be killed, life for life, the Sabbath – for worship overrides the Sabbath – should not (דין הוא) it be overridden to provide the possibility of saving a life?" The basic difference between worship that is overridden in order for a murderer "to be killed, life for life" and the Sabbath that is overridden to possibly "save a life," is kept, but the words are chosen for their similarity and the formula seems more elegant, all the while preserving the basic problematic issue found in the Mekhilta.

The most developed attempt to solve this problem is found in b. Yoma 88b: "R. Akiva replied and said: But if a man come presumptuously upon his neighbor...thou shalt take him from mine altar, that he may die. From mine altar, but not from on top of the altar. And Rabbah bar bar Hannah said in the name of R. Johanan, they did not say but that he may die, but to save, even from the top of the altar. For this one, who may be speaking the truth or not speaking the truth, and worship overrides the Sabbath, all the more so that saving a life should override the Sabbath." The reading in the name of R. Johanan changes the scene drastically: we are not discussing a murdering priest who is taken from the altar to be killed but rather a priest who is a witness in a murder case. This claim is more logical: if the suspect's life is to be saved at the expense of the priest officiating at the altar, an act which overrides the Sabbath, all the more so that the Sabbath itself should be overridden to save lives.

27 CD XI:17–18.

Lawrence Schiffman offered the simplest and most extreme reading: the Sabbath whole-burnt-offering sacrifice refers exclusively to the sacrifice mentioned in Num. 28:9:

On the Sabbath day: two yearling lambs without blemish, together with two-tenths of a measure (i.e., of an *ephah*) of choice flour with oil mixed in as a meal offering, and with the proper libation.

Indeed, this sacrifice is called in the next verse עולת שבת בשבתו like עולת השבת in the Damascus Document. This suggestion, however, is very difficult to accept, as Schiffman himself notes, since the verse continues, "in addition to the regular burnt offering and its libation," and so the Sabbath sacrifice is brought in addition to the daily perpetual sacrifice (קרבן התמיד).²⁸

More plausible is Yadin's and Baumgarten's suggestion, who explain that "Sabbath sacrifice" refers to all the sacrifices offered for the Sabbath, both perpetual and additional, and the Damascus Document only forbids the offering of the holiday sacrifices on the Sabbath.²⁹ The advantage of this suggestion is that it explains the prooftext: "for it is written, *beside your Sabbaths*."

This verse is an adapted quote from Lev. 23:38,³⁰ part of the summary of the sacrificial laws of Lev. 21:1–36:

These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon his day. Beside (מלבד) the Sabbaths of the Lord, and beside (ומלבד) your gifts, and beside (ומלבד) all your vows, and beside (ומלבד) all your freewill offerings, which ye give unto the LORD.

Shlomo Naeh and Moshe Halbertal pointed out a severe syntactical problem in these verses. The second half of the summary contains four exceptions ("beside"); three are sacrifices, but the first is "the Sabbaths of the Lord." One possibility is to understand this term as a metonymy meaning "the sacrifices of the Sabbath." This would mean that Sabbath sacrifices, gifts, vows and freewill offerings will all be offered together

28 Schiffman 1975, 128–131. Schiffman's suggestion that על עולת התמיד was read by the Qumranites as meaning "instead of the perpetual sacrifice," is implausible. See Baumgarten 1985, 398 n. 23. Additionally, as Schiffman himself pointed out, this law also contradicts Jub. 50:10: "and to rest on [the Sabbath] from any work that belongs to the work of mankind except to burn incense and to bring before the Lord offerings and sacrifices for the days and the Sabbaths," i.e. both the perpetual and Sabbath sacrifices.

29 Yadin 1978, 1:105; Baumgarten 1985.

30 MT adds "of the Lord," but CD's reading is shared by the Vulgate and the fifth column of the Hexapla. See Schiffman 1975, 128 n. 297.

with the festival offerings. However, a straightforward understanding of the words "the Sabbaths of the Lord" as referring simply to a day creates a rather cryptic verse. As the word מלבד may mean both "in addition" and "except of," CD understood that the meaning of first "מלבד" is to exclude from the terms of the previous verse:

Those are the set times of the LORD that you shall celebrate as sacred occasions, bringing offerings by fire to the LORD – burnt offerings, meal offerings, sacrifices, and libations, on each day what is proper to it – except on the Sabbaths of the LORD.

This law, that the festival sacrifices are not offered on the Sabbath, was reformulated in the Damascus Document from the point of view of the Sabbath: "No one may offer any sacrifice on the Sabbath except the Sabbath burnt offering, for so it is written, *except for your Sabbaths*."³¹

This law in CD prompted scholars to posit a polemic between various groups in the Second Temple period on the permissibility of offering festival sacrifices on the Sabbath. They found additional proof for the existence of this polemic in other places. Cana Werman pointed to the Sifra: "How do we know that the Sabbath sacrifices are to be offered (שיקדמו) with the festival suet? Scripture says *beside the Sabbaths of the Lord*."³² This homily quotes the same Lev. 23:38 and derives the opposite law from it, in accordance with the simple meaning of the text, that the Sabbath sacrifices are offered together with the festival sacrifices. Werman claims that this homily would not have been warranted had not this very same law been disputed with the Sadducees.³³

Joseph Baumgarten found proof for the existence of this polemic at Qumran itself. Frg. 4 of 4Q513 preserves several words from the middle of five lines:³⁴

]יז[]ם[1
]הגף עמר]	2
]מלבד שבתות] ^x	3

31 I thank Profs. Naeh and Halbertal for granting permission to quote their notes written for a seminar at the Hartman Institute, Jerusalem.

