Traces of Jewish Traditions

Since all indications point to the fact that the OT is not the product of a single effort, the question arises whether strands of pristine translations, or at least early interpretative traditions can be detected in it. Setting out some evidence why this question may be answered in the affirmative, we must enter a caveat. Given the extreme literalism of the version under review, one must not expect any glaring instances of hermeneutics as are found e.g. in some of the Aramaic targums. One has to read between the lines, so to speak, in order to perceive echoes of exegetical traditions; in other words, the minute details of lexical equivalents and idiomatic renderings in each single verse have to be scrutinized. This is a task yet to be done systematically; the examples adduced in the following discussion are merely meant to serve as illustration.

A priori one may feel entitled to presume that Jewish Bible translations into Latin existed in relatively early times. It had been the custom of the Jews before the period under review to translate biblical books into their vernacular; such translations, sometimes made orally but frequently also written down, were needed for public reading in the synagogue and for the instruction of the young. Since we know of Jewish communities in many corners of the Roman Empire and in Rome itself, it is plausible to ascribe some translational efforts to them. Moreover, there does exist tangible evidence: In Jewish catacombs of ancient Italy a third of the inscriptions quote biblical verses in Latin: The grave is called domus aeterna ‘the eternal home’ (cf. Eccl. 12:5), and in memory of the deceased it is said ligatus in ligatorium vitae ‘bound in the bundle of life’ (1 Sam 25:9), and memoria iustorum ad benedictionem ‘the memory of the just is blessed’ (Prov 10:7).

Indeed, a number of scholars are inclined to believe that the OT has at its base pre-Christian translations made from the Hebrew. The proofs they adduce are, however, far from conclusive. Isolated linguistic or exegetical points of contact with Jewish idioms or targumic renderings do not necessarily prove a direct dependence. The proofs they adduce are, however, far from conclusive. Isolated linguistic or exegetical points of contact with Jewish idioms or targumic renderings do not necessarily prove a direct dependence.

The assumption of a Hebrew original as the ultimate source of the OL is defended by Blondheim, Probleme, xxxv-liii; Cassuto, Hattargumimhaychidu, 205-16; and in a modified form: Baumgarten, ‘Orientalische Probleme’, 89-114; Sparks, ‘Latin Bible’, 102-03; Schillingberger, ‘Altlatini­sche Texte’, 51. Rahner, Hebräische Traditionen, 12-13 points to some midrashic remarks that speak of a Latin Bible version. Mohrmann, ‘Linguistic Problems’, 22-29 has doubted the assumption mentioned, pointing out that Christian Latinity flourished after the rupture between Christians and Jews. However, far from conclusive. Isolated linguistic or exegetical points of contact with Jewish idioms or targumic renderings do not necessarily prove a direct dependence.

First one may mention those blunders of the translators that can be explained only from the Hebrew. The OL has Edom for Aram (2 Chr 20:2) — correctly rendered ‘Syria’ by the LXX and Vg — due to a confusion of the Hebrew consonants רֶז and דָאֵל that graphically especially resemble each other. The consonantal sequence גֶּמלִים ‘carmels’. Hebrew dèvarim (Hos 14:3), correctly translated into Greek logoi ‘words’, is rendered multi ‘many’, reflecting a reading rabbim. Hebrew miqd̄ar ‘from dwelling’ (Ps 84[83]:11) is rendered a generatione ‘from the generation’, i.e. middor;šam ‘there’ (ib. 87[86]:4) nomen ‘name’. i.e. šēm. Blunders and errors these may be, yet they prove the point under discussion. Then there are the cases of Christian erudition, genuine or otherwise. In the verse just mentioned (Hos 14:3) the OL renders the words ‘Take away all iniquity’: potens es dimittere peccata ‘powerful thou art to forgive sins’, a rendering that equates kl ‘all’, with ykl ‘to be able, strong’. Hebrew bahārîm ‘young men’ (Amos 8:13) — correctly: neaniskoi — is translated: iuvenes electi ‘chosen young men’, reflecting the meaning of the verbal root brh ‘to choose’. Similarly, the name Tabor (1 Sam 10:3), rendered thabor electae, is derived from the root brh ‘to select’. The OL quite correctly renders the MT: et ideo sic ‘and therefore’ (1 Sam 3:14), where the LXX misreads the Hebrew (lōʾkēn ‘not like this’ instead of lōkēn); foveam for Hebrew téālā (1 Kgs 18:32) where the LXX merely offers a transliteration (thaala); but the OL transliterates aoth (hawwār); Judg 10:4 where the LXX offers a translation. The Hebrew hesed ‘mercy’ (2 Chr 35:26) had received an extraordinary rendition in the LXX: elpis ‘hope’; the OL returns to the standard equivalent misericordia.

An echo of Jewish halakhic law we seem to detect when the OL omits the conjunction, found in the LXX between the second item and the third: ma’dayn ʿābōr miqweh mayim ‘a fountain and a pit, full of water’ (Lev 11:36) > lacu collectionis aquae. According to the Greek text there are mentioned three different things: a fountain and a pit and a gathering of waters. The OL dis-
tinctures between two, namely the fountain and the pit which is a ‘collection of water’; the identical distinction is made in M. Mikwaot 1:7.21

The OL occasionally inserts a clause, a fact which is of special interest since here the translator, or some interpolator, offers a clue to his beliefs, his religious vocabulary, or his knowledge of the Bible. The prophet had warned his people: ‘Rejoice not, o Israel, for joy, as (other) peoples’ (Hos 9: 1). The last word ka‘amnim ‘like the nations’, is rendered: sicu populi terra ‘like the nations of the world’, an expression that recalls the denotation of the heathens in later Judaism.22 In the book of Jeremiah we find in the same context two interpolations: ‘he that getteth riches’ (Jer 17:11) is explained: multos pariat sibi filios adquirens divitias suas ‘he begets many sons acquiring his wealth’; and ‘they that depart from me shall be written in the earth’ (ib. 17:13) is explained: qui discesserunt a terra scribantur in libro mortis, ‘... the earth they shall be written in the book of death’. On both verses the rabbinic commentators offer very similar explanations. It is obvious that the latter verse contains a negative allusion to the ‘Book of Life, of the Living’ (Ps 69:68:29. Cf. Jerome 4. 961 delei de libro viventium ‘stricken from the book of the living’).’

Considerations of space prevent us from presenting additional material which at any rate would have done little more than give support to the conclusions one may attempt to draw from the limited survey presented above. There can be no question at all that the influence of a Hebrew text-tradition is noticeable in the OL; the traces of such influence are relatively rare, in other words, they occur embedded in wide stretches of a text that closely follows the Septuagint. It also seems, that these Hebrew-influenced patches have the tendency to appear in bundles; many of these patches do not testify to the solid work of an erudite Hebraist, but rather give the impression of improvised remarks by a half-learned person. This leads us to believe that most of these points of contact with the Hebrew text, or with Jewish exegesis, are not

...
and Hebrew

In many biblical passages testamentum does not denote the last will of the deceased but rather a covenant of the living').

A similar case is that of the verb evangelizare, a loan-word which stands side by side with the calque translation bene nuntiare ‘to announce’. Whereas the LXX consistently employs the vb. euangelizin, the old Latin versions vacillate between the Greek and Latin verb. In view of the very specific way in which the LXX mentions evangela and evangeliosthe, there is a glaring difference between: bene nuntiatioe de die in diem ‘announce from day to day’ (Ps 96[95]:2), and: dominus dabat verbum evangeliizantibus (ib. 68[67]:12), which will be understood to mean ‘God gives the word to those that announce the gospel’. A like dichotomy has developed in the OL in the wake of, but in contradistinction to the LXX concerning many other words, such as diabolus vs. adversarius ‘devil, adversary’; psalmare vs. canturre, cunere ‘to praise, sing’; synagoga vs. congregatio ‘congregation’; eleemosyna vs. iustitia ‘justice, alms’, and so on. The incorporation of the loan-words of a narrowly defined applicability side by side with their Latin equivalents that continued to fulfill the broader functions was one of the ways by which the OL aided in creating a unique idiom of Christendom.

Another way was the moulding of a Latin, lexically and semantically enriched, out of the old language. Sufice to remind us of the new, additional meanings some well known words assumed having passed into the Latin Bible: fides ‘trust, reliance’, also denotes ‘the religious faith’ (Hab 2:4; 1 Tim 1:2); gentes ‘nations’ denotes ‘the heathen’ (Ps 79[78]:10), peccatum ‘a fault, blunder’, becomes the term for ‘sin, guilt’ (Gen 18:20), testamentum ‘a will, testament’, stands for covenant’ (ib. 17:2), saeculum ‘a generation, an age’, denotes ‘forever, in all eternity’ (Ps 37[36]:27).

Now and then his Christian faith seems to have dictated the wording to the translator. Thus he renders — against the Mt and LXX — the key word in the clause ‘the fruit of his deeds’ (Jer 17:10): cogitation ‘a thought, design’; thus the prophet’s saying comes to mean that God who searches the heart, giveth every man according to his inner thoughts (cf. Jerome ad loc. quod nullus cognitionem secretum cognoscit nisi solo deus, ‘because no one save God knows the secret thoughts’; 4, 960). The rendering thronus virtutis ‘a mighty throne’ (ib. 17:12) for Hebrew kisế kâbôd and Greek thronos doxês ‘a glorious throne’ (Vg. solium gloriae) may be based on 2 Thess 1:7; 9 where ‘glory’ and ‘might’ are combined (et a gloria virtutis eius). The wording avulsus sumus in eis ‘we are removed (i.e. we die) in them (the bones)’ (Ezek 37:11) may refer to the belief in a resurrection of the flesh. The prophet Amos in very harsh words condemns the ‘pride’ of Jacob: ‘... saith the Lord... I abhor the excellency of Jacob’ (Am 6:8). The word for ‘excellency, pride’. Hebrew gadon, Greek hybris, is not rendered superbia as one would expect but instead the OL has: iniuria ‘injustice, injurious act’. According to this translation, it is not Jacob’s splendour that has caused God’s wrath but rather his actions done contrary to justice. The OL of Hos 14:3(2) has the following addition: et eapelabatur in bonis corvestrum ‘and your heart shall feast upon the good things’; this is reminiscent of 1 Cor 5:8, 27

26 Blaise, Manuel, 11-15. Souter, Glossary, passim e.g. on peccatum p. 290, Jerome deemed it necessary to explain the broadened meaning of testamentum in Christian Latin: ‘In plurisue Scripturarum locis testamentum non voluntatem defunctor omnis, sed pactum viventium’ (5, 957 ad Mal 2:4; ‘In many biblical passages testamentum does not denote the last will of the deceased but rather a covenant of the living’).

The commonplace statement that every translation is an interpretation could be given a sharper edge: Even a translation that aims at literalism offers the translator an opportunity to introduce something of his personal thoughts and beliefs. In the case of the OL, though, it is not the voice of a single person we think to discern but rather the sounds of an historic workshop that has been continuously engaged in transferring the Scriptures into Latin.

