Chapter Three

The Bible Rewritten and Expanded

George W. E. Nickelsburg

In the previous chapter we discussed Jewish narrative literature set in biblical and early post-biblical times. Characteristic of the narratives about biblical times was their very loose connection with biblical traditions about Israel's past. The authors of these works used settings in biblical history and built stories around biblical characters, but, for the most part, their plots and the events recounted in them had no real counterparts in the biblical accounts. In the present chapter we shall treat literature that is very closely related to the biblical texts, expanding and paraphrasing them and implicitly commenting on them. This tendency to follow the ancient texts more closely may be seen as a reflection of their developing canonical status.

The order of our treatment reflects developing ways of retelling the events of biblical history. To judge from present evidence, this process of narration began with stories that recounted individual events or groups of episodes from relatively brief sections of the Bible. Our earliest text is the story of the fall of the watchers, preserved in *1 Enoch* 6-11. From it developed accounts of other episodes involving Enoch and Noah. Some of the earlier Enochic and Noachic traditions, as well as early narrative materials about other patriarchs, were subsequently alluded to, or reshaped and incorporated into such works as *Jubilees* and the Genesis Apocryphon, which are running paraphrases of extensive portions of the Pentateuch. The *Book of Biblical Antiquities* is a later paraphrase of much broader scope (Genesis to Samuel). Here the narrative elaborations are less traditional and more often the author's *ad hoc* creations. The Adamic literature is of uncertain date; like the Enochic and Noachic stories, it focuses on a brief portion of Scripture. The works of Philo the Elder, Theodotus, and Ezekiel the Tragedian are a special category and indicate relatively early attempts to recast the biblical narratives into forms that would appeal to the Hellenistic tastes of their audiences.

It is clear that these writings employ a variety of genres: running paraphrases of longer and shorter parts of the Bible, often with lengthy expansions (*Jubilees,* Genesis Apocryphon, *Biblical Antiquities*); narrative blocks in a non-narrative genre (stories about the flood in the apocalypse or

testament known as *1 Enoch*); a narrative roughly shaped by a non-narrative genre (the quasi-testamentary *Apocalypse of Moses*); poetic presentations of biblical stories in epic and dramatic form (Philo the Elder, Theodotus, Ezekiel the Tragedian).

The last part of the chapter will discuss a different kind of expansion of the biblical text, viz., the introduction of new material into the texts themselves.

1 Enoch and the Book of the Giants

1 Enoch is a collection of apocalyptic traditions and writings of diverse genre and date, composed during the last three centuries B.C.E. and accumulated in stages.[1] Common to most of the components of the collection are three related apocalyptic myths: the fall of the watchers and the bloody deeds of their sons, the giants; the watchers' revelation of heavenly secrets to humankind; and Enoch's ascent to heaven (cf. Gen 5:24), where he is commissioned as a prophet of judgment and a scribe of esoteric traditions about the structure of the universe and the mysteries of the end-time. The stories that we consider here recount the events connected with these myths; most of them have been preserved in *1 Enoch*.[2]

1 ENOCH 6-11

These chapters conflate at least two mythic traditions about the angelic origins of sin and God's punishment of this rebellion.[3] The first of these traditions, in which Semihazah is the chief angelic rebel, is an expansion of parts of Genesis 6-9.[4] We may outline it as follows:[5]

1. *The origins of a devastated world:* a. the proposal, 6:1-8 (Gen 6:1-2a); b. the deed, 7:1a-c (Gen 6:2b); c. its results, 7:2-5 (Gen 6:4, 7)
2. *The turning point:* a. the pleas of the earth and humanity, 7:6; 8:4 (Gen 4:10f.); b. the angels see, hear, and intercede, 9:1-11 (Gen 6:5, 12)
3. *The divine resolution of the situation:* a Sariel is sent to Noah,[6] 10:1-3

[1] On the collection as a whole and its literary history, see below, pp. 395-408 and Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 46f., 150-51.

[2] For a broad survey of Noachic and flood traditions outside the Pseudepigrapha, see Lewis, *Study*.

[3] For the various possibilities, see Hanson, 'Rebellion,' 197-202, 220-25; Nickelsburg, 'Apocalyptic and Myth,' 384-86; Collins, 'Methodological Issues,' 315-16; Nickelsburg, 'Reflections,' 311-12; Dimant, '1 Enoch 6-11'; Newsom, 'Development,' 313-14.

[4] Milik (*Enoch*, 30-31) argues that Genesis 6 is an abridgement of this part of *1 Enoch*. According to Barthelmus (*Heroentum*, 22-24, 198), Gen 6:3 is a secondary interpolation into Genesis, reflecting the tradition about Semihazah.

[5] For details, see Nickelsburg, 'Apocalyptic and Myth,' 386-9.

[6] For the angelic name, Sariel, see Milik, *Enoch*, 172-4.

(Gen 6:13-21); b. Michael is dispatched, 10:11-11:2 (Gen 8:17, 21f.; 9:1, 8-20).

Although the author quotes and alludes to the biblical text throughout his narrative, his final product differs significantly from Genesis. In section 1, he consistently identifies 'the sons of God' and the giants – rather than humankind – as the source of evil in the antediluvian world. The angels' intercourse with the daughters of men is explicitly an act of rebellion against God. The giants are not simply 'men of renown' (Gen 6:4); they are a race of malevolent halfbreeds, who devour the fruits of the earth, slaughter humankind and the animal world, and then turn on one another. The 'birds and beasts and creeping things' are their victims and not a part of 'all flesh' which God plans to annihilate (Gen 6:7).

In section 2, the author interpolates a lengthy intercessory prayer, in which the angels make a clear and pointed statement of the problem of evil, contrasting the repeated assertion that God knows and sees all things (Gen 6:5, 12) with the fact that he is not exercising his authority in support of justice.

In section 3, the author recasts the biblical material into two parts. God sends Sariel to instruct Noah how to save himself and his family from the coming deluge (10:3; cf. Gen 6:13). As in Genesis, he will be the patriarch of a new human race (10:3). Noah is viewed here as a righteous man (10:3; cf. 10:16), although we have not yet heard of a wicked humanity to which Noah would be an exception. The author's interest and emphasis are revealed in the second part of this section. God dispatches Michael against the angels and the giants and commands him to purify the earth. Since, in the author's interpretation of Genesis, the angels and the giants are responsible for the desolation and defilement of the earth, it is they who must be judged. Also significant is the manner in which the descriptions of the postdiluvian earth imply a veritable return to creation and paradisiacal conditions.

Our author utilizes an *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology; the judgment and new beginning in Noah's time are a prototype of the final judgment and new age. Thus, the description of the ancient judgment and the renewed earth is coloured by the author's expectations regarding the final judgment and the age to come.[7] This same typology is reflected in other parts of his elaboration of Genesis. The prayer of the angelic intercessors is in reality the bitter and desperate cry of the author's own people, who are querying about the problem of evil as they experience it at the hands of their enemies, the giants of the earth.

The narrative is implicitly exhortative. The author writes during a time

[7] See the questions raised by Collins ('Methodological Issues,' 317-19) and the response by Nickelsburg, 'Reflections,' 312.

of great violence and bloodshed. His people are experiencing a crisis of faith, expressed in the angelic prayer. Where is the justice of God, and why does he do nothing? The author answers his people in section 3. God has heard their prayers. He has issued his orders. The judgment is at hand! Therefore, stand fast.

The mythic imagery of the story is essential to the author's viewpoint. Section 1 presents his view of the nature of the present evil. Behind the brutal actions of violent men exists a world of malevolent and rebellious spirits. In the mighty of this world one confronts 'not flesh and blood, but principalities and powers.' Humanity's one hope is divine intervention.

The Semihazah story in *1 Enoch* 6-11 is an apocalypticized retelling of the Genesis story, and the author's restructuring of the biblical text and his mythical view of reality have counterparts in apocalyptic texts from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.[8] The Semihazah story itself must be dated before the second century B.C.E. and perhaps as early as the wars of the Diadochi (323-302 B.C.E.).[9]

The second main strand of tradition in *1 Enoch* 6-11 depicts *Asael* as the chief rebel angel. The revolt is the revelation to humankind of forbidden information, mainly the arts of metallurgy and mining. Its principal result is man's ability to forge the implements of war. The tradition appears to reflect Gen 4:22; however, the idea that the metallurgical arts were revealed by a divine rebel suggests influence from Greek myths about Prometheus.[10] The revelation of other secrets is attributed to Semihazah and his companions; this motif may be secondary to the Semihazah story and due to the influence of the Asael material.[11]

Around this basic story of sin, judgment, and salvation, there has developed a cycle of stories about the various dramatis personae and their reactions to the impending disaster. In all these stories, Enoch figures prominently as the recipient and /or interpreter of revelation regarding the judgment.

1 ENOCH 12-16

An angel commands Enoch to announce judgment to the fallen watchers. At their request, he intercedes for them. In response to his prayer, Enoch is taken up to the heavenly temple, where God commissions him to announce the irrevocability of the sentence against the watchers and their progeny. Different from chaps. 6-11, the giants are not types of the violent in the

[8] Nickelsburg, 'Apocalyptic and Myth,' 391-5.

[9] *Ibid.*, 389-91; see also Barthelmus (*Heroentum*, 154-60, 175-83), who dates the book later, but sees allusions to Hellenistic royal ideology; see also Collins, 'Apocalyptic Technique,' 97-98.

[10] Barthelmus, *Heroentum*, 160-7; Nickelsburg, 'Apocalyptic and Myth,' 399-404. Hanson ('Rebellion,' 220-6) seeks a broader background in ancient Near Eastern mythology.

[11] See literature cited in n. 3 above.

author's time, but upon their deaths, their spirits are released as the host of demons that plague the world until the eschaton. The portrayal here of the watchers as disobedient priests from the heavenly temple suggests that this author has a complaint against the Jerusalem priesthood, and the setting of the story in upper Galilee near the ancient shrine of Dan may reflect the actual geographic place of origin of this tradition.[12]

1 ENOCH 106-107

These chapters recount the marvelous events surrounding Noah's birth. The child's resplendent appearance and precocious acts lead his father Lamech to suspect angelic conception.[13] His father Methuselah seeks an explanation from his father Enoch, since the latter dwells with the angels.

Enoch's oracle consists of two major parts. In the first part (106:13-18), he recounts the sin of the angels, summarizing briefly *1 Enoch* 6-7.[14] Then he announces the flood which will destroy the human race. Noah and his three sons will be saved, and Noah 'will cleanse the earth from corruption.' The climax of this part of the oracle is the command to assure Lamech that the child is his son and to 'call his name Noah, for he will be your remnant, from whom you will find relief.'[15] (106:18) The concluding line repeats the promise (106:18 ef).

The second part of the oracle deals with events after the flood (106:19-107:1). Iniquity will again increase for many generations until generations of righteousness arise and 'evil and wickedness come to an end, and violence ceases from the earth, and good things come to them upon the earth' (107:1). The story concludes with Methuselah's return and with the naming of the child, 'And his name was called Noah – he who gladdens the earth from destruction.'[16] (107:2)

Noah's miraculous appearance and actions occupy the reader's attention for the first half of the story. However, they are important not in themselves, but as portents of Noah's significance and as the catalyst that

[12] Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter,' 582-7. See also Suter, 'Fallen Angel.'

[13] Not an unnatural conclusion, since a glorious appearance and the praise of God are both angelic characteristics. Presumed are the ideas in *1 Enoch* 6-7, although they are introduced in 106:13f. as a piece of new information. On the beauty of Noah and its parallels, see Betz, 'Geistliche Schönheit,' 71-86.

[14] The non-biblical words 'in the days of Jared' indicate dependence on *1 Enoch* 6:6. For other parallels, cf. 106:17c, 18 ef; 107:1def with 10:20.

[15] The author draws on the etymology in Gen 5:29. On the various explanations of the significance of Noah's name, see Milik, *Enoch*, 213-16. See also the next note.

[16] This second explanation of Noah's name is problematic. The Grk. verb εὐφραίηω means gladdens. The corresponding verb in the Eth. is *yästafešeḥ* which may properly be translated 'will comfort'; see Charles, *APOT* 2, *ad loc.*; Knibb, *Enoch* 2, *ad loc.*, and cf. Dillmann, *Lexicon*, 1349. This corresponds with the occurrence of נחם (comfort) in Gen 5:29. However, since the Eth. root *fašḥa* means rejoice, primarily, it may be best to suppose that the Eth. translator had the Grk. εὐφραίνω before him and used a form of the Eth. verb that is ambiguous.

leads Lamech to discover this. The story focuses on Noah's double role in God's redemptive activity. He is the saved one – the remnant that continues the human race after the destruction of the flood. He is also a saviour figure, who will cleanse the earth from corruption and bring joy to it after its destruction.[17] For the author, both of these functions are implicit in Noah's name, and hence he embodies his message in a naming story, which has its roots in Gen 5:28f. As such, it stands in the tradition of similar stories about the conception, birth, and naming of other important figures in biblical history: Isaac, Samson and Samuel.[18] In the details of its plot, however, it is closer to Matthew's story of the conception and birth of Jesus.[19] The version of the Noah story in the Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran and the related story about Melchizedek's miraculous conception in the appendix to *2 Enoch* are probably both secondary to the present story.[20]

The similarity between 106:18ef and 107:1def suggests a typology between the flood as an end to all evil and the eschaton, when evil will be obliterated completely and finally.[21] In its present location at the end of *1 Enoch*, this birth story offers the promise of a new beginning. Noah and the flood are symbols for the judgment and the new age announced throughout the book.

1 ENOCH 65-67 AND 83-84

Two other narratives in *1 Enoch* indicate significant parallels to the story of Noah's birth. In the first of these (chaps. 65-67), Noah is the main figure. Frightened at the sight of the earth having sunk down, he hurries to 'the ends of the earth,' seeking an explanation from Enoch. The patriarch reveals the coming end, but promises that Noah will be saved and will found a new race. In chapter 67, God informs Noah that the angels are

[17] In *1 Enoch* 10:20, Michael cleanses the earth. Cf., however, 1QGenAp 10-13 and *Jub.* 6:2.

[18] Gen 21; Judg 13; 1 Sam 1. All these births are miraculous in that God intervenes directly to overcome the mothers' barrenness. For similar ideas, cf. the oracles in Isa 7:1-17; 9:1-7.

[19] Fitzmyer, 'Contribution,' 399-400. See also Betz, 'Geistliche Schönheit,' 81. See also the next note. This story of Noah's birth is preserved in a Latin fragment (see Charles, *APOT* 2, 278-9), the precise provenance of which is unknown. It might reflect christological interest. Milik (*Enoch*, 30) suggests that it was taken from a world chronicle.

[20] Cols 2-5 of 1QGenAp are badly mutilated. Where they are intact, there are a number of close verbal parallels to *1 Enoch* 106-7. The main lines of the plot are the same as the latter except for the lengthy section describing Lamech's suspicion of, and conversation with his wife (2:3-18), on which see Doeve, 'Lamechs achterdocht,' 401-15. The story of Melchizedek's miraculous conception and birth also has this motif of the father's suspicion and is located at the end of *2 Enoch*. For translations see Morfill – Charles, *Secrets*, 85-93; and Vaillant, *Secrets*, 65-85. In some of its details this story is closer to Matt 1:18-25 than is the Noah story. For the fragments of yet another Noah story, the shape of which we cannot reconstruct with any certainty, see 1Q19, *DJD* 1, 84-86.

[21] Cf. also *1 Enoch* 91:5-9 for the same double pattern.

preparing an ark, and he promises that Noah's seed will continue, so that the earth will not be 'without inhabitant.'

The parallels between *1 Enoch* 83-84 and chapters 65-67 are especially close. Enoch sees in a vision that the earth has sunk down. He cries out to his grandfather Mahalalel, and describes the vision. Mahalalel predicts the destruction of the earth and tells Enoch to pray that a remnant may remain. Enoch's prayer is reminiscent of the prayers of the angels in chap. 9; however the petition is a request, 'to leave me a posterity on earth, and not destroy all the flesh of man, and make the earth without inhabitant' (84:5). We cannot here untangle the complicated history of the tradition represented by these three stories. Primitive elements may be present in each, indicating oral derivation from a common original.[22] All the stories have several elements in common. The sin of the angels is a major cause of the flood.[23] Of central concern is the continuation of the human race, and Noah is seen as its progenitor.[24] In the stories in chaps. 65-67 and 83-84 a typology between the flood and the final judgment is not explicit; however, like chaps. 106-107 and chaps. 6-11, they are set in *pre*diluvial times and describe the anxiety of the central figures. Concern about the extinction of the human race is common to 9:2 and 84:5, and the assurance of a remnant is present in all the stories. It is likely that all of these Noachic stories presume a typology between the flood and the final judgment. Moreover, they all reflect the uneasiness and anxiety inherent in times that spawn predictions of an imminent judgment. Conversely, they assure the reader that the righteous remnant will survive, even as they did at the time of the deluge. The typology of flood and final judgment also appears in sayings attributed to Jesus (Matt 24:37f.; Luke 17:26f.), but here the analogy functions as a warning. Perhaps Jesus is reversing a popular eschatological hope, as Amos did with the Day of the Lord (Amos 5:18-20).

THE BOOK OF GIANTS

The giants – the half-breed offspring of the rebel angels and the daughters of men – complete the cast of antediluvian characters who were the subject of extensive narrative treatment. The Book of Giants is extant, however,

[22] In 83:3, Enoch sees the earth sinking down *in a vision,* whereas in 65:1, before the waters are let loose (cf. chap. 66), Noah sees it sinking *in reality*. In 65:2, Noah seeks Enoch at the ends of the earth, as does Methuselah in 106:8. In 83:6, Enoch seeks his grandfather Mahalalel. In 106:18, the idea that Lamech will have a remnant in which he will find rest suggests the anxiety expressed by Enoch in 84:5. The evident word-play on Lamech in 106:1 Greek ('righteousness was made low,' from Aramaic מוך may have been suggested by the idea of the sinking of the earth (65:2; 83:3).

[23] 65:6; 84:4; 106:13-17. This element is especially noteworthy, since different from chaps. 6-11, these stories stress the punishment of humankind and not of the angels.

[24] Only in chap. 84 is Noah not mentioned, but surely an answer to Enoch's prayer is implied (in the next vision?).

only in fragments of six Qumran Aramaic manuscripts from the first century B.C.E.[25] and in fragments of a Manichaean version of the book preserved in a number of other oriental languages.[26] The fragmentary nature of the evidence makes any reconstruction uncertain, the more so until the Aramaic evidence has been published in full.[27] With these cautions in mind, we can, nevertheless, draw some conclusions on the basis of the painstaking work of Milik, who has sought to integrate the Qumran and Manichaean evidence.[28]

Central to the story are *Ohyah* and *Hahyah,* the sons of Semihazah, and *Mahawai,* the son of the rebel angel Baraqel. The names of the giants are causative forms of the verb 'to be' and are evident plays on the Tetragrammaton.[29] The angelic rebellion is exacerbated through blasphemy. Perhaps the names are intended to be ironic: the devastating giants are given names which imply creative activity. Ohyah and Hahyah are recipients of dreams that presage the coming judgment. According to the one dream, two hundred trees (the rebel angels; cf. *1 Enoch* 6:6) in a garden sprout branches (the giants) and are then inundated with water and destroyed by fire (the flood and their eternal destruction). Ohyah and Hahyah report their dreams to the rest of the giants, who commission Mahawai to seek an interpretation from Enoch, 'the distinguished scribe.' Mahawai flies to the outer reaches of the earth, where he obtains this explanation.

Similarities to the patterns in the other Enochic stories are evident, although the precise interrelationships between the traditions are not always discernible. The stories about the giants are surely secondary to *1 Enoch* 6-11 and presume the action in the latter.[30] They may have been composed as complements to *1 Enoch* 12-16: Enoch announces doom to the giants as he had done to their fathers. Mahawai's voyage to the ends of the earth in search of Enoch's interpretation is reminiscent of the similar quests by Methuselah (*1 Enoch* 106-107) and Noah (*1 Enoch* 65-67). However, the fragmentary nature of the stories about the giants does not permit a typological comparison with the Noah stories. Moreover, dating based on paleographic evidence is inconclusive.[31]

[25] Published in part by Milik, *Enoch*, 298-307. On the dates of the MSS., see below, n. 31.

[26] Published by Henning, 'Giants,' 52-74.

[27] Milik has presented in full 4QEnGiants^{a} (*Enoch*, 310-17). J. T. Milik has published parts of 4QEnGiants^{bc} (*ibid.*, 303-8), to be published in full by Starky together with another MS. of the work (*ibid.*, 309). Milik (*ibid.*, 300-3, 309) identifies the already published 6Q8 and 1Q23 as copies of the Book of Giants.

[28] *Ibid.*, 298-317.

[29] *Ibid.*, 427, *sub Ahyâ.*

[30] Cf. 4QEnGiants^{c} 5-7 with *1 Enoch* 9; and 4QEnGiants^{a} 8:9-12 with *1 Enoch* 7:6; 10:1-3,4.

[31] Milik dates the MSS. as follows: 4QEnGiants^{a} is contemporary with 4QEn^{c} (ca. 30-1 B.C.E.), which contains chaps. 106-107 (*Enoch*, 310, 178). Actually Milik claims (*ibid.*, 310) that the Book of Giants was part of the same scroll as parts of *1 Enoch.* However, on the place of the Book of Giants in the Enochic corpus, see Greenfield and Stone, 'Pentateuch.' 4QEnGiants^{b}

Stories about the rebel angels and the giants continued to influence Jewish and Christian tradition for many centuries,[32] and the dream about the trees may be reflected in *2 Baruch* 36 and *4 Ezra* 4:13-19.[33]

Jubilees

The *Book of Jubilees* is a rewritten version of Genesis 1 - Exodus 14, purportedly dictated to Moses on Mount Sinai by an angel of the presence.[34] The order of the book follows, with few exceptions, that of the Bible itself; however, the author's treatment of the wording of the biblical text varies widely. Often he reproduces that text verbatim. On occasion he deletes what he does not find useful.[35] Most typically, however, he recasts the narrative or makes additions to it in line with his interests and purpose. Especially noteworthy is the book's chronological framework, which divides history into weeks and jubilees of years, dating events in Israelite history to specific times in these cycles. The chronology culminates in the jubilee of jubilees, *Anno Mundi* 2451, with the entrance into the Land (or the giving of the Torah, according to one resolution of certain critical problems).[36]

The largest group of additions to the biblical text are halakhic. They appear in several forms. 1) The establishment of religious festivals are dated according to the solar calendar of 364 days that structures the book's chronology. 2) Additions within the narratives themselves depict the patriarchs properly observing the Torah. Most often these additions portray the celebration of a festival, again witnessing to the author's calendrical interest (e.g., 15:1f.; 16:20-31).[37] 3) The author places in the mouth of the patriarchs the commands and admonitions that he himself wishes to make to his readers. The most striking example of this occurs in Abraham's three testaments in chapters 20, 21, and 22. Similarly, in a long addition, Rebecca admonishes Jacob not to marry a Canaanite woman.[38] 4) The author adds to biblical stories halakhic commentaries, which often

was written ca. 100-50 B.C.E. (Milik, *Enoch*, 304, citing Cross). 6Q8 was written 50-1 B.C.E. (*ibid.*, 300, citing Cross). No manuscript of the book is early enough to indicate priority to *1 Enoch* 106-107, but this does not prove that the MSS. did not derive from much earlier archetypes.