32 'Emor 12:1, edited by Weiss 1883, 102b, according to MS Vat. ebr. 66. שיקדמו is the correct reading, despite the emendations in other manuscripts (such as MS Vat. ebr. 31). See Naeh 1991.

33 Werman 2000.

34 4QOrdin^b (4Q513 IV:1–7). The *editio princeps* of the fragment is Baillet 1982, 287–295. Baillet joined frgs. 3 and 4 despite the lack of a physical connection. Frg. 3 mentions the Sabbath as well, but the join seems dubious. See Schiffman 1994, 147–148.

]ל תעות עוררו ה[4
]ולא מתורת משה[5

1.]da[y?
2.]the waving of the *Omer*[
3.] except for the Sabbaths [
4.] the straying of blindness [
5.] and not of the law of Moses[

This fragment apparently discusses the date of "the waving of the *Omer*" (line 2). This issue was famously the center of a polemic between sectarian and Pharisaic halakhah. Lev. 21:11 mandates that the *Omer* be waved "on the morrow after the Sabbath," ממהרת השבֹּת. At Qumran, this was understood as "Sunday," and according to the Qumranite calendar, which assigned a permanent weekday to every date, it was the 26th of the 1st month, the first Sunday after the Festival of Unleavened Bread. The Pharisees, on the other hand, read this expression to mean "the day after the festival," meaning the 16th of the 1st month. The polemical nature of the fragment is apparent from the expressions "straying of blindness" and "not from the law of Moses" in lines 4 and 5, which are probably derogatory epithets for the Pharisaic interpretation. Here, as in CD, line 3 quotes Lev. 23:38, "beside your Sabbaths!" This verse functions here most likely as a refutation of the Pharisaic interpretation of the law, just as in CD.

According to the Pharisaic law and calendar, "the morrow of the Sabbath" can fall on a Saturday, and in that event the *Omer* will be waved on Friday night, the Sabbath eve, since the Pharisees contend that waving the *Omer* overrides the Sabbath. This is emphasized in the mishnah (men. 10:3) that describes the ceremony of waving the *Omer*:

When it is dark, he says to them: has the sun set? They reply: yes [...]

On the Sabbath he says to them: on this Sabbath? They reply: yes [...]

[He asks] three times for each and for each they reply: yes, yes, yes. Wherefore? Because of the Boethusians who said: the *Omer* is not harvested on the morrow of the festival.

The author of 4Q513 uses Lev. 23:38 against this Pharisaic interpretation: Scripture itself prohibits any sacrifice on the Sabbath except the Sabbath sacrifices. 4Q513:4 is best explained by the law in CD and, at the same time, proves the correct interpretation of that law.

Nevertheless, this interpretation is quite problematic; it is difficult to assume that Qumranic law forbade the offering of holiday sacrifices

on the Sabbath, and even more difficult to assume that this is the intention of CD.

As we know, the Qumranic calendar has a fixed day of the week for each holiday. The first day of *Miluim*, the first day of the first month, always falls on a Wednesday. The paschal sacrifice, the fourteenth of the first month, always occurs on a Tuesday; the days of firstfruits always fall on a Sunday, and so on with all other festivals. Most important for the current discussion is the fact that according to the Qumran calendar the first day of Sukkot, the fifteenth of the seventh month, always falls on a Wednesday. Accordingly, the only Sabbaths that have a festival sacrifice are the intermediate Sabbaths of the Festivals of Unleavened Bread and Booths. However, the Torah says explicitly that on these holidays a fire offering is to be offered for *seven days* (Lev. 33:8; 36). Yadin (followed by Baumgarten)³⁵ suggested that the sect did not count the Sabbath among these days, but continued to count them after the Sabbath. However, this suggestion seems dubious in light of the list of all the sacrifices offered on each day of the year in cols. XIII–XXIX of the Temple Scroll. This list is based on Num. 28–29 together with additional sacrifices not mentioned in the Torah, such as those for the first day of the first month, the days of *Miluim*, the days of firstfruits and the day of the wood offering. The last paragraph of this pericope is a reworking of Num. 29:39 with Lev. 23:37–38, together with some original additions:

אלה [מועדי ה' מקראי קודש אשר תצומה לכול בני יש]ראל
 לעלות עולה [ומנחה זבח ונסכים כמשפט] בבית אשר אשכין
 שמי עליו [ויקריבו בן] עולת [יום] ביומו, כתורת המשפט הזה
 תמיד מאת בני ישראל, לבד מנדבותמה לכול אשר יקריבו
 לכול נדריהמה ולכול מתנותמה אשר יביאו לי לרצון לה[מה]

These are [the festivals of the Lord that you shall command all the children of Is]rael

To make burnt offerings [and meal offerings and sacrifices and drink offerings according to the rule] in the house upon which I shall make

my name reside [and they shall offer in it] burnt offerings, the offering [of each day] in its day, according to the ruling of this regulation

continually, from the children of Israel beside their freewill offerings. All that they will offer

35 See above, n. 29.

All their vows and all their presents which they bring me for th[eir] acceptance.³⁶

The central element in the scroll that is taken from Leviticus is the expression "each day in its day (דבר יום ביומו)." This expression is missing in Numbers. Despite Yadin's claim, however, the omission of the clause "beside your Sabbaths" in Leviticus does not prove that the Temple Scroll (TS) believes that the festival sacrifices are not offered on the Sabbath. The reason TS does not quote this clause is because, while Lev. 23 does not list the Sabbath sacrifices, Num. 28 does so in full. In the same manner, TS too begins with the perpetual sacrifice and the Sabbath sacrifices (XIII:10–17) and then goes on to list the additional sacrifices for special days. Therefore, there is no reason for the author of TS to add in the closing paragraph a clause saying that the Sabbath sacrifices also should be offered since they have already been mentioned. The only components of the sacrifice that should be mentioned are the previously not mentioned individual sacrifices: votive offerings, voluntary offerings and gifts.