Jerome and the Vulgate

Education; Qualifications

As the Old Latin version accompanied the growth of the victorious Western church the number of its copies, revisions and recensions grew to such an extent that the need was felt for the establishment of one authoritative Latin Bible-text out of the many text-forms in circulation. Such reliable text was to be used not only for instructional and liturgical purposes but also in controversies with heretics and Jews. This task of preparing a revised Latin version, of the mt as
first step, was entrusted to Eusebius Hieronymus, or Jerome as later ages would call him, in c. 382 who at that time had already won a fame in Rome as scholar and writer.28

In the present context only those biographical details are significant that help to explain his tireless occupation with philological material and testify to his abilities and qualifications to perform the gigantic task of translating the Bible. As son of wealthy parents Jerome received a good education which included the study of Latin grammar and literature, rhetoric and Greek. Though later, having begun serious theological studies, he felt strong qualms about his being attracted so much by classical culture, his works, all of them dedicated to ecclesiastical and biblical subjects, not only bear witness to his classical training but also betray a continued affection toward it. In one of his letters (Epistulae 53:6) he mentions grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, geometry, dialectics, music, astronomy, astrology and medicine as useful skills; he cites Horace and praises Vergil (5, 11-13); and in connection with Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 1) he mentions Hippocrates’ doctrine of the four elements fire, air, water, earth (ib.). For identification of the precious stones mentioned by Ezekiel (28:11-19) he sends his diligent readers to Pliny’s Natural History (diligens a nobis mittendus est lector; 5,334). He informs us of the extensive concurrence of Christian dogma and Stoic doctrine (4, 159). In his translation from the Hebrew we find terms taken from pagan mythology: gigantes (Gen 6:4), pythones, aruspicus (2 Kgs 21:6), (the goddess) fortuna (Isa 65:11), sirenes (ib. 13:22), lamia, onocentaur (ib. 34:14), fauni ficarii (Jer 50:39) and so on. We may suspect that the extraordinary rendering populus for st’ón ‘a noise, tumult’ in the verse vox populi de civitate… vox domini ‘a voice of noise from the city…, a voice of the Lord’ (Isa 66:6) is due to a reminiscence of the Latin proverb: vox populi vox dei.29 Jerome’s translation not infrequently assumes the sonority and rhythm of poetry. Contrast the following passage in his work, the Vulgate, with the OL.

Gen 37:34
Jacob rent his clothes and put sackcloth on his loins, and mourned for his son many days.

Vg
scissisque vestibus et conscidit iacob vestimenta sua
OL
indutus est celiacio et posuit saccium super lumbum suum
lugens filium et flebat filium suum
mulo tempore diebus multis

Having moved to the desert of Chalcis, east of Antioch, (374), leading a life of ascetism and study, he took up Hebrew studies: a convert to Christianity taught him ‘the hissing and puffing words’ of that language until he was able to harvest ‘sweet fruits from the bitter seed’ (Epistulae 125:12).30 After many years there and in Antioch where he undoubtedly perfected his Greek but also continued to learn from Jewish masters (Epistulae 18:10), he returned to Rome (382). There he established contact with a Jew who supplied him with Hebrew texts, taken secretly from the synagogue. In the year 385 Jerome left Rome for Palestine and after a journey through that country in order to acquaint himself with its geography and history,31 he finally settled at Bethlehem (385). Again he succeeded in finding a number of Jewish teachers with whom he discussed the minutiae of the Hebrew Bible. Frequently in his commentaries he tells us that he had asked a Jew to explain the meaning of a word or a phrase to him (6,934, 4,291; 5, 94) because ‘whenever someone opines something better and more correct, we should gladly accept it’ (6,814) and ‘when in doubt, ask the Jews’ (sicubi dubitas, Hebraeos interroga; Epistulae 112:20; cf. Adversus Rufinum 2:25, 28, 30 where he quotes from his earlier writings). Jerome mentions one of his teachers by name (Baranina i.e. Bar-Hanina; 2, 469) and calls others by their titles, such as deuterôtës (i.e. Tanna), scriba (i.e. sofer), spliens (i.e. hakâm). It is inconceivable that such persistent efforts should not produce results. Against those who maintain that Jerome’s knowledge of Hebrew has been overestimated, it must be stressed that he was, indeed, proficient in this language. In conjunction with his monumental translation, the Latin Vulgate, innumerable remarks on Hebraic philology witness to this proficiency.32

For Jerome Hebrew was ‘the progenitures of all the other languages’ (matrix omnium linguarum; 6, 730), the language of creation (ad Isa 13:10; 4,240, ad Amos 5:8-9,6, 288-89). The Greek and Latin names of the stars bear witness to the ridiculous fables of the heathen; the Hebrew language possesses its own language. In conjunction with his monumental translation, the Latin Vulgate, innumerable remarks on Hebraic philology witness to this proficiency.32

For Jerome Hebrew was ‘the progenitures of all the other languages’ (matrix omnium linguarum; 6, 730), the language of creation (ad Isa 13:10; 4,240, ad Amos 5:8-9,6, 288-89). The Greek and Latin names of the stars bear witness to the ridiculous fables of the heathen; the Hebrew language possesses its own language. In conjunction with his monumental translation, the Latin Vulgate, innumerable remarks on Hebraic philology witness to this proficiency.32

28 Quotations of Jerome’s words in the present study are from Vallarsi; see note 18. Bardenhewer, Geschichte 3,605-5; Lietzmann, ‘Hieronymus’, 305-25; Campenhausen, Westminster Church, 129-82. We learn of Jerome’s commission from his Preface to the Gospels which is phrased as a letter to Pope Damasus (c. 304-384).
29 The ultimate source of this proverb may be Hesiod, Works and Days, 763-64; the Latin rephrasing, however, is quite old (cf. Walter, Lateinische Sprichwörter, 391). Jerome comments (4, 804) that one voice is that of Jerusalem’s wailing population when the city is attacked by the Romans while the other voice is that of the punishing God. It should be noted that the lemma corrects the inaccurate rendering, substituting (vox) fremitus for (vox) populi.
30 Barr, ‘St Jerome’s Appreciation’, 283-302.
31 Jerome, probably, was the first to stress the need to get acquainted with the geography of Palestine in order to better understand the Scriptures (Prol. in Paralip.) Miller, ‘Aufenthalt’ 40-54.
32 Burkitt, ‘The Debt’, 91: ‘... the Latin Vulgate is not, strictly speaking, a new translation, (Jerome’s) knowledge of Hebrew was not profound’. The first part of this statement is obviously wrong, if only because it ignores the heterogeneity of the work; the second part is disproved by the translator’s achievement. As to his perseverance with regard to his Hebrew studies cf. Rahmcr, Hebräische Traditionen, 5-15; Barr, ‘St Jerome and the Sounds’ and ‘St Jerome’s Appreciation’; Hardy, ‘Saint Jérôme’, 145-64; Kedar, Vulgate, 50-51, 296 n. 61.
this script the letter Taw (Ezek 9:4) has the shape of a cross (5, 95-6). He
admires the Hebrew language and deems, as compared with it, the Latin and
Greek languages poor in their vocabulary (proper... ad comparisonem
linguæ Hebraææ, tam Graeci quam Latinisermis pauperiem; 4,488). When
a mistaken σχισμι rendering is based on a scribal error in the original, he
comments on the resemblances of Hebrew letters, e.g. the letter ר� and the letter
Daleth; thus amicitia ‘friendship’ (r') might easily be confused with scientia
‘knowledge’ (d') (ad Jer 15:12; 4, 947). Doubts as to Jerome’s knowledge of
Hebrew have been voiced inter alia because he apparently did not distinguish
between ב and ד; he explains the ambiguity of the consonantal sequence בb
that it can be taken to mean either ‘seven’ or ‘satiated’ (4,873) ignoring that the first
is pronounced with a ב (šeba) the other with a ד (šaba). But since Jerome dealt
with the problems the ancient translator faced who had a text, unvocalized and
without diacritical marks, before him, the confusion as indicated by him could
indeed take place. Moreover, Latin has no equivalent, neither phonetic nor
graphic, for ב. At another occasion he does point out ‘the different accentu-
ation’ (pro diversitate accentum; 4,786) of the two sibilants; is he to blame that
he did not find a way of proper transliteration?33
Jerome’s seriousness and philological precision in reading the Hebrew text
finds its expression when he is ready to forgo a christological interpretation of a
verse because one silent letter is in the way: ‘The Lord’ declares to man what is
his thought’ (Am 4:13) had been rendered by the LXX (in Jerome’s Latin translation):
annuntius in homines Christum suum... announcing his Christ to men’. Had the Hebrew letters been מִשְׁפַּח he expounds, it could have stood for מָשֶׁה Messiah’; since, however, the sequence had a superfluous מַשֶּה as second letter, i.e. מְשֵׁיה (HE secundum litteram plus habens; 6,278) Jerome feels obliged to correct this rendering (Vg annuntius homini eloquium suum). Though having before him an unvocalized text, he frequently comments on the
proper vocalization: MEM, JOD, MEM-si legatur MAIM ‘aquas’ significat, si
MEIAM ‘de maris’, if the sequence m-y-m is read muyim, it means ‘water’, if
miyym ‘from the sea’ (6, 131).34
The fact that Jerome can compare three languages and the problems he faces
as a translator, make him a keen observer of linguistic phenomena.35 He raises
fine points of grammar and semantics. He notices the lack of the definite article
in Latin (7,503) and comments on number and gender of nouns. Hebrew RUA
‘spirit’ is feminine; however, nobody should find this, in view of the Holy Spirit,
scandalous: in Latin the word is masculine, in Greek neuter, so that we learn
that deity has no sex (in divinitate enim nullus est sexus; 4, 485-486). Jerome is

33 Cf. Siegfried, ‘Aussprache’, 34-83; Sutcliffe, ‘St Jerome’s Pronunciation’, 112-25; Sperber,
‘Hebrew’, 103-27.
34 Obviously, the many transliterations in Jerome’s works are not trustworthy from a text-critical
point of view. Copyists, ignorant of Hebrew, inevitably introduced many scribal errors.
35 Jerome prides himself: ‘ego philosophus, rhetor, grammaticus, dialecticus, hebraeus, graecus,
latinus, trilinguis’ (2, 537); the order of the languages enumerated is noteworthy.