[32] Milik, *Enoch*, 317-39. On the development in gnosticism see below, pp. 451-6.

[33] Ezek 17 and 31, Dan 4. Cf. Judg. 9:8-15.

[34] See 1:29; 2:1; cf. also 30:17-21; chap. 48, where his person is explicit. See also below, n. 62.

[35] E.g., Gen 12:11-15a, 18-19a at *Jub.* 13:12; Gen 13:5-10 at *Jub.* 13:17; Gen 20 at *Jub.* 16:10.

[36] See the discussion of Wiesenberg, 'The Jubilee of Jubilees,' of which VanderKam ('Author,' 209) promises a critique.

[37] On other matters, see, e.g., the mode of sacrifice in *Jub.* 15:1f. and the tithes to Levi in chap. 32.

[38] *Jub.* 25. In the biblical account (Gen. 28:1-4), Isaac admonishes Jacob; cf. *Jub.* 27:8-11, where he does so at Rebecca's behest.

begin with the expression, 'For this reason it is written (*or* ordained) in the heavenly tablets that . . .' In these commentaries the author utilizes some element in the biblical narrative as the springboard for his exposition on a point of law: nakedness is prohibited (3:31); feasts are to be observed according to the solar calendar (6:17-22); blood must not be consumed (7:28-33); circumcision must be performed, and only on the eighth day (15:25-34); one must not marry a foreign spouse (30:7-23); incest is forbidden (33:10-20; 41:23-27).

The non-halakhic revisions of the biblical texts vary in their content and function. The author frequently revises the biblical text in order to make a theological point. He interpolates Enochic traditions into the story of the flood and its aftermath (cf. *1 Enoch* 6-16). These additions explain the causes of the flood (chaps. 5 and 7) and the origins of the demonic world which is presupposed throughout the book.[39] References to the final judgment also drawn from the Enochic literature (cf. *Enoch* 10) are used in the narrative in *Jubilees* 5:10-16 and are expanded. Other eschatological additions occur from place to place (e.g., 16:6-9; 30:22).[40] The longest of these is 23:9-32. In context this apocalypse is an elaboration on the biblical reference to Abraham's age (Gen 25:7f.; *Jub.* 23:8). Because of sin, human life becomes increasingly shorter until, at the time of the end, infants will be like old men. Repentance will reverse the process, and there will be a return to primordial longevity. The time of the end is the author's own time, and in this passage he expresses his belief that the great reversal will take place imminently.[41]

Other non-halakhic additions and expansions are exhortative in function. We have already noted formal exhortations placed in the mouths of the ancients. While these may deal with specific points of law, they also contain more general ethical admonitions. Exhortations are also implied by narrative additions and commentaries on them. Most notable in this respect are the stories about Abraham, who is depicted as a model of a variety of virtues. He is a paragon of wisdom and insight. As such he sees through the folly of idolatry, teaches the Chaldaeans the science of agriculture, learns of the futility of astrological forecasting and studies 'the books of his fathers' (11:5-12:27). Moreover, his zeal leads him to burn the local idolatrous temple (12:12).[42]

The stories of the Sacrifice of Isaac and the purchase of the Cave of

[39] See, e.g., chap. 11; 17:16; 48:2-19. On the figure of Enoch in *Jubilees*, see VanderKam, 'Enoch Traditions.'

[40] See Davenport, *Eschatology, passim.*

[41] There is an interesting parallel between this passage and Mark 13. A predictive passage in a narrative setting makes reference to events in the real author's own time and implicitly recommends certain conduct. On Mark 13, see Petersen, *Literary Criticism*, 69-73.

[42] Cf. *Apoc. Abr.* 1-2 and *T. Job* 1-5. Cf. the other parallel to the Book of Job in the Sacrifice story mentioned below.

Machpelah are expanded to depict Abraham as a model of faithfulness and patient endurance under trial. The biblical story of the sacrifice states simply that 'God tested Abraham' (Gen 22:1). His celebrated faith is not mentioned in Genesis 22, but in Genesis 15:6 with reference to his belief in God's promise of a son. Taking the biblical motif of testing as his point of departure, the narrator transforms the biblical story (which is repeated almost verbatim) into a full-blown courtroom scene. He prefaces it with a confrontation between the angel(s) of the presence and the satanic accuser, the prince of *mastema,* clearly reminiscent of Job 1-2, (*Jub.* 17:15f.), and he concludes the story with reference to the defeat of the accuser (18:9-12). The story is but one example (though probably the example *par excellence*) of Abraham's lifetime of faithfulness to God and patient endurance (17:17f.). The author appears to have drawn on a tradition about the ten trials of Abraham, of which he names the bargaining over the Cave of Machpelah as the tenth (19:1-9).[43] In short, the author takes characteristics which the Bible explicitly attributes to Abraham in one situation and applies them to his behaviour in a variety of circumstances. The motif of faithfulness applied to the sacrifice becomes traditional in Jewish and Christian literature, and the motif of endurance under trial is applied to other patriarchs.[44]

Chapters 35-38 are a lengthy expansion on the list of Edomite kings in Genesis 36:31-39 (*Jub.* 38:15-24). The passage reflects contemporary Jewish-Idumaean hostility and explains its origin, stressing Jewish superiority. The point is made in a lengthy narrative describing relationships between Jacob and Esau that culminate in a war in which Jacob slays Esau. Other events contemporary to the author are alluded to in some of the commentaries in the form of predictions.

These many non-halakhic additions and revisions notwithstanding, our author's pervading interest and emphasis is halakhic. Unlike the above-cited material about Abraham, most of the stories about the patriarchs do not exemplify abstract vices or virtues, as in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* Good or bad behaviour involves, rather, obedience or disobedience of a specific law, and penalties are specified for such disobedience. The *halakhoth* propounded in *Jubilees,* touching on a wide variety of issues, differ at many points from Pharisaic and Sadducean *halakhoth,*[45] and like many of the Qumran *halakhoth,* they are noteworthy

[43] The author states that there were ten trials but does not tell us what they were. In addition to the Sacrifice and the Cave of Machpelah, he seems to enumerate six other trials in 17:17f. For the tradition, see *M. Aboth* 5:4 (Albeck, *Mishnah* 4 *ad loc.,* and p. 499); *Aboth de R. Nathan* A + B, p. 94f.; *Midr. Psalms* 18, 25 (77a-b). See also the next note.

[44] For Abraham's faithfulness exemplified in the sacrifice, cf. Sir 44:20; 1 Macc 2:52; Jdt 8:24-27; Heb 11:17; James 2:21-23. For Joseph's endurance in the face of ten trials, cf. *T. Joseph* 2:7. Cf. also Job's endurance in *T. Job.*

[45] Albeck, *Jubiläen,* 35-37. See also Safrai, 'Halakhic Literature', the typescript of which was graciously made available by the author.

for their severity.[46] To what extent these laws reflect early practice that was later relaxed and to what extent they represent sectarian innovation is a question in need of investigation. It does seem likely, however, that in some cases the author is protesting current practice in the Second Temple period.[47] The apocalypse in chapter 23 must be considered in this light. Israel is suffering for its disobedience to the Torah, i.e., the commandments and laws as this author expounds them.

Especially noteworthy is the attention given to calendrical matters. On the one hand, this interest is chronological, and the crucial dating of the entrance to the Land (or the giving of the Torah) reflects a belief in God's sovereignty over time and history.[48] On the other hand, the concern with calendar is halakhic in nature. The solar calendar has the force of law because it is rooted in the created structure of the universe,[49] and the chronological framework demonstrates the proper observance of the religious feasts in accordance with the solar calendar.[50] The 364 days of the year, according to this calendar, comprise exactly 52 weeks, which divide into four equal seasons (thirteen weeks), each of which begins on a Wednesday. All feasts begin not only on the same date, but also on the same day of the week, a Wednesday, a Friday, or a Sunday. In all cases, the Sabbath is avoided. This may be connected with the severity of the laws that govern the Sabbath, which are especially prominent in the book (2:1, 17-33; 50:6-13).[51] This emphasis on the Sabbath is perhaps to be connected with the author's interest in the cycles of seven and forty-nine years (note the juxtaposition of relevant laws in 50:1-5 and 6-13). Whether the author's solar calendar was ever in use in pre-exilic or Second Temple Judaism is a question that scholars continue to debate.[52]

Divine revelation is the ultimate authority for the *halakhoth* propounded in *Jubilees.* They were dictated to Moses by an angel of the presence. Details regarding the celestial structures on which the solar calendar is based were revealed first to Enoch (4:17). The source of all these laws are the immutable heavenly tablets. Alongside these claims to direct revelation, the author often indicates that there is an exegetical base for his laws. Specific laws derive from some detail or item in the biblical text that he is transmitting (and revising).

[46] *Ibid.* On the severity of the Sabbath laws, see Finkelstein, 'Jubilees,' 45; Albeck, *Jubiläen,* 36; Testuz, *Les idées,* 116; Schiffman, *Halakhah,* 78.

[47] Safrai, 'Halakhic Literature'.

[48] The chronology may also reflect eschatological speculation; see Testuz, *Les idées,* 164-77; and Davenport, *Eschatology,* 69-70, n. 3.

[49] This structure is described in *1 Enoch* 72-80, cited in *Jub.* 4:17.

[50] On the calendar, see the brief discussion by Herr ('Calendar,' 839-43) and other literature cited in the bibliography below.

[51] Albeck, *Jubiläen,* 7-12.

[52] On this issue, see most recently VanderKam, 'Origin'; and idem, '2 Maccabees 6,7A,' and the literature cited by him.

This process of transmitting and revising the biblical text reflects a remarkable view of Scripture and tradition. The pseudepigraphic ascription of the book to an angel of the presence and the attribution of laws to the heavenly tablets invest the author's interpretation of Scripture with absolute, divine authority.[52a] His understanding of biblical laws is God's, and his extraction of other laws from non-legal biblical texts is also of divine origin. Thus obedience to 'the laws' and 'the commandments' as he expounds them and a return to 'the paths of righteousness' as he reveals them are a *sine qua non* for the coming of the eschaton (23:26).[53]

This author's view of tradition differs formally from the familiar rabbinic view presented in *Mishnah Aboth* 1:1. This latter envisions an oral transmission from Sinai. According to *Jubilees, halakhoth* not found in the biblical text were already committed to writing on Mt. Sinai. On the other hand, the claim that these laws were inscribed on heavenly tablets parallels rabbinic views about the eternity of Torah.[54]

A variety of factors point to a time of writing in the second century B.C.E. Explicit citation of the book in the Qumran Damascus Document (CD 16:3f.) indicates a *terminus ad quem* ca. 100-75 B.C.E.[55] Paleographical evidence places the *terminus* close to 100 B.C.E.[56] A *terminus a quo* early in the second century is provided by the book's reflection of details of the Hellenistic reform. Two passages are noteworthy. The Jews 'should not uncover themselves as the gentiles uncover themselves' (3:31). Circumcision is the sign of the covenant (15:14), and uncircumcision is imitation of the gentiles (15:34).[57]

Charles, Testuz, and others have suggested that *Jubilees* was written in the reign of John Hyrcanus (ca. 110-105 B.C.E.) by a partisan of the Hasmonaean dynasty.[58] Two factors tell against this position. Supposed references to the Hasmonaeans are not all that clear or certain.[59] A pro-

[52a] Cf. below, pp. 427ff.

[53] A similarly exclusivistic view of Torah is well known from the Qumran Scrolls and seems to be assumed in *1 Enoch* 92-105. On the latter see Nickelsburg, 'The Epistle of Enoch.'

[54] See, e.g., *Gen. Rabba* 1:1, where Torah is identified with pre-existent Wisdom.

[55] On the citation, see VanderKam, *Studies*, 255-7. [56] *Ibid.*, 254.

[57] Cf. 1 Macc 1:15, 2 Macc 4:12-14; Jos. *Ant.* 12:241. In view of these references to Jewish hellenization, Albright's arguments (*Stone Age*, 346) for a fourth to third century date must be rejected; similarly, the even earlier date of Zeitlin, 'Jubilees,' 1-31. See Testuz, *Les idées*, 35-39.

[58] See Charles, *Jubilees*, lviii-lxvi. On essential points he is followed by Testuz, *Les idées*, 34f. See also Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament*, 608.

[59] Charles (*Jubilees*, lix, 191) and Testuz (*Les idées*, 35) assert without evidence that the title 'Priest of the Most High God' (32:1) was borne only by the Hasmonaeans – an argument from silence. The title is implied in *T. Levi* 2-5, where the epithet 'Most High' occurs five times (3:10; 4:1-2; 5:1,7). That this testament was the product of Hasmonaean partisans (see Charles, *APOT* 2, 314, n. on 18:6) is problematic given the popularity at Qumran of the Aramaic testament (see Milik, 'Le Testament de Lévi'). The alleged reference to the dual civil and religious functions of the Hasmonaeans in 31:15 (Charles, *Jubilees*, lxii) is indemonstrable since the dual office was not new to the Hasmonaeans (VanderKam, *Studies*, 248-9). On the alleged references to the battles of Judas Maccabaeus (Charles, *Jubilees*, lxxii-lxiii), see below, n. 67.

Hasmonaean bias is difficult to explain in a document that was obviously popular in the anti-Hasmonaean community at Qumran and that appears to have originated in circles closely related to Qumran (see below).

Davenport distinguishes three stages in the composition of *Jubilees*.[60] The basic document was composed ca. 200 B.C.E. to inspire obedience to the Torah in the face of encroaching hellenization.[61] The work was updated ca. 166-160 B.C.E. with references to the persecution under Antiochus, and again ca. 140-104 B.C.E., probably at Qumran. Davenport is correct in stressing the book's front against hellenization (see below). His literary analysis is, however, problematic.[62]

An alternative analysis of the dating of *Jubilees* is that of VanderKam.[63] His *terminus a quo* is Judas Maccabaeus' victory over Nicanor (161 B.C.E.), referred to in 34:2-9.[64] The *terminus ad quem* is determined by several factors. Although *Jubilees* has many close points of similarity with Qumran theology, the author belongs to a community that worships in Jerusalem (49:21). There is no hint of a wicked high priest or of an exodus to Qumran. Thus the terminus must be set before Simon's death (135 B.C.E.) and more likely before his acclamation as high priest (140 B.C.E.). The 'glowing terms' in which the priesthood is described suggests that the author does not know of the Hasmonaean high priesthood at all; thus a date before Jonathan's accession (152 B.C.E.) seems probable.[65]

VanderKam's dating of *Jubilees* is not without its difficulties. While it is true that he has made, to date, the strongest argument for the identification of *Jubilees* 34:2-9 and 37-38 as descriptions of the Maccabaean wars,[66] the identification is far from certain and depends on a number of textual emendations.[67] Two other factors must be considered. First, the apocalypse in 23:16ff. refers to events connected with the controversy over Hellenism.[68] Nonetheless, no reference is made to the person of Antiochus IV,

[60] Davenport, *Eschatology*, 10-18.

[61] According to Davenport (*ibid.*, 10-14), this document included 1:1-4a, 29a; 2:1-50:4 minus 4:26, 23:14-31, 31:14.

[62] His criteria for determining strata (*ibid.*, 80) are not always convincing. Specifically, on his hypothesis that the original book was an 'angelic discourse,' see VanderKam, 'Author.' Furthermore, the main points of this thesis are more presumed and asserted than proven in his book. On pp. 1-18 he presumes and never demonstrates the independent existence of the basic document. He never explicates his evidence for the later dating of 1:4b-26 (see p. 14, n. 2). Only in the case of chap. 23 does he provide a detailed analysis, pp. 32-46. In part his case appears to rest on the assumption that the parenetic and predictive character of 1:4bff. and 23:14ff. are inconsonant with the didactic function of the angelic discourse. However, cf. 15:34 with 23:23.

[63] VanderKam, *Studies*, 214-85.

[64] *Ibid.*, 217-29.

[65] *Ibid.*, 283-5.

[66] *Ibid.*, 217-38. The identification had already been made by Charles and Bousset, before him; see Charles, *Jubilees*, lxii-lxiii.

[67] See Nickelsburg's review of VanderKam, *Studies*, in *JAOS* 100 (1980), 83-84.

[68] See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 46f.

his pollution of the temple, and his edict – an omission most unusual for a document of this period.[69] Secondly, many of *Jubilees'* additions to the biblical text of Genesis and Exodus have the Jew-gentile situation in focus. In addition to the strictures against nakedness and uncircumcision mentioned above (3:31; 15:34), are the following items. Observance of the lunar calendar is construed as following 'the feasts of the gentiles' (sic!) (6:35). Marriage to a gentile is strictly and repeatedly forbidden (20:4; 22:20; 25:1; 27:10; 30:1-15). Warnings are issued against idolatry (20:7-9; 22:16-18) and consuming blood (6:12-41; 7:30; 21:6). The author stresses Israel's unique covenantal relationship to God and qualitative difference from the gentiles (cf. also 2:31 on the Sabbath).[70] His stringent prohibitions against contact with the gentiles suggest that such contact was not infrequent in the Israel of his time.

These considerations suggest that *Jubilees* was written during the time of the Hellenistic reform close to 168 B.C.E. If one accepts VanderKam's dating, one must admit the strange omission in chapter 23. Moreover, the anti-gentile warnings must be read as post-factum reflections on the enormity of the deeds that brought on the disaster of the 160's[71] or as evidence for continued hellenization and Jew-gentile contact.

Connections between *Jubilees* and the Qumran community are especially close. The Damascus Document cites it as authoritative (CD 16:3-4). Twelve fragmentary manuscripts of *Jubilees* have been found at Qumran.[72] The religious ideas, theology, and laws in *Jubilees* closely parallel, and are often identical with those in writings unique to Qumran.[73] Either of the early dates suggested above precludes its actual composition at Qumran,[74] and there are some differences between *Jubilees* and the Qumran texts.[75] It issued from unnamed circles related to those responsible for the composition of Daniel 10-12, *1 Enoch* 72-82; 85-90; and 93:1-10; 91:12-17.[76] The historical relationship between these sects and the Qumran sect are now obscure, but the latter fell heir to their literature.

[69] *Ibid.* 47, n. 9.

[70] Testuz, *Les idées*, 59-74.

[71] This explanation was suggested to me by VanderKam in private correspondence, Feb. 20, 1977.

[72] For the publication and main discussions of these manuscripts, see the bibliography below.

[73] See VanderKam, 258-83. See also below, p. 530.

[74] Scholars accepting a later date for *Jubilees* are divided on the question of its relationship to Qumran. Milik (*Ten Years*, 32) and Grintz ('Jubilees,' 325f.) favor Essene provenance. Testuz (*Les idées*, 179-95) sees many similarities with Qumran, but also some differences.

[75] *Ibid.*; Schiffman (*Halakhah*, 78, 129) indicates some differences between the *halakhoth* of Qumran and those in *Jubilees*. See also VanderKam (*Studies*, 311-14) and Safrai, 'Halakhic Literature'.

[76] Manuscripts of Daniel and the relevant parts of *1 Enoch* have been found at Qumran. On the relationship between Dan 10-12 and *Jub.* 23, see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 1-33. For parallels to *Jub.* 23:16, 26, cf. 1 Enoch 90:6f.; 93:10; CD 1:8-11. On the relationship between the calendars of *Jubilees* and Qumran, see the literature listed in the bibliography below.

Jubilees was composed in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and from Greek into Ethiopic, in which language alone it is extant in its entirety.[77] Knowledge of the Hebrew original may be reflected in later Jewish midrashim.[78] The Greek version was well known among Byzantine Christian authors.[79] Some *halakhoth* of the Ethiopian Falashas are derived from *Jubilees,*[80] and the book continues to be printed in the Ethiopic Bible.

The Genesis Apocryphon

The Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran Cave I is a compilation of patriarchal narratives. The extant portion of the scroll covers the period from Lamech to Abraham,[81] but its badly deteriorated condition severely limits a reconstruction of its contents. Of the twenty-two extant columns, only five are legible in substantial portion (cols. 2, 19-22).[82] The narratives are versions of the biblical accounts, freely reworked in Aramaic and, largely, in the first person singular.[83] In places the actual wording of the Bible is reproduced, more often it is paraphrased, and not infrequently there are substantial additions, some of which parallel other contemporary written sources.[84]

Columns 2-5 related a version of the same story of Noah's birth that is preserved in *1 Enoch* 106-107 (cf. above pp. 93f.) The present version differs from *1 Enoch* in several ways: 1) Following the usual technique in this scroll, the narrator is the person immediately concerned, viz., Lamech, rather than Enoch. 2) Lamech's suspicion that Noah's conception was of angelic origin (cf. *1 Enoch* 106:6) leads to a lengthy and emotional scene-totally absent in *1 Enoch* – in which Lamech adjures his wife to reveal the truth of the matter (2:3-18). 3) *1 Enoch* stresses the child's miraculous appearance by a double repetition of the initial description (106:5f., 10-12). This appearance suggests to Lamech that the child is a portent of things to come (106:1b).[85] The Genesis Apocryphon eliminates Lamech's speech to

[77] Charles, *Jubilees,* xxvi-xxxiii; VanderKam, *Studies,* 1-18. Both also discuss the Latin and Syriac fragments of *Jubilees.* Brock ('Abraham') considers another Syriac text that parallels *Jub.* 11-12, but concludes it is based on a source common to *Jubilees* and not on the book itself.

[78] Charles, *Jubilees,* lxxv-lxxvii; *id., Ethiopic Jubilees,* 179-82.

[79] See Denis, *Introduction,* 150-62; and Milik, 'Recherches.'

[80] See Schiffman, *Halakhah,* 19, and the many parallels scattered throughout Albeck, *Jubiläen.*

[81] The first sheet of the scroll probably had other columns before the present column 1, and the fourth sheet (cols. 16-22) was attached to yet another, final sheet; Avigad – Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 14f.

[82] On the condition of the scroll, see *ibid.,* 12-15, and Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 3f.

[83] In the badly preserved columns, see 5:3, 9, 26; 6:2, 6; 7:7; 10:13, 15; 12: 13-16. The narrative changes to third person at 21:23ff.

[84] On the genre of the scroll and its relationships to targum and midrash, see Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 6-14, 30-39.

[85] Doeve, 'Lamechs achterdocht,' 409-10.