The real problem with the interpretation suggested by Yadin and Baumgarten is the incompatibility of their theory with the sacrifices of the Festival of Booths. As in the Torah, TS lists the varying number of sacrifices for each day of the festival. Every Festival of Booths has at least one Sabbath, but the scroll makes no mention of the fact that the holiday sacrifices should not be offered on the Sabbath. The problem is compounded when we recall that, according to the sectarian calendar, every day of the year is fixed to a certain day of the week. The fourth day of the festival, according to this calendar, is always a Saturday. If the festival sacrifices for this day should have been offered on a Sunday, it seems reasonable to assume that TS would have found a way to mention this. In reality, TS lists the sacrifices of the third day (XXVIII:6–9), and then the sacrifices of the fourth day, with no note as to their being offered on a different day.

We now return to CD. The rule under discussion is the last law in a series of over twenty laws for the Sabbath, all of them formulated: "Let no man do X on the Sabbath day." These are all directed at private individuals, not at officials such as the *mebaqer*, judges or priests. It is therefore more logical to assume that this law also addresses the private individual, and therefore does not refer to public offerings such as the

36 11QT^a XXIX:2–6. Original, according to Qimron 2011. The translation is according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997, 1251, with slight modifications.

perpetual or holiday offerings, since such a law would be directed at the temple functionaries, the priests.

The meaning of the law is thus very simple; its aim is to forbid the offering of private sacrifices by individuals on the Sabbath. Ginzburg and Rabin already read this law in this way, although they thought this was a trivial law and transposed it to the paschal sacrifice, in contradiction to the rabbinic law that required the paschal sacrifice to be offered on the Sabbath.³⁷ From what we know today about the sectarian calendar, Ginzburg and Rabin were entirely wrong: the paschal sacrifice is offered on the fourteenth day of the seventh month, which is always a Tuesday. Additionally, the Sabbath laws in CD are hardly polemical. Some indeed disagree with rabbinic law in substance (such as the prohibition of saving a person in a well) or detail (such as the laws of the Sabbath boundary), but others agree with rabbinic law, for example as in the instruction to avoid work on Fridays shortly *before* sundown. Moreover, in the Qumran community, where laws of purity were of the utmost importance, the prohibition on private sacrifice on Shabbat is far from trivial. Women who had given birth, lepers and those suffering from genital fluxes (זבים) were required to offer sacrifices in order to complete their purification process, and it is reasonable to assume that some would have wished to purify themselves as soon as possible and to bring their obligatory purification sacrifices even on the Sabbath. The law in the Damascus Document counters this impulse and rules: "No one may offer any sacrifice on the Sabbath except the Sabbath burnt offering."

What remains to be discovered is how this law was derived from the verse "beside your Sabbaths." The following passage from the Sifra provides an interesting parallel.

ר' עקיבה אומר: מה תלמוד לומר "אלה מועדי יי אשר תקראו אתם מקראי קודש?" אם לעינין ימים טובים כבר עיניין ימים טובים אמורים שנאמר, "מלבד שבתות יי", ואומר: "ביום הראשון שבתון וביום השמיני שבתון." אם כן, למה נאמר "אלה מועדי יי אשר תקראו אתם מקראי קודש?" אילא אילו ימי מועד שהן אסורין במלאכה.

R. Akiva says: what can be learned from *the festivals of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations*. If it is meant to teach regarding the holidays (ימים טובים), this matter is already mentioned, as it says *beside the Sabbaths of the LORD* (Lev. 23:38), and on the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a Sabbath (Lev. 23:39). If so, why does it say *the festivals of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations*? These are

37 Ginzberg 1976, 69–70; Rabin 1954, 58.

the (intermediate) days of the festival (ימי מועד) during which work is forbidden.³⁸

R. Akiva reads "the Sabbaths of the Lord" to mean "holidays," quoting Lev. 23:39 that refers to the holiday at the beginning and the end of a festival as a "Sabbath" (שבתון). "Festival," מועד, acquires a completely new meaning now: the intermediate days of the festival, ימי מועד in rabbinic Hebrew. The homilist here assumes that "Sabbaths" mean just that, and are not a metonymy for "Sabbath sacrifices." This understanding, as emphasized above, does not allow for reading all four "beside" clauses as a group; the first "beside" clause, "beside the Sabbaths of the LORD," places a limitation on the first half of Lev. 23:37, "These are the festivals of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations." The other three clauses place limitations on the second half of the verse, "to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon his day." According to R. Akiva, Lev. 23:37–38 should be read thus:

These are the (intermediate) festival (days) of the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, (on which you are) to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice and drink offerings [...], beside (= in addition to) your gifts, vows and freewill offerings, and all this is beside (= in addition to) your Sabbaths (= the holidays).

The clause, "beside your Sabbaths" is difficult to understand correctly within the context; it is read as a kind of marginal note or footnote that qualifies the entire law laid out in the verses.

CD read these verses similarly. CD also understood "Sabbaths" as referring to a day and not to a system of sacrifices, and thus could not read all four "beside" clauses together. However, unlike R. Akiva, CD understood "Sabbaths" to mean "Saturdays" not "days on which work is forbidden." It was thus left with no alternative than to read "beside your Sabbaths" as meaning *except* on your Sabbaths. Thus, vv. 37–38 are read:

These are the festivals of the LORD which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice and drink offerings everything upon his day. On each day beside (= except) your Sabbaths, [these offerings shall be] beside (= in addition to) your gifts, vows and freewill offerings.