capable of making nice semantic distinctions between Hebrew synonyms
(though he does not always pay attention to them in his translation): nêbêla
is the corpse of a beast which has died without shedding blood, têrêpâ is a corpse
 torn by beasts (5, 45). The verb znh ‘to fornicate’ denotes the conduct of a
woman who lies with many men, nô ‘to commit adultery’, a woman that deserts
her husband for someone else (6, 14), dwôn ‘iniquity’, antedates the law, hêt
‘sin’, occurs after the law (6, 89). Jerome remarks on the polysemy of words:
ruah, according to the context, may mean either spiritus ‘spirit’, or anima ‘soul’,
orventus ‘wind’ (5,7). rehêm denotes vulva ‘womb’ and misericordia ‘mercy’ (6,
235).
There are hundreds of examples of the above kind. Jerome inadvertently
demonstrates that he is able to find easily a Hebrew equivalent for a given
Greek word whenever, in correcting the wording found in the LXX, he states
what the Hebrew vocabulary, not found in the MT, should have been, were the LXX
correct (e.g. 4, 470). And thus we may believe him, that when he translated
the Aramaic text of Tobit, he asked a Jew to give an improvised Hebrew
rendering of it which Jerome, in his turn, dictated on the spot in Latin to his
scribe (Prologus Tobiae). If we accept this evidence, it proves a high degree
of proficiency.
It is probable that Jerome had acquired a fair knowledge of Aramaic or Syriac
and a smattering of Arabic, yet the evidence (Epistulæ 17:2; Prologus in
Daniehel; Prologus in Job) is not conclusive. But that his inquisitive mind
always turned to languages which might help to elucidate a biblical text, cannot
be doubted: Jerome tells us of his inquiries into the Egyptian and Punic
languages (4,291; 6,425).
What then shall we make of the alleged mistaken renderings and errors in
Jerome’s translation? To begin with, most of the so-called mistakes, if not all,
commonly adduced are definitely not blunders but conscientiously chosen
renderings in agreement with philological notions current in his times. Indeed,
it is easy to find support for his renderings in Jewish versions and commentaries.
As we shall return to this question later, suffice it to adduce an example or two.
As is well known, Jerome derived the verb qun (Exod 34:29) not from qen ‘a
ray’, but from qen ‘horn’, and thus aided in creating the image of a ‘horned
Moses: his face was homed (cornuta). This, however, is not a haphazard
rendering: Jerome could have copied the LXX (‘glorified’), had he wanted it.
Yet his way of translating is a replica of Aquila’s etymologizing rendition and
was meant as a glorification of Moses: horns are the insignia of might and
majesty (6, 321; 4, 68). Jerome overlooking the homonym presents the usual
translation costa ‘a rib’ for seba (Job 18:12) instead of ‘a fall, ruin’ (calamity is

36 E.g. Isa 38:9. For Hebrew miktâv ‘A writing, letter’ the LXX had prosœchì ‘a prayer’ Jerome
comments (4,470): ‘Miror quomodo soli Septuaginta pro scripaturum’ orationem ‘proseruit, quan
oramio THEPELLAT dicat et non MACHITTAB quae in praesenti locoscibatur’; in other
words, Jerome easily, i.e. without contextual aid, was able to find the lexical equivalents: Greek
prosœchì > Latin oratio, and oratio > Hebrew stîlla.
ready for his ruin). Yet Jerome elsewhere knew how to translate the homonym correctly: *plaga* (Ps 38:18), and on the other hand, the Jewish medieval commentators support Jerome’s interpretation of our verse; Ibn Ezra says the word here means ‘the side’, while Rashi thinks ‘the rib’ refers to ‘a man’s wife’. The vocable *'ibul* occurs three times in the same context: Dan 8:2, 3 and 6. The Vg has for *this porta’ gate*, *palus* ‘pool’, and *again porta’. Is Jerome so insecure? He is not; a glimpse into rabbinic commentaries reveals the existence of two traditions: ‘the entrance gate’ (Saadya) and ‘a stream of water’ (Ibn Ezra).

Of course, Jerome did err a few times. In his commentary (6.120) he confuses Shalman (Hos 10:14) with Zalmunna, the Medianite king (Judg 8:5). He also seems to have confused now and then the gutturals *'Aleph* and *'Ayin*, thus *n'mnym* ‘pleasant’ > *fideles* ‘faithful’, as if spelled with an *'Aleph* (Isa 17:10); *ba’er* ‘to destroy’ (ib. 6:13) > *inostensionem* ‘for exposing, manifestation’, as if written *b’r*. In his commentary Jerome not only corrects these mistakes (4,196, 283, 99) but appears to be astonished at the erroneous translations. Yet they are not so surprising. Jerome generally worked in great haste and obviously did not look up every Bible verse he wanted to quote; or somebody unable to pronounce the gutturals read the passage to him whereupon Jerome dictated his Latin rendering. We submit therefore, that this kind of error, paradoxically, constitutes additional proof of Jerome’s expertise.

**Scholarly Works**

Jerome was a prolific author. It would be futile to enumerate his works, the more so since we would necessarily limit ourselves to a list of the extant writings; it seems, however, that he had written more but part of it has perished without trace except a few remarks in Jerome’s extant writings. Thus we shall mention only some of the more important treatises directly relating to the interpretation of the Bible text.

At the outset Jerome translated biblical treatises by renowned Greek Fathers (c. 381) – an activity which he continued to practice now and then in later years – but soon contributed works of his own. The ‘Book on Hebrew Names’ (*De Nominibus Hebraicis*) was meant to be a revision of Origen’s book on this subject but contains Jerome’s incisive criticism based upon his Hebrew learning. His ‘Book of Hebrew Questions on Genesis’ (*Liber Quaestionum Hebraicarum in Genesim*) deals only with the more difficult and important passages, yet it offered its author the opportunity to point out the grave defects of the old version and thus the obligation to return to the original text (c. 389). At about the same time he composed his commentary on Ecclesiastes (*Commentarius in Ecclesiisten*), a discussion and explanation of the Hebrew text which is rendered in an ad-hoc Latin translation. Jerome repeats here thoughts contained in

---

37 Kedar, Vulgate, 52-53. Jerome kept complaining about his bad eyesight (Ep. 21:42) which made him dependent upon people who read the texts aloud for him.

38 Bardenhewer, Geschichte, 612-27.
THE VULGATE

Historical and Technical Data
In view of the confusion caused by the innumerable Latin text-forms, Jerome was commissioned by Damasus, bishop of Rome, to revise the Latin Bible, in other words to prepare an authoritative text in the light of the Greek. Whether this revision was to be limited to the NT or was meant to include the whole Bible, is a moot question. The latter seems more plausible since we know of a revision of some books of the OT, first and foremost the Psalter, which Jerome emended from the Greek of the LXX. In the main, however, the product of this revision is the text of the NT as we find it in the Vulgate. The revised four Gospels appeared in 383, the remainder received a rather cursory revision at best. As regards the OT the revision, or the planning of such, soon yielded to a much more ambitious design, namely that of a fresh translation directly from the Hebrew original. Admittedly, Jerome did not execute this ambitious plan in a prefixed, logical sequence; there also was no official commission for it. But his growing awareness of the enormous discrepancy between the Hebrew and the Greek Bible texts and his wish, at the request of friends, to produce a reliable translation, determined Jerome’s basic attitude towards the canonical books of the OT as disparate as the various portions of his Vulgate may be in other respects: In order to obtain the sense of the biblical message, recourse must be had to the original ‘truth’ of the Hebrew text (hebraica veritas).

This bold conception entailed the discarding of the authenticity of the LXX as maintained by Church authorities such as Augustine who had whole-heartedly favoured the LXX revisions but strongly opposed Jerome’s abandonment of the Septuagint and his unconditional acceptance of the Hebrew text. Now and then, especially in the prefaces to the translated books, Jerome attempts to convince his audience that it is not his intention to disparage the LXX, but rather to render the Hebrew as faithfully as possible. But obviously, prudence and expedience, besides a natural attachment to the traditional belief, dictated such pronouncements. Gradually Jerome became more outspoken in his views until, at the end, he rejects the view of the LXX as being an inspired version. The report about the miraculous production of the Greek version is an unfounded legend, Jerome maintains; the apostles’ quotations of the OT as disparate as the various portions of his Vulgate may be in other respects: In order to obtain the sense of the biblical message, recourse must be had to the original ‘truth’ of the Hebrew text (hebraica veritas).

Jerome dedicated fifteen years to the new translation (c. 390-405). One can establish, in the main, the sequence of the books translated; some details are still debatable. In 393 he had accomplished the translation of the books of the Prophets, Samuel and Kings, the Psalms, and Job (Epistulae 49:4). It is commonly supposed that the ‘four books of Kings’ constitute the first step; the Prologus Galetaus, the ‘Preface with a Helmet’ attached to this portion appears to be an introduction to the whole work. However, these prefaces seem to have a history of their own. Thus, e.g., in his preface to the book of Joshua, Jerome mentions as a task lying ahead the translation of Judges, Ruth, and Esther; he also mentions the death of his aristocratic sponsor Paula. His preface to the book of Esther, however, is dedicated to this lady. It follows that the preface to Esther was written prior to, and independently of the translations. The evidence of the Prologus Galetaus should thus not be overestimated; it is conceivable that this preface was sent out later. From the point of view of the mode of translation it seems that the Prophets and the Psalter were the first books to be translated; they are also the theologically most important books. Be this as it may, in 394-396 Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles are translated; 398 Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs follow; 398-405 the work is completed with the translation of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth and Esther. Of the Apocrypha – Jerome was rather suspicious of the apocryphal books – he translated Tobit and Judith from the Aramaic but left other books (Wisdom, Ecclesiastics and Maccabees) unrevised.

The reception of this new Latin translation was anything but enthusiastic; clergy and laity tended to cling to the old version they were used to hear and quote, and to look with suspicion upon any attempt to produce a new Latin Bible-text which, moreover, involved a depreciation of the LXX and the acceptance of the Hebrew Bible of the Jews. After the great scholar’s death, however, his translation from the Hebrew was gradually adopted, first side by side with the OL until it won a complete victory: in the year 1546 the Council of Trent officially elevated it to the position of the authoritative text (textus uxoritute plenus). From that time on Jerome’s version has been indeed the Biblia Vulgata, i.e. the commonly used edition of the Holy Scriptures regarded as the ultimate authority by the Latin-speaking Catholic Church.

Translation Technique
Among the classical Bible versions the Vg occupies a unique position insofar as it is the fruit of one man’s labour; his biography as well as the circumstances under which he produced his translation are known to us; and he describes in detail the problems he faced as a translator and the solutions he found best.

40 Schwarz, Biblical Translation, 30-33 (Jerome), 37-42 (Augustine).

41 The commonly accepted chronology is given by Bardenhewer, Geschichte, 617. White, ‘Vulgate’, 875-76; Cavalleria, St. Jerome has suggested a divergent sequence, namely that the Prophets were translated before Kings. In his prologue to Isaiah Jerome justifies his presenting the text per cola et commata, a remark which would be appropriate at the beginning of his work. Moreover, in his preface to Daniel he expounds the tripartite arrangement of the Hebrew Bible: why does he not refer to the Prologus Galetaus where the identical information is given. If indeed it did already exist? Kedar, Vulgate, 280-85, has attempted to support Cavalleria’s assumption from a different angle that changes of Jerome’s translation technique.