Methuselah (2:19; *1 Enoch* 106:5f.) and may or may not have contained the second repetition of the description.[86] The scene between Lamech and his wife is quite consonant with other emotionally oriented additions to the biblical accounts in this document[87] and may well be the work of its author. The present state of the text, however, permits no certain conclusions about the precise relationship between the two versions of the story. Columns 6-17 described the deluge and its aftermath. The legible parts of these columns reveal significant parallels (including chronological details) to non-biblical material in *Jubilees*.[88]

The story of Abram probably began in column 18. Columns 19-22 retell the events in Genesis 12:8-15:4. The fragmented beginning of column 19 (lines 7-10a) appears to parallel the slightly expanded version of Genesis 12:8-9 in *Jubilees* 13:8-10.[89] The story of Abram's sojourn in Egypt (Gen 12:10-20) is extensively elaborated in columns 19:10-20:32 but reveals only chronological parallels to *Jubilees* 13:11-15. Novelistic devices are employed, and independent forms (a dream and its interpretation, a description of Sarai's beauty, and a prayer) are introduced to create a story richer and more complex than its biblical counterpart. Abram's dream is likely intended as divine justification for his subsequent lie.[90] The lengthy description of Sarai's beauty follows a traditional genre,[91] but is suggested in Genesis 12:15, '. . . the princes of Pharaoh . . . praised her to Pharaoh.' A third addition is Abraham's prayer for judgment, which triggers the plague on Pharaoh and his household. Later Abram himself functions as the divinely empowered healer. Pharaoh's inability to consummate his marriage to Sarai has moral or apologetic overtones.[92] Through these additions, the biblical story is transformed so as to underscore the providence of God and his power over the Egyptian king. Abram is his agent – seer and interpreter of dreams, wise man, speaker of efficacious prayer, and a healer set in opposition to the magicians and physicians of Egypt. Thus he assumes characteristics associated with Joseph and Daniel.[93] The storyteller's art is evident in his development and resolution of the plot and in his portrayal of the relevant reactions and emotions of his characters. Columns 20:33-21:7 retell the story of Abram and Lot (Gen 13:1-13) in compressed

[86] The bottom of column 2 could have described again the confrontation between Lamech and his wife or the appearance of the child.

[87] Cf. 2:25; 7:7; 19:21; 20:8-9, 10, 12, 16; 21:7 (cf. *Jub.* 13:18); 22:5.

[88] See the citations in Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 99-105.

[89] *Ibid.,* 105.

[90] See *ibid.,* 110. Cf. *T. Levi* 5 for a similar justification for Levi's participation in the slaughter in Shechem. On the dream see Dehandschutter, 'Le rêve,' 48-55. For a parallel to the dream, cf. *T. Abr.* 7.

[91] See Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 119-20.

[92] *Ibid.,* 131-32.

[93] See Dehandschutter, 'La rêve,' 52-54.

form. God's promise and command to Abram (Gen 13:14-18) are reproduced almost in their entirety, with additions containing geographical information (21:10-12, 15-19). Genesis 14 is paraphrased in somewhat compressed form (21:23-22:26) with no striking additions to the Melchizedek incident. The scroll breaks off midway through an expanded version of Genesis 15:1-4 (22:27-34).

In retelling the biblical stories, the author of this work has employed techniques akin to those in *Jubilees,* parts of *1 Enoch,* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* Similar to *Jubilees,* he has compiled a running narrative that parallels a sizable part of Genesis, and, indeed, he may have used *Jubilees* as a source.[94] His wording is a much freer paraphrase of Genesis than is generally the case in *Jubilees.* Different from *Jubilees* and the *Testaments,* the extant sections indicate little interest in halakhic matters or moral exhortation. Considerable notice is given to geographical details,[95] and there is some emphasis on prayer.[96] The author's treatment of his characters is marked by a sensitivity to the emotions and reactions that reflect their humanity.

The Genesis Apocryphon appears to have been actually composed in Aramaic[97] around the turn of the era.[98] Indications of Essene beliefs are not demonstrable.[99]

Portions of *1 Enoch, Jubilees,* and the Genesis Apocryphon comprise a related group of texts. They share related generic features. There is, moreover, some interdependence: the author of *Jubilees* has used material from stories that we know from *1 Enoch*; the writer of the Genesis Apocryphon appears to have known *Jubilees,* but has also used a story about Noah's birth found in *1 Enoch* but not in *Jubilees.* A common fascination with the figures of Noah and Enoch is evident. Quite possibly this is due to a common apocalyptic viewpoint, although this is not clear in the extant portions of the Genesis Apocryphon. Of significance is the presence of this

[94] See the discussion in Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 16-17. Especially noteworthy is the chronological reference in 1QGenAp 22:27-28, which tallies with the chronology of *Jubilees.* Its placement here may well have been suggested by the typical introductory chronological reference in *Jub.* 14:1. The reverse relationship is highly unlikely. On the relationship between the biblical text used in *Jubilees* and in the Genesis Apocryphon, see VanderKam, 'Textual Affinities.'

[95] Cf. 2:23; 12:13; 16; 17; 19:11-12; 21:8, 10-12, 15-19.

[96] Cf. 12:17; 19:7; 20:12-16, 28; 21:2-3.

[97] Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 25.

[98] See the discussion and opinions, *ibid.,* 16-19.

[99] *Ibid.,* 11-14. Doeve ('Lamechs achterdocht,' 411-14) sees a parallel between Lamech's suspicion of his wife and similar attitudes which Josephus attributes to the Essenes (*War* 2:121). However, the idea of angelic conception is present already in *1 Enoch* 106:6 (which Doeve, p. 415 does not think is dependent on the Genesis Apocryphon), and Lamech's questioning of his wife is natural and need not presume an Essene context.

literature in the Qumran library,[100] although we are not yet in a position to make well-informed conjectures about its specific religious and social provenances in relation to the Qumran community.[101]

The Book of Biblical Antiquities

This lengthy chronicle retells biblical history from Adam to the death of Saul.[102] The treatment of the ancient material varies widely. Lengthy portions of Scripture are briefly summarized or completely bypassed. Other sections are paraphrased, with occasional verbatim quotations. Still others are interpolated with prayers, speeches, or narrative expansions. In a few cases, whole new stories have been inserted, or old ones have been radically revised. Among the sections deleted are the following: Genesis 1-3; Genesis 12-50 (its contents are briefly summarized in *LAB* 8);[102a] Exodus 3-13; all the legal material in Exodus except chapter 20; almost the entire book of Leviticus; all the legal material in Numbers; Deuteronomy 1-30; the descriptions of the conquest in Joshua (chaps. 3-21); parts of 1 Samuel.

The Book of Judges is a notable exception to the author's techniques of excision and compression. Only chapters 1-3 have been deleted; however, they have been replaced by the lengthy story of Cenez (*LAB* 25-28). According to Judges 1:13, he was the father of Othniel; here he assumes Othniel's place as the first judge (Judg 3:7-14).[103] The stories of Deborah, Gideon, Abimelech, Jephthah, Samson, Micah, the Levite, and the war between Benjamin and Israel have all been retained, though with many revisions. The section corresponding to Judges comprises one-third of the entire work (*LAB* 25-49).

Two tendencies in the *Biblical Antiquities* are consonant with this concentration on the Book of Judges. The first relates to the historical pattern of Judges: sin; divine punishment by means of an enemy; repentance; salvation through a divinely appointed leader. The pattern and references to it appear in many of the (interpolated) speeches in the *Biblical Antiquities.*[104] In presenting this theme, the author often raises the question: Can

[100] Also noteworthy for their presence in the Qumran library are the Aramaic Testament of Levi (on its relationship to *1 Enoch* 12-16, see Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, Peter, and Levi') and, perhaps, Tobit (for parallels between Tobit and *1 Enoch*, see above p. 45f. n. 68-72.

[101] On this problem, see Nickelsburg, 'Social Aspects'; and *id.*, 'The Epistle of Enoch.' See also below, pp. 487-9.

[102] James (*Antiquities*, 60-65) and Strugnell ('Philo,' 408) believe that the ending of the *Antiquities* has been lost. Feldman ('Prolegomenon' lxxvii) and Perrot (*Les Antiquités*, 21-22) contest this hypothesis.

[102a] *LAB* indicates the Latin name of the book: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.*

[103] So also Josephus, *Ant.* 5:182, noted by James, *Antiquities,* 146.

[104] Cohn, 'An Apocryphal Work,' 322.

Israel survive the present onslaught of its enemies?[105] His affirmative answer is rooted in Israel's status as the chosen covenant people of God[106] and is sometimes spelled out in a recitation of Israelite history, including the partriarchal history he bypassed earlier in his narrative.[107]

A second tendency in the *Biblical Antiquities* relates to the manner in which the Book of Judges organizes history around great Israelite leaders.[108] The story of Abraham is radically revised: the patriarch was present at the building of the tower of Babel, but he and eleven others refused to participate in the idolatrous enterprise; from these twelve, Abraham is set apart as the only one who rejects the possibility of escape and confronts death in a fiery furnace (*LAB* 6).[109] The story of Moses' birth is prefaced by a lengthy episode involving his father, Amram, a leader of Israel, who convinces the elders of God's protection of the nation and leads a mass disobedience of the Pharaoh's decree (*LAB* 9). The other parts of the Pentateuch that are reproduced center mainly on the figure of Moses and his functions as mediator of the covenant, intercessor for his people, spokesman of God, and executor of his judgment (*LAB* 10-19); clearly he maintains his preeminent position in Israelite history (*LAB* 19:16). So too, the author's treatment of the book of Joshua centers on the figure of Moses' successor (*LAB* 20-24). Cenez is introduced and celebrated as a leader par excellence (*LAB* 25-28; cf. 49:1). The treatment of Judges makes specific moral judgments about Israel's leaders, often adding a motif of retribution lacking in the biblical text. Gideon, who dies unpunished for his idolatry (Judg 8:22-32), will be punished after death (*LAB* 36:4).[110] Jephthah's loss of his daugher is punishment for a wicked vow (*LAB* 39:11), and she is said to be wiser than her father (*LAB* 40:4). Samson is blinded because his eyes went astray (*LAB* 43:5). Judges 17-20 is unified around the theme of Micah and his idolatry (*LAB* 44-47); his punishment, not mentioned in Judges, is explicit (*LAB* 47:12), and Israel's initial defeat by Benjamin is punishment for those who did not oppose Micah's idolatry (*LAB* 47). The birth of Samuel is set against a vacuum of leadership in Israel, and he is designated as a leader like Cenez (*LAB* 49:1).Finally, the treatment of 1 Samuel centers mainly on the figures of Samuel, Saul, and David, which is quite consonant with the biblical book.

The message of the *Biblical Antiquities* is probably to be found in the two tendencies we have just described. The content of the many speeches put

[105] E.g., 9:3; 12:8; 18:10-11; 19:9; 30:4; 35:3; 49:3.

[106] See Perrot, *Les Antiquités*, 43-47.

[107] 18:5-6; 23; 32:1-10.

[108] See the detailed discussion by Nickelsburg, 'Good and Bad Leaders,' 50-62.

[109] Cf. Dan 3 and see Nickelsburg, 'Good and Bad Leaders,' 52. The legend of Abraham in the fiery furnace is found in rabbinic literature in various other forms. Cf. *Gen. R.* 38, p. 361-363, *Seder Eliahu Rabba* p. 27f., *Seder Eliahu Zutta* p. 47, *Midr. ha-Gadol Gen.* p. 206 and 252.

[110] For other references to *post-mortem* judgment, see 3:10; 16:3; 23:13; 25:7.

on the lips of the leaders of Israel functions as a kind of kerygma: Israel is God's people, chosen already before creation;[111] therefore, even when their very existence is threatened, God's covenant fidelity will deliver them. The embodiment of this 'kerygma' in speeches by Israelite heroes adds a particular dimension to the biblical portraits of these leaders and undergirds their significance in the present book. The author often contrasts them to the people, and his frequent use of the first person singular in their speeches underscores their individuality.[112] This literary technique as well as his portrayals of the leaders suggest that he is stressing good or bad leadership as an important constituent in the strong or weak religious and moral fiber of the nation.

The *Biblical Antiquities* has usually been dated shortly before or after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E.[113] Similarities to *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra* tend to support that contention,[114] and the book's many similarities with traditions in Josephus' *Antiquities* may also indicate a date late in the first century.[115] The message of the book, as we have profiled it, fits well into the post-70 period. A query about Israel's continued existence in the face of powerful gentile opposition and conquest would have been much to the point,[116] and it presents another facet of the problem raised by *2 Baruch* and *4 Ezra*.[117] The emphasis on the necessity of good leaders would have been especially appropriate after the chaos of the years 66-70 and their proliferation of would be Messiahs, prophets, and demagogues.[118] In such a context, the specific message and function of the book would be this. 'In the midst of oppression, disillusion, dissolution, and despair spawned by the events of 70, this author preaches a message of hope, appealing to God's promises to Abraham and Israel's status – even now – as God's chosen people. The day of Deborah stands as a promise (32:14). In God's right time, a ruler like Cenez will arise to deliver his people. The secret sins

[111] 60:2.

[112] E.g., 6:11; 9:3-6; 24:1 (cf. Josh 24:15).

[113] Cohn, 'An Apocryphal Work,' 327; James, *Antiquities*, 30-33; Strugnell, 'Philo,' 408; Harrington in Perrot – Bogaert, *Les Antiquités*, 78. Bogaert (*ibid.*, 66-74) suggests wider limits for the date. A date in the time of Pompey is proposed by Helot, 'La Datation.'

[114] For the parallels, see James, *Antiquities*, 46-58; Bogaert, *Apocalypse*, 247-52; and Feldman, 'Prolegomenon,' liv-lv.

[115] For the many parallels to Josephus, see *ibid.*, lviii-lxiv.

[116] Especially noteworthy is the frequent use of the negative form: God will *not forget* his promises (35:2-3). God will *not* let Israel *be totally destroyed* (9:3; 18:10; 30:4). He will *not cast off* his people forever, *nor hate* them to all generations (49:3). This negative formulation is spoken to people who suppose that they may have been totally rejected by God and permanently disenfranchised from the elect status.

[117] The two apocalypses ponder Israel's defeat at the hands of its enemies, and this relates to the question of God's justice. Pseudo-Philo raises, and rejects, the possibility that Israel's defeat may lead to its extinction. A similar query is made by Baruch (*2 Bar.*3:5-6).

[118] The chaos and crisis of leadership during these years are detailed by Rhoads, *Israel in Revolution.*

of the people will be found out, and the nation will be purged, and the precious stones of the twelve tribes will shine in the new Jerusalem (26:12-15).'[119]

The *Biblical Antiquities* is extant only in Latin, which is generally thought to be a translation of a Greek translation of a Hebrew original.[120] Its author is unknown, but the work came to be attributed to Philo of Alexandria because it was transmitted with genuine works of Philo.[121]

An exhaustive comparison of Pseudo-Philo's narrative technique with that in parallel writings would require extended treatment.[122] In general we may note the following. It differs from *Jubilees* in its highly selective reproduction of the text and its lack of halakhic interest. Indeed, whereas *Jubilees* makes many halakhic additions to the narratives, Pseudo-Philo deletes almost all of the legal material in the Pentateuch. Pseudo-Philo's selective reproduction of the text also differs from the Genesis Apocryphon; however, like the Apocryphon, the narrative is characterized by the addition of lengthy non-biblical incidents. The selective mixture of quotation, paraphrase, and expansion is similar to the Genesis Apocryphon and *1 Enoch* 6-11. As to contents, Pseudo-Philo almost completely ignores the Enochic-Noachic traditions that are so important to *1 Enoch, Jubilees,* and the Genesis Apocryphon.[123] The book's possible relationship to traditions attested in the rabbinic literature awaits detailed study.[124]

The Books of Adam and Eve

The story of Adam and Eve inspired a considerable volume of Jewish and early Christian literature. The *Vita Adae et Evae* and the *Apocalypse of Moses* are two major recensions of one such work.

THE APOCALYPSE OF MOSES

This Greek text is the shorter and simpler of the two recensions. It is primarily an account of the first father's death, its cause and its cure. Chapters 1-4 retell Genesis 4:1-25: the birth of Cain and Abel, the murder

[119] Nickelsburg, 'Good and Bad Leaders,' 63.

[120] James, *Antiquities,* 28-29; Strugnell, 'Philo,' 408; Harrington in Perrot – Bogaert, *Les Antiquités,* 75-77. See, however, Feldman, 'Prolegomenon,' xxv-xxvii.

[121] See James, *Antiquities,* 26-27; and Feldman, 'Prolegomenon,' xxii-xxiv.

[122] See James, *Antiquities,* 42-60; and Feldman, 'Prolegomenon,' li-lxxvi.

[123] The excursus on the final judgment and resurrection attached to the flood story at *LAB* 3:9-10 does suggest familiarity with the flood/final judgment typology so frequent in the Enochic texts (see above, pp. 90-5).

[124] See the many parallels in rabbinic literature cited in the index of Perrot –Bogaert, *Les Antiquités* 2, 294-9. On the problems of dating the possible common traditions, see Feldman, 'Prolegomenon,' xxxi.

of Abel, and the birth of Seth.[125] The function of this section is to introduce Seth, the recipient of important traditions and in other ways a central figure in the action that follows. Once Seth has appeared, the author moves quickly to Adam's terminal illness (5:1-2), and the remainder of the book deals with the events surrounding his death. Most of the elements of the testament genre (see below, chap. 8) occur in these chapters, although they are in the service of the author's special purposes and are part of a broader plot.[126]

When Adam sees that he is going to die, he summons his children (5:2). Since they do not understand what death is (5:4-6:3), he recounts his past – the Temptation, the Fall, and the expulsion from paradise (chaps. 7-8). Different from typical testamentary narratives, this recital does not exemplify good or bad conduct, but explains why Adam must die. Eve and Seth go in search of the oil of mercy that flows from a tree in paradise, so that Adam may find rest from his pain (chap. 9).[127] The story of the beast's attack on Seth (chaps. 10-12) is either an exegetical elaboration on Genesis 3:15 or an illustration of how, after the Fall, the beasts are no longer subject to humankind (cf 24:4).[128] When Seth and Eve pray for the oil of mercy (chap. 13), Michael responds by contrasting the present time and the future. Adam may not have the oil now, i.e., he must die. However, in 'the end of the times' there will be a resurrection. Then the delights of paradise will be given to 'the holy people,' and sin will be extirpated.

Eve now gathers her family and rehearses the events that brought death into the world (chap. 14). Like chapters 7-8, this longer account (chaps. 15-30) of the events in Genesis 3 explains Adam's death to his children.[129] The artful and imaginative elaboration of the biblical account describes the relationship between serpent and devil and the nature of the Fall, viz., Adam's and Eve's loss of their 'glory' and 'righteousness.' The author also expands the biblical list of consequences for Adam, Eve, and the serpent (chaps. 24-26). The detailed description of the expulsion from the garden repeats Adam's petition for mercy and God's response (chaps. 27-29). He asks for pardon, and God chides the angels for temporarily discontinuing the expulsion.[130] When Adam asks for the fruit of the tree of life, God responds, 'not now.' However, if Adam turns from sin, God will raise him up in the resurrection and give him of the tree of life. God does give Adam

[125] Elements in Eve's dream (*Apoc. Moses* 2:2-3 and especially the form in *Vita* 22:4) suggest an exegetical development from Gen 4:11.

[126] The author's purpose is often to be seen at precisely the point at which he diverges from the genre. For details see Nickelsburg, 'Related Traditions,' 516-19.

[127] On this motif and its development in later folklore, see Quinn, *Quest*.

[128] A connection with Gen 3:15 is more evident in *Vita* 37:3.

[129] See Nickelsburg, 'Related Traditions,' 518.

[130] The wording of this section is reminiscent of *1 Enoch* 63, especially 63:1, 5-6, 9. cf. also *1 Enoch* 63:11 and Gen 3:24.

permission to take herbs and seeds from paradise, so that he can offer incense to God and have food for his sustenance. The section closes with a stereotyped testamentary exhortation that the children not follow their parents' example (chap. 30).

The narration of the deathbed events now focuses on Adam's fate. We have the first indication of a concern with the disposal of Adam's body (31:3-4). Eve's prayer in behalf of Adam is typical of the book's emphasis on her primary responsibility for the Fall (32:1-2).[131] In confessing her sin, Eve implicitly lessens Adam's fault in the hope that he will obtain mercy. Eve's vision of the heavenly throne room (for which Seth acts as an *'angelus' interpres*) provides the evidence that her prayer has been answered (chaps. 33-37). The angels intercede for Adam and then break into a hymn of praise because God has had mercy on him. The first father is purified in the Acherusian Lake[132] and is promised ultimate victory over Satan. Michael then conveys Adam's soul (37:6) to the heavenly paradise.

God gives the angels directions for the burial of Adam and Abel (38:1-41:2). His last word is: 'Adam, Adam . . . I told you that earth you are and to earth you will return. Again I promise you the resurrection; I shall raise you up on the last day in the resurrection with every man who is of your seed' (chap. 41). Again the author juxtaposes the necessity of Adam's death because of his sin (cf. Gen 3:19) with the promise of resurrection. Chapters 42-43 describe Eve's death and burial. Seth receives special instructions for her burial, together with the command to bury everyone in the same manner (43:2-3). Eve's death and burial close the narrative.

Speculation about the salvation of Adam and Eve is central to this book. Will God have mercy on the people responsible for the presence of sin and death in this world? The answer is twofold. Death is an inevitable consequence of Adam's (and Eve's) sin, and no amount of bargaining and praying can alter this fact.[133] Adam has been cut off from the tree of life; the most he can take from paradise are seeds to grow food and incense to accompany his prayer. In the latter is a bridge from condemnation to ultimate salvation, which is the author's second point. In spite of Adam's death, God does have mercy on the first father. He receives his soul and promises the resurrection of his body and access to the delights and eternal sustenance which he left behind in the garden.

The author's interest is not limited to speculation about Adam and Eve. The resurrection will be a general resurrection. The specifications for burial apply to 'every man who dies' (chaps. 38-43). If the death and trouble which Adam and Eve brought into the world are a universal malady, the resurrection provides a remedy for all 'the holy people' who

[131] Cf. 9:2; 10:1-2; 14:2; 21:6.

[132] An indication that the author was familiar with Hellenistic cosmology.

[133] For a similar theme, see the discussion of *T. Abr.*, above, pp. 60-4.

descend from him. Proper burial is performed in the hope of the resurrection and as a sign of it. Because of this hope, mourning must give way to joy. It must not extend beyond six days, since the seventh day is symbolic of the eternal rest.[134] In short, our author admits the inevitability of death for everyone, but he expresses his faith in the resurrection. As Adam was the creature of God and his image, so it is with all humanity; and the Creator will redeem his creature in the resurrection.[135]

THE LIFE OF ADAM AND EVE

Approximately one-half of the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* overlaps with a similar proportion of the *Apocalypse of Moses.*

	Vita	*Apoc. Mos.*
Penitence, the devil's narrative, Cain's birth (section 1)	1:1-22:2	——
The birth of (Cain) Abel, Seth *et al.* (2)	22:3-24:2	1:1-5:1a
Adam's revelations to Seth (3)	chaps. 25-29	——
Adam's sickness, narrative (4)	chaps. 30-44	5:1b-14:3
Eve's narrative (5)	——	chaps. 15-30
Adam's death, Eve's vision, Adam's burial (6)	chaps. 45-48	31:1-42:2
Eve's testament (7)	49:1-50:2	——
Eve's death and burial (8)	50:3-51:3	42:3-43:4

The overlapping parts of the *Apocalypse* and the *Vita* parallel one another closely in order and wording. The material found in the *Vita,* but not in the *Apocalypse of Moses,* occurs in three blocks (*Vita* 1:1-22:2; 25 - 29; 49:1-50:2).

The narrative thread that binds together *Vita* 1-22 is Adam's and Eve's quest for food, although other episodes and themes are interspersed. When Adam and Eve are driven from paradise, they find the earth devoid of food (1:1-4:2). They hope that acts of penitence will obtain divine favour and result in the gift of food (4:3—6:2). Adam will fast forty days and then spend forty days in the Jordan River. Eve is to stand in the waters of the Tigris for thirty-seven days. Satan appears to Eve in the guise of an angel (cf. *Apoc. Moses* 17) and once again deceives her (7:1-10:4). He then explains his treachery in an account of his expulsion from heaven (11-17; cf. Isa 14). After Cain's birth, which is narrated as a separate incident (18:1-21:3), God sends Adam seeds to grow the food for which he has been searching (22:2).