On the holidays, "the festivals of the LORD," therefore, private offerings are permitted and obligatory, but on the Sabbaths, "No one may

38 Sifra, 'Emor 12:7, edited by Weiss 1883, 102b, according to MS Vat. ebr. 66.

offer any sacrifice on the Sabbath except the Sabbath burnt offering, for so it is written, *beside your Sabbaths*" (Lev. 23:28).³⁹

I would now like to return to the two apparent proofs used by scholars to buttress their claim that the question of offering the festival sacrifices on the Sabbath was a point of contention between sectarian and Pharisaic halakhah.

The first proof is Sifra, 'Emor 12a: "How do we know that the Sabbath sacrifices are to be offered (שיקדמו) with the festival suet? Scripture says *beside the Sabbaths of the Lord*."⁴⁰ This homily is purportedly intended to counter the tradition that forbade the offering of holiday sacrifices on the Sabbath. However, I believe that reading the homily in its context in Sifra reveals a different meaning. The following homily in Sifra is:

Beside your gifts, beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which ye give unto the LORD. What can be learned from this? Perhaps (one might think,) nothing is offered on the festival but the festival sacrifices. How do we know that private sacrifices, [and] public sacrifices, that were set aside (שהוקדשו) on the festival are brought on the festival, [or] that were set aside before the festival are brought on the festival? Scripture says Beside the sabbaths of the LORD, and beside your gifts ...

This homily reads Lev. 23:38 according to its simple meaning: it is permissible and commendable to offer private and public sacrifices on a festival, in addition to the festival sacrifices. Note that the verb used here is "to bring" (להביא), in contrast with "to be offered" (שיקדמו) in the previous homily. Additionally, the first homily does not discuss the "festival offerings" but rather "the festival suet." A ruling stating that the Sabbath sacrifices are to be offered with the festival suet is not a discussion of which sacrifices are to be offered, but rather which is to be offered *first*; the homily rules that the Sabbath sacrifice should be put on the altar ("offered") together with the suet of the festival sacrifice. The order of the sacrifices is also the subject of the previous homily:

39 Ginzberg 1976 suggested a seemingly simple explanation as to how CD derived the law that private sacrifices are not to be offered on the Sabbath from the words "beside your Sabbaths": CD read the verse according to its simple meaning, i.e. that on the "festivals of the LORD" every individual should offer his personal offerings in addition to the communal daily and Sabbath offerings. Since this directive is mentioned only in connection with the festivals and not the Sabbath, CD understood that the law does not apply to the Sabbath, on which private sacrifices are not to be offered. This is an argument based on omission, which is problematic in itself, and, as Ginzburg himself pointed out, it does not hinge on the words "beside your Sabbaths," but rather on the latter part of the verse, "beside your gifts, ...," which is not quoted by the law in CD.

40 Ed. Weiss 1883, 102b. See above, n. 32.

To offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meal offering. [Is the meal offering mentioned to teach that,] if there is no burnt offering, there should be no meal offering? [No, it is mentioned to teach] that the burnt offering should precede the meal offering; that if the meal offering precedes the burnt offering it is disqualified. *A sacrifice, and drink offerings.* [Is the drink offering mentioned to teach that] if there is no sacrifice, there should be no drink offerings! [No, it is mentioned to teach] That the sacrifice should precede the drink offerings; that if the drink offering precedes the sacrifice it is disqualified. *Everything, day* teaches that the entire day is fitting for the additional offerings. *By day* – if the time has elapsed, he is not liable for the sacrifice. Perhaps the drink offerings also carry no liability for the following day? Scripture says, *and their meal offerings and drink offerings – today, and their meal offerings and drink offerings – tomorrow.*

The homily under discussion is clearly a continuation of this homily; it does not even begin with a verse, only with a question (the *following* homily begins by quoting a verse, "beside your gifts ..."). Thus, it is clear that it deals with the same subject, the order in which the sacrifices are to be offered on the altar. By reading the homily in this way, we have discovered a new law: on the intermediate Sabbath during a festival, the meat of the Sabbath offering and the suet of the festival offering are to be offered together.

The second proof is 4Q513:4, discussed above. Joseph Baumgarten explained this fragment using the assumption that the sect did not allow the offering of festival sacrifices on the Sabbath, while strengthening the supposition that this is also the meaning of the law in CD. The quote "beside your Sabbaths" in the fragment is indeed intended to prove that the Pharisaic celebration of the waving of the *Omer* on the second day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread is "straying of blindness" and "not from the law of Moses." However, this reading does not require the hypothesis that festival sacrifices cannot be offered on the Sabbath. The fragment claims that since "beside your Sabbaths" (Lev. 23:38) is contrasted with "the festivals of the LORD" (23:39), the word "Sabbath" cannot mean "festival," but only "Saturday." Since the *Omer* must be waved on "the morrow of the Sabbath" (23:11), it is to be waved on Sunday and not on the day after the festival. The Pharisaic reading, which claims otherwise, is a mere "straying of blindness."⁴¹

41 This explanation is better than Baumgarten's since his is limited to the rare (1:7) occurrence of the sixteenth day of the first month falling on a Sabbath, based on the Pharisaic calendar (In the sect, this is impossible since the sixteenth of the first month is always a Thursday). My explanation limits the debate to linguistics and is not dependent upon the actual practices of the opponents.

And so, both Qumranic and rabbinic halakhah are in agreement that the public temple worship continued uninterrupted on the Sabbath. In rabbinic thought, this is a precedent that can be cited when attempting to ground the tradition that saving lives also overrides the Sabbath. At Qumran, however, saving lives on the Sabbath was not allowed, as we saw above. Why was this so? Perhaps Jubilees provides an answer. The tension between cessation of work on Shabbat and the obligation to offer sacrifice is referred to in Jub. 50:10–12:

For great is the honor which the Lord has given Israel to eat, drink and be filled on this festal day; and to rest on it from any work that belongs to *the work of mankind* except to burn incense and to bring before the Lord offerings and sacrifices for the day and the Sabbaths. Only this (kind of) work is to be done on the Sabbath day *in the sanctuary of the Lord your God* in order that they may atone continuously for Israel with offerings from day to day as a memorial that is acceptable before the Lord; and in order that he may receive the forever, day by day, as you were ordered.