42 Sparks, ‘Jerome’, 532-35.

43 On the name ‘Vulga’ cf. Sutcliffe, ‘Vulgate’, 345-52. This new Vulgate was, of course, exposed to the usual process of textual corruption. Several attempts were made to reconstruct onerable text-forms of the bewildering amount of MSS at variance with one another (cf. Berger, Histoire; White, ‘Vulgate’, 877-82.) As to the critical editions at our disposal nowadays cf. Biblius Novum Testamentum in the bibliography.
Jerome’s testimony is, admittedly, to be taken with more than a grain of salt; he is prone to exaggerate and to be misled by his memory when attempting to explain processes that had taken place many years ago. With this reserve we may try to put the puzzle together. It has already been said that Jerome made the translation at the request of others; the prefaces to the individual books mention the respective sponsors. Sometimes these people, or their messengers, were waiting for the product while Jerome was working on it. Thus he wrote, or rather dictated in great haste, his amanuensis becoming restless whenever Jerome paused to consider the passage: ‘I dictate what comes into my mouth’ (Comm. in Gal. 3, Prol.; Comm. in Isa. 5, Prol.; Ep. 75:4). There seemed to be no time to revise the dictation, let alone turn over the leaves of old codices or scrolls. In extreme cases then, Jerome’s rendering was based on the knowledge stored up in his mind, in others, of course, he had recourse to a variety of written sources.

The Hebrew text he had before him was much closer to, but by no means identical with the MT. It is interesting to note that Jerome who permanently censured the Greek and Latin Bible texts had utmost confidence in the reliability and constancy of the Hebrew; he seems to have assumed that the current Hebrew text-form was identical with that underlying the LXX. This can best be explained as consequence of the impression the relatively stable text of the Hebrew did make on any person who compared this situation with that prevailing in the area of the Greek and Latin versions. He mentions minor variants, though. On the verse ‘no breath at all in the midst of it’ (Hab 2:19) he remarks that in some Hebrew MSS the word kol ‘all’ does not appear; this parallels Aquila’s rendering et spiritus eius non est in visceribus eius (6,630); yet in the Vg he renders: et omnis spiritus… He also comments on the variant reading of the proper name Efron vs. Efcran found in MSS of his day (Quaest. Hebr. in Gen. 23:16-17). There seems to be some agreement between Jerome’s Hebrew text and the Qumran scroll of Isaiah; e.g. ‘for signs and wonders’ (Isa 8:18) the Vg, like the scroll, have the singular for a sign and wonder’ (in signum et in portentum). It should be noted that in his commentary, composed c. 17 years later, Jerome introduces the plural forms echoing the vs (signa…portenta). The Vg reveals a variant parallel to one found in the Talmud: Job 14:16 tu quidem gressus, reading ‘and thou’ like P. T. Berakhot 5:1(9a) instead of ‘atad ‘now’ as in the MT. Most of what is known as emendations of the Scribes and Masoretes are introduced into the Vg but not all. As far as the vocalization is concerned, the Vg not infrequently strays from the vs. Since there did not yet exist Hebrew vowel signs, Jerome though certainly acquainted with the reading traditions, to a certain extent felt free to improvise. For saddiq ‘the righteous man’ (Prov 18:5) he reads sedeq ‘righteousness’; for lâ ad ‘forever’ (Isa 30:8) he read l’â ed ‘in testimony’ and the like.64

Entering the stage of translating Jerome had recourse to the information offered by several sources. First probably occurred to him the version of the OL. In some instances, plausibly for reasons of Church tradition, he left it intact. Thus the verses Isa 11:1-3a are identical in the OL and the Vg. The same occurs with regard to the clause Gen 49:10 that was applied to the Messiah (et ipse e rit expectatio gentium ‘he is the hope of the nations’). Then there was the Septuagint and the three later Greek translations by Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. Much has been made of Jerome’s dependence on these, especially on Symmachus. However, such impression of dependence prevails only as long as we look for points of contact between the Vg and any particular source. The moment we survey the overall picture, his relative independence becomes apparent: He never agrees with one of his informants for more than a short clause. In other words, Jerome made use of the works of his predecessors in a way a modern scholar has recourse to a concordance, a dictionary, a grammar and scholarly commentaries. This, of course, also applies to the information he gathered from his Jewish instructors. The final decision rests with Jerome and he reaches it having weighed the evidence.65

The Process of Linguistic Transfers

These were the mechanics of translation; now comes its philosophy. The transfer of a message from one linguistic code into another can be carried out, roughly speaking, either in the direction of the target language or towards the source language. In other words, either the sense of a message is figured out and then encoded according to the rules of the target language, or else the constituent morphemic and lexical elements contained in the message are decoded and then represented by their approximate counterparts in the target language. When carried to excess, both modes become absurd: the first disrupts the connection with the original, the other produces unintelligible statements. Translational practice follows one of the many possible routes between the two extremes, yet taking one of them as guideline.

Concerning this question Jerome displays extreme contradictions.66 Not only do we find in his writings conflicting theories about the commendable method

---

64 Ep.75:4 contains a vivid description as to the technical aspect of bookproduction in those days: From Spain six short-hand writers (noturii) had arrived in order to copy Jerome’s works for their wealthy patron.


66 In many cases Jerome, it is true, agrees with other versions; the very inconsistency in this respect provides an indirect proof that the final decision was always his own.

67 Ceresa-Gastaldo, Latino, 73-75.

68 Stummer, Einführung 90-124; Ziegler, Jüngere griechische Übersetzungen; Cannon, Jerome 191-99. Remarks on and references to the later Greek versions abound in Jerome’s writings (4. 122; 5,932; 6,258; 9,1100 and many, many more).

69 The classic formulation of the translator’s dilemma was put forward by Franz Rosenzweig: ‘... wie sich das Herrschaftsgebiet der beiden Prinzipien, das der Bewegung des Textzusammen- und das der Bewegung des Lesers zum Text, gegeneinander abgrenzt’ (Kleinere Schriften, 144). Stummer, ‘Beobachtungen’, 3-30; Johannessohn, Entstehung’, 90-102.
of translating; not only do we encounter opposite practices in his version; but he speaks of the need to translate according to the sense at a moment when he offers very literal renderings (Epistulae 57:5-10) and prides himself of literalism in connection with a biblical book. Esther, that can serve as a model of paraphrastic translation (Prolegomenon).

In one of his letters (Epistulae 106:3) he defines as the translator’s task to render idiomatic expressions of one language into suitable expressions peculiar to the other. The translator had to represent the sense of the original rather than its wording (cf. above Epistulae 57:10): *non verba in Scripturis consideranda sed sensus*. In some of the prefaces the voices similar sentiments (e.g. Prolegomenon in Paralipomenon). On the other hand he maintains, in the Holy Scriptures every word is sacred and even the wordorder, a mystery (Epistulae 53:8; 57:5). Thus it seemed imperative for the translator to preserve the peculiarities of the original. It remains to be seen to what extent these conflicting principles exerted their influence on Jerome’s practice.

Linguistic equations that juxtapose Hebrew and Latin words do exist in the mind of all who have knowledge of both languages; they certainly were present to Jerome’s mind. Examples of lexical equations are: *bayit* ‘house’ > *domus;* *’issá* ‘woman’ > *mulier;* *milhámda* ‘war’ > *bellum;* *yóm* ‘day’ > *dies;* *máwétp* ‘death’ > *mors;* *kós* ‘cup’ > *calix;* *kl* ‘to eat’ > *comedere;* *bhn* ‘to build’ > *aedificare;* *gádol* ‘great, large’ > *magnus;* *hákam* ‘wise’ > *sapiens;* *tób* ‘good’ > *bonus,* and many others like these. But also grammatical morphemes, such as the ending *-im* indicating the plural, or the hiph’il conjugation denoting the causative, and syntactical constructions, e.g. the construct state or relative clauses, had found Latin counterparts. Complications occurred, of course, as when the polysyonym of a Hebrew lexeme, e.g. *minhá* ‘gift’, and *sóhad* ‘a bribe’, both by *muneru,* or when a very specific Hebrew term had to be rendered periphastically, e.g. *gázt* ‘a hewn stone’ > *lapis quadrus;* *bsh* ‘to gather grapes’ > *colligere quasi vindemium.* But these questions are peripheral; the crucial dilemma of the translator lies elsewhere: At what point is he ready to forgo the standard equation replacing it by semantically, but not formally, suitable substitutes."

An extremely free translation ignores all the established equations even where they would serve their purpose; an extremely literal translation sticks to those equations even in a context where they do violence to the character of the target language. As we have said, most translations move somewhere between the two extremes where their position can be determined by the ease with which they abandon the standard equations. We shall find that the Vg in this respect displays extreme variability. As to the rendering of a grammatical morpheme there exists on the one hand its analytical transfer, on the other hand, its semantic recasting: *hístia* ‘to let hear, announce’ > *auditum fucio* (Amos 3:9) vs. *adnutio* (Jer 48:4) or *nuntium mitto* (1 Kgs 15:22); *hískin* and *hískit* ‘to lead somebody to (a place of) rest’ are rendered *habitare fucio* (Ezek 32:4) and *dormire fucio* (Hos 2:20[18], respectively, or *conlocó* (Gen 3:24; 1 Kgs 3:20). The morpheme of a plural tantum is either transferred into Latin, against the usage of this language, or disregarded: *šámaýim* ‘heaven, sky’ becomes either *caeli* (Isa 1:2) or *caelum* (Gen 1:1). The Hebrew word for ‘blood’ can be used in the sing., *dám,* or in the pl., *dámín.* The latter form is translated *sanguines* (Ezek 9:9; Mic 3:10) or *sanguis* (Deut 19:10).

Still more informative in this connection are the divergent renderings of lexemes. Only a few examples can be added. *lehem* ‘bread’ means metonymically: ‘sustenance, subsistence’. Vg has *panis* (Amos 7:12) vs. *esca* (Ruth 1:6), *vic tus* (Deut 10:18), *necessaria* (Prov 27:27), *dábár* ‘a word, an event’ is generally rendered *verbum,* *sermo* or *res* but sometimes a semantic specification is offered instead: *concilium* ‘advice’ (Gen 41:37; *ol. verba;* *promissum* ‘a promise’ (Judg 11:10; *ol. verbum); *propositum* ‘a plan’ (1 Kgs 18:24; *ol. verbum,* *bayit* ‘a house, home’, is generally rendered *domus,* occasionally translated into *domesti* ‘domestics’ (Prov 31:15), *intrínsecus* ‘inside’ (Gen 6:14); or *temp ló* (2 Kgs 10:25), *funum* (Judg 9:27), *delubrum* (Jer 43:12) when the word refers to a sanctuary (but Hag 1:4 *domus.* Cf. *Mic 3:12 vs. 4:1). The standard rendering for *básár* ‘flesh, meat’, *caro,* has been maintained even where the Hebrew word refers to ‘all living creatures’. *finis universae carnis* ‘the end of all flesh’ (Gen 6:13; noteworthy that the *ol,* following the *iix,* reads *tempus omnium hominum* ‘the time for all men’), but *básár > verenda* ‘the private parts’ (Lev 16:4), *lěb* ‘heart’ generally becomes *cor* (Hos 2:16) but also *mens,* *anima,* *conscientiu* (Eccl 1:16, 7:26, 23), *cogitatio* (Deut 18:21), and can altogether be lexically discussed (Gen 50:21, 2 Sam 19:8). Idiomatic expressions are either rendered literally or are transformed: ‘in the ears of the people’, i.e. with the people listening *in auribus populi* (Jer 36:13), or *audientepopulo* (ib. 36:14); ‘is *el *dáhíw* ‘a man to his brother’, i.e. to one another  > *vir ... frater* (Isa 9:18), or *ad invícem* (Exod 16:15) and *mutuo* (Gen 37:19); similarly, *iš el *rē dáhó *vir ... collega* (Jonah 1:7), or *mutuo* (Exod 18:7). It must be remembered, however, that such cases of the literal renderings must have sound to Romanian ears unaccustomed to biblical idiomatic usage, after a while, through constant use, the extended meanings were absorbed by the target language. A process which had taken place long before the publication of Jerome’s translation. Thus the noteworthy fact is the latter’s gradual breaking away from such strange
sounding literalism rather than his original attachment to it. As a curiosity we may add that the Hebrew idiom ‘lay thine hand upon thy mouth’ i.e. be silent, was once translated literally (Prov 30:32) but twice the key-word underwent a change from ‘hand’ to ‘finger’: pone digitum super os tuum (Judg 18:19; OL impone manum tuam super os tuum), superponite digitum ori vestro (Job 21:5; OL . . . manum . . .), obviously in accordance with the more refined Roman manners.