[134] This idea is clearer in *Vita* 51:2.

[135] On the soteriology of the work, see Sharpe, 'The Second Adam.' For the relationship between creation and redemption with reference to resurrection, cf. 2 Macc 7:11, 22-23, 27-29.

In chapters 25-29, Adam transmits secret knowledge to Seth. In the first part of this instruction (25:1-29:1), he relates his vision of God after his expulsion from the garden.[136] Its theme (God's threat of death, Adam's petition, God's promise of mercy) parallels the last part of Eve's narrative in the *Apocalypse of Moses* 27-29.[137] The second half of Adam's instruction is an historical apocalypse revealed to Adam after he had eaten of the tree of knowledge (29:2-9).

In the *Apocalypse of Moses* 14, Adams bids Eve to recount the story of the Fall, and Eve's narrative follows. In *Vita* 44 Adam tells Eve to recount the story *after his death.* At that time and immediately before her own death, Eve gathers her children. However, she does not tell the story of the Fall. Rather she repeats Michael's instructions that the children should write on clay and stone tablets the lives of Adam and Eve (chaps 49-50). The book ends with Seth fulfilling this command.

There are two major structural differences between the *Apocalypse of Moses* and the *Vita.* Eve's narrative is missing in the *Vita,* and three blocks of material in the *Vita* are missing in the *Apocalypse of Moses.*

An explanation of these differences is very possibly to be found in Slavonic and Armenian versions of this work. The Slavonic version follows the order of the *Apocalypse of Moses,* and lacks none of the latter's major sections, although it compresses some of them. The end of Eve's narrative differs in three major respects, however. The dialogue between God and Adam is shortened. Adam leaves paradise without any seeds. The narrative then continues with a section that parallels *Vita* 1-22 and describes how Adam looks for food.[138]

The situation is somewhat different in the Armenian *Penitence of Adam.*[139] The book begins with the account of the penitence of Adam and Eve, the devil's narrative, and the birth of Cain which corresponds with *Vita* 1-22. Thereafter, the *Penitence* agrees in its structure with the *Apo-*

[136] Scholem (*Jewish Gnosticism*, 17, n. 10) mentions this text in his discussion of Merkabah texts. Terminological similarities to Merkabah texts are evident. The parallels between this text and *1 Enoch* 12-16 (see below, n. 142) also point toward a connection with Jewish mystical texts; see Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, Levi and Peter,' 576-82.

[137] The end of the passage (*Vita* 28:3-29:1) suggests that in fact the incident took place before the expulsion from the garden. To what waters does the author have reference: the water-like appearance in throne visions (Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism*, 14-15); or the rivers around the earthly paradise (Gen 2:10-14)? For God's heavenly palace of ice, cf. *1 Enoch* 14:8-14, on which see Nickelsburg, 'Related Traditions,' 526-27; and *id.*, 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter,' 578-80.

[138] This section is shorter than *Vita* 1-22 and shows some evidence of confused compression. It omits the account of Cain's birth. More important, Adam and Eve receive food early in the account (chap. 31) and not at the end as in the *Vita.* Thus the penitence does not serve the same function as in the *Vita.* See also the next note.

[139] For a translation, see Stone, *Penitence of Adam.* Lüdtke ('Georgische Adam-Bücher') has published an account of the Georgian version, which appears to correspond very closely in order and content to the Armenian *Penitence*; see *ibid.*, 155-6.

calypse of Moses against the *Vita*. That is, it lacks Adam's revelation to Seth and Eve's testament (sections 3 and 7 in the above plan) and it contains Eve's narrative (section 5). The account of the expulsion, however, omits mention of the seeds for food (chap. 29).[140]

In both the Slavonic version and the *Penitence,* the story of the quest for food and the penitence is the counterpart of the request for seeds in the *Apocalypse of Moses* 29:4-6. A comparison of all the texts raises two questions. 1) Is the longer story in *Vita* 1-22 and *Penitence* 1-22 an expansion of the incident in the *Apocalypse of Moses* 29, or are the relevant elements in the latter a compression of the longer story? 2) Is the original placement of the story of the quest and penitence to be found in the Slavonic *Adam and Eve* or in the Armenian *Penitence* and the *Vita?*

A final and certain solution to these problems is not possible on the basis of presently published texts and analyses. Clearly all the texts are witnesses to a long and complex history of literary and possibly oral transmission, and each of them represents a different stage in the development of this transmission.

The present author's hypothesis is, however, as follows.[141] Section 1 (*Vita* 1-22; *Penitence* 1-22) is largely an expansion of its counterparts in the *Apocalypse of Moses.* The story and description of the penitence of Adam and Eve is religiously motivated (see below). The role played by the devil in this section (chaps. 7-10) dramatizes the fact that temptation is a continuing fact of life. The devil's narrative reflects theological speculation (chaps. 11-17) that may be hinted at in *Apocalypse of Moses* 16:3. The story of the birth of Cain (chaps. 18-21) is more ambiguous. It may be an elaboration of the *Apocalypse of Moses* 25:3, although the latter could well be a fleeting allusion to the longer story. In section 2 the account of Adam's ascent to the heavenly paradise (*Vita* 25-29:1) is a revision of the heart of Eve's narrative (*Apoc. Moses* 24-29). The transformation of the account was probably due to a theology of a transcendent God, which preferred a theophany in the heavenly paradise to God's descent to earth as depicted in Genesis 3. The account reflects traditional ascent texts such as *1 Enoch* 12-16.[142] Adam's second revelation to Seth about the future of the world (*Vita* 29:2-10) and Eve's testament (section 3, chaps. 49-50) comprise the kind of apocalyptic material that is at home in testamentary literature. These may have been drawn from an Adamic testament, also alluded to in Josephus (*Ant.* 1:70-71).[143] If the account of Adam's and Eve's penitence is, in fact, an expansion of Eve's narrative, the account may very likely have been placed

[140] As in the *Vita*, Adam and Eve decide on acts of penitence in order to obtain food (chap. 4). However, by the end of the section (chap. 22), this motivation has been forgotten, different from *Vita* 22:2, where the receipt of the seeds brings the section to a logical conclusion.

[141] For details, see Nickelsburg, 'Related Traditions,' 516-25, especially 524-5.

[142] *Ibid.*, 526-28.

[143] *Ibid.*, 525, 532.

originally after that narrative, as it is in the Slavonic version. The episode would have later been moved to its present position in the *Vita* and the *Penitence* because it belonged there chronologically, i.e., before the story of Adam's death.

In short, the *Apocalypse of Moses* is a more original form of the work. The *Vita* is an expansion of the earlier work – although it may contain some original elements that have dropped out of the *Apocalypse* and some original wording now revised in the *Apocalypse.* The Slavonic and Armenian versions are related and intermediate steps in the recensional process.[144]

Introductory questions about these Adamic works are not easily answered. The date of composition of the *Apocalypse of Moses* and the *Vita* cannot be determined with any certainty.[145] Although the author of the *Vita* may well have known the Adamic tradition referred to by Josephus around the end of the first century ,[146] the date of that putative work is itself unknown.

The *Apocalypse of Moses* is extant in Greek,[147] and the Latin *Vita* and the Slavonic and Armenian versions doubtlessly derive from Greek originals.[148] Scholars have suggested that alleged mistranslations, Semitic constructions, and Semitic word-plays indicate that such Greek texts were based on Hebrew originals[149] or on Hebrew or Aramaic sources.[150] While the non-biblical word-play in *Vita* 21:3 (Cain = קין; reed = קנה/קני clearly reflects Hebrew or Aramaic midrashic activity,[151] derivation of the whole work from a Semitic original (rather than composition in Semiticizing Greek) has not been demonstrated.

An important point of dispute is whether the *Apocalypse* and the *Vita* are Jewish or Christian compositions.[152] Although all the extant versions have been transmitted in Christian circles and contain occasional Christian allusions, this does not exclude the possibility that the original work was

[144] The priority of the *Apocalypse of Moses* is argued by Wells, 'Adam and Eve,' 128. According to Meyer ('Vita,' 205-07), both the *Apocalypse* and the *Vita* preserve elements from a Hebrew original.

[145] After a lengthy discussion, Kabisch ('Die Entstehungszeit') identifies the *Apocalypse of Moses* as a Jewish writing of the second centurey C.E. Wells ('Adam and Eve,' 126-27) inclines toward the first century C.E. Denis, (*Introduction,* 6-7) suggests first or early second century. None of the criteria are totally convincing.

[146] See above, n. 143.

[147] For the texts see Tischendorf, *Apocalypses,* 1-23.

[148] On the Latin, see Meyer, 'Vita,' 207. On the Slavonic, see Jagić, 'Slavische Beiträge,' 3. On the Armenian, see Conybeare, 'Apocalypse of Moses,' 217; and Preuschen, *Adamschriften,* cited by Kabisch, 'Die Entstehungszeit,' 110.

[149] Fuchs, 'Das Leben,' 511; Meyer, 'Vita,' 207.

[150] Wells, 'Adam and Eve,' 129-30.

[151] See Fuchs, 'Das Leben,' 515, n. h; Wells, 'Adam and Eve,' 138.

[152] For the variety of opinions, see Denis, *Introduction,* 6.

composed by a Jew or that the secondary recensions were Jewish. Christian allusions could be interpolations. On the other hand, dependence on Jewish sources does not exclude Christian composition from such sources. A crucial text in this respect occurs in the *Apocalypse of Moses* 13:3-5 and its parallels in *Vita* 42 and *Penitence* 42, viz., Michael's answer to the request for the oil of mercy. According to the *Apocalypse of Moses,* Michael announces the resurrection of all flesh from Adam to that day and their receipt of the delights of paradise. According to the *Penitence,* Christ will resurrect Adam's body and baptize him in the Jordan, and Michael will anoint 'the new Adam' with the oil of joy. In the *Vita*, an interpolated passage from the Gospel of Nicodemus[153] describes how Christ will come and raise the body of Adam and all the dead, and he (Jesus) will be baptized in the Jordan and will anoint all believers with the oil of mercy. This interpolation appears to have replaced a reading similar to that in he *Penitence.* Whether such a reading was original to a work that was then, by definition, a Christian composition,[154] or whether the reading was a Christian revision of an originally Jewish reading (such as *Apoc. Moses* 13:2-5) is a matter to be debated.

Although the Jewish or Christian origins of these works cannot yet be determined with certainty, there is a series of allusions that suggest one aspect of the books' provenance, viz., the references to ablutions and immersion in water. In her vision, Eve sees Adam washed in the Acherusian Lake (*Apoc. Moses* 37:3). The apocalypse in *Vita* 29:9 makes reference to water purification, and in *Vita* 1ff., both Adam and Eve carry out an act of penitence by standing at length in the rivers Jordan and Tigris. Moreover, the Christian passages in *Penitence* 42 and *Vita* 42 speak of Adam's and Jesus' baptism in the Jordan. All of this suggests that the book was composed and transmitted in Jewish and/or Christian baptist circles.[155] Moreover, a careful comparison of the penitential and other ritual acts described in the book with parallel materials in Jewish and Christian sources may indicate a feasible context for the composition and transmission of the books in Jewish and/or early Christian circles.[156]

The figures of Adam and Eve were the subject of endless speculation in Jewish and early Christian circles, as is evident from the commentaries of Philo of Alexandria, the writings of Paul the Apostle (Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:42-50),[157] and the late first century apocalypses (*2 Bar.* 54:15; *4 Ezra*

[153] Meyer, 'Vita,' 204-05.

[154] That the Christian reading in the *Penitence* is the more original is the opinion of M.E. Stone, expressed in conversation.

[155] Briefly suggested in Nickelsburg ('Related Traditions, 538) following the suggestions of G.W. MacRae and A. Böhlig regarding the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam.*

[156] For an example of such an analysis of Jewish and early Christian Daniel traditions, see Satran, 'Daniel.'

[157] On Paul's Adam/Christ typology, and its Jewish background, see Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus.*

3:20-27; 4:30-32; 7:116ff.; cf. *3 Bar.* 4).[158] Moreover, works such as the *Hypostasis of the Archons* and the *Apocryphon of John* offer the peculiarly Gnostic interpretations of the acts of the first parents and their consequences. The figure of Seth is also crucial in Gnostic literature.[159]

The works that we have considered here are only a small part of a vast Adamic literature generated in Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic circles. The *Apocalypse of Moses* and the *Vita* may themselves be based on an earlier Adamic testament or testaments (see above, p. 111). In turn, the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam* is a testament with important affinities to the present texts (not the least an interest in water ablutions) and possibly roots in other Jewish tradition.[160] The many other Christian Adamic works are still in need of careful study.[161]

Hellenistic Jewish Poets

The pseudonymous or anonymous texts discussed thus far in this chapter have tended to follow the prose form employed in their biblical prototypes. In this section we discuss three named authors who used the Greek poetic genres of the epic and the drama as their narrative media. These authors are known to us only through fragments of their works, which were collected by Alexander Polyhistor, a Greek writer of the mid-first century B.C.E. Parts of his work, *On the Jews,* were preserved, in turn, in book 9 of Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica.*[162] These poets are noteworthy examples of Hellenistic Jews who sought to bring the resources of Greek culture into a creative interaction with Jewish religion and culture.

PHILO THE EPIC POET

The veneration of the Homeric epic and the composition of new epic works were important and typical features of the Hellenistic age.[163] Following this literary and cultural trend, and writing in flowery, bombastic, and often obscure Greek,[164] Philo the epic poet composed a work of uncertain length entitled *On Jerusalem.* Eusebius has preserved from Alexander

[158] On the Adam speculation in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch,* see *ibid.,* 27-42. On 3 Bar. 4, see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature,* 300-1.

[159] See below, pp. 446ff., 453. For a broad perspective, see the papers gathered in Layton, *Rediscovery* 2: *Sethian Gnosticism.*

[160] See above, n. 154. On the work itself, see below, pp. 470-4.

[161] For a summary description of the other Adamic works, see Denis, *Introduction,* 7-14. For more detailed descriptions of some of these works, see Frey, 'Adam.' For a briefly annotated translation of the Armenian *Death of Adam,* see Stone, 'Death.'

[162] For other Jewish works preserved by Polyhistor, see below, pp. 160ff.

[163] See Gutman, 'Philo,' 59-63.

[164] *Ibid.,* 37; Wacholder, *Eupolemus,* 283.

Polyhistor six short fragments drawn from three contexts in the poem – a total of twenty-four hexameter verses.

These fragments were arranged by Polyhistor in chronological order, beginning with Abraham (*Praepar. evang.* 9:17,1-19,3). After Polyhistor's brief summary of the story of the sacrifice of Isaac (9:19,4) Eusebius gives the first two fragments of Philo's epic, assigned by Polyhistor to the first book of *On Jerusalem* (9:20,1). Its subject matter is Abraham and especially the sacrifice. Philo very likely included the event in his epic because of the traditional identification of Mt. Moriah with the temple mountain in Jerusalem.[165] The first fragment, in typical epic style, is addressed directly to Abraham; its language is obscure.[166] God is referred to as 'the thunderer,' a Homeric epithet for the god Ares.[167] The end of the passage interprets the event as the confirmation of God's promise of offspring, now realized in the existence of Israel.[168] The second fragment, also drawn from the account of the sacrifice, is phrased in the third person and anticipates God's intervention at the climactic moment in the story.

Polyhistor's third fragment from Philo is the second of two passages that he quotes about the patriarch Joseph (*Praepar. evang.* 9:23-24). He attributes it to the fourteenth book of Philo's *On Jerusalem.*

> For them the great leader of all, the Most High, created a most blessed dwelling place (ἕδος), even of old, from (the time of) Abraham and Isaac (and) Jacob, blessed with children, whence came Joseph, who as an interpreter of dreams, bearing the sceptre on Egypt's throne, whirling about time's secrets in the flood-time of fate.

Although the thrust of this passage is clear enough, a number of particulars remain obscure. These in turn affect our understanding of the shape of Philo's epic. 'For them' appears to refer to the Israelites, but what is the blessed dwelling place? Is it the promised land,[169] or, given the subject of the poem, is it Jerusalem, the dwelling place of God?[170] Also problematic is the space that the author devotes to this 'dwelling place' and to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Joseph appears to be mentioned almost as an afterthought. Did the context say more about Joseph? If so, why would Polyhistor – who quotes the passage for what it says about Joseph – have

[165] See 2 Chr 3:1; and explicitly *Jub.* 18:13; Jos. *Ant.* 1:224, 226; 7:333.

[166] Compare the translations by Gutman ('Philo,' 40) and Attridge ('Philo').

[167] For this use of βρυήπυος, see Homer, *Iliad* 13: 521, cited by Attridge, 'Philo.'

[168] In the biblical account itself (Gen 22:1) God tests Abraham by asking him to give up the tangible evidence of the fulfilment of the promise of a multitude of progeny made earlier (Gen 12:3; 13:14-17; 15:5-6, etc.). On Abraham's faith as the subject of the test, see above, pp. 98-9.

[169] So also Attridge, 'Philo.'

[170] For this meaning, see Liddell-Scott, *Lexicon*, sub ἕδος. The meaning would be that God has established his dwelling place in Jerusalem *for their benefit.*

dropped such material while retaining the first half of the passage? These questions bear on attempts to emend 'fourteenth' to read 'fourth,' on the grounds that Philo would not have taken fourteen books to describe the patriarchal history up to Joseph.[171] In fact, we know nothing about the order of Philo's epic or about the context in that epic in which the present passage occurred. The chronological ordering of Polyhistor's excerpts provides no certain index of the order of any of the works that he quotes.

The final three fragments from Philo's poem describe the water system of Jerusalem (*Praepar. evang.* 9:37). They are quoted as from one section of *On Jerusalem,* but its location in the poem is not specified. Among the extracts, these three fragments appear at the end of a section on Solomon (19:30-34) and are the third of four passages on the topography and hydraulic system of Jerusalem (9:35-38). The fragments stress the abundance of the city's water, as do the passages from Timochares (*History of Antiochus*) and *Aristeas to Philocrates,* which are also quoted by Polyhistor.[172]

The fragments from Philo's epic provide a tantalizing glimpse of a Jewish author who employed a Hellenistic literary genre to sing the praises of his capital city and of the history of the people who inhabited it and worshipped there.[173] Such contents were consonant with other, non-Jewish epics of the period.[174] Beyond this and the epic form that Philo employs and some occasional linguistic parallels to the Greek epics, it is difficult to determine the manner and the extent of Greek influence on the poem.[175]

The date of the epic is debated. If one identifies the author with Philo (the elder) mentioned by Josephus (*Ag. Apion* 1:218) and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1:141,3), he should probably be dated between the historians Demetrius (221-204 B.C.E.) and Eupolemus (161-157 B.C.E.). Both Josephus and Clement give the sequence: Demetrius, Philo, Eupolemus.[176] The identification, however, is far from certain.[177] The *floruit* of Alexander Polyhistor in the mid-first century B.C.E. provides a *terminus ante quem,* and a date as early as the late second century seems quite possible. The poem reflects detailed knowledge of Jerusalem but

[171] See Gutman, 'Philo,' 38; Wacholder, *Eupolemus,* 282-3; Attridge, 'Philo.'

[172] For a translation of Timochares, see Stern, *Authors* 1, 135. See also the discussion and translation of *Schoinometresis Syriae,* which also is quoted by Polyhistor, Stern, *Authors* 1, 137-8. Common to *Aristeas* 88-90, Philo, fg. 6, and Sir 50:3 is reference to the water system of the temple, as well as a panegyrical tone.

[173] Fg. 6, with its reference to the temple, indicates that this institution and its functions were an important part of Philo's poem.

[174] See the discussion of Gutman, 'Philo,' 59-63.

[175] Gutman ('Philo,' 40-57) draws some far-reaching conclusions about the nature of Greek influence in the first fragment, but Wacholder ('Philo,' 407) does not agree. See also the different translation by Attridge, 'Philo.'

[176] For this identification, see Schürer, *Literature,* 223-24; and Denis, *Introduction,* 270-71.

[177] The identification is questioned by Wacholder, 'Philo,' 407; and Attridge, 'Philo.'

need not point to a Palestinian origin. The author's knowledge of Jerusalem could have come from a written source or an extended stay in the city.[178] Egyptian writings such as the *Sibylline Oracles,* the *Epistle of Aristeas,* and 3 Maccabees, indicate sufficient interest in Jerusalem to justify the Alexandrian provenance to which other Hellenistic aspects of the poem may point.[180]

THEODOTUS THE EPIC POET

Eusebius' extracts from Alexander Polyhistor which preserve fragments attributed to Theodotus' epic poem *On the Jews* differ in significant ways from the preserved fragments of Philo's *On Jerusalem.* As to length, the forty-seven hexameter lines and additional prose summary are well over twice the amount preserved from Philo. The fragments, moreover, are gathered in one place (*Praepar. evang.* 9:22, under the heading of Jacob), and the editorial comments indicate that they were drawn from a single context. Together they retell a single incident in the Bible, whose general narrative shape we can reconstruct. The subject matter is the rape of Dinah and the sack of Shechem (cf. Gen 33:18-34:31).

Because the summaries and fragments reproduce most of the essentials of the biblical account and comprise, in themselves, a unified and understandable whole, it is probable that they faithfully reproduce most, if not all of the relevant part of Polyhistor's text. His technique here was to present a prose summary followed by a fragment of the poem, drawn either from the part summarized or from the material immediately following it. There are eight such fragments with prose introductions and a brief concluding prose summary.

The first summary and fragment introduce the story by providing its setting (9:22,1). In *On the Jews,* Theodotus explained the name and origin of Shechem (summary) and described features of its geographical setting and physical appearance (nine lines of description are quoted). Fragment 2 and its prose introduction (9:22,2) anticipate the outcome of the story (Shechem was conquered by the Hebrews when Hamor was its ruler) and introduce the characters (Jacob, Hamor, and his son Shechem). The third segment is a flashback (9:22,3), briefly describing Jacob's arrival in Mesopotamia and his activities there. The prose introduction summarizes the fifteen line fragment that follows. Jacob fled to Mesopotamia after a dispute with his brother. He was received by Laban and married his two

[178] On Philo's possible connections with Jerusalem, see Wacholder, *Eupolemus,* 282-83. However, his conjecture that Philo was a member of 'the highest echelons of the priestly class' is scarcely justified on the basis of the fragments. Interest in temple and cult is hardly evidence of priestly status.

[180] Alexandria is suggested as a possibility by Attridge, 'Philo.'

daughters. They bore him eleven sons, who were very wise, and a daughter, Dinah, who was beautiful and of noble spirit.

The introduction of these characters prepares us for the action in the first major scene,[181] which is depicted in a lengthy prose summary (9:22,4-5) and two quotations (9:22,6-7). When Jacob arrived in Shechem,[182] Hamor received him and provided him with land (Gen 33:18-19), where he worked with his eleven sons and his daughter Dinah. The story of Dinah's visit to Shechem, her rape, and Hamor's and Shechem's visit to Jacob are briefly recounted (cf. Gen 34:1-17). This lengthy summary is followed by two poetic fragments of three or four lines (probably taken from the part of the poem summarized in prose)[183] which provide the rationale for circumcision. Fragment 4 (9:22,6) corresponds roughly to Genesis 34:14-16: Hebrews may marry only persons of their own race. Fragment 5, which appeared in the poem 'a little below' the previous one, makes reference to the divine institution of the Abrahamic covenant of circumcision (9:22,7; cf. Gen 17:1-14).