The differentiation Jubilees makes between the permitted work, which is done in "the sanctuary of the Lord your God," and the forbidden "work of mankind" conjures up an image markedly different from that of Jesus and the rabbis. Jubilees understands that the definition of "work" that is prohibited on the Sabbath includes only "work of mankind." The reason that the Temple service is to be performed as usual is not because the commandment to sacrifice to God overrides the Sabbath, but because it is not "work." Therefore it cannot be used as a precedent for permitting other violations of the Sabbath in order to fulfill human needs.

Circumcision Overrides the Sabbath

As stated above, Mishnah Shabbat assumes that timely circumcision overrides the Sabbath. This assumption is also the basis of the homily mentioned above of R. Eleazar b. Azaryah regarding the question of whether saving a life overrides the Sabbath.

Rabbi El'azar spoke up with a different answer: Just as circumcision which [saves] only one member of a person supersedes the Sabbath, the entire body even more so!

This *a-fortiori* is famously paralleled in John, where Jesus justifies an act of healing for a man who had been ill for thirty-eight years. Jesus heals him by telling him to take up his bed and walk (5:1) and claims:

Moses gave you circumcision – it is, of course, not from Moses, but from the patriarchs – and you circumcise a man on the Sabbath. If a man re-

ceives circumcision on the Sabbath in order that the law of Moses may not be broken, are you angry with me because I healed a man's whole body on the Sabbath? (7:22–23).⁴²

This inference is based on a perception, similar to that in Jubilees, that a late circumcision endangers the infant, who is liable for *karet*. This is explicated in t. Šabb., "R. Liezar says: circumcision overrides the Sabbath, why? For it incurs *karet* if delayed." However, the claim that circumcision overrides the Sabbath because it is in fact a matter of saving a life could not be valid at Qumran, as they did not accept the principle that saving lives overrides the Sabbath, as shown above. What then did the Qumranites do in the case of a child born on Shabbat who should be circumcised on the following Sabbath, the eighth day? I think the only option is that they circumcised him on a Friday. Perhaps this was the content of the law in 4Q251:1–2 lines 6–7:

[החיל [] מִיָּא נְדָה בַשּׁ[ר] בְּיוֹם [הַשַּׁבָּת]	6
[בְּיוֹם [הַשְּׁשִׁי בָשָׂר עָר] ⁴³	7

6. [... to] profane [] water of *niddah* his fl[e]sh on [the] Sabbath day
7. [...] on the sixth d[a]y flesh of [his] fore[skin]

Both lines discuss Sabbath laws. Line 6 probably prohibits purifying with the ashes of the red heifer (מִיָּא נְדָה) on the Sabbath.⁴⁴ But what is the content of line 7? The editors read "on the sixth d[a]y the flesh of naked[ness]," and understood it as a commandment to bathe before the Sabbath.⁴⁵ However, "flesh of nakedness" appears only once in the Bible (Exod. 28:42) and it refers not to the whole body but to the "hips until the thighs," which for the priests should be covered by pants. I think a preferable reading is "[and every male who is born on the Sabbath day should be circumcised] on the sixth d[ay] the flesh of [his] fore[skin]" (בָּשָׂר עָר[לה]). According to this, the scroll commands that since circumcision may not be performed on the Sabbath and it may not be postponed, which would render the child one of the "sons of the pit," cir-

42 See Kister 1984, 357, and Kister 1982, 7 n. 1.

43 Larson, Lehmann and Schiffman 1999, 28.

44 See a similar law in 4QTohorot (4Q274:2i ll. 2–3), Larson, Lehmann and Schiffman 1999, 103: "ואם יח[יל] עליו השביעי ביוםה שבת אל יז בשבת כין אמר שמור את[ה] שבת: [fa]ll on the Sabbath day, he shall not sprinkle on the Sabbath, for [it says, Keep the]Sabbath.").

45 See Kister, 1982, 30, and Baumgarten 1985, 93.

cumcision is thus brought forward to Friday, the seventh day after birth.

Bibliography

- Baillet, Maurice. 1982. *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD VII. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bar Kochba, Bezalel. 1981. *The Hasmonean War: The Days of Judah Maccabee*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi [Hebrew].
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 1985. Halakhic Polemics in New Fragments from Qumran Cave 4. In *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*, ed. Janet Amitai, 390–399. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- Epstein, J. N., and Ezra S. Melammed. 1955. *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Simon b. Jochai*. Jerusalem: Mekize Nirdamim.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 1997. 1Q1–4Q273. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ginzberg, Louis. 1976. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. MorS 1. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A. 1976. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41. New York: Doubleday.
- Goodman, Martin D., and A. J. Holladay. 1986. Religious Scruples in Ancient Warfare. *CQ* 36:151–171.
- Herr, Moshe David. 1961. The Laws of War on the Sabbath in the Second Temple and Talmudic Periods. *Tarb.* 30:242–256 [Hebrew].
- Horowitz, Chaim S., and Israel A. Rabin, eds. 1960. *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Ismael cum variis lectionibus et adnotationibus*. Jerusalem: Bamberg & Wahrmann.
- Kister, Menahem. 1982. Jesus and the Midrash. *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 1:1–20 [Hebrew].
- . 1984. Plucking on the Sabbath. *Jerusalem Studies in Jewish Thought* 3:349–366 [Hebrew].
- . 1985. The History of the Essenes. *Tarb.* 56:1–18 [Hebrew].
- Krochmal, Nahman. 1923. *More Nevuche Hazman*. Berlin: L. Lamm [Hebrew].