As to literalism in syntactical constructions, suffice it to observe instances of juxtaposition of clauses, and of paronomastic linkage and their linguistic transformation. In Jonah 1:14-16 we find, in close imitation of the Hebrew: et clamaverunt . . . et dixerunt . . . et tulerunt . . . et miserunt, whereas in Ruth 4:1d-3a the formally similar verbal forms are rendered thus: qui divertit . . . et dixerit . . . et dixit . . . et tulerit instead of ‘to dream’. On this point, Jerome’s translation displays an unevenness with regard to the guiding principle to an extent unknown from any other classical Bible version. Moreover, this unevenness, though somewhat observable in each individual book, becomes most conspicuous on comparing the books with one another. Psalter and Prophets exhibit adherence to the linguistic structure of the source language while Joshua and Judges, Ruth and Esther abound in free renderings. It can hardly be a coincidence that the former were the early products of Jerome’s labour, the latter constitute the concluding part: step by step, as Jerome grew more and more assured and practised, he turned his attention to the sense of the complete statement, leaving aside its linguistic constituents.

In fine, Jerome’s translation displays an unevenness with regard to the guiding principle to an extent unknown from any other classical Bible version.

The overall similarity is obvious: The Vg, indeed, gives the impression of a mere recension. Thus it omits the amplification timore magno and corrects stertere ‘to snore’ into sopore gravz ‘a heavy sleep’ (cf. Jerome’s remark: Thardema . . . id est gravi et profundum soporem; tardemid i.e. a heavy and deep sleep’; Quaest. Hebr. in Gen 2:21). From the point of view of Latinity the improvements are: miserunt; a synthetic rendering, instead of the analytic iactum fecerunt which imitates the causative Hebrew high‘il; and interiora navis ‘the interior of the boat’ instead of ventrem navis ‘the belly of the boat’. On the other hand, the Hebraism vir ‘man’ for ‘everyone’, imitative of Hebrew ‘is ‘man; everyone, each’ should be noted. This juxtaposition should be compared to that of Gen 37:18-25 cited above where the Vg boldly diverges from the beaten track.

We now proceed to contrast two widely divergent ways of rendering linguistic features as can be observed in the following parallel passages.

Then the mariners were afraid, and cried every man unto his god, and cast forth the wares that were in the ship into the sea, to lighten it of them. But Jonah was gone down into the sides of the ship; and he lay, and was fast asleep. So the shipmaster came to him and said unto him etc.

52 A well-known stylistic tendency to be observed in the Vulgate is that of lexical variety; Plater-White: ‘Jerome has the tantalizing habit of translating the same Hebrew word by different Latin equivalents’ (Gramm. 7). Rehm, ‘Bedeutung’, 192: ‘Hieronymus vermeidet es, in inmellcher Aufeinanderfolge mehrmals das gleiche Wort zu gebrauchen’. Reuschenbach, ‘Hieronymus als Übersetzer’, 31-57, Stummer, Einführung, 114.

53 Kedar, Vulgate, 252-58.
Evidently, Isa keeps much closer to the Hebrew **structur** than Kgs. As said before, each method of translating has its merits; and it is precisely in many a literal rendering that Jerome imparts invaluable linguistic insights. This must be

---

**The Imprint of Christian Tenets**

The need to amplify a verse where the Hebrew seemed too concise or cryptic; the possibility to compress one that contained redundant constituents; but first and foremost, the ambiguity inherent in each and every linguistic expression, left ample room for interpretations of the text by even such a conscientious a translator as Jerome. Many of these interpretations were, of course, not Jerome’s own innovation but rather the reflection of exegetical traditions that had grown through the centuries.

Of the Christian application of the **σ** Jerome was deeply convinced; specific evidence if one needed it, is amply found on every page of his commentaries: e.g. on Isa 19:3-15 (4, 203-206) Jesus Christ is mentioned not less than eight times. The Bible text, as interpreted by Jerome, also proves, of course, that the Christian Church holds the true faith whereas the Jews, their prayers and customs, are of the devil (6, 14, 22 etc.)

Thus he remarks on the verse ‘That unto me every knee shall bow’ (Isa 45:23) that such indeed was the custom of Christians while the Jews, revealing their haughty mind, did not practice it (4, 543).

Another example: Jerome, in his rendering of the Psalter had substituted the terms **congregation, assembly** for the loan-word **synagoga of the OT**; only once did he leave this word intact, namely Ps 106 (105):18-19 where the word refers to the party of Dathan and Abiram who rebelled against the leadership of Moses, i.e. against God’s will; for such a rebellious crowd the word **synagoga** appeared to him appropriate.

It is the more remarkable then, in view of his fervent belief and unshakeable convictions, that Jerome admitted, nay kept insisting that the **OT** also contained information about actual historic events besides predictions of the coming of

---

**THE LATIN TRANSLATIONS**

said in response to those who limit their praise of the **Vg** to those portions that are smooth and elegant from the point of view of Latin letters, overlooking the fact that undoubtedly much of the original’s pungency has been blunted in such passages; the flavour of the Hebrew Bible seems best preserved in **Vg** passages that do not give the text in an arbitrary clarity and stylistic elegance. At any rate, with regards to the varying modes of translating within the **Vg**, suspending judgement, we should content ourselves to register the facts. It may be that in its very variability, linguistic and translational, there lies the attraction of the **Vg**.

---

*Jerome was ever ready to condemn violently and indiscriminately whatever, at that precise moment of his theological career, appeared to him like heresy. It is not surprising therefore, to find in his writings many venomous statements against Judaism and the Jews: their stubbornness is the outcome not of any innate inclination but of their own volition (7, 88); God, far from being their protector, has become their enemy and rejects them (4, 745; 6, 104); their synagogue is the outcome of such indeed was the custom of Christians while the Jews, revealing their haughty mind, did not practice it (4, 543). Another example: Jerome, in his rendering of the Psalter had substituted the terms **congregation, assembly** for the loan-word **synagoga of the OT**; only once did he leave this word intact, namely Ps 106 (105):18-19 where the word refers to the party of Dathan and Abiram who rebelled against the leadership of Moses, i.e. against God’s will; for such a rebellious crowd the word **synagoga** appeared to him appropriate.

It is the more remarkable then, in view of his fervent belief and unshakeable convictions, that Jerome admitted, nay kept insisting that the **OT** also contained information about actual historic events besides predictions of the coming of
Christ; and that any christological interpretation was admissible only to the extent that it was philologically justifiable. On Isa 17:7-8 he censures those who deem the words to be fulfilled in the time of Christ: the interpreters’ pious disposition had eclipsed the historic dimension (4, 195). In the same vein he disapproves of the current popular etymology according to which Aramaic Puscha ‘Passover; Easter’ derives from Greek paschein ‘to suffer’, and thus denotes the Passion; the word comes from Hebrew pesh ‘to pass by’, Jerome explains (4, 423-424), and thus means transitus ‘a going over, a passage’. The Latin spelling of the name place-name Bosra, namely Bosra, had misled many to combine it with Hebrew basar ‘Flesh’ and find in it a reference to Christ’s body. This widespread pious error (multi pio erreore lapsi; 4, 746) is due, as Jerome points out, to a confusion of Sadas with Sin. Even discussing the crucial verse ‘Behold, a virgin shall conceive’ (Isa 7:14) Jerome admits that the Hebrew word ‘almah, employed in this verse, was not the usual one for ‘virgin’; this would have been betulah. Yet, according to Jerome (4, 108), the proper etymology of ‘almah indicates the Christian interpretation: the root ‘im means ‘to hide, conceal’ and thus the word under review denotes ‘a maiden hidden from the view of men’, i.e. a virgin.

Wherever language leaves room for a Christological acception, Jerome of course propaganda it. Thus he tends to render the homonym kur- which denotes either ‘a lamb’ or ‘pastures’ –agnus ‘a lamb’, even where the other meaning seems appropriate (Isa 30:23). The Christological application of the word under review is brought into relief Isa 16:1; Jerome rejects the historically legitimate rendering ‘send a lamb to the ruler’ (emitte ugmentum dominatori; 4, 269) but rather equates the lamb with the ruler: emitta ugmentum dominatorem terrae ‘send the lamb, the ruler of the earth’, a translation which is meant to confirm the ‘grave’ for ‘sleep, resting-place’. Jerome admits that by substituting ‘rest, resting-place’ (pro dormitione et requie) he intended to make the sense clearer to the reader (4, 161). Jerome who takes Prov 8:22 as referring to Jesus explains that the Hebrew verb qnh which may denote either ‘to create’ or ‘to possess’ should be understood in the latter sense in this context (4, 351; Vg dominus possedit me); thus the Arians’ conception is philologically refuted. In the same vein Jerome introduced the following correction: Ps 8:6 states that the human being, or rather ‘the son of man’, is only a little lower than ‘elohim ‘God’. The latter word had been rendered by the ancient Latin Psalters- in the wake of the uca = ‘angels’ (paulo minus abangelas); Jerome in whose opinion the Ps alluded to Jesus (7,461) who is God made man, felt free to restore the original wording: paulo minus a deo.

The root ysh offered Jerome the opportunity to introduce the name of Jesus into the text of the or: Hab 3:18 ‘I will joy in the God of my salvation (ysy’y); Vg

... in deo iesus meo ‘in God, my Jesus’. Previously (5, 13) there had been mentioned the mashiy ‘the anointed (ruler) as the object of God’s deliverance. Jerome renders the word as usual, cristus, but through a linguistically forced interpretation of the nota accusativa ‘et as with ‘turns the Anointed into the active savour: egressus es... in salutem cum christo tuo Thou art come forth... for the deliverance with Thine Christ’. Jerome is happy to note that even Aquila who generally preferred the Greek rendering eleimmenos ‘an anointed one’, this time had opted for christos (6, 655-656).

It is in consequence of the Christian faith in the or that Jerome hated and bitterly attacked people like Marcion and the adherents of Manicheism who refused to accept this old portion of the Scriptures and ‘with rabid mouth tear the Old Law to pieces’ (3,480).