Fragments 6 and 7, which comprise scene two of the story, are an addition to the biblical account which provides a rationale for Simeon's and Levi's attack on Shechem (9:22,8-9) that is paralleled in contemporary Jewish writings. The action is initiated by Simeon, who co-opts his brother,[184] and it is based on a divine oracle that God would give ten peoples to the children of Abraham (frag. 6).[185] God prompted the brothers to attack the city because its inhabitants were 'impious' (ἀσεβεῖς) and did evil to whoever came to them' (frag. 7).[186]

A third scene completes the story. Two prose lines summarize the attack on Shechem (cf. Gen 34:25-26a): Levi and Simeon enter the city fully armed (καθωπλισμένους),[187] kill whomever they meet and then dispatch Hamor and Shechem.[188] A poetic fragment of seven lines describes the

[181] Not only are Jacob and his eleven sons and daughters mentioned at the beginning of the next scene, but Dinah's beauty will be the cause of the incident.

[182] This item at the beginning of this summary (9:22,4) recalls the last item in the previous summary (9:22,3).

[183] The last line of 9:22,5 (Hamor agrees to the circumcision) presumes Jacob's speeches here recorded and links with opening line in 9:22,8, which begins the second scene.

[184] The order, Simeon and Levi, follows the biblical account (Gen 34:25), but the prominence of Simeon is asserted in Jdt 9:2. See also the next note.

[185] Cf. *T. Levi* 5:3, where Levi receives an angelic commission to avenge the deed; 6:1, where he finds a shield; and 6:8, where he 'saw' God's sentence against Shechem. For Levi as a visionary and prophet, cf. also *Jos. As.* 22:13; 23:8, and on the typology between this story and that of Shechem, see above, pp. 66-7. In view of the tradition of Levi as a prophet, the ascription of the oracle to Simeon here is odd and may reflect some confusion or manipulation of the tradition.

[186] Cf. *T. Levi* 6:8-10.

[187] Cf. *T. Levi* 5:3, where Levi receives a sword and shield from the angel, and 6:1, where he finds a shield.

[188] The order Simeon/Levi and Hamor/Shechem follows Gen 34:25-26. *T. Levi* 6:4 reverses the order but attributes the deaths of the two men to Levi and Simeon respectively.

murderous act in detail. Three prose lines about the pillaging of the city and the rescue of Dinah (cf. Gen 34:26b-29) conclude the account and the extracts from Theodotus.

The story as recounted by Polyhistor is remarkable for its unity and narrative flow. The scene is set. The characters are introduced. The action follows with due explanation of the characters' motivations. These motivations and other hints of the author's point of view – particularly as these are evident in his manipulation of the biblical material – provide some clues as to the book's provenance and author's purpose.

Our discussion will look at two competing claims about the provenance of the work. Conventional wisdom since Freudenthal (1875) has argued for a Samaritan origin.[189] According to this view, the title, *On the Jews,* given by Polyhistor is simply wrong. Rather the epic described the history of 'the holy city' (ἱερὸν ἄστυ) Shechem, and may even have been entitled *On the Foundation of Shechem.*[190] Most recently Collins has offered a detailed refutation of this view and argued that Theodotus was 'a militant and exclusivistic Jew,' who here defends and glorifies Hyrcanus' conquest of Shechem.[191]

As we have observed, fragment 1, which is an addition to the biblical account, serves as an introduction to the story. The lush description of the landscape is paralleled by similar passages in Homer, which introduce such unhappy events as Odysseus' sojourn with Calypso (*Od.* 5:55-75) and his encounter with the Cyclops (*Od.* 9:105-142). These parallels neutralize claims that the poem was written in praise of Shechem.[192] That the epic itself spoke in detail about the foundation of Shechem or glorified the city cannot be determined from present evidence.[193] Of Shechem itself we hear no more in the preserved fragments.

Once Jacob and the two Shechemite princes are introduced, the story immediately focuses on Jacob. His arrival is told against the background of his exploits in Mesopotamia. His reception and subsequent deception by Laban appears to be an artistically contrived foil for his reception by Hamor and the subsequent violation of hospitality by his son.[194]

[189] Freudenthal, *Studien*, 99-100; Denis, *Introduction,* 272; Hengel, *Hellenism*, 1, 59, 89, 266; Wacholder, *Eupolemus,* 283-5.

[190] Jacoby, *Fragmente*, 3C, 2, no. 732.

[191] Collins, 'Theodotus.' The hypothesis of a Samaritan origin was previously challenged by Kippenberg, *Garizim,* 84; and Charlesworth, *Modern Research,* 210. See also now, Fallon, 'Theodotus.'

[192] Even less can it be shown that the description was intended as a counterpart of Philo's glorification of Jerusalem, as is suggested by Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 283-4.

[193] Furthermore, the Homeric expression, 'the holy city,' need only reflect the biblical view that Shechem was a sacred site. See Collins, 'Theodotus,' 94.

[194] The verb, ὑποδέχομαι ('receive'), occurs 9:22,3 of Laban and 9:22,4 of Hamor. On the Shechemites' violations of hospitality, cf. also *T. Levi* 6:8-10.

Two factors in the first scene (frags. 4-5) argue for a Jewish provenance and against a Samaritan origin. The requirement of circumcision is set by Jacob and is explained as a divine ordinance. There is no hint that this demand is a deceitful ploy (contrast Gen 34:13). A similar tendency is evident in the second scene (frags. 6-7). We are not told that the Shechemites did in fact undergo circumcision. Thus the treachery of the brothers' attacking the helpless men is bypassed in silence.[195] This feature is more easily attributed to a Jewish than to a Samaritan author. More important, the slaughter of the Shechemites is described as a divinely sanctioned act of judgment on the impious Shechemites,[196] of whose lawless character and deeds the rape of Dinah was simply an example.[197] The viewpoint is hardly that of a Samaritan. The gory description of the murder of Hamor and Shechem has many parallels in the accounts of the Trojan war[198] and helps to arouse the emotions of the reader, who happily sees divine vengeance enacted.

In short, both in its own right and in comparison to the biblical account, the present story is easily explicable as a Jewish product and is completely mystifying in the context of a Samaritan hypothesis. Moreover, a number of the details which set this story off from its biblical counterparts are paralleled in such Jewish documents as the *Testament of Levi* 5-7, *Jubilees* 30, and Judith 9.[199]

This story appears to have a typological dimension that reflects contemporary Jewish-Samaritan hostility.[200] The Hebrews, the children of Abraham, are characterized by the rite of circumcision and are contrasted with the uncircumcized inhabitants of Shechem – who in the author's time would have been the Samaritans. Moreover, a divine oracle justifies the Hebrews' domination over 'ten people' – i.e., the land of the North.[201]

A determination of the precise nature of the hostility between Jews and Samaritans in the author's time depends upon the dating of the poem. This, however, is uncertain. In the light of archeological evidence, the description of the great wall in fragment 1 appears to point to a date before the middle of the second century B.C.E., when the great cyclopean wall fell into disuse.[202] Collins argues, on the other hand, that the story may well reflect Hyrcanus' conquest of Shechem (between 129 and 107 B.C.E.) and

[195] While an argument from this silence is not decisive, the circumcision is also not mentioned in *Jubilees* 30 and in the account by Josephus, *Ant.* 1:337-41. This suggests a common apologetic tendency; see Collins, 'Theodotus,' 97; and Fallon, 'Theodotus.'

[196] See also *T. Levi* 5-7; *Jub.*. 30:5-7; Jdt 9:2-4, all cited by Collins, 'Theodotus,' 96-97.

[197] Cf. *T. Levi* 6:8-11; 7:2-3 and Sir 50:26.

[198] As a single example that could be multiplied many times, cf. *Iliad* 17:617-19.

[199] See above, nn. 185-8, 194-7. The texts are part of the anti-Samaritan hypothesis of Collins, 'Theodotus,' and are also cited by Fallon, 'Theodotus.'

[200] Collins, 'Theodotus,' 98.

[201] *Ibid.*, 100.

[202] Bull, 'A Note,' 227.

that the author could have described an architectural feature known to him, even if it was no longer functional or in good repair.[203] The point is moot. The violent description in fragment 8 can be explained by epic style and anti-Samaritan invective. Other Jewish documents certainly written before Hyrcanus' attack retell or allude to the story of Shechem with an equallyu bitter tone.[204] Thus it remains unclear whether the present work describes or prescribes such an attack.

The extent of the original poem cannot be determined with any certainty. The title, *On the Jews,* suggests a scope considerably broader than the single incident now preserved. Whether the flashback technique in fragments 3 and 5 indicates that the poem did or did not include these incidents cannot be determined on the basis of present evidence.[205] In any case, the given title of the work and the content of the present story suggest that the poem was intended to serve as nationalistic propaganda, a function consonant with the epic form.[206] The poet's familiarity with the environs of Shechem suggests that the poem may have been written by a Palestinian, perhaps for a Diaspora Jewish audience.[207]

As its hexametric prosody indicates, the poem was composed in Greek, of condiserably higher quality than that of Philo the epic poet.[208] The literary considerations mentioned above also reflect the quality of Theodotus' artistry.

EZEKIEL THE TRAGEDIAN

'The Leading Out' (ἡ ἐξαγωγή) was the title of a drama composed in iambic trimeters – the usual tragic verse – by a certain 'Ezekiel the Poet of Tragedies.'[209] Two hundred sixty-nine verses of the drama have been preserved for us in the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius' *Praeparatio evangelica* 9:28-29.[210] The preserved fragments follow quite closely the biblical account, and specifically the text of the Septuagint,[211]

[203] Collins, 'Theodotus,' 101.

[204] On the dates of these documents, see above pp. 50f., 101-3.

[205] One can argue that the presence of the flashback implies that the incident has not been previously treated. However, see Collins, 'Theodotus,' 94.

[206] *Ibid.,* 102.

[207] *Ibid.,* 102-3.

[208] Thus uniformly, Schürer, *Geschichte* 3, 500; Gutman, 'Philo,' 36-37; Wacholder, *Eupolemus* 283-4; Collins, 'Theodotus,' 102.

[209] For this title, see Eusebius, *Praepar. evang.* 9:28.1. Clement of Alexandria refers to him as 'Ezekiel, the Poet of Jewish Tragedies' (*Strom.* 1:23).

[210] Two selections from the first fragment (lines 7-39, 50-54) are also preserved by Clement (*ibid.*), and lines 256-69, describing the phoenix bird, are reproduced without attribution in Pseudo-Eustathius' *Commentary on the Hexaemeron* (*PG* 18:729D, cited by Mras, 537). Line numbers given here are those of Robertson and follow the sequence of quoted text in Eusebius.

[211] For details, see Robertson, 'Ezekiel.'

with some concessions to dramatic convention and necessity and some additions reflecting Jewish exegetical tradition.

Polyhistor's fragments begin with a lengthy monologue by Moses, which functioned as the prologue to the drama (58 lines; *Praepar. evang.* 9:28, 2-3). Moses has just arrived in Midian (line 58).[212] Typical of the tragic prologue, the speech summarizes the past circumstances and events that provide a setting for the drama. These include Jacob's departure from Canaan and his arrival in Egypt, the oppression by the Egyptians, Moses' birth and his discovery by Pharaoh's daughter, his upbringing in the royal palace, and his slaying of the Egyptian and flight from Egypt – a pithy summary of Genesis 46 and Exodus 1:1-2:15. The comment after line 31 indicates that some material has been omitted, perhaps some extra-biblical details about Moses' infancy.[213]

The first Episode (or Act) described how Moses met and helped the daughters of the Midianite priest (Exod 2:16-17). Only seven lines are preserved, including a fragment of a speech in which Zipporah identified herself and her father (9:28, 4).

From Polyhistor's summary comment, it appears that the next Episode elaborated greatly on Exodus 2:18-21 and described Moses' marriage to Zipporah. In two lines of preserved dialogue, Zipporah discusses her (forthcoming?) marriage with a certain *Chous,* either her brother or a suitor.[214]

After interrupting his account of Ezekiel to include some material pertaining to Zipporah's genealogy drawn from the Jewish historian Demetrius (9:29, 1-3), Polyhistor returns to his account of the drama. Here he reproduces twenty-two lines of a dialogue in which Moses recounts a dream and his father-in-law interprets it (9:29, 4-6). The material is without counterpart in the biblical account. Structurally the scene was probably linked to the description of Moses' marriage.[215]

In his dream Moses is conveyed to Sinai's peak, where he sees a gigantic throne and upon it, God himself in human semblence. God bids him approach the throne, gives him the sceptre, seats him on the throne and crowns him. From the throne, Moses beholds the whole universe. According to the interpretation, Moses 'will cause a great throne to arise,' (line 95), and he himself will rule over mortals. His vision of the universe is inter-

[212] Cf. the wording of Exod 2:22.

[213] This comment is problematic because lines 30-31 reflect Exod 2:10b and lines 32-33 correspond to Exod 2:10a, while lines 34-35 suggest in brief retrospect what logically might have been the content of the section omitted by Polyhistor, viz., Moses' education by his mother.

[214] On the problem of this section, see Robertson, *ad loc.*

[215] If one wishes to limit Ezekiel's drama to a traditional five episodes, this scene must be tied to either the previous or succeeding fragment. A change of location to Mt. Horeb in the next fragment and the connection: Zipporah/Zipporah's father suggests that it should be linked with what precedes. For an analysis of this fragment, see Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète'.

preted not cosmologically, but historically; he will see all things present, past, and future.

The use of a dream to foretell the future is a relatively common device in Greek drama.[216] In the present scene, however, a number of features indicate this author's indebtedness to Jewish tradition, as well. The description of God is reminiscent of the throne visions in Isaiah 6 and Ezekiel 1-2.[217] That the deity invites Moses to sit upon the throne can be related to the commissioning function of those visions. More important, it recalls the enthronement of the one like a son of man in Daniel 7 and, indeed, the first person account of Enoch's appointment as Son of Man in *1 Enoch* 71. Other features are paralleled in the account of Enoch's ascent in *1 Enoch* 14 and of Abraham's ascent in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* 19.[218] In general, the idea of the exaltation of a mortal has many parallels in Jewish tradition,[219] and the image of the stars prostrating themselves before Moses is probably drawn from the story of Joseph and his dream of exaltation.[220] Parallels between this passage and other Moses traditions are also evident. The tradition of Moses' vision of God's throne on Mount Sinai is rooted in Exodus 24:9-11. His vision of heaven and the cosmos is mentioned in *2 Baruch* 59:4-12, and Pseudo-Philo connects a similar vision with Moses' viewing of the land before his death (*LAB* 19:10).[221] Moses' knowledge of past, present, and future has its biblical base in Deuteronomy 32, but the idea is expanded in the *Testament of Moses.*[222] Moses' enthronement draws on the idea that the prophet was also king, an idea attested in Philo of Alexandria and the Rabbis and based on Deuteronomy 33:5.[223] His being seated upon God's throne may reflect Exodus 7:1 ('See, I make you as God to Pharaoh'). Whether line 85 implies a messianic hope as the fruition of royal functions of God, Moses, and the kings of Israel is uncertain.[224]

This evidence indicates that Ezekiel here reflects significant Jewish traditions about Moses and about enthronement. The twofold division of

[216] Cf. Aeschylus, *Persians* 181-214; *Choephori* 526-39; Sophocles, *Elektra* 417-30; Euripides, *Hecuba* 68-97; all cited by Snell, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama,' 155; and Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète,' 220.

[217] *Ibid.*

[218] Especially noteworthy in the *Apocalypse of Abraham* is the patriarch's view down through the spheres.

[219] See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection,* especially chapter 2.

[220] Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète,' 220. On the Joseph story and the motif of exaltation, see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection,* 49.

[221] *2 Bar* 59 is cited by Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète,' 221-2. For another Mosaic ascent text dated to the day of his death, see the texts from *Bereshit Rabbati,* translated by Attridge, 'The Ascension.'

[222] On the *Testament of Moses* as an expansion of the last chapters of Deuteronomy, see Harrington, 'Interpreting Israel's History.'

[223] Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète,' 221. For a detailed discussion, see Meeks, 'The Prophet-King,' 107-17, 177-97. Cf. also below, pp. 267-8.

[224] This is suggested by Starobinski-Safran, 'Un poète,' 223-4.

the material into dream and interpretation, while it is not foreign to analogous scenes in Greek drama, may well indicate that Ezekiel has made use of an apocalyptic account of vision and interpretation.[225] The disparity between the content of the vision and that of the interpretation (here cosmology becomes history) is also a well known feature of such apocalyptic accounts.[226] That Ezekiel may have drawn on a Mosaic tradition seems quite possible. In any case, his insertion of the material provides a framework for his interpretation of Moses' activities in the remainder of the drama. According to lines 36-38, the young Moses was given a royal upbringing.[227] Here Ezekiel anticipates Moses' functions as ruler of Israel. The functions will, of course, include a confrontation with the Egyptian king.

The third Episode in the drama is Moses' encounter with God at the burning bush (*Praepar. evang.* 9:29, 7-13). Eusebius has preserved 103 lines of dialogue from Polyhistor's extracts. First Ezekiel describes the encounter and conversation at the bush, reproducing the substance of Exodus 3:1-4:17 with some rearrangement and additions (9:29,7-11; lines 90-131), which serve his dramatic purposes. By placing the material about Moses' staff (Exod 4:2-7) after the discussion about Moses' speech defect – Exod 4:10-16), he provides a link with the account of the ten plagues. Reference to the Nile turning to blood (Exod 4:9) leads to the actual account of the first plague, which is accomplished by means of Aaron's staff (Exod 7:17ff.). Thus still speaking in the future tense, but with no shift in scene, God moves into a description of the ten plagues (lines 131-51; cf. Exod 8-11) and from there into his commands for the Passover (lines 152-92; cf. Exod 12-13). This conflation and manipulation of the biblical material avoided an extra change in scene and presented the content of the dramatic events in Egypt while avoiding the difficulty of depicting them on stage.[228] While it is inappropriate to speak here of haggadic and halakhic material, it is noteworthy, nonetheless, that Ezekiel considers the celebration of Passover sufficiently significant for him to repeat in detail the divine commandments regarding its observance.

The fourth Episode of the drama recounted the Egyptians' pursuit of Israel and their destruction in the Sea (*Praepar. evang.* 9:29,14; cf. Exod 14). The event itself is not depicted, but the story is told in a fifty-line speech by a messenger, evidently the sole Egyptian survivor of the disaster. This scene would have been set in Egypt among the Egyptians. The device of a messenger narrating action that taste or the limits of the theater prevented from being depicted on stage is a well known convention of

[225] For examples of such accounts, cf. Dan 7 and *1 Enoch* 17-32; 40; 46; 52-56.
[226] See, e.g., the discussion of *4 Ezra* in Stone, 'The Concept.'
[227] See Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, 153.
[228] Thus Robertson, 'Ezekiel.'

Greek drama. An unmistakable parallel and probably the model for this scene is the messenger's description of the Persian defeat in Aeschylus' *The Persians* 353-514.[229]

The fifth and final Episode was set among the palms of Elim (*Praepar. evang.* 9:29,16; cf. Exod 15:27). A person unidentified by Polyhistor speaks to Moses, commenting on the lush beauty of the place (lines 243-53). Among the creatures inhabiting the oasis with its palm trees (φοῖνικες) was the phoenix bird (φοῖνιξ)[230] whose beauty is described in the sixteen lines that conclude the fragments from Ezekiel's drama. The descriptions of the place and the bird are consonant with one another and suggest that Ezekiel is depicting Elim as a kind of paradise.

In *The Exodus,* Ezekiel has employed a major Greek literary genre to interpret Israelite history. His combination of content and form was a good one. The scriptural material and its development in the Jewish tradition offered a rich potential for the development of character and plot and the presentation of dramatic action. That the story had the status of a national epic made it all the more a prime candidate for dramatic presentation. Although Ezekiel may not have been a great and significant poet, the surviving fragments indicate that this work did have its moments of beauty and dramatic effect.[231] His 'metrics are competent,'[232] and his knowledge and use of dramatic technique and tradition are readily evident.[233] Although his focus on an historical event differs from dramatic practice of the classical period,[234] the fragments suggest that the figure of Moses was central and crucial to the action.

Two features of the fragments are best explained by the hypothesis that the drama was created for actual representation on the stage [235]: the avoidance of scenes that were unpresentable; God's explicit statement that he could be heard but not seen. The occasion for such a presentation is uncertain; however, the detailed recounting of commands regarding Passover suggest that the play would have been of special interest in the passover season. The precise function of such a presentation cannot be ascertained on the basis of the fragments. Nonetheless, it would have offered a Jewish audience a drama from their own rather than from gentile religious tradition, and that in itself would certainly have been a motivat-

[229] Snell, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama,' 154.

[230] For the association of the phoenix and the palm tree, see Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15, 391-400, cited by Robertson, 'Ezekiel.' On the myth of the phoenix, see van der Broek, *The Myth.*

[231] Snell, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama,' 151, 164, 153.

[232] Strugnell, 'Ezekiel,' 453.

[233] See Snell, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama,' 154-7.

[234] Robertson, 'Ezekiel.'

[235] See Schürer, *Geschichte* 3, 502; Snell, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama,' 153-4; Robertson, 'Ezekiel.'

ing factor for an author writing in a center of Hellenistic culture and learning.[236]

Whether that center of culture was Alexandria is debatable.[237] Knowledge and use of the legend of the phoenix may support such a conclusion.[238] In such a case, the play would have served to maintain one's Jewish identity over against those gentiles in one's immediate environs.[239]

The date of writing is uncertain. A *terminus post quem* is the third century B.C.E., when the Greek translation of the Torah – which Ezekiel quotes – was first made. A *terminus ad quem* is the mid-first century B.C.E., when Polyhistor excerpted his fragments.[240]

Concerning Ezekiel himself we have no external evidence except the title 'The poet of (Jewish) Tragedies,' which indicates that *The Exodus* was not his only dramatic work.

Supplements to Biblical Books

In the previous part of this chapter we discussed works that interpreted biblical stories by retelling and paraphrasing them, often adding new material. Here we shall discuss supplements to biblical books, i.e., blocks of text interpolated into, or added to the form of the biblical books that is known to us in the canonical Hebrew Bible. In the case of 1 Esdras, Esther, Jeremiah, and Daniel, these supplements have been transmitted in the Septuagint. However, the brief narrative entitled 'the Songs of David' has been preserved only in the Hebrew Qumran Psalter (11QPs^{a}). Some of these additions, supplements, and interpolations surely existed independently of the biblical texts with which they are now associated. In their present context, however, they interpret the earlier forms of the texts. In this respect their function is akin to that of the texts discussed in the first part of this chapter.

In this section there is a problem of classification; some of the present texts could have been grouped with works treated elsewhere in this volume. For example, Baruch could have been placed with the wisdom literature, and the additions to Daniel, with Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers. They are discussed here because of their function as interpretations of Scripture.

The biblical interpretation in these supplements is of two sorts. At many

[236] See Holladay, 'Portrait.'

[237] An Alexandrian provenance is generally accepted; see Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 286; Snell, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama,' 151. Robertson ('Ezekiel') argues that the evidence is indecisive.