- Larson, Erik, Manfred R. Lehmann and Lawrence H. Schiffman. 1999. 4QHalakha A. In *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*, ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, 23–51. DJD XXXV. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lauterbach, Jacob Z. 1923. *Mekilta According to Rabbi Ishmael*. Philadelphia: JPS.
- Lieberman, Saul. 1955. *The Tosefta: According to Codex Vienna, with Variants from Codex Erfurt, Genizah Mss. and Editio Princeps (Venice 1521), Together with References to Parallel Passages in Talmudic Literature, and a Brief Commentary*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Naeh, Shlomo. 1991. KDM: A New Meaning from a Puzzling Baraita. *Leš 42:163–171* [Hebrew].
- Qimron, Elisha. 2011. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew Writings*. Jerusalem: Yad Ben Zvi [Hebrew].
- Rabin, Chaim. 1954. *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schiffman, Lawrence H. 1975. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1994. Ordinances and Rules (4Q159 = 4QOrd^a, 4Q513 = 4QOrd^b). In *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*. Vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translation*, ed. James H. Charlesworth, 145–149. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Segal, Michael. 2007. *The Book of Jubilees: Rewritten Bible, Redaction, Ideology, and Theology*. JSJ.S 117. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Shemesh, Aharon. 2009a. 4Q265 and the Authoritative Status of Jubilees at Qumran. In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, 247–260. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2009b. *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law From Qumran to the Rabbis*. The Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies 6. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tabory, Joseph. 1996. *The Passover Ritual throughout the Generations*. Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad [Hebrew].
- Vanderkam, James C. 1989. *The Book of Jubilees*. Leuven: Peeters.
- VanderKam, James C., and Józef T. Milik. 1994. Jubilees. In *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*, eds. Harold Attridge et al., 1–185. DJD XIII. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Weiss, Isaac H. 1883. *Vom Abschluss der Mischna bis zur Vollendung des babilonischen Talmuds*. Vol. 3 of *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Tradition*. Wien: Pressburg [Hebrew].
- Werman, Cana. 2000. CD XI:17: Apart from Your Sabbaths. In *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998*, eds. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon and Avital Pinnick, 201–212. StTDJ 34. Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill.
- Yadin, Yigael. 1978. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Karta [Hebrew].

Index

HEBREW BIBLE

Genesis

1-3	79	7:22-23	128
1-10	135ff	8:17	123
1-11	19	8:20-9:24	123
1:1	78	8:21-22	139
1:14-18	111	9:25	207
1:14a	78	9:27	54, 124
2-3	91	10:19	154
2:1	239	11	51
2:7-8	78	11:10-26	158
2:15	83	11:26	53
2:17	80, 91	12-50	19
2:19	78	12	62
3:4-5	91	12:1-3	137
3:5	87	12:6	34
3:21	83	12:7	60
3:22	87f, 90	12:7-15:3	52
5:24	90	12:19	35
6-9	129	14	61
6-49	117	14:20	256
6:1-4	116, 128, 139, 159	14:24	12
6:2	104	15	59
6:3	105, 122	15:2-6	56
6:5	78	15:4	60
6:5-8	138	15:6	56
6:9-12	137	15:13	54
6:13	105, 122	17	137, 159
7:6	122	17:1	138
7:21-22	105	17:20	138
		18	60
		18-19	147, 159, 161
		18:1-2	159

18:1–15	161f	24:44	28
18:5	26	24:55	12
18:16–33	153, 158ff	24:61	12
18:17	35	25	62
18:19	70	25:9	53, 234
18:20–21	159	25:27	12
18:20–25	147	27:29	207
18:23	27	27:40	207
18:25	162	27:43	7
19	157, 161	28	62, 68
19:1–28	162	28:1–2	239
19:2	149	28:2	7
19:4	157	28:5–6	7
19:21	150	28:6	64
19:24	151	28:10–22	177
19:25	150	29:1	29
19:27–28	147	30:38	11
19:29	150, 162	31:18	7
19:30–38	161f	31:46–47	8
20:2	35	32:20	30
20:14	39	32:30	65
20:25	238	33:18–19	193
21	56	34	193
21:12	13f	34:1	65
21:17–20	13f	34:15	31
21:17	13, 27	35	68
22	57, 159	35:1–15	178
22:7–8	62	37:11	6
23	193, 204	39:7–13	21
23:19	234	40:9–12	21
24:3–4	239	41:1–7	22
24:10–14	22	41:21	33
24:14	12f, 16, 28, 43, 55	42:13	197
24:15	13	48:22	191ff, 200, 208
24:16	12	49	181
24:28	12f	49:4	151
24:43–44	13	49:7	3

49:10	126	24	68, 253
49:11	3	28:4	86
49:27	11	28:40	86
49:29–31	234	28:42–43	86
50	237	30	85
50:1–14	234f	30:8	87
50:2–3	235	31:2	239
50:9	235	31:8	85
50:13	234	35:15	85
50:25	41, 234f	37:25	85
50:26	235	40:5	85
Exodus		Leviticus	
1:6	233	6:2	9
1:10	238	6:3	10
2:1	245	6:15–16	10
2:5	12	8:13	86
3:1	4	12	82
3:15	3	14:20	256
6:16–18	233	18:12–14	240
6:17	237	19:12	6
6:19	237	19:17–18	204
6:20	239	23	176
6:29	4	23:38	274
7–11	20	26:32–33	183
7:7	239	26:44–45	183
12:40	54	Numbers	
13:19	234f	2	195, 199, 201
17:14	4	15:29	103
20 (SP)	182	15:38–39	15
20:7–8	6	24:15–17	181
20:12	197, 203	28–29	176
20:13	8	Deuteronomy	
20:14	6	1–3	20
20:23	86	5:12	6
22:4	16	5:18	6
22:12	8	6:23	69
23:5	16	8	67