The Influence of Jewish Exegesis

If Christian faith proved the fundamental exegetical guide, the influence of Jewish exegetical traditions is noticeable in innumerable smaller details of Jerome’s translation and commentaries. Considerations of space permit us to adduce no more than a handful of examples out of the practically unlimited stock.

Already in his treatise on Hebrew names, Jerome had displayed his philological interest which, crude as it was, faithfully reflected conceptions and methods of his Jewish contemporaries; he remained faithful to this way of linguistic interpretation. The name of the land Hadharch (Zech 9:1) is explained: ‘sharp and gentle’ (ucutom, molle; 6, 856) on the base of Hebrew had and rak respectively; the words of the Lord are sharp to the wicked and gentle to the just, he remarks. Jewish tradition offers an almost identical exposition: sharp to the heathen, gentle to Israel (Sifre Deut 1, p. 7; Rashi ad loc).

Proper names are of course usually transliterated in the Vg but sometimes an explanatory remark is added (e.g. Ruth 1:20) or an etymologizing rendition is given: Thus the city name ur kadiim ‘Ur of the Chaldees’ is transliterated Ur Chaldeorum in Genesis (e.g. 11:28) but somehow etymologically interpreted deigne Chaldeorum ‘out of the fire of the Chaldees’ in Nehemiah (9:7); the latter reflects an old midrash (cf. Rashi on Gen loc.cit.).56 Similarly, the place-name Achzib is explained as derived from the root kzb ‘to lie’; (domus) menducii ‘(house) of falsehood’ (Mic 1:14) to which Ibn Ezra’s comment that the word is not to be taken as a place-name should be compared. When Jerome translates the name Elhanan, the son of Jaare: adeodatus filius salus (2 Sam 21:19), this constitutes an implicit commentary that this is not really a person’s name but rather a sobriquet of David (cf. Tg. Yonatan and Rashi). Jerome transliterates

56 In his commentary on Genesis Jerome elaborates the Jewish tradition ‘(tradunt autem Hebraei ...’) according to which Abraham, having refused to worship the fire, was thrown into the flames but saved by God (‘dei auxilio liberatus de idololatriae igne profugerit’; 3,323); cf. Pirke de-R. Eliezer 26.
the cryptic name šēšak (Jer 25:26; 51:41) but he is acquainted with the rabbinical tradition that takes it as a cypher for Babel on a system that substitutes the last letter of the alphabet for the first, the penultimate (s) for the second (b) and so on (4, 1019). On philological grounds, mistaken though, he renders nesef (Isa 21:4) Babylon since he thought to find the same root in the word nispēh (ib. 13:1-2) which refers to Babel. Jerome is prone to offer etymological renderings when a word is rare and difficult. sokēn ‘a steward’ is rendered qui habitat in tabernaculo (Isa 22:15), as if derived from sukka ‘a tabernacle’; the same derivation is found in Aquila and Symmachus (skēnounta and skēnopoiounta respectively, from skēnē ‘a tabernacle’). rōzēn ‘a prince’ is translated prīnceps (Judg 5:3) but also secretorium scrutator ‘an investigator of secrets’ (Isa 40:23), as if this word and rāz ‘secret’ were linked. This assumed etymology also explains the Latin wording for rāzē lī rāzē lī (Isa 14:26) ‘my keenness, my keenness? (or ’I waste away, I waste away?’): secretum meum secretum meum ‘my secret …’. This indeed is also the view of Jewish translators (Tg. Yonatan, Symmachus) and commentators (cf. Rashi. But Kimhi differs. Now and then Jerome attempts to reflect the presumptive etymology of a verb in a periphrastic rendering. Thus shē ‘to seek’ desiderare (Prov 7:15), vigiliare (Job 24:5) but also consurgere diluculo ‘to rise in the morning’ (Prov 11:27), de mane vigiliare ‘to watch from early morning’ (Isa 26:9) because of sahar ‘the dawn’; similarly, phē ‘to distinguish’ > miraculum dividere ‘to distinguish by a miracle’ (Exod 11:7; but cf. ib. 33:16) because of pele ‘a miracle’; and mhr ‘to rebel’ > ad amaritudinem concitare ‘to rouse up into bitterness’ (hos 14:1; but cf. Num 14:9) because of mar ‘bitter’.

Many words are translated according to rabbinic explanation; in some instances Jerome explicitly states this to be the case, while in others it becomes obvious from parallel expositions in Jewish writings. The word geber ‘man’, usually rendered vir or homo, is once translated gallus gallinacæus ‘a poultry-cock’ (Isa 22:17) = geber ‘cock’ is attested only in post-biblical Hebrew because, as Jerome tells us, ‘the Hebrew who instructed me in the studies of the OT had offered this explanation’ (4, 318); the medieval commentators, one should add, know of this lexical equation and accept it (cf. Rashi and Kimhi ad loc.) qēľ ‘to fear’ to be translated praedicare ‘to praise’ (Isa 29:23) to which Pirkē de-R. Eilezer 4 should be compared. The rendering nišād ‘loquamur’ ‘let us talk’ (ib. 41:23) against the usual S’h > respicere ‘to look about’, is based upon the Aramaic sense of the root; this parallels the explanation given by Rashi and Kimhi. Jerome having asked his Jewish informant, was instructed that the meaning of qeset (Ezck 9:2:11), was that of Greek kalmairion (graeco sermone apellari kalmairion; 5, 94), i.e. ‘an inkstand’ which he then rendered atrumentarium. In passing it should be mentioned that the loan-word kalmairion ‘inkstand’ occurs in the Mishna. Some important conclusions regarding his reliance upon Jewish informants may be drawn from Jerome’s report just mentioned. First, he was in a position to receive what appears an on-the-spot information from a learned Jew when he needed it, and secondly, their common language sometimes, if not always, was Greek. These conclusions are confirmed by additional observations. On the hapax legomenon kāpîs (Hab 2:11) Jerome remarks that it denotes ‘a beam in the middle of a building to uphold its walls; in common Greek language himantosis’ (6, 617). The Latin paraphrase of the Greek word (on which cf. Sir 22:16) makes the impression of an ad-hoc Latin translation of an oral Greek explanation; the Vg puts it somewhat more elegantly: (lignum) quod inter uncturas aedificiorum est. A conclusive indication as to Jerome’s work-procedure we may find in the following instance of a mistaken translation: The word hōl ‘sand’, in the verse ‘I shall multiply my days as hōl’ (Job 29:18) is rendered palma ‘a palm-tree’: et sicut palma multiplicabo dies. This deviation cannot be explained as dependent upon the LXX (though the verse contains telechospoinikos ‘the stem of a palm-tree’, it diverges widely from the Hebrew text and the Vg); Jewish tradition, however, offers a clue since it also ascribes an extraordinary meaning to the word hōl in this verse, namely as denoting the miraculous bird that is consumed by a fire in its nest but then comes to life again (cf. B. T. Sanhedrin 108b; Jewish commentators: Gen Rabba 19:5, p. 174: ‘... except one bird called hōl etc.’). This, of course, corresponds with the fabulous bird Phoenix, the phoinix of the Greek. This Greek word, however, did have an additional meaning: ‘a palm-tree’. It seems, then, that Jerome’s Jewish consultant pointed out that the usual equation hōl ‘sand’ was not appropriate in this case and then explained the required sense in Greek: phoinix, meaning the bird, of course. Jerome, however, perhaps with the LXX in the back of his mind misinterpreted the information, thinking of the alternative meaning ‘a palm-tree’ and translated accordingly. This again testifies to the oral consultations and also to the haste in which they were conducted. Indeed, not infrequently we find evidence that Jerome did not bother — or find the time — to look up passages he wanted to quote. On Hos 4:14 where he had translated qēdesōt ‘harlots’, effeminati (‘effeminales that submit to unnatural lust’), Jerome reminds his readers (6, 41) that Isa 3:4 also contains the word effeminati — which is correct — as a translation of Hebrew qēdesīm — which is not correct! The Hebrew word there is a completely different one (ta’ālâ̂līm). Evidently he had reconstructed the text from memory.

68 Jerome who mockingly criticizes Aquila’s attempts to render not just the foreign vocable but also its etymology (Ep. 57:11), is himself prone to etymologizing rendition: qūm > qeset Deut 16:9 but stancesegites ‘standing corn’ (Exod 22:26) because of qūm ‘to stand’; métēlān, ‘but, cottage’ > tugurium (Isa 1:8) but also tabernaculum noxice ‘a hut for one night’ (Isa 24:20) because of the linkage to lyn ‘to pass the night’; (odable) sallcept > (porta) quae duxit ‘(the gate) leading to ...’ deriving it from lkt ‘to walk, go’ and the like.

69 ‘... the qalmairin (’inkstand’) of Yosef, the priest’ (M. Mikwaot 10:1).
70 LXX telechosphoinikos: this composite expression is rendered by Jerome arbor palmae (Job ex Graeco): 10, 82). This and the widely divergent wording of the whole verse in the LXX make it highly improbable that Jerome followed the Greek.
Analytical renderings of supposed compounds reflect Jewish tradition: šîmût > umbrâ morît (‘shadow of death’) (Job 3:5 and freq.) parallels the Greek versions and the masoretic vocalization; qîqîlûn ‘utter disgrace’ (Hab 2:16; probably an emphatic form of qâlûn ‘disgrace’ > vomitus ignominiae ‘the vomiting of disgrace’ as if spelled qîqîlûn parallels Esther Rabba 3 and Kimhi ad loc. Ṣ).

Many amplifications in the Vg betray their Jewish origin. The word hammâ ‘ûnigîm ‘those that go deep’ (Isa 29:15) is rendered qui profundi estis corde ‘who are deep in their heart’; this corresponds exactly with Ibn Ezra’s comment: ‘... in the depth of their heart’. The clause ‘where is he that weighed’ (ib. 33:18) is expressed in Latin: ubi legis verbandoperantur ‘where is he that weighs the words of the law’: exactly like B. T. Hagiga 15b: ‘they weighed the light and the grave matters of the Law’. The words ‘too short is the bed to stretch oneself on it’ (ib. 28:20) are rendered thus: coangustum est enim stratum ut alter decidat ‘the bed is so narrow that one of the two will fall’; thus also B. T. Yoma 9b: ‘too short... as that two friends could stretch themselves on it at the same time’. In his commentary Jerome explains this saying slightly differently (4,382): ‘This is a metaphor... the husband says to his adulterous wife: The one bed cannot hold myself and the adulterer with you’. A like elaboration on this verse we find Lev Rabba 17:7 The bed cannot hold a woman and her husband and her lover.

It probably was his acquaintance with the actual conditions prevailing in Palestine that caused explanatory renderings such as kâna’âni > mercator ‘merchant’ (Zech14:21) instead of the usual chananâeus ‘Canaanite’; arâbi > latro ‘robber’ (Jer 3:2; instead of the usual arâb ‘an Arab’; and the explanation of Hebrew bôrît ‘soap’ (Jer 2:22) as a vegetable used by the walkers in the Palestinian province (4,851). Jerome was well aware of rhetoric devices employed in the Bible and he points out metaphorical and metonymical figures of speech as well as irony and hyperbole (6,596,956; 7,620 and passim). It is not surprising then to find the clear recognition of the fact that the Bible employs words and measurements according to human custom: humanae consuetudinis verborum utitur atque mensuris 4,487). He is referring to the description of God’s workmanship Isa 40:12. On this same verse Kimhi remarks that it has to be taken metaphorically. The Christian father and the Jewish erudite agree with the talmudic dictum: ‘The Scriptures speak the language of man’ (B. T. Berakhot 31b).