[238] On the connections between Egypt and the phoenix, see Rush, 'Phoinix: Der Wundervogel,' 416-19.

[239] Other works of likely Egyptian provenance which take a rather dim view of the Egyptians include Wisdom of Solomon and 3 Maccabees. On *Joseph and Aseneth*, see above, pp. 69f.

[240] Attempts to date the work to the time of the supposed appearance of the phoenix are speculative, Robertson, 'Ezekiel.'

points, the contents of the supplements interpret a wide variety of biblical material. For example, the Song of the Three Young Men in the Greek Daniel is a variation on a number of biblical psalms, and the last part of Baruch paraphrases Second Isaiah. More immediately, however, all these supplements interpret the biblical books in or alongside of which they have been placed.

Since all but one of these texts have been preserved only in the Greek Bible,[241] it is convenient to discuss all of them – including the Hebrew addition to the Psalter – in the order of the books' occurrence in the Septuagint.

THE STORY OF DARIUS' BODYGUARDS (1 Esdras 3-4)

1 Esdras is extant only in the Greek Bible and the versions dependent on it.[242] Its contents parallel 2 Cronicles 35-36, the book of Ezra, and Nehemiah 7:73-8:13. The order of some of the material from Ezra has been rearranged, and there are some additions from other sources. The most significant of these is the story we discuss here.

In its present context in 1 Esdras the story relates the incident responsible for the completion of the Second Temple.[243] King Darius has summoned all his rulers and feted them to a great banquet (3:1-3). Afterwards, when he has retired, his three bodyguards devise a contest. Each of them will propose the one thing that he considers 'the strongest.' The king will then bestow great honours on the one whose proposal seems the wisest (3:4-7). The three proposals are: 'Wine is the strongest'; 'The king is the strongest'; 'Women are the strongest, but truth is victorious over all' (3:8-12). The next day the king summons his rulers to his council chamber and commands the three bodyguards to defend their proposals (3:12-17a).

The speeches parallel one another in form and rhetoric.[244] They begin and close with similar formulae. Throughout, the three speakers appeal to the audience to agree with them, employing the negative form of the rhetorical question: 'Is not . . .? Does not . . .?' The author's ingenuity lies not simply in the cleverness and humour of their assertions and in their ability to support the respective propositions, but, more important, in the manner in which each speaker oversteps the previous arguments.[245]

For the first bodyguard, wine is the strongest (3:17b-24). Its power over men can be seen in its capacity to transform and lead their minds astray,

[241] The story of the three bodyguards in 1 Esdras 3-4 is also recounted by Josephus in *Ant.* 11:33-58, but this is dependent on a form of 1 Esdras.

[242] On 1 Esdras see below, pp. 157-60.

[243] On the relationship of the story to its context, see below, n. 265.

[244] For further details, see Crenshaw, 'The Contest,' 80.

[245] *Ibid.*, 81.

and to erase all social distinctions. According to the second bodyguard, the king is the strongest (4:1-12). As the king's rulers here present can attest, men are strong, for they rule over land and seas and all that is in them. The king, however, is stronger, because he is lord over all these rulers. The point is illustrated by a series of examples, all formulated in a stereotyped way. The third bodyguard – now identified as Zerubbabel – discourses on women and truth (4:13-32, 33-40). He agrees that the king is great, men are many, and wine is strong. But it is women who rule and lord it over all of these. They give birth to the king, the people who rule over sea and land (cf. 4:2), and those who plant the vineyards that produce the wine. In that sense women are superior to all that the previous speeches have acclaimed as strongest. Furthermore, women receive the same attention, obedience, and benefits that kings receive. If wine leads men's minds astray, women cause men to *lose* their minds (4:26). For women, men perish and stumble and sin (4:27). Surely the king is mighty and feared by all, but even he is not exempt from the power of women. With a touch of ironic humour, Zerubbabel depicts Darius as a captive to the whims and antics of his concubine, Apamē (4:29-31).

The king and his nobles look at one another, probably less in agreement with his wisdom than in astonishment at his outspokenness.[246] However, before they can respond, Zerubbabel outdoes himself by launching into a second speech (4:33-41), this one on the unsurpassed power of truth. It is a brilliant stroke. While the speech is interesting and important in its own right and as a refutation of all the previous speeches, its immediate function is to disarm any objections to Zerubbabel's irreverent observations about the king's conduct. If these were true, they cannot be objected to. This is, in effect, admitted at the end, when truth is acclaimed.

In this speech Zerubbabel follows the technique employed in the previous speeches, arguing or asserting the superiority of the object of his praise over those previously discussed. Here, however, it is not simply a matter of superiority. Rather, the absoluteness of truth relativizes all that has been previously mentioned. 'Truth' is here a polyvalent term. It has connotations not only of truth, but also of rightness, steadfastness, and uprightness.[247] As a quality of God, it excludes its opposite, unrighteousness, which characterizes everything that has been previously praised: wine, the king, women, all the sons of men and their deeds (4:36b-37). Moreover

[246]Laqueur ('Ephoros,' 170) sees the natural continuation of 4:33 in 4:41, with 4:34-40 as an interpolation (see below). This does not exclude our interpretation of 4:33 in the present form of the story.

[247] ἀλήθεια may here reflect the Aramaic קושטא. See Torrey, 'Nature and Origin,' 25. קושטא in the Aramaic Targum translates both צדק and אמת in Hebrew. Likewise, preserved fragments of the Aramaic of *1 Enoch* 91ff. indicate that קושטא stands behind both *ṣedeq* and *rete* in the Ethiopic of that work, indicating that the single Aramaic term was rendered both as 'uprightness' and 'truth' by the Greek translator.

truth exacts righteous judgment from all who are unjust and wicked and shows no partiality (a further defense of Zerubbabel's asserting the truth about the king). Thus, to truth belong all the qualities that would seem to belong to wine, the king, and women, viz., strength, kingship, authority, and greatness, and they are hers forever. Therefore 'Blessed is the God of Truth' (4:40).

The people acclaim truth as great and strongest of all (4:41), and the king offers Zerubbabel the great honours that the bodyguards had anticipated (4:42). When he requests, instead, that the temple be rebuilt and its vessels returned to Jerusalem, Darius agrees (4:42-57). Zerubbabel's prayer makes clear that it was God who gave him the wisdom that was victorious in this contest (4:58-60; cf. 3:4).

Although the story makes good sense in its present form and context, careful analysis indicates a number of literary problems that suggest that the story has been altered or revised in the course of its transmission. A difficulty is immediately evident in the opening verses.[248] According to 3:3, King Darius awoke before the guards devised their contest, although the subsequent action suggests that the king was still asleep (see especially v. 13). Moreover, it is unclear, under these circumstances, how the guards could be certain that the king would reward the winner of the contest. The version of the story in Josephus (*Ant.* 11:34–36) solves the problem by having Darius propose the contest and promise the rewards.[249] Furthermore, a number of literary considerations suggest that the speech about truth is an intrusion into a story describing three guards giving three speeches,[250] and that the original story placed the speech about the king before the one about wine.[251] A natural (and naive) beginning is that the king is the strongest. The second bodyguard refutes this by showing how wine neutralizes the power of the king. The third shows how both of these are subject to the power of women. How the story might have ended and dealt with the affront to the king's dignity is uncertain.[252]

In its present form and context, the tale of the bodyguards is a Jewish story. Its hero is the builder of the Second Temple, and the story explains how he came to accomplish this feat. In doing so, it employs a tradition known to us in the stories in Daniel 1-6 (see above, pp. 34-35). The

[248] On these problems, Zimmermann, 'Story,' 181-2.

[249] Zimmermann, *ibid.*, 194-7, posits that Josephus knew an earlier version of the story. For another view, see below p. 158f.

[250] Laqueur, 'Ephoros,' 170-71. In particular he notes that in 3:3 the three bodyguards agree to speak of *one* thing, but that Zerubbabel breaks the rules by speaking about two. He also sees 4:34-40 as an intrusion between 4:33 and 4:41, and he makes reference to other problems. He is followed by Pohlmann, *Studien,* 39-40.

[251] Laqueur, 'Ephoros,' 171. Crenshaw ('The Contest,' 82) disagrees.

[252] Since the story is clearly unhistorical, ideas as to what could or could not have happened in such circumstances cannot govern a reconstruction of the story.

Jewish youth pits his divinely given wisdom (4:58-60) against that of his gentile colleagues in the Mesopotamian court, and he wins both the contest and the king's favour.[253] The story climaxes with an acclamation of God and a doxology of his truth. Other features in the story – the various observations about wine and women and kings – have many parallels in Jewish wisdom literature, and the Jewish audience of 1 Esdras would have read them in such a context.[254] Especially close to the Bible are statements about a man forsaking his parents for his wife (4:20-21; cf. Gen 2:24) and claims about the power and eternity of truth (4:38; cf. Ps 117:2; 146:6).[255]

Nonetheless, a majority of scholars have rightly argued that the story is most likely of non-Jewish origin.[256] Parallels to Jewish wisdom literature do not prove Jewish origin, since this wisdom literature itself reflects a broader, international tradition.[257] Even the formulation about the eternity of truth – though it may have been drawn from the Bible – has close parallels in Egyptian wisdom sayings.[258] When the story is read apart from its present context, there is little in it that is unambiguously Jewish. The identification of the third bodyguard as Zerubbabel is a secondary intrusion.[259] The parallels to the Danielic stories, which provide a broad literary analogy to the tale, are themselves based on non-Jewish models.[260] Taken as a whole, the story has many parallels in the folklore of many nations.[261] In short, the Jewish author of 1 Esdras has revised a gentile story and reused it as a catalyst for a crucial event in Israelite history. God endows Zerubbabel with the wisdom that enables him to win the contest and secure the king's permission to rebuild the temple.

Although scholars have debated the original language of the story, there is some consensus that it was composed in Aramaic rather than in semiticizing Greek.[262] The story's time and place of origin are uncertain. Torrey identified the concubine Apamē with the Persian wife of Ptolemy I

[253] Parallels with the story of Esther have also been noted; see Torrey ('Story,' 47-48), who also discusses parallels with Daniel.

[254] See Myers, *I and II Esdras,* 54-56, and Crenshaw, 'The Contest,' 77-79. Especially noteworthy is the similarity between 1 Esdras 4:6-9 and the series in Eccl 3:1-9, cited in *ibid.,* 85-86.

[255] See Pohlmann, *Studien,* 44.

[256] See Torrey, 'Story,' 45-46; Laqueur, 'Ephoros,' 172; Rudolf, 'Der Wettstreit,' 179; Zimmermann, 'Story,' 185, 197-98; Pfeiffer, *History,* 251-57; Pohlmann, *Studien,* 40-47.

[257] Cf. below pp. 283-4.

[258] Humbert, 'Magna est veritas.'

[259] Torrey, 'Story', 57; Pohlmann, *Studien,* 38. The identification occurs very late in the story and breaks into the context.

[260] This is evident from the similarities between these stories and the originally non-Jewish story of Ahikar. Cf. below, p. 284.

[261] See Laqueur, 'Ephoros,' 172; Pfeiffer, *History,* 252-54; Crenshaw, 'The Contest,' 74-76.

[262] See Torrey, 'Nature and Origin,' 23-25; Zimmermann, 'Story,' 183-94 – even if one does not agree with all the alleged mistranslations from Aramaic; and Pohlmann, *Studien,* 48-49. Rudolf ('Der Wettstreit,' 182-85) argues for a Greek origin.

and suggested that the story originated either in Egypt or Palestine ca. 300 B.C.E.[263] However, the identification of Apamē is uncertain, as are any conclusions about date and place of origin based on it.[264]

The circumstances and manner in which the story was incorporated into 1 Esdras and the literary origins of 1 Esdras itself are matters that continue to be discussed.[265]

ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER

The Greek translation of Esther includes six passages not found in the Hebrew version of the book, and they are universally recognized to be additions to the Hebrew version.[266] Alongside these additions, certain passages in the Hebrew have been changed. When Saint Jerome revised the Old Latin version of the Bible, he removed all but the last of the additions and appended them as a collection at the end of the canonical book. In this position they received the chapter and verse numbers found in modern editions. Here is the order of the Greek translation:

Hebrew Text	*Additions*
	A. 11:2-12:6, introduction, Mordecai's dream, transition
1:1-3:13	
	B. 13:1-7, Artaxerxes' decree of extermination
3:14-4:17	
	C. 13:8-14:19, Mordecai's, Esther's prayers
5:1-2 (omitted)	D. 15:1-16, Esther before the King
5:3-8:12	
	E. 16:1-24, Artaxerxes' decree
8:13-10:3	
	F. 10:1-11:1, interpretation of dream, conclusion, colophon

Some of the alterations in the Greek are paralleled in other of the old court tales (see above, pp. 34-35) and especially in 3 Maccabees (se above, pp. 83-84).

Additions A and F. The book is framed by Mordecai's dream and its interpretation. The battle of the dragons (representing Mordecai and

[263] Torrey, 'Story,' 39-42.
[264] Myers, *I and II Esdras,* 55.
[265] On this very difficult problem, see below, pp. 159-60, Torrey, 'Nature and Origin'; Pfeiffer, *History,* 233-50; Pohlmann, *Studien,* 32-73. On the relationship between the text of 1 Esdras and the canonical material, see Klein, *Studies.*
[266] See Moore, *Additions,* 153-54.

Haman), the phenomena in heaven and earth, and the gentiles' preparation for war against the Jews add a cosmic dimension to the tale. In the midst of this tumult appears Esther, depicted as a tiny spring become a river, God's appointed deliverer sent in answer to the people's prayer. Chapter 12 (Gk A:12-17) expands on 2:21-23, which is then altered at that place in the Greek translation to indicate that Mordecai's promotion was the cause of the conspiracy against the king (cf. Dan 6:3-4).

Addition B. The 'copy' of Artaxerxes' decree adds a note of authenticity to the narrative. [267] The charges against the Jews (13:3-5) elaborate on 3:8, stressing the Jews' peculiarity and alleged disobedience by adding the motifs of hostility and strangeness. This hostility and other wording unique to 13:4-7 are paralleled in 3 Maccabees 3:7, 24-26.[268]

Addition C. The prayers of Mordecai and Esther add an important religious dimension that is not explicit in the Hebrew book. The deliverance of the Jews comes in response to prayer. Mordecai's prayer is roughly paralleled by the prayers of Simon and Eleazar in 3 Maccabees 2 and 6. Mordecai's 'remembrance' of all the works of the Lord (13:8, Gk. C:1) may indicate the priority of 3 Maccabees, where God's deeds are enumerated. In 14:2, Gk. C:13, Esther's acts of self-abasement constitute a foil for her self-adornment in 15:1, Gk. D:1.[269] Her prayer climaxes in a petition that God use her speech as an instrument of deliverance (14:13-14, Gk. C:24-25; cf. Jdt 9). Verses 15-18, Gk. C:26-29 answer questions about the propriety and problems of Esther's Jewish-gentile marriage.[270] The attack on the temple which Esther anticipates (14:9, Gk. C:20) is not mentioned earlier in the book. This may indicate the priority of 3 Maccabees, where the king attempts to enter the temple and then contemplates its destruction (chaps. 1-2; 5:42-43; cf. also Esth 14:8, 10; 2 Macc 4:16).[271]

Addition D. This expansion and replacement of 5:1-2 adds a strong dramatic and emotive element to the story. Esther's audience with the king is depicted with language at home in biblical epiphanies.[272] Verses 2 and 8 interpret the king's response to Esther as an answer to her prayer, made the more dramatic and miraculous by the king's sudden change of disposition.

[267] For a similar use of documents, see above, p. 76, the *Letter of Aristeas.*

[268] Comparisons with 3 Maccabees are based on Motzo, 'Rifacimento,' 275-80.

[269] For a metaphorical use of this double imagery, cf. Bar 4:20; 5:1-2.

[270] Cf. the Greek revision of 2:20.

[271] It is also possible that there is some connection with Artaxerxes' decree that the building of the temple cease; cf. Ezra 4:6-24.

[272] Cf. the language and imagery in Gk. Esther 15:1-7 with *1 Enoch* 14:19-15:1, which doubtless reflects contemporary court protocol, but intensifies the imagery in a way that is also evident in Gk. Esther 15:1-7.

Addition E. This decree adds a note of authenticity. More important, it resolves tensions created in the first part of the story. God has judged the arrogant enemy who accused his people (16:2-6). Thereby he vindicates their innocence, which is acclaimed by the king (16:15-16), who also publicly acclaims the universal sovereignty of this God (16:21). These elements are all typical of the tales about the persecuted righteous (see above, pp. 34f., 37f.). Verbatim parallels indicate a close relationship between 16:3-6, 10-16 and 3 Maccabees 6:23-28; 7:2; 3:18; and 5:20.

In the Hebrew book of Esther, a tale about a persecuted and exalted courtier (Mordecai) is the nucleus of a story about the persecution and rescue of the Jewish people.[273] The additions and changes in the Greek version underscore some tendencies in the Hebrew book and serve a number of literary, religious, and theological purposes.

From a literary point of view, the additions and changes embellish and reinforce the genre and sharpen the focus on the fate of the people, here 'the righteous nation' (11:9). They also enhance the book's dramatic appeal and add a note of authenticity.[274]

More important to the reviser's purpose, the additions and changes add an explicitly religious dimension to the original form of the book, which never mentions God. The nation is God's people (10:9), and their deliverance is from him and in answer to prayer. The temple is of concern. Also in focus from time to time is the propriety of Esther's marriage to a gentile and her life-style in his court (14:15-18; 2:20).

The additions to Esther may have accreted in stages. Sections A, C, D, F give some indications of having been composed in Hebrew and added to a Hebrew form of the book, while sections B and E appear to have been composed in Greek.[275] The precise relationship between the Greek Esther and 3 Maccabees is uncertain. Parallels between 3 Maccabees and the parts of the Greek Esther that were possibly translated from Hebrew might suggest that 3 Maccabees is dependent on the whole of the Greek Esther. However, if the prayers and decrees were added to Esther in Greek, the Greek version as a whole may well be dependent on 3 Maccabees.[276] The purpose of such a revision might have been to introduce into Egyptian Jewry the celebration of the feast of Purim in the place of the festival that commemorated the Jews' deliverance from death in the hippodrome.[277]

[273] Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 50-51.

[274] Moore, *Additions*, 153.

[275] On the issue of the original language, see *ibid.*, 155 and the literature cited there.

[276] Motzo ('Rifacimento') argues the dependence of the Greek Esther upon 3 Maccabees. Moore *(Additions*, 197-99), who does not cite Motzo, compares 3 Maccabees with both the Hebrew and Greek Esther. 3 Maccabees is dependent on the Hebrew book, but the Greek version may be dependent in some places on 3 Maccabees.

[277] Motzo, 'Rifacimento,' 287-90.

The Greek Esther is preserved in two forms.[278] The first of these, attested in almost all manuscripts of the Septuagint, follows the content of the Masoretic text quite closely, but is often free and paraphrastic in its translation. The second form is preserved in only four minuscules.[279] It is shorter than the Septuagint at many points and contains many Hebraisms not found in the Septuagint. The very small incidence of verbatim agreement between the two versions may well indicate that they are separate translations, based on somewhat different Hebrew texts, rather than recensions of a single translation. If there were two separate translations, the additions would have been borrowed by one translation from the other.[280]

The colophon in the Septuagint (11:1) attributes the translation to 'Lysimachus the son of Ptolemy, one of the residents of Jerusalem,' and indicates that it was brought to Egypt during the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra, that is in 77 B.C.E. (Ptolemy XII)[281] or, less likely, 114 B.C.E. (Ptolemy VIII).[282]

DAVID'S COMPOSITIONS

This prose passage of ten lines is extant only in the Qumran *Psalms Scroll,* where it has been inserted between 2 Samuel 23:1-7 and Psalm 140 (11QPs^{a} 27:2-11).[283] Two statements about David's inspiration frame an enumeration of his poetic compositions.

Wisdom language fills the opening lines (2-4). David was a sage (חכם) and a learned man, or scribe (סופר), enlightened by God and enlightening others. According to line 11, he was the recipient of words of prophecy from the Most High. The obvious source of these ideas is 2 Samuel 23:1-4, the psalm that precedes this passage.[284]

The combination of wisdom and prophetic attributes is not the fortuitous result of this author's dependence on passages about David which mention such attributes. In Sir 24:30-34, the sage likens wisdom to prophecy, as he speaks of his own activity, also employing the light metaphor.[285] Thus the author of the present passage describes David's activities in categories current in Palestinian Judaism of the Greco-Roman

[278] For a discussion of the text and relevant bibliography, see Moore, *Additions,* 162-65.

[279] See Hanhart, *Esther,* 15.

[280] Moore (*Additions,* 165) thinks it likely that the additions originated in the Septuagint text.

[281] See Bickerman, 'The Colophon.'

[282] This dating is accepted by Moore, *Additions,* 250.

[283] On the non-canonical contents and order of tha Scroll, see Sanders, *Dead Sea,* 10-14. For the text of this passage, a translation, and some commentary, see *ibid.,* 134-37; and the *editio princeps, id., Psalms Scroll,* 91-93. For the passage in context, see *ibid.,* 48. The title here given is drawn from these publications.

[284] Sanders (*Psalms Scroll,* 92) cites this passage, as well as 2 Sam 14:20 and 1 Sam 16:12b-23.

[285] See Hengel, *Hellenism* 2, 134-6.

period. Wisdom, like prophecy, is 'given' by God (lines 3, 11). The emphasis on David's wisdom is also consonant with the presence of several non-canonical sapiential psalms in the Qumran *Psalms Scroll.*[286]

David's inspired wisdom is embodied in his poetic compositions, which the central part of this passage enumerates in categories (lines 4-10). These compositions – a total of 4,050 – include 3,600 psalms (תהלים) and 450 songs (שיר). Among the latter are: 364 to be sung over the *tamid* offering, one each day of the year; 52 for the *korban* offering on the sabbaths; thirty for various festivals, and four for making music over the stricken.[287]

The place of its insertion into the *Psalms Scroll* indicates that this passage is primarily an interpretation of the psalm known to us from 2 Samuel 23. It draws upon and emphasizes the psalm's description of David as an inspired psalmist and prophet, and it elaborates on this by an enumeration of his compositions.

The categories in this enumeration indicate the author's special interest in the cult and in the cultic function of the psalter. The specifying of 364 psalms for the daily offering presumes the solar calendar known in *Jubilees* and in Qumranic calendrical texts and indicates that this passage was penned by a member of the Qumran community or someone with similar views on the calendar.[288] If it is Qumranic, it is important as a testimony to a continuing interest in the temple cult in a group that had cut itself off from that cult.

There is an evident connection between this passage and 1 Kings 4:29-34 (Heb. 5:9-14), which describes Solomon's wisdom and his literary output. In such a case, it is probably not by accident that the total of David's compositions exceeds Solomon's 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs.[289] A comparison with Solomon's wisdom – also 'given' by God (1 Kgs 4:29, Heb. 5:9) – would also be implicit, although mention of David's wisdom here was generated by the factors mentioned above.

The insertion of this passage into the psalter and the inclusion of 2 Samuel 23 and the apocryphal Psalm 151 (termed by Sanders 'a poetic midrash on I Sam 16:1-13')[290] reflect a developing tendency to associate the psalter with David.[291] Traditional interpretations of first century Jewish religious thought have stressed David's role as patriarch of the royal

[286] Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92.