13	54, 157	24:5	141
13:13–19	153, 160	24:18–20	129
13:14	157	24:18	142
13:17	160	24:23	143
19:15	8	26:8	4, 11
20:10–18	153	26:20	142
21:23	243	29:18–23	183
22:19	12	33:23	11
25:6	4	41:8	55
25:19	4	45:19	183
26:3	69	48:1	182
29:22	150f	54:9–10	139
30	79	Jeremiah	
30:15–20	80	23	151
33	155	33:19–22	142
33:12	124	Ezekiel	
Joshua		7	140
24:32	234	8:3	15
1 Samuel		14:14	139
7:9	10f	14:16	139
9:9	8	14:18	139
16:12	12	14:20	139
17:55–56	11f, 14	28	82
17:58	12	47	82
20:21–22	11f	47:15–20	154
Judges		48:31–34	195, 199
9:4	151	Hosea	
10:4	16	5:8	183
19	156f	6:10	151
2 Samuel		7	150
7	155	11	150
12:24–25	9	12:13	7
Isaiah		Amos	
1:9–10	156f	4:11	150
10:20–22	183	8:2	140
19:20	8	Zephaniah	
24–27	141ff	2:8–11	151

3:4	151	APOCRYPHA AND	
3:9	59	PSEUDEPIGRAPHA	
Psalms			
6	155	1 Enoch	
51:6	4	6–11	104, 116
51:21	10f	6:3, 7	116
63:12	4	8:1–2	116
73:27	149	10:12–13	104
78	103	14:5	104
109:13	4	24–25	84
Job		29–32	84
12:20	5	85–90	130
Proverbs		91:11–17	130
10:7	3	93:1–10	130
Song of Songs		106:13–14	104
4:3	4	1 Maccabees	
Lamentations		2:38–40	266
4:6	150	Greek Vita of Adam and Eve	
4:10	5	15–30	91
Ezra		29	89, 91
9:2	241	33:2–5	89, 91
1 Chronicles		38:2	89, 91
1:24–26	158	Latin Vita:	
2:19	239	43:5	91
6:34	85	Jubilees	
28:18	85	2:19–23	264
2 Chronicles		3	82, 90
20:7	54f, 124	3:8–14	81, 85
26:16	85	3:12	82
26:19	85	3:19	87
		3:26–27	92
		3:26–31	81, 83
		3:26	83, 86f
		3:27	86, 88, 90
		3:30	92
		4:17–26	90
		4:23	87

4:24	90	20:7–8	257
4:25	87	21:5	257
4:26	82	21:16–17	257
4:29–30	91	21:19	257
8:19	82	22:1	257
11:2	196	22:3–4	257
11:6–7	255	25:4–7	257
11:14	255	22:15	177
11:16–17	255	22:16–17	257
11:21–23	256	22:20	257
12:16–17	255	27:27	258
13:4	256	28:6–7	258
13:9	256	30:1	193
13:16	256	30:2	258
13:25–26	256	30:7–8	258
14:9	256	30:16	258
14:11	256	30:17–19	258
14:20	256	30:18	90
15:2	256	31:2	258
15:11–14	256	31:15	258
15:23–24	256	31:20	258
15:28	256	31:13–14	90
15:25–28	264	31:15–17	176
15:33–34	256	32	178f
16:9	256	32:1–8	66
16:13–14	256	32:2	258
16:17–18	256	32:5	258
16:20	256	32:8	258
16:21–25	256	33:10	258
16:28	256	33:19	258
16:30–31	257	34:1–2	195
17:15–16	58	34:1–9	189f, 193f
17:18	58	34:1	193, 197
18:18–19	257	34:2	203
19:1–9	193	34:3	197, 200, 203
19:9	55	34:5–6	203
20:2–4	257	34:6	200f

34:7	192, 202, 205	Sirach	
34:8–9	202	15:14–17	78
34:9	206f	15:14	80
34:18	175, 258	44:17	140
36:10	151	44:19–23	177
36:21–24	204	Testament of the Twelve	
36:21	195	Patriarchs	
36:22	198	T. Ash. 8:3	233
37:1–38:14	189f, 194	T. Benj. 12:3	233
37:1–13	195, 198	T. Dan 2	233
37:1	203	T. Gad 8:5	233
37:6	203	T. Iss. 7:8	233
37:9–10	203	T. Jos. 15:1–2	175
37:14–17	198, 203f	T. Jud. 26:4	233
37:14	195, 203	T. Levi	
37:18–23	195, 204	3:4–8	88
37:24–25	204	19:1	233
37:25	202	19:5	233
38:1–3	202, 205	T. Naph. 9:1	233
38:1	198, 201	T. Reu. 7:2	233
38:2	192	T. Sim. 8:1	233
38:4–8	195, 199, 201f	T. Sim. 8:2–4	233
38:4–9	202	T. Zeb.	
38:5	201	6–7	233
38:8	198, 203	10	233
38:9–12	204	Tobit	241
38:11–12	198, 202, 206	1:2	242
38:12	207	1:18–20	242
39:6	258	2:3–9	242f
41:28	70	4:3–21	242
45:14	192	4:12	140
46	234, 237	14:3–11	242
46:6–47:1	236	14:12	243
46:9	233ff	14:15	242
46:10	237	Wisdom of Solomon	
50:10–12	283	10:4	140
50:12–13	267		