The Contribution of the Latin Versions

In conclusion, the influential role played by the Latin translations in the cultural history of mankind deserves to be mentioned. Through the Old Latin version – or versions –, region after region of the greatest empire the West had ever seen, became acquainted with the Bible. The Old Latin was perhaps the base of the Old Slavonic translation, and portions and whole books of it found their way into what later on became the standard Latin Bible, the Vulgate. This latter version, with regard to the books of the or one man’s translation made from the Hebrew, must be considered a great and definitely a most influential literary accomplishment. Jerome’s Vulgate accompanied the Western Church as it emerged to its dominant position; it was the focus of theological debates and scholarly studies. The early Bible translations into European vernaculars are based upon it. This is not merely a matter of quantitative diffusion: Europe had risen to predominance in human history, a rank it would hold for centuries to come. Consequently, it was the world which the Scriptures in their Latin dress set out to conquer. Israelite and Jewish emotion and thought from earliest beginnings on down to the times of Jesus, were passed on unto the new centres of civilization and their letters. Dozen of fundamental concepts and a thousand phrases were transferred from Hebrew into Latin, and then from Latin into modern tongues. The Hebraic spirit, its essence and its form, poured into Latin molds but its imprint on all subsequent human affairs.
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Chapter Ten
Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran
Michael Fishbane

Introduction
Almost with the first publication of the documents found in and around the Dead Sea, attempts were made to appreciate and evaluate their exegetical content.’ As Dupont-Sommer, one of the early writers on the Qumran scrolls was quick to observe, in this remarkable corpus Mikra was subject to an ‘immense laboe exégétique’. Here, then, one could begin to glimpse something of the context out of which ancient Judaism, and its vast exegetical enterprise, was formed. To be sure, a sense of this had long been noted and its value assured. Quite well known, for example, were the inner-controversies among the earliest Pharisaic sages on assorted exegetical points; the diverse (if not highly stylized) exegetical contestations between the Pharisees and other groups (like the Sadducees, Samaritans and Boethusians); and the other exegetical productions – like the book of Jubilees – whose homiletical style and legal content could not easily be aligned with the known Pharisaic literature.

Indeed, even the historical work of Josephus, in which is found the famous account of several ancient Jewish ‘philosophies’ (the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes) distinguished by exegetical differences, is itself replete with exegetical features and traditions. What the evidence of the Dead Sea scrolls offers then – and, indeed, offers in abundance – is primary and hitherto unknown documentation from this milieu of ancient Jewish exegesis. Not only is this material distinct from the Pharisaic mainstreams known to us, but it also provides direct

2 Dupont-Sommer, Les Ecrits esséniens, 319.
3 Cf. e.g. M. Edyot 1:3; M. Yadayim 4:6-8; B.T. Shabbat 17a, 88b. In Avot de-K. Natan A12 (end p. 56), an individual who did not know the exegesis of purity as practiced in R. Yohanan’s circle was chided: ‘If this is how you have practiced, you have never eaten heave-offerings in your life’.
4 Cf. e.g. M. Menahot 10:3; T. Menahot 10:23; B.T. Menahot 65a-66b; B.T. Roshha-Shanah Aa, and Jos. Ant. 13:293-98.
attestation to the vital role played by the interpretation of Mikra in the formation of ancient Jewish communities.

For the communities in and around Qumran, the Mikra of ancient Israel was a cherished inheritance. Virtually every book of this corpus is attested in long scrolls or assorted scraps (save the scroll of Esther), and were subject to a vast labor of learning and elaboration. This was no mere antiquarian exercise on their part. For the covenanteers who called their community a ‘house of Tora’ (CD 7:10), this effort was rather part of a living commitment to the truth and significance of Mikra, a corpus of divine teachings whose correct interpretation provided the way of salvation (CD 14:1f.) and the knowledge of the divine plan for history (1QpHab 2:6-10). Mikra thus contained the concrete basis for proper action and required hope, not solely because it contained the revealed teachings of God through Moses and the prophets, but particularly because the community believed itself alone to possess the proper understanding of the ancient laws and prophecies contained therein. The covenanteers of Qumran thus lived the Law of Moses and longed for the Day of the Lord: in resolute confidence that their interpretation of Mikra were true and certain.

The documents of Qumran thus attest to a dual commitment: a commitment to the truth of the Tora and the prophecies (that of Moses and his prophetic successors), and a commitment to the truth of their interpretation of the Tora and the prophecies (that of the founding ‘Interpreter of the Tora’ and his successor[s] the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’). There was, then, both Mikra and its Interpretation, as guided by the head teacher and those authorized to interpret under his guidance (or the exegetical principles laid down by him). In this matter, too, the Qumranians were part and parcel of the exegetical milieu of nascent Judaism. Like them, the different Pharisaic fellowships were also organized around teachers and their interpretations of Mikra. Indeed, even within the fairly broad consensus of ancient Pharisaic teachings, and the (eventually formulated) ultimate divine authority for its modes of interpretation (M. Avot 1:1), sharp disagreements and even disarming confusion over its diverse results abound. Depending on the issues, differences of interpretation could also be and were the basis for communal subdivisions and splits. Such features are also highly characteristic of our Qumran sources, as we shall yet see, and many other contemporary analogues could be adduced. Here it may suffice to recall that in the traditions that developed around Jesus and his followers a main ingredient was the centrality of the Teacher, along with the convincing or distinctive character of his interpretations of Mikra. Clearly, at this time, neither the shape of Pharisaic Judaism nor the temper of its exegetical program had been definitively set. Still and all, two points are abundantly clear: (1) the style of Judaism which one chose was directly related to the style and methods of its exegetical tradition; and (2) the authority of this tradition was the basis for the contentions anent the value and truth of the Judaisms at hand.

We are thus presented with a vast exegetical oeuvre in ancient Judaism – one of intense and immense significance – of which the productions of the Qumran covenanteers is a valuable addition. It will therefore not be surprising to observe that these interpreters of Mikra utilized many modes of exegesis characteristic of the early Pharisaic sages. For despite the more formalized character of the latter, the fact is that their earliest exegetical efforts overlap with those of the covenanteers. In addition, precisely because of the more formal character of the Pharisaic traditions, these latter provide a foil against which the more rudimentary expressions of Mikra interpretation in the scrolls can be perceived. The issue, then, is not to project Pharisaic methods of interpretation into the Qumran sources, but to utilize them (where appropriate) for reconstructing or isolating related (and contemporary) exegetical features. By the same token, both the Pharisaic and Qumran exegetical traditions can also be viewed as heirs to the earlier exegetical efforts of ancient Israel, efforts which, in their final creative and editorial stages at least, overlap these productions of ancient Judaism. For indeed, if the exegetical works of the Pharisees and Qumranians presuppose a received and authoritative Mikra, this latter is also a repository of the exegetical labor of the scribes and sages of ancient Israel. And if the former represent the earliest interpretations of Mikra as a foundation document for Judaism, “inner-Biblical” exegesis represents interpretations of Mikra as a document in formation. It will therefore be of interest to place the interpretations found in the scrolls at the cross-roads of these two great cultural stadia: ancient Israel and rabbinic Judaism. Hereby, its common and unique exegetical patterns and assumptions, the use, interpretations and notions of authority of Mikra at Qumran, can be brought into comparative perspective.

A final introductory word is in order about the categories to be employed here. For while such terms as ‘use’, ‘authority’ and ‘interpretation’ (in the title) provide the means for an analytical description of the role of Mikra at Qumran, such a classification must not obscure the fundamental interrelationships between them. Every use of Mikra, it may be argued, is also a reuse of it in some way, and presupposes certain notions of authority. Similarly, the notions of authority of Mikra which exist variously condition the nature, style and manner of presentation of the interpretations brought to bear on it. Accordingly, the static nature of the ‘categories taken separately consistently presupposes their

---

7 This was the normative ideology, from which those of ‘little faith’ defected; cf. 1QpHab 2:1-10.
8 See above, n. 3.
9 This is particularly true in matters of food piety, around which a special Pharisaic fellowship developed. For the pertinent rabbinic sources and a comparison with Qumran materials, see Rabin, Qumran Scrolls.
10 Cf. Matt 15:1-3; Mark 7:1-3; 1 Tim 6:3-4; Col 2:8.
11 On the whole phenomenon, see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation.
dynamic correlation. This consideration is all the more vital given the variety of materials to be analyzed. They differ in genre and form; in technique and terminology; and in time and tradition. Accordingly, to speak of the Qumran scrolls in monolithic terms -whether in ideology, communal formation, or uses of Mikra - would be to blanche the evidence. Moreover, if the texts are themselves diverse, their historical attribution is, in many cases, well-nigh inscrutable. For whether the Rule Scroll and the Damascus Document represent two phases of one community, or the disciplines and ideologies of several, and whether or not the contents and styles of these latter are related to the so-called Temple Scroll, are not matters given to clear or final determination. But since some estimation of these social-historical questions - further compounded by the questionable relationship between the covenanters and the Essenes, based on what is known about them from Josephus and Philo - has a vital bearing on the problems to be discussed here, it seems prudent to use the diverse materials at hand primarily as evidence for types of use, authority and interpretation of Mikra in and around Qumran, not as evidence for one sectarian community at any one time.

**Mikra and its Uses**

**Mikra as a Textual Artifact**

A consideration of the uses of Mikra in the Qumran scrolls must begin with a recognition of its privileged presence as a textual artifact. As is well-known, the caves of the Judean desert have yielded a vast treasure trove of hand copies of biblical books. These represent the oldest manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible in our possession, with all the books of the later massoretic canon represented except for the scroll of Esther. Most of these manuscripts are preserved only in smallish scraps, or at best in several columns of texts representing a short sequence of chapters, sometimes continuous, sometimes not (depending on whether the columns are from one section of leather or from several which melded as the rolled document decomposed). The preservation of an entire book, like the great Isaiah scroll (1QIsa), is a rarity. But despite the inconsistent and incomplete evidence, there is no doubt that the preservation of Mikra was a matter of great scribal care and tradition. Great care was taken to write the texts in a clear hand; and, despite some paleographic variations over the course of time, the so-called square script in the Herodian style shows signs of stability and conventionality. The use of the older paleo-Hebrew script for writing the Tetragram in some of the sectarian compositions probably represents a convention for rendering the Divine Name in a nonsacral manner, alongside such other conventions as marking four dots or writing the eu-

phemichest hw‘h’(1QS8:14). The consistent use of the paleo-Hebrew script in some manuscripts of biblical books, like 4QpaleoExm (on Exodus), presumably derives from other Palestinian scribal traditions, and is quite different from the majority of Pentateuchal manuscripts found at Qumran.