[287] On the identification of psalms belonging to these various categories, see Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 93, and the bibliography cited in *ibid.*, 92, n. 1.

[288] *Ibid.* On *Jubilees*, see above, p. 100. On Qumran, see below, p. 530.

[289] Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92. For the Masoretic text's 1005 songs, the Septuagint reads 5000.

[290] *Ibid.*, 56. It is noteworthy that this scroll contains two interpretations of biblical passages about David.

[291] *Ibid.*, 92; Sanders, *Dead Sea*, 157-8.

messianic line. The present passage, with its portrait of David as sage, prophet, and the composer of cultic songs par excellence, offers us a glimpse of a broader range of Davidic speculation, which may set some of the old texts in new perspectives. Noteworthy in this respect is Acts 2:25-36, which interprets the Davidic Psalm 16 to refer to Jesus, mentioning that David was a prophet (2:30-31).[292] In a more general framework, 'David's Compositions' provides further testimony to the diversity of early Judaism.

BARUCH

This is the first of several works attributed to Baruch, the secretary of Jeremiah. It stands after the book of Jeremiah in many manuscripts of the Greek Bible. The work divides into four sections of diverse origins: narrative introduction (1:1-14); prayer (1:15-3:8); wisdom poem (3:9–4:4); and Zion poem (4:5-5:9). These sections are bound together by the common theme of Exile and Return, which is often expressed in biblical idiom.

The introduction (1:1-14) describes the alleged purpose of the book and the circumstances of its origin. In the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem (i.e., in 582 B.C.E.), Baruch assembled the Jewish leaders in Babylon for a formal hearing of the book.[293] After rituals of repentance, they contributed money to be sent to Jerusalem together with the temple vessels that Nebuchadnezzar had taken as booty. The high priest was to offer sacrifice, pray for Nebuchadnezzar and his son Belshazzar, and intercede for the exiles in the words of the prayer that constitutes the second section of the book.

The prayer (1:15-3:8) is comprised of a corporate confession of sins and a petition that God will withdraw his wrath and return the exiles to their homeland.[294] Its logic follows the scheme of Deuteronomy 28-32, and the language of both Deuteronomy and Jeremiah has heavily influenced its wording.[295] Verbal parallels to Daniel 9:4-19 indicate a very close relationship also to that prayer.[296]

The inhabitants of Jerusalem are first to confess their own sins[297] and

[292] Although this passage may imply that David uses the first person because he is speaking of his descendent, it speaks only of his function as prophet and not as messianic forebear.

[293] For this meaning of 'to read in one's hearing,' see Orlinsky, 'The Septuagint,' 94-96.

[294] Moore (*Additions*, 291) suggests that 2:5-3:8 may originally have been three independent prayers; his divisions are unconvincing, however. 'And now . . .' (2:11) would hardly begin a prayer. 2:31-35 and 3:6-8 are logically related (see above) and represent similar clusters of motifs that are hardly coincidental.

[295] On Deuteronomy, see the notes in Whitehouse, 'Baruch,' 583ff; on Jeremiah, see Tov, *Baruch*, 13-27.

[296] See Moore, 'Dating,' 312-17; idem, *Additions*, 291-3.

[297] See 1:15 and 2:1-2 and note the contrast between 'we' in Jerusalem and 'they' in dispersion in 2:3-5.

admit that they are now suffering the curses of the covenant which Moses predicted in Deuteronomy (1:15-2:5). In a second, parallel confession they are to speak in the name of the exiles (2:6-10).

The petitionary part of the prayer (2:11-18) begins with the formulaic 'And now . . .' Here, as throughout the prayer (and the introduction), God is addressed by his proper name (translated κύριος), and the covenantal relationship is indicated by the title 'God of Israel' (cf. 3:1,4; and 'our God,' *passim*). The exiles pray that God's wrath will turn from them, that he will deliver his people and grant them favour with their captors, and that he will look down and consider his people. The language of Exodus 3:7-8, 20-21 is reflected throughout this passage, for the author, like Second Isaiah, construes return from Exile as a second Exodus.

In 2:19-26 the people again confess their sins and acknowledge God's just punishment. Then in 2:27-35 they return to Deuteronomy for a word of hope: God's promise that when they repent in the land of their Exile, he will return them to their own land, increase their numbers, and then make an everlasting covenant with them.[298] In 3:1-8 they raise the prayer that God anticipated (cf. 2:31-33 and 3:7-8). The prayer breaks off without an explicit request for return, but the implications are clear.

Chapters 3:9-4:4 contain a wisdom poem in the tradition of Sir 24.[299] It differs from the previous section of Baruch in several significant respects: its poetic (as opposed to prose) form; its concentration on Torah as Wisdom; its dependence on the language of Job; and its use of 'God' rather than 'Lord.' These differences notwithstanding, it has been made an integral part of Baruch.

The poem is connected to the previous section by 3:9-13.[300] Israel is 'dead' in the land of their enemies (3:10-11; cf. 3:4) because they have forsaken the fountain of wisdom (3:12; cf. Jer 2:13), that is, the Torah, the commandments of life (3:9; cf. Deut 30:15-19).

The finding of wisdom is the topic of the poem, which is beholden to Job 28:12-28. The opening strophe admonishes the readers to learn where there is wisdom and strength and life (3:14). The next three strophes enumerate those who have *not* found wisdom (3:15-19, 20-23, 24-28). By contrast God alone found the way to wisdom, and he has given it to Israel alone (3:29-37). The last strophe (4:1-4) make explicit the identification of Wisdom and Torah hinted at in 3:29-30 (cf. Deut 30:11-13). Like Sir 24, this poem asserts that Wisdom is embodied in the Torah and grants life to

[298] Cf. Deut 30:1-5 but also 1 Kgs 8:47; cf. also Tob 13:7.

[299] There are important differences between the poems. The personification of Wisdom in Baruch 3:9-4:4 is less clear than it is in Sirach 24. This poem is *about* her rather than *by* her. She is the object of a search rather than the one who searches the universe. Only in 4:1 is she the subject of a verb of action.

[300] The passage may be redactional; the reference to the dead recalls 3:4. However, the direct address to Israel and the appellative 'God' (rather than Lord) are at home in the poem.

those who hold her fast.[301] Conversely it threatens with death those who forsake her, which explains why Israel is now 'dead' in the land of her captivity. The author appeals to the readers to repent (4:2) and find life, which here implies Return, and he concludes with a blessing (4:4) that paraphrases Deut 33:29.

Although this poem paraphrases Job 28, its explicit nationalism is foreign to its prototype (cf. 3:36-37 with Job 28:23-28), while it parallels Sir 24 and fits well with the rest of Baruch. Explicit references to Israel (3:9, 24, 36; 4:2, 4) and 'our God' (3:35) are complemented by the Wisdom/Torah identification and the consequent distinction between Israel and the gentiles.

Having appealed for the obedience that can change Israel's fortunes, the author begins his last major section (4:5-5:9), issuing the first of several exhortations to 'take courage.' God's punishment is not final (4:6). Although this section is again stamped with the language of Deuteronomy,[302] the controlling metaphor is Second Isaiah's image of Mother Zion and her children.[303]

Before the author turns to his hope of the future, he again rehearses the past: the nation's sin and their punishment through exile (4:6-20). The main speaker in this passage is Mother Zion, who recounts her sorrows to her neighbours. She then addresses her children in a pair of strophes that also begin with 'take courage' (4:21-26, 27-29), and she appeals to them to offer the prayer for deliverance that stands at the beginning of the book. The individual units of these strophes are generally marked by a contrast between past calamity and future salvation.

In view of this prospect for salvation, the author then addresses four strophes to Jerusalem herself, each beginning with an imperative to act out a stage of the unfolding drama of salvation (4:30-35; 4:36-37;[304] 5:1-4;[305] 5:5-9).[306]

Having now expressed his hope for salvation and return, the author has solved the dilemma with which the book began. Prayer has been answered. Exile and Dispersion have ended. Sorrow has turned to joy.

A proper literary and historical analysis of Baruch requires a careful comparison of the book with parallel materials in Jeremiah. To date this has not been done, and it is possible here only to sketch out the issues and their implications for our understanding of the work.

[301] Cf. especially 3:37-4:2 with Sir 24:8-11, 24.

[302] Cf. 4:7-8 with Deut 32:17-18 and 4:25 with Deut 33:29 (LXX).

[303] See the many parallels cited by Kneucker, *Baruch, ad loc.* Specifically, the author reflects a tradition paralleled in 2 Macc 7 (see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection,* 106-8) and *Ps. Sol.* 11 (see Moore, *Additions,* 314-16).

[304] Cf. Isa 49:14-23; 54:1-13; 60:4-9.

[305] Cf. Isa 52:1-2.

[306] See the discussion of Moore, *Additions,* 314-16.

Obvious from the outset is a connection between the book's ascription to Baruch, the companion and secretary of Jeremiah (cf. Jer 32:12-16; 36:4-32), and its setting in the wake of the destruction of Jerusalem and its message of Return from Exile. Closer inspection indicates a large number of verbal parallels between the book and a variety of passages in Jeremiah.[307] A comparison of the prayer (1:15-3:8) with its counterpart in Daniel 9:4-19 indicates the following: 1) Baruch's prayer is 47% longer than Daniel's.[308] 2) Almost all of the Jeremianic phrases in Baruch's prayer are in passages not found in Daniel's prayer.[309] Daniel's prayer, on the other hand, contains very few Jeremianic expressions not found in Baruch 1:15-3:8.[310] 3) All but one of Daniel's references to the desolation of Jerusalem have as their counterparts in Baruch references to the exiles in Babylon.[311] 4) The most extensive of the passages found in Baruch, but not in Daniel, are additional confessions of sin[312] and expressions of hope that God will rescue his people from Exile.[313]

These data suggest the following hypothesis about the origin of 1:1-3:8. The author has taken up a traditional prayer of confession (attested also in Daniel 9)[314] which was structured on the scheme of Deuteronomy 28-32, but also employed some cliches from Jeremiah. He has greatly expanded it with other Jeremianic material[315] and made it the heart of a work attributed to Jeremiah's scribe. Thus, the borrowings from Jeremiah in both the introduction and Baruch's version of the prayer are the work of a single author.

Although we cannot be certain whether the prayer behind Baruch 1:15-3:8 and Daniel 9:4-19 focused on the problems of Jerusalem or the exile, or both,[316] from a compositional point of view, Baruch differs from

[307] The parallels are quoted in Hebrew in Tov, *Baruch,* 13-27. They are found almost exclusively in the first two sections (Tov, *Translation,* 126). The narrative introduction (1:1-14) has drawn many details from Jeremiah, especially from its narrative passages.

[308] Moore, *Additions*, 292.

[309] See the comparison in Wambacq, 'Les prières.' An exception is the cliche in Bar 2:11/Dan 9:15.

[310] An exception is Dan 9:7; cf. Jer 29:14.

[311] Cf. Dan 9:12 and Bar 2:2; Dan 9:16 and Bar 2:13-17.

[312] Bar 1:19, 20-21; 2:24.

[313] Bar 2:27ff.

[314] See Moore, 'Dating,' 312-17. For another prayer in the same tradition, see 'The Words of the Heavenly Lights,' a Qumran text published by Baillet, 'Un receuil.' For an English translation, see Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 202-05.

[315] Often he takes words from Jeremiah's oracles of indictment and incorporates them into confessions of sins committed. Elsewhere details in Jeremiah's threats of punishment are described as having taken place.

[316] Some of the confusing data are these: Daniel's is a prayer of confession relating to the desolation of Jerusalem, a matter of central concern for the author of that book. The author of Baruch, because of the particular fiction of his book includes a double confession, for those in Jerusalem and those in exile. However, 'The Words of the Heavenly Lights' also has this double focus.

Daniel 9 in its almost exclusive focus on Exile and Return. This is the case in the prayer, both in passages that have Danielic counterparts that refer to the desolation of Jerusalem and in passages without Danielic parallels. More important, the author sets his story in Babylon and writes his book as a kind of letter calling on the Jerusalemites to pray for the return of the exiles. This last point is especially striking if we compare 1:1, 9 with Jeremiah 29:1-2; 24:1.[317] Jeremiah 29 is the prophet's letter written from Jerusalem to the exiles in Babylon. In it he counsels them to make themselves at home in their new city, because it will be 70 years before they will return. Jeremiah's words are in opposition to false prophets who have counselled rebellion against Babylon and have opposed Jeremiah's prediction of a long exile, and he predicts doom on those who have remained in Jerusalem. Here Baruch writes from Babylon to Jerusalem, asking the Jerusalemites to expedite the exiles' return. Finally, it should be noted, the repeated expressions of confession, not found in Daniel 9,[318] lend to this work – in spite of its pseudepigraphic character – a sense of earnestness in the face of real guilt.

The precise compositional relationship between 1:1-3:8 and the last two sections of the present book of Baruch (3:9-4:4 and 4:5-5:9) remains something of a problem.[319] Although there is virtual unanimity that 1:1-3:8 was composed in Hebrew, scholars have reached no such consensus on 3:9ff.[320] If either or both of the last two sections were composed in Greek, it would follow that they were added to 1:1-3:8 only after it was translated into Greek. Also noteworthy is the difference in idiom between the first two and the last two sections. Given the propensity of the author of 1:1-3:8 to use the Jeremianic idiom, the lack of any number of clear allusions to Jeremiah in 3:9-5:9 is striking.[321] Another possible indicator is 1:14, which states that the function of 'this book' is to enable the people in Jerusalem to make confession. Does this suggest that the exhortations and promises in 3:9-5:9 were not part of 1:1-3:8 when it was first composed?

[317] Bar 1:1 employs a formula paralleled in Jer 29:1. Bar 1:9 is most closely paralleled in Jer 24:1, but the formulation is close enough to Jer 29:2 to indicate that that chapter may well have suggested the association of the two passages in one context here.

[318] This emphasis on confession is noted by Goldstein, 'Baruch,' 98.

[319] For a summary of suggested solutions, see Burke, *Baruch*, 32, 63, n. 321. See also Moore, *Additions*, 314-16, and Goldstein, 'Baruch,' 187-89.

[320] On the Hebrew origin of 1:1-3:8, see Pfeiffer, *History*, 416-17; Moore, *Additions*, 259-60; and especially Tov, *Translation*, 111-33; *id. Baruch*, 5-27, who provides a retroversion of these chapters into Hebrew. On the difficulties of positing a Hebrew text of 3:9-5:9, see Pfeiffer, *History*, 419-21; Moore, *Daniel*, 260; R. A. Martin, 'Criteria,' 297-306, 309-10 (who thinks that 3:9-4:4 may derive from a Hebrew *Vorlage*); and Tov, *Translation*, 126. Supporting a Hebrew original for 3:9-5:9 are Kneucker (*Baruch*, 354-61), who provides a retroversion; Goldstein, 'Baruch', 187-89; and Burke (*Baruch*), who argues the position in great detail and offers 'a systematic and scientific reconstruction of the original Hebrew text' (p. xxi).

[321] The only certain allusion to Jeremiah in these sections is 3:12, which draws on Jer 2:13.

These difficulties notwithstanding, all of the book's four diverse parts are united by the common theme of Exile and Return. Unless compelling evidence can be mustered to demonstrate that either of the last two parts was composed in Greek, it is probably a safe hypothesis that the author of 1:1-3:8 was, in fact, responsible for the composition of the book more or less as we have it.

Since the book makes no reference to historical events after the sixth century, its date is uncertain. The book as a whole and its parts have been dated variously between the fourth century B.C.E. and the second century C.E.[322] Reasonable certainty concerning the date of the translation of the book of Jeremiah establishes 116 B.C.E. as a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of 1:1-3:8, since this part was translated by the translator of Jeremiah.[323] Even if 1:15-3:8 is dependent on Daniel 9:4-19,[324] that prayer itself is almost certainly traditional,[325] and thus the date of Daniel provides no *terminus post quem* for Baruch 1:1-3:8.[326] Similarly, parallels between Baruch 4:37-5:9 and *Psalms of Solomon* 11 are of no real help, since we cannot be certain about the date of that psalm.[327]

The fictional date in Baruch 1:2 may provide a clue to the date of composition. If Nebuchadnezzar is a stand-in for Antiochus IV the book is possibly to be dated to 164 B.C.E., five years after Antiochus's sack of Jerusalem and after Judas's purification of the Temple. The high priest Jehoiakim would be none other than Alcimus. The book would be an appeal both to accept the authority of Antiochus V, the son of Antiochus IV (i.e., Belshazzar, son of Nebuchadnezzar; cf. 1:11-13 and the emphasis in 2:21-23), and to seek that obedience to the Torah that would facilitate the return of the Dispersion, especially, perhaps, those sold into slavery by Antiochus IV and his lieutenant, Apollonius (2 Macc 5:14; 1 Macc 1:32; 2 Macc 5:24). Dating the book in this time would explain the fictional setting and would also fit well with the strong consciousness of sin, guilt, and punishment that pervades chaps. 1-3.[328] On the other hand, if one is

[322] For a summary of the possibilities and issues, see Pfeiffer, *History*, 415-23. See also Kneucker (*Baruch*, 32-37), who dates the book between 167 B.C.E. and 135 C.E.!

[323] Tov, *Translation*, 111-33, 165.

[324] This is argued by Wambacq, 'Les prières.'

[325] See Moore, 'Dating,' 312-17.

[326] The problem is further complicated by the fact, agreed upon by most critics, that the prayer in Dan 9 is a secondary insertion in that book; see Moore, *Daniel*, 292.

[327] For the parallels, see Ryle – James, *Psalms*, lxxii-lxxvii. Since the *Psalms of Solomon* as a collection are generally dated to the mid-first century B.C.E. and Baruch is most likely dependent on the psalm (see Moore, *Additions*, 314-16), the decade after the conquest of Pompey is often given as a *terminus post quem* for Baruch or this part of it; see, e.g., Wambacq, 'L'unité,' 575. Moore (*Additions*, 314-16) confines the parallels to Bar 5:5-9 (see, however, Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 153, n. 41), which he sees as a late addition to Bar 1:1-5:4. The difficulty with the argument from comparison is that *Ps. Sol.* 11 is one of the least typical psalms in the collection and could be a traditional piece reused in the first century collection.

[328] This dating is proposed by Goldstein in 'Baruch'.

inclined to play down the importance of the fictional setting and to emphasize the discrepancies between the narrative and the circumstances of 164, then a date higher in the second century, or perhaps earlier, may be more plausible.[329]

Present evidence offers some hints regarding the status of Baruch (or Baruch 1:1-3:8) in relationship to the book of Jeremiah. According to Tov, at least Baruch 1:1-3:8 was translated into Greek by the same person who translated Jeremiah.[330] This suggests that at least Baruch 1:1-3-8 was once joined to Jeremiah in a Hebrew scroll.[331] In major manuscripts of the Greek Bible, Baruch appears between Jeremiah and Lamentations. The fact that some of the church fathers cite the work as Jeremianic ('Jeremiah says') suggests that they considered it to be either an appendix to Jeremiah or a part of it.[332]

Other, later works associated with the figure of Baruch are also set in the aftermath of the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem and deal with the problems of destruction and dispersion and the hope of restoration. Both *2 Baruch* and *3 Baruch* (see below, pp. 408-12) were written after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. They anticipate eschatological restoration and heavenly salvation respectively. The *Paraleipomena of Jeremiah* was probably composed after the Second Revolt (see above, p. 75). Like the present work, its theme is Exile and Return. Quite possibly it is based on a Jeremianic work that dated from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, the period suggested above for the composition of Baruch 1:1-3:8.[333]

THE EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH

Satirical polemics against idols and idolatry are a developing mode of expression in exilic and postexilic literature.[334] Taking his cue from one such text in Jeremiah 10:2-15[335] and from the prophet's letter in Jeremiah 29, this author has composed a tractate which he alleges to be the copy of

[329] For a date before 168 B.C.E., see Moore, *Additions*, 260. His arguments are met, at least in part, by Goldstein, 'Baruch.' Nonetheless, at least two elements in Baruch fit the time of the Exile better than 164 B.C.E. In the fifth year, Nebuchadnezzar was alive, but Antiochus IV was not. Unlike 582, the principal problem in 164 was not captivity.

[330] See above, n. 323.

[331] Tov, *Translation*, 169.

[332] *Ibid.*

[333] Nickelsburg, 'Narrative Traditions.'

[334] See Roth ('For Life, He Appeals to Death,' 21-47), who discusses Isa 40:18-41:7; 44:9-20; 46:5-8; Jer 10:3-8; Hab 2:18-19; Ps 115:4-8; 135:15-18; Wis 13:10-19; 15:7-13; the Epistle of Jeremiah; Bel and the Dragon; *Jub.* 12:2-5; 20:8-9. In rabbinic literature, one famous example is Abraham's ironical polemic against idolatry, preceding his martyrdom. See the sources cited in n. 109.

[335] Cf. vv. 67-70 with Jer 10:2-5. For details see Moore (*Additions*, 357-58), who also notes the influence of Isa 44 and 46; Ps 115 and 135; Deut 4: 27-28 (*ibid.*, 319-323).

another letter Jeremiah wrote to the exiles in Babylon.[336] Beyond this claim in the superscription (v. 1), however, there are no indicators in the text that it is either Jeremianic or a letter.[337]

In the introduction (vv. 2-7) the author tells his readers that they will see gods of silver, gold, and wood carried in procession and worshipped and feared by the gentiles. Such fear should not possess the Jews. In their hearts they should determine to worship the Lord, whose angel is with them to witness their thoughts and requite them.[338]

Following this introduction are ten sections of unequal length (vv. 8-16; 17-23; 24-29; 30-40a; 40b-44; 45-52; 53-56; 57-65; 66-69; 70-73) in which the author heaps up arguments and evidences that demonstrate that idols are not what the gentiles suppose or claim they are.

The author's message is explicit in a refrainlike, slightly varying formula that punctuates and concludes each of the ten sections and recalls vv. 4-5 in the introduction.[339] Typical is v. 23: 'Thence you will know that they are not gods. Therefore do not fear them'.

The claim that idols are not gods is negative in form and antithetical in function. It is a conclusion drawn from a multitude of observations about the things that idols do not and, more strongly, 'cannot' (vv. 8, 19, 34, 35) do. Idols do not and cannot do all the things that gods do (vv. 34-38, 53, 64, 66f.). In a parallel argument that remains implicit the author recounts without comment practices in the idol cult or by its priests which he considers inappropriate: e.g., cultic prostitution (v. 43); the priests' theft of gold and silver and robes from the idols (v. 10, 33), etc.

Carrying his argument one step further the author points out that these false gods cannot even do the things that humans do: speak, see, and breathe (vv. 8, 19, 25). Put in the strongest way possible, they cannot even help themselves (vv. 12-14, 18, 24, 27, 55). This last point is also implied by describing how the idols are the object of a number of human actions: they are decked out with crowns and robes (vv. 9-12), carried in procession (v. 26), hidden in time of war or calamity (v. 48). But most fundamentally, the fabrication process itself is a parable of their falseness: gold and silver on the outside but wood underneath; they are not what they appear or are claimed to be (vv. 50, 44).

The ironic use of simile provides the author with yet another means of

[336] For yet another pseudepigraphic Jeremianic letter see *Par. Jer.* 7. See also the letters ascribed to Baruch: 1 Baruch and *2 Baruch* 78-87. The latter, like the present work, is sent to tribes in Exile, albeit in Assyria.