DEAD SEA SCROLLS		4Q175	181
(QUMRAN)		4Q176	
		1-2 i 9-10	55
1QIsa ^a	148	1-2 i 9-11	182
1QpHab		4Q177 (4QMidrEschat ^{a,b})	155
XI 4-8	267	1-4 X 15	183
1Q18	173	XI 7-10	156
1Q19	130	4Q178	155
1Q19bis	130	4Q180	112, 117, 125, 158
1Q20 (1Qap Gen ar)	148	1	112
XIX-XXII	52	1 1	158
XXI 6-7, 23	61	1 1-4	117
XXII 17-18	254	1 1-5	158
1Q21 (1QT Levi ar)	174	1 4	117
1Q27		1 5	60
4 1	254	1 7	112, 115
1Q33 (1QM)		1 7-8	159
XI 6-8	181	1 9-10	116
XIII 7-8	69	2-3 i-ii	125
XIV 8	69	2-4 + 8 i-ii	159f
1Q34bis	110	2-4 i	113, 117
3 ii	125	2-4 ii	60, 112ff
3 ii 1-8	110	5-6	112f, 117, 125, 159
2Q1		4Q180-181	62
1	147	4Q181	
3Q14		2 1	60
8 2	148	4Q182-183	155
4Q158	65, 180, 253	4Q185	
1-2 8-9	65	1-2 i 13-ii 3	129
4 6	68	1-2 ii 1-2	172
4Q163		4Q196-4Q200	242
4-6 ii 8-11	183	4Q213a	
4Q172	161	3-4 8	174
4	148, 150f	4Q213b	174
4Q174	155, 179	4-5	66
		4-6	254

4Q215	173	IV 3-7	66
4Q222	173	IV-VI	125
4Q223-224	173	V 1-7	66
2 ii 52-53	151	V 1 5	126
2 III 17-18	198	4Q253	117f
2 IV 13-15	204	4Q254	
2 IV 14-15	202	1	118
2 IV 15-16	201	4Q254a	
2 IV 18-19	192	1-3	118
2 IV 18-20	205	4Q256	
2 IV 20-26	199	6 5-8	268
2 IV 21-22	201	4Q265	
2 IV 30-31	198, 206	7	81
4Q225	57, 64, 174	4Q364	
1 4	67	3 ii 1-6	64
2 i-ii	117	3 ii 7	173
2 i 2	115	4Q370	126, 129, 137, 143
2 i 3ff	56	i 1-3	111
2 i 8-14	62	i 1-9	126
2 ii 1-10	62f	i 6	105
2 ii 10	58	i 4	139
4Q226	64	ii 5-9	129
4Q251		4Q372	179
1-2 6-7	284	4Q378	
4Q252	53ff, 121, 137, 157	11 3-7	67
1 i 1-ii 5	126f	22 i 4	67
1	118, 122f	4Q379	
1-2	115, 125	1 1-6	66
I	126	4Q385a	
I 1	122	3a-c 4	178
I 1-3	105, 118, 129	4Q388a	
II 1, 3	119	7 ii 1-3	68
II 6-12	123ff	4Q389	
II 7-8	54	8 ii 6-9	68
III 1-9	125	4Q393	
III 2-6	152	3 7	67
III 12-14	125		

6-9 3	69	4Q544	
4Q422	121	1	232
1-7 i-ii	129	1 1-9	232
1 i 10-12	129	1 3	234
1 i 12	139	4Q545	
4Q462	182	1 3-4	242
1 19	183	1a-b ii 11-19	232
4Q464	59, 65, 117	1a-b ii 14	237
1	147	1a-b ii 18	234
1 1-2	117	1a i 2-3, 5-6, 8-9	239
3 ii	117	4	236
5 ii	117	4Q546	
6	117	2	232, 235
7 5	173	4Q547	
7-9	117	1-2 1-9	232
4Q504		9	236
1-2 v 7	183	4Q548-4Q549	232
8-9	129	4Q559	
4Q505		2-3	175
124 4-7	68	4Q577	
4Q508		4	109
3 2	68	7 2, 4, 5	110
4Q509		4QGen	
97-98 ii	110	8	147
4Q513		5Q13	71, 102, 110, 125, 179
4	275	1-3	105ff
4Q521		1 7, 12	109
8 7	181	2 6	68
4Q539	66	8Q1	
2	174	2-3	147
4Q542	231, 241, 246	11Q19 (11QT ^a)	
1 i 4-5	241	XIII-XXIX	176
1 i 7-8	70	XXIII 7	176
1 i 7-11	175	XXIX 2	278
4Q543		XXIX 9-10	68
3-4	232	LV	153

Aramaic Levi Document

	231, 236, 246
17	241
62	239
71	239
CD	
II 14–21	102f
II 16	139
II 19–20	105
III 1–4	105
III 1–12	104
III 2–3	55
III 2–4	67, 172
III 2–7	252
VII 18–21	182
VIII 17–18	69
XI 13–17	268
XI 17–18	273
XII 11	67, 253
XVI 4–6	253

NEW TESTAMENT AND
JOSEPHUS

Matthew	
12:1–8	271
Mark	
2:23–28	271
Luke	
6:1–5	271

John

7:22–23	284
Revelation	
8:2–5	89
Josephus, Antiquities	
2.199–200	233f
3.105	239

RABBINIC LITERATURE

Mishnah

mBets 5.6	4
mOhal 3.7	8
mShab 19.5	265
mShab 24.5	8
mTam 1.1	13
mZev 12.2	10

Babylonian Talmud

bSot 58b	240
bZev 27b	10

Midrashim and Minor

Tractates

Exodus Rabba 1.17	239
Genesis Rabbati	
16.5	83
100.3	235
Mek. de-R. Ishmael	88, 270
Sifra `Emor 12.7	280