[337] Cf. below, p. 584 n. 26.

[338] I interpret vv. 6-7 to be referring to a common topic. For the idea cf. Wis 1:6-10. The Greek verb ἐκζητεῖν frequently has connotations of judgment and refers to searching out for the purpose of requiting. Cf. *1 Enoch* 104: 7-8.

[339] The formulas occur in vv. 16, 23, 29, 40, 44, 49, 52, 56, 64, 69, 72.

mocking the false gods. He likens them to things that are useless and altogether inappropriate as images of the deity (vv. 12, 17f., 20, 70-73).

The uniqueness of the Epistle of Jeremiah lies not in the types of arguments presented. Many of these have parallels elsewhere, both in biblical and post-biblical Jewish literature[340] and in the writings of pagan philosophers.[341] The special character of the Epistle is in the persistence with which the author pursues his point by means of repetition and rhetorical devices.

The Epistle of Jeremiah is extant only in the Greek Bible and the versions dependent on it. One small fragment of the Greek has been identified among the scrolls of Qumran Cave 7.[342] There is, however, substantial evidence in the text that the work was composed in Hebrew. A fair number of difficult or incoherent expressions in the Greek can be explained as mistranslations from Hebrew, and a similar hypothesis explains some of the variants in the Greek manuscripts.[343]

The precise date of composition cannot be determined with any certainty. Two data indicate a *terminus ad quem* ca. 100 B.C.E. The Epistle is cited in 2 Maccabees 2:2,[344] which is to be dated early in the first century B.C.E.[345] The Qumran Greek fragment of the Epistle is dated ca. 100 B.C.E.[346] This suggests that the Hebrew original was written some time before the turn of the century. Verse 3 of the Epistle may indicate a date of composition a full two centuries earlier. Here the author predicts that the exilic period will last up to seven generations. If one presumes that the author would not create a false prophecy, one can posit a *terminus ad quem* ca. 317-307 B.C.E., seven generations of forty years after the first or second deportation in 597 or 587 B.C.E.[347]

The place of writing is uncertain. The author's evident familiarity with aspects of Babylonian religion[348] may indicate composition in Mesopotamia, although an author so informed could have written the book any place where idolatry presented a threat.[349]

[340] See above, n. 334.

[341] See the fourth epistle of the Cynic, Ps. Heraclitus; Heinemann, 'Pseudo-Herakleitos'; Attridge, *First Century Cynicism*, 58-61; Malherbe, *The Cynic Epistles*, 190-3; and the parallels cited by Attridge, *First Century Cynicism*, 13-23.

[342] See Baillet, *DJD* 3, 143.

[343] See the list in Ball, 'Epistle,' 597-98, and the discussion in his notes; see also Naumann, *Untersuchungen*, 47; and Moore, *Additions*, 326-7, and his notes.

[344] See Moore, *Additions*, 327; but see Naumann, *Untersuchungen*, 52-53.

[345] See Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 36.

[346] See Baillet, *DJD* 3, 143.

[347] See Moore, *Additions*, 334-5; see also Naumann (*Untersuchungen*, 53), who is cautious on the use of v. 3, but still dates the work in the late fourth century B.C.E.

[348] See the detailed discussion in *ibid.*, 3-31.

[349] Cf., e.g., *1 Enoch* 99:7, 9, in a Palestinian document.

The book's evident composition in Hebrew suggests that the intended audience was Jewish; this is further supported by vv. 29-30, 43, which assume that the audience shares the Jewish presuppositions of the author's critique of Babylonian religion.

The placement of the Epistle varies in biblical manuscripts. In the Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, in the Milan manuscript of the Syriac Hexapla, and in the Arabic version, it stands immediately after Lamentations. In other Greek and Syriac manuscripts and in the Old Latin version, the Epistle is appended to the book of Baruch. As a result, modern editions often count it as chapter 6 of that work.

THE PRAYER OF AZARIAH AND THE SONG OF THE THREE YOUNG MEN

In the previous chapter we discussed Susanna and Bel and the Dragon, the two stories that frame the book of Daniel in its Greek versions (pp. 37-40). The present addition was inserted into the Greek Daniel between 3:23 and 3:24. It consists of a prayer of confession attributed to Azariah (Abednego) and a hymn of praise placed on the lips of the three young men. These two poetic pieces are joined to each other and to verses 23 and 24 by some brief narrative prose.[350]

Azariah's prayer stands in the tradition of the national laments of the canonical Psalter (e.g., Pss 74, 79, 80).[351] It differs from these psalms in its explicit use of the pattern of traditional Israelite covenant theology and its occasional allusions to the language of Deuteronomy 28-32.[352] In these respects, it parallels most closely the prayers of confession in Baruch 1:15-3:8 and Daniel 9:4-19, although the latter make more frequent and explicit reference to Deuteronomy 28-32.[353] Also noteworthy in the Prayer of Azariah is its prologue (vv. 3-5), in which God is 'blessed' for his righteous judgments, that is, his present punishment of the nation's sins. Although the motif of God's righteous judgment does occur in the canonical psalter with some frequency, it is also noteworthy in Daniel 9:7 and Baruch 1:15 and 2:6, and it is a frequently repeated motif in the *Psalms of Solomon.*[354] Thus it is a characteristic of the Jewish theologies of the Greco-Roman period which are wrestling with disparity between Israel's covenantal status and its present misfortune.

Azariah's prayer appears to have been a previously existent composition reused for its present purpose. Its insertion here conforms to a typical

[350] The versification used here follows that of standard translations of the Apocrypha. Editions of the Greek Daniel begin versification with v. 24 (i.e., English v. 1 is Greek v. 24, etc.).

[351] Kuhl, *Die drei Männer,* 100. On this *Gattung,* see Kraus, *Psalmen* 1, LI-LII.

[352] For details, see Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature,* 28.

[353] On these prayers, see above, pp. 140-1.

[354] Cf., e.g., *Ps. Sol.* 2:16-18 and 8:30-40.

Jewish literary pattern: deliverance comes in response to prayer.[355] In point of fact, however, the contents of this prayer hardly fit the young men's present predicament. No mention is made of the mortal danger in which they find themselves. Rather they confess the nation's sins, which have led to desolation and defeat, and it is from these that they pray for deliverance. Thus the prayer is more appropriate to the general circumstances of the Babylonian Exile or to the time of Antiochus' persecution of the Jews, that is, to the supposed or the real setting of the book of Daniel. Reference to the cessation of the cult and lack of leadership (v. 15) and to the unjust and wicked king (v. 9) may indicate that the prayer was actually composed during the persecution.[356] In any case, it is, together with Daniel 9:4-19, Baruch 1:15-3:8, and the Qumran 'Words of the Heavenly Luminaries,'[357] part of the penitential liturgical tradition of post-biblical Judaism.

The prose insertion following the prayer forms a transition to the second half of the addition. Verses 23-25 emphasize the ferocity of the fire, thus heightening the miracle, although v. 25 may be an answer to the prayer in vv. 20c-21.[358] Verses 26-27 describe the miraculous deliverance for the curious reader and provide cause for the three young men to sing their hymn of praise.[359]

The hymn divides into four major sections. Verses 29-34 are a doxology to the God who is enthroned in his temple (vv. 31-33), perhaps his heavenly temple (v. 34). Stylistic considerations may indicate that this section was composed separately from the rest of the hymn.[360] Verses 35-66 are a threefold appeal for the whole creation to join in the praise of God. Verses 35-51 are addressed to heaven, its inhabitants and its elements. Verses 52-60 extend the appeal to the earth, its components and its inhabitants, following in general the order of creation in Genesis 1. Having mentioned the last-created beings, 'the sons of men,' the author now addresses Israel in particular (vv. 61-65). Finally, as a climax v. 66 makes reference to the three

[355] Cf. 1 Macc 4:30-34; 2 Macc 3:15-24; 3 Macc 2; and Esth 14-15, as well as the addition in the Greek translation of Esther placed after 4:17 in the canonical book with the same effect.

[356] Moore, *Additions*, 46. See, however, Kuhl (*Die drei Männer*, 103-04), who suggests a date much earlier in the post-exilic period. Reference to the lack of a prophet could have been made at *any* time that *the author* believed there was no prophet.

[357] See below pp. 567, 570ff.

[358] Verse 25 has been taken over from v. 22 in the original, which has dropped out of some manuscripts of the Greek. Perhaps the author of the addition displaced it so that it could function as an answer to the prayer.

[359] The original story does not actually describe the deliverance but only the king's discovery of the miracle. In order to insert the prayer before that discovery, the author of the addition must mention the deliverance here.

[360] See Kuhl, *Die drei Männer*, 99-100; Moore, *Additions*, 75-76. The change from direct address of God to speech about God need not be determinative, however. Cf., e.g., Pss 104, 106, 116, 118, 135, and 144, where such fluctuation can be found. On Moore's conclusions about the relationship of the hymn to Tobit 8:5 (*Additions*, 76), see below, n. 365.

young men and the reason for singing the hymn. The brevity of this reference in the context of such a long hymn suggests that here too the author of the addition has employed an extant liturgical work, inserting this verse to make the hymn relevant to its new context.

The genre of this composition is that of a Hymn.[361] Its closest counterpart in the canonical Psalter is Psalm 148, although the relationship between the two hymns is uncertain.[362] The structure of the present hymn, with identical refrain after each line, recalls Psalm 136 and suggests that the hymn may originally have had an antiphonal liturgical function. The wording of vv. 67-68 closely parallels Psalm 136:1-3. As with the Prayer of Azariah, we have an example of Jewish liturgical tradition preserved now in a secondary setting.

The hymn cannot be dated with any certainty. Its theme is perennial. The two brief songs of praise in Tobit 8:5-6 and 15-17 very possibly reflect knowledge of this hymn, including its introduction.[363] This suggests a date at least well back into the third century.[364]

These two poetic compositions were probably written in Hebrew.[365] If this is the case, they and their narrative framework may have been inserted into the Semitic manuscript of Daniel from which the Greek translation was made. Alternatively, they could have been translated and inserted into Daniel by the Greek translator of that book.

This long addition has the effect of breaking up the continuity of the story in Daniel 3. On the other hand the sharp contrast between the tone and genres of the two poems serves to underscore the change in the action from disaster to salvation.[366] The poems convert the story from mere narrative to quasi-liturgical drama, eliciting the involvement of an audience attuned to such liturgical tradition and, perhaps, familiar with the compositions themselves.

The liturgical function of these compositions was not lost on the early

[361] Kuhl, *Die drei Männer*, 90-99. On the Gattung, Hymn, see Kraus, *Psalmen* 1, XLI-XLV.

[362] Kuhl, *Die drei Männer*, 97-98; Pfeiffer, *History*, 448; Kraus, *Psalmen* 2, 961. For a comparison of the two compositions, see *ibid.* and Moore, *Additions*, 42-43.

[363] Moore (*Additions*, 76) notes that 'the first two cola of Tobit 8:5 correspond fairly accurately to the general theme and opening lines of the Ode (vv. 29-34), and that its third colon is a capsule statement of our Psalm.' He suggests that this combination may have inspired a scribe to add the Ode to vv. 35ff. However, Moore takes no note of further parallels between Tob 8 and this hymn: the reference to creation in Tob 8:6; the references to God's saints and all his creatures, and to his angels and his chosen ones in the prayer in 8:15. Nor does he note that both prayers in Tobit change from direct address to God ('Blessed are you') to the third person *imperative* ('let the heavens . . . your creatures, etc., bless you'). Thus on the basis of both style and content, it is equally likely that the author of Tobit has used our hymn, including its introduction, but without its present conclusion.

[364] See above, p. 45.

[365] Pfeiffer, *History*, 445; Moore, *Additions*, 4-49. For a retroversion of the entire addition into Hebrew, see Kuhl, *Die drei Männer*, 128-33, 150-55, 158, 161.

[366] See the discussion of Tobit, above, pp. 43-44.

church. They were included in the collection of 'Odes' which was appended to the book of Psalms in Greek manuscripts of the Bible written in the fifth century and thereafter.[367] They continue to be used in the liturgies of the Greek Orthodox Church,[368] and the Song of the Three Young Men is still found in many Christian hymnals, often under its Latin name, *Benedicite opera omnia.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1 Enoch and the Book of Giants

The stories about Noah and Enoch, the fallen angels and the giants have been the subject of a considerable number of related articles: HANSON, 'Rebellion'; NICKELSBURG, 'Apocalyptic and Myth'; COLLINS, 'Methodological Issues'; HANSON, 'Response'; NICKELSBURG, 'Reflections'; DIMANT, '1 Enoch 6-11'. SUTER, Fallen Angel'; NEWSOM 'Development'; NICKELSBURG, 'Enoch, Levi, and Peter'; COLLINS, 'Apocalyptic Technique'. Treatments written independently of these include: DIMANT, 'Fallen Angels'; DELCOR, 'Le Mythe'; BARTHELMUS, 'Heroentum'. For the Qumran texts of the Book of Giants, see MILIK, *Enoch*, 298-317. For the Manichaean texts, see HENNING, 'Book of Giants'. On the relationship of the book to *1 Enoch*, see GREENFIELD – STONE, 'Pentateuch'.

Jubilees

On the Qumran Hebrew manuscripts of *Jubilees*, see VANDERKAM, *Studies* 18-101, comparison of all published Hebrew fragments with the Ethiopic manuscripts. For a critical edition of the Ethiopic text and for the Greek, Syriac, and Latin fragments, see CHARLES' *Ethiopic Jubilees.* Five or six other Ethiopic manuscripts are mentioned in BAARS–ZUURMOND, 'Project'. On the Greek version, see Milik, 'Recherches'. For a concordance of the Latin Fragments, see DENIS, *Concordance.* For an annotated English translation with introduction, see CHARLES, 'Jubilees'. For a somewhat more detailed introduction and commentary, see CHARLES, *Jubilees.* A helpful introduction to the thought of the book is provided by TESTUZ, *Les idées.* The text of the Hebrew fragments, the biblical text employed in *Jubilees,* and the date of the book are discussed by VANDERKAM, *Studies.* On *halakhah* in *Jubilees*, see FINKELSTEIN, 'The Book of Jubilees'; ALBECK, *Das Buch der Jubiläen.* On eschatology, see DAVENPORT, *Eschatology.* A vast

[367] Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis,* 78.
[368] Swete, *Introduction,* 254.

literature has developed on the calendar of *Jubilees*, in part as it relates to the Qumran calendar. JAUBERT, 'Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân'; *id.*, 'Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jours liturgiques de la semaine'; *id.*, *La date de la Cène*; LEACH, 'Method'; TALMON, 'Calendar Reckoning'; MILIK, *Ten Years*, 107-13; WIESENBERG, 'The Jubilee of Jubilees'; KUTSCH, 'Der Kalendar'; *id.*, 'Die Solstitien'; CAZELLES, 'Sur les origines'; BAUMGARTEN, 'The Calendar'; WIRGIN, *Jubilees*; ZEITLIN, 'Judaean Calendar'; HERR, 'The Calendar'; VANDERKAM, 'Origin'; *id.*, '2 Maccabees 6, 7A'.

The Genesis Apocryphon

AVIGAD — YADIN, *A Genesis Apocryphon, editio princeps,* introduction, text, translation, plates. FITZMYER, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, introduction, text, translation, and detailed commentary, bibliography.

The Book of Biblical Antiquities

COHN, 'An Apocryphal Work', the first major treatment of the work with many insights that are still valid. JAMES, *Antiquities*, extensive introduction, translation; reprinted in 1971 with a lengthy 'Prolegomenon' by FELDMAN, who comments on James' edition, provides many corrections, and carries on a dialogue with subsequent scholarship. BOGAERT, *Apocalypse*, 242-58, the relationship of Pseudo-Philo to *2 Baruch*. STRUGNELL, 'Philo', a summary article. HARRINGTON, *Hebrew Fragments*, text and translation of the parts of the Hebrew *Chronicles of Jerahmeel* which correspond to Pseudo-Philo, a retroversion from the Latin. DIETZFELBINGER, *Pseudo-Philo,* introduction, annotated German translation. For the most recent major work, see HARRINTON — CAZEAUX, *Les Antiquites* 1, a text-critical introduction, critical text of the Latin with facing French translation; volume 2 by PERROT — BOGAERT, contains an introduction, commentary, and extensive bibliography. On the message and setting of the work, see NICKELSBURG, 'Good and Bad Leaders'.

The Books of Adam and Eve

For a critical edition of the Greek texts of the *Apocalypse of Moses*, see TISCHENDORF, *Apocalypses,* 1-23. For an analysis of the manuscripts, textual history of the Books of Adam and Eve, transcription of the Greek texts, and concordance, see NAGEL, *La Vie.* The Latin text of the *Vita*, together with an extensive introduction, was published by MEYER, *Vita*, and a critical edition was published by MOZLEY, 'Documents'. For a text and translation, with discussion, of the Slavonic version, see JAGIĆ, 'Slavische Beiträge'. For a translation of the Armenian *Repentance*, see ISSAVERDENS, 'Penitence'

and of the *Penitence*, STONE, 'Penitence'. The Georgian version is discussed by LÜDTKE, 'Georgische Adam-Bücher'. For an English translation, with introduction, of the *Apocalypse*, the *Vita*, and the Slavonic version, see WELLS, 'Adam and Eve'. For an important early discussion of the *Apocalypse of Moses*, see KABISCH, 'Die Entstehungszeit'. On the theology of the Apocalypse, see SHARPE, 'The Second Adam'. On the *Apocalypse* and the *Vita*, and their relationship to one another and to the Gnostic *Apocalypse of Adam*, see NICKELSBURG, 'Related Traditions'. For an English translation of the *Apocalypse of Adam*, see MACRAE – PARROTT, 'Apocalypse'. On the wide spate of Adam literature, see the extensive article by FREY, 'Adam'. On the Armenian literature about Seth and Adam, see STONE, 'Armenian Seth Traditions'.

Philo the Epic Poet

MRAS, *Eusebius*, 506-07, 517-18, 546-47, critical text of Greek. JACOBY, *Fragmente*, 3c 2, 689-90, critical text of collected Greek fragments. DENIS, *Fragmenta*, 203-04, Greek text. ATTRIDGE, 'Philo' (forthcoming), introduction with bibliography, annotated English translation. WALTER, *Fragmente*, annotated German translation. Studies include: Schürer, *Literature*, 222-4, older bibliography; DALBERT, *Theologie*, 33-35; GUTMAN, 'Philo', an extensive discussion; DENIS, *Introduction*, 270-71, discussion with bibliography; WACHOLDER, 'Philo'; *Id., Eupolemus*, 282-3.

Theodotus the Epic Poet

MRAS, *Eusebius*, 212-16, critical text of Greek. JACOBY, *Fragmente*, 3 c 2, 692-94, critical text of Greek. DENIS, *Fragmenta*, 204-7, Greek text. WALTER, *Fragmente*, annotated German translation. FALLON, 'Theodotus' (forthcoming), introduction, annotated English translation. Studies include, FREUDENTHAL, *Studien*, 99-100, argument for Samaritan origin; SCHÜRER, *Literature*, 224-5; BULL, 'A Note', a discussion of relevant archeological evidence at Shechem; DENIS, *Introduction*, 272-3; WACHOLDER, *Eupolemus*, 283-5; COLLINS, 'Theodotus', detailed critique of hypothesis of Samaritan origin.

Ezekiel the Tragedian

MRAS, *Eusebius*, 524-38, critical text of Greek. DENIS, *Fragmenta*, 207-16, Greek text. ROBERTSON, 'Ezekiel' (forthcoming), introduction, annotated translation. SCHÜRER, *Literature*, 225-8, brief comments, older bibliography. KUIPER, 'Le poète juif Ezechiel'. WIENEKE, *Ezechielis*, detailed study in Latin. DALBERT, *Theologie*, 52-65. DENIS, *Introduction*, 273-7. SNELL, 'Ezechiels Moses-Drama', special attention to relationship to

classical drama. STRUGNELL, 'Notes', on the text and metre of the fragments. STAROBINSKI-SAFRAN, 'Un poète', analysis of the enthronement scene and its antecedents. HOLLADAY, 'The Portrait of Moses in Ezekiel the Tragedian.' DELLING-MASER, *Bibliographie,* 55, additional bibliography.

The Story of Darius' Bodyguards (1 Esdras 3-4)

HANHART, *Esdrae liber I,* critical edition of the Greek text. COOK, '1 Esdras', introduction, annotated translation. TORREY, 'Story', historical questions, relationship to context. LAQUEUR, 'Ephoros', 168-72, brief, but perceptive early analysis of literary problems. SCHALIT, 'The Date and Place'. RUDOLF, 'Der Wettstreit', general discussion; ZIMMERMANN, 'Story', alleged mistranslations from Aramaic, literary problems and reconstruction. PFEIFFER, *History*, 250-7, special attention to historical matters and extra-Israelite parallels. POHLMANN, *Studien*, important discussion of many aspects in the context of a treatment of 1 Esdras as a whole. MYERS, *I and II Esdras*, translation with brief commentary. CRENSHAW, 'The Contest', literary and rhetorical features, context within Israelite wisdom tradition.

Additions to the Book of Esther

HANHART, *Esther*, critical edition of the Greek texts. BICKERMAN, 'Colophon', an important discussion of the date of the translation. *Id.*, 'Notes', a good introduction to major issues. BROWNLEE, 'Le livre grec d'Esther', the additions are an orthodox correction of the Hebrew book. MOORE, *Additions*, annotated translation of the Hebrew book, interwoven with a translation of the additions and a commentary on them. MOTZO, 'Rifacimento', Greek translation was made on the basis of 3 Maccabees.

David's Compositions

SANDERS, *Psalms Scroll*, 91-93, text, translation, and some commentary. *Id., Dead Sea*, 134-6, a more popular version of the *editio princeps.*

Baruch

ZIEGLER, *Ieremias, Baruch*, 450-67, critical edition of Greek text. TOV, *Baruch*, Greek text, English translation, Hebrew retroversion of 1:1-3:8 and Hebrew parallels from Jeremiah. WHITEHOUSE, 'Baruch', introduction and annotated translation, dates the work ca. 78 C.E. KNEUCKER, *Baruch*, extensive introduction, German translation and commentary, retroversion of entire book into pointed Hebrew; it remains a learned and indispensable tool. PFEIFFER, *History*, a good discussion of major introductory issues.

MOORE, *Additions,* 255-316, translation and commentary. TOV, *Translation,* 111-33, comparison of translation techniques in Jeremiah and Baruch 1:1-3:8, concluding that the two were translated by the same person and that the translation was revised by the same person. GOLDSTEIN, 'Baruch', the historical setting of the book, in 163 B.C.E. BURKE, *The Poetry of Baruch,* philological study and analysis of the poetry in 3:9-5:9.

The Epistle of Jeremiah

ZIEGLER, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae,* 494-504, critical edition of Greek text. BALL, 'Epistle', introduction, annotated translation, emphasis on Hebrew *Vorlage.* NAUMANN, *Untersuchungen,* background in Babylonian religion, philological details, historical setting. MOORE *Additions*, 317-58, introduction, translation, commentary.

Additions to Daniel

ZIEGLER, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco,* 119-32, critical edition of the Greek text. KUHL, *Die drie Männer*, detailed philological, form-critical, and historical discussion of Daniel 3 including the addition; retroversion of the addition into Hebrew. MOORE, *Additions,* introduction, translation, commentary.