Evidence for scribal care and conventionality in the treatment of Mikra-as-artifact is also reflected in such matters as the incising of transverse lines and the way the letters were ‘hung’ on them, as well as in such matters as line-length and spacing between letters and words. Such considerations were of very great concern to ancient Jewish scribes, as one can estimate from the materials preserved in the (non-canonical) post-talmudic tractate known as Massekhet Soferim. Indeed, the fortunate fact that many texts (like the large Isaiah scroll) are not preserved in clean copy, and preserve many errors, erasures and over-writings intact, show how great was the concern to preserve the literary tradition in the proper, i.e. conventional and authoritative, manner. In addition, the artifacts also reveal that these texts were copied in a way to render them meaningful for the community which used them. As we shall see below, the concern for paragraphing, by joining or separating rhetorical units, reflects a clear concern by the tradents to isolate coherent thematic units; similarly, the resolution of syntactic ambiguities, by one means or another, also demonstrates that texts were not simply copied or read, but done so in an authoritative and conventional manner.

Presumably, then, it is an intense preoccupation with a text important to the community, and no mere off-hand regard for the authority of its formulations, which accounts for the expansions and harmonizations which can be found in a whole variety of Mikra manuscripts from Qumran. The complexity of these materials do not lend themselves to neat groupings of text families corresponding to such later text-types as ‘Masoretic’, ‘Samaritan’, and ‘Septuagint’. There are, too be sure, observable correspondences between these types and the Qumran evidence; but the multiple alignments make any final categorization premature at this stage. But the variety attests to a great fluidity in the state of the text at this time, and considerable allowances for filling-in gaps of content and resolving diverse formulations. In this regard, it has even been suggested that the phenomenon of biblical paraphrases found in such MSS as 4Q154 - where diverse passages are brought together along with connecting exegetical comments - may, in fact, be ‘the forerunner of biblical manuscripts’; that is, the scribes were influenced by literary compositions in which the editorial procedure behind the act of harmonization was already accomplished and on which the actual harmonization was based. This is not certain by any means, and it is just as likely that we have different attempts in different genres to add

---

13 See Skehan, ‘Samaritan Recension’.
14 For a reevaluation of these matters, see Tov, ‘Modern Textual Outlook’.
15 Ibid.
to the coherence of the Mikra tradition at hand. It might even be the case that the paraphrases reflect speculations on textual harmonizations in scribal circles where there was greater hesitancy to insert the additions and comments into the pentateuchal text. Indeed, despite the variety of texts (in fact, precisely because of them) one is left in doubt about the attitude of the Qumran covenanters themselves. Do the variety of texts simply reflect a diversity of materials brought to their library for examination or collection (by members who came from Jerusalem priestly circles and elsewhere), even though the sectarian groups only considered one fairly stable text-type to be authoritative? Or do the various Mikran manuscripts indicate a more fluid notion of the authority of the textual artifact itself, perhaps something along the lines of ‘official’ vs. ‘vulgar’ text-types?

Some of these questions could certainly be resolved if we had any indication whether Mikra was read-out in a synagogue liturgy. For were this the case, there would undoubtedly have been a preference for one text-type or another. Moreover, if Mikra was used in a lectionary setting at Qumran, this would also provide some context for the targum manuscripts found there, on the assumption (following later explicit rabbinic tradition) that such texts as 11QigLev reflect a simultaneous translation during a prayer service. But despite the enormous importance of the Tora of Moses for study and observance at Qumran (as we shall see), there is as yet no indication of a synagogue lection, and thus no ritual setting for targumic renditions of it. This is all the more remarkable, on the one hand, given that a lectionary setting (with accompanying textual interpretation) is actually preserved in our early post-exilic sources (Neh 8), and that the very record of this event suggests that it is based on an even older liturgical procedure (possibly of exilic provenance). Moreover, it is also notable that rabbinic sources have preserved a tradition on this text to the effect that the custom of targumic renditions was practiced in the time of Nehemiah. While this specific tradition may stretch the linguistic evidence, the antiquity of vernacular renditions of Mikra need not be doubted. Indeed, the suggestion that the earliest Septuagint sources reflect a diglossic translation in a liturgical context strongly commends itself. In any event, the targum to Leviticus (like that to Job, and others still unknown) indicates a living context of study of Mikra at Qumran, a matter which, of course, lies at the heart of the scribal enterprise as a whole.

Knowledge and study of the Tora of Moses was thus a basic prerequisite for the proper understanding and faithful performance of the commandments. Contemporary Stoics queried about the relative importance of theory and practice; and our early Pharisaic sources show a Jewish adaptation of this topos in the recurrent debates over the relative importance of study (of Tora) and practice (of the commandments). A famous rabbinic resolution of this dilemma was to prefer study, and to say that ‘Tora is (the) great(er), for it leads to practice.” Such a dilemma would have been resolved quite differently by the Qumran covenanters. Faced with the question, they would have said that both are ‘great’, but that study of Tora is the greater, for without it there can be no true and proper religious practice. Study of the Tora is thus is correct study and interpretation; and only on this basis can there be legitimate and divinely authorized observance of the commandments.

The fundamental interrelationship of these themes recur in the sources. It is mentioned at the very outset of the Rule Scroll, where members of the community are enjoined ‘to do (i.e., perform) what is right and proper before [God], in accordance with what He commanded through Moses and all His servants, the prophets … to perform the statutes of God … [and] to clarify their knowledge in the truth of the statutes of God’ (IQS1:3, 8, 12). And an initiate is subject to a period of examination with respect to ‘his understanding and practice’ (6:14), and cannot become a full member until a noviate period is passed and he is again thoroughly examined with respect to ‘his spirit and practice’ (6:17-18). These initiates into proper wisdom and practice are also called, in a textual variant (to 6:24), ‘men of the Tora’. Like all members, they must ever after continue their study of the Tora and be scrupulous in performance of the rules, as revealed in the text and as exegetically derived therefrom. ‘And in any settlement where there obtains [a communal quorum of] ten let there not be lacking a person who Interprets the Tora (תורה) continuously, day and night (ב뺌 טוהרה), in shifts among the fellows; and the Many shall engage diligently together one-third of every night of the year: studying the book (Mikra), and interpreting rule(s), and blessing together’ (6:6-8).

Quite clearly, this legal injunction of continuous study for those who have separated themselves from sinful practices is itself an exegetical adaptation of the sapiental exhortation in Ps 1: 1-2. There the truly happy person is portrayed as one who forsakes the way of the sinners and does not dwell among scoffers: ‘but whose delight is the Tora of the Lord and in His Tora (תורה) he meditates (なる) day and night (ב쉬 שם הלל). The verb ‘not be lacking’ (יתון ל) is not found in the psalm, but is found in Josh 1:8 (together with the other language of our scroll). Another adaptation of this ‘biblical’ language occurs in a related context in the Damascus Document, which states that ‘in any settlement where there obtains a [communal quorum of] ten let there not be

17 See M. Megilla 4.4.
18 Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 113.
19 B. T. Megilla 23a, commenting on Neh 8.
21 Sifre Deut. 41, p. 85.
22 So Milik, reported in RB 63 (1956) 61.
23 Josh 1:8 is itself an exegetical reworking of an earlier passage; see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 384.
lacking \(\text{א ל של וק}^\text{a}\) a priest versed in the book of ‘\(\text{ר}^\text{א}\)’. The background of this language in Psalms and Joshua suggests that this text is nothing other than the ‘book of Meditation’par excellence, the Tora of Moses.\(^{24}\) But the passage from IQS 8:6-8 is important in another respect. For just this regulation may indicate the liturgical context of lection and exegetical study concerning earlier. This possibility is, in fact, rendered quite plausible in the light of Nehemiah 8 itself. For just as there Ezra (a priest able ‘to inquire \(\text{דכ}^\text{א}\) into the Tora of the Lord’ [Ezra 7:10]) convened the people to hear the Tora recited, which ‘reading’ (verb \(\text{נ}^\text{i}\)) was proceeded by a ‘blessing’ (verb \(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\)) and extended by interpretations (vv. 2-9; 13-16), so does the Rule Scroll state that the community was convened continuously ‘to read \(\text{דכ}^\text{א}\)’ the Tora, ‘to interpret/inquire \(\text{כ}^\text{n}\) into the law, and ‘to bless \(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\) together. The specific language found in 7:6-8 may therefore be more than a mere stylistic conceit, and point to the liturgical tradition of considerable antiquity.

The need ‘to return’ in faith ‘to the Tora of Moses’, and to study it intensively, is ‘because in it everything can be learnt’ (CD 16:1-2; 753). This striking expression is somewhat reminiscent of the nearly contemporaneous remark attributed to one Ben Bag-Bag, in a classical Tannaic source: ‘Turn it (the Mikra), and turn it (again), because everything is in it’ (M. Avot 5:22; \(\text{ר}^\text{ד}^\text{ג}\)). Indeed, for both the early Pharisees and the covenanteers of Qumran everything could be found in Mikra through exegesis. Concerned that they ‘proceed in accordance with the Tora’ (IQS 7:7), the sectarianists studied the ‘revealed text’ (\(\text{דכ}^\text{א}\)) for its ‘exact formulation’ (\(\text{ש}^\text{i}\); cf. CD 6:14, 18, 20; 12:6) and explicit ‘ordinance’ (\(\text{נ}^\text{ג}\)) (CD 7:7). Where this was not forthcoming, they proceeded to uncover its ‘hidden content’ (\(\text{כ}^\text{n}\)), according to the exegetical principles of the group (see below). In this way, everything necessary for proper legal-ritual practice could be derived from the books of Moses.

In a similar way, study of the nonlegal portions of Mikra, particularly the narratives, the psalms, and the prophecy-involved instruction in the manifest and hidden content. Thus, in group study or in homiletical exhortations, ‘the Preceptor’ might ‘inform the Many in the way of God; instruct them in His wondrous might; and recite before them the \(\text{ר}^\text{א}\)’ (CD 13:7-8). This last phrase alludes to the metaphysical teachings of the Spirits and their enmity in the heavens (among the angels) and on earth (among mankind) until the final divine Judgment (see IQS 3:15-4:14; and \(\text{דכ}^\text{א}\) at 3:15). These teachings bear on the relationships between cosmic and historical events, and are concerned with future events. In the same way, recollections of the mighty acts of God include both a celebration of past deeds and instruction in the events to come. What such exegetical instruction might have been like can be gauged from the material at hand. In a text like the War Scroll, for example, a long prayer is recited to God (IQM 9:17-16:1) in which certain past acts of power —

\(^{24}\) For interpretations of this difficult term, see Rahm, \textit{Zadokite Documents}, ad loc. Cf. also Dimant ‘\(\text{Qumran}\) Sectarian Literature’, 493 n. 57; 527.

---

\textit{USE OF CITATIONS AND CITATION-FORMULAE}

The authority of Mikra is furthermore evident through the variety of citations and citation-formulae employed in the scrolls, and through the various ways lemmata and comments are correlated.\(^{25}\) Indeed, the citations are used to give both prestige and authority to the legal, homiletical or prophetic comments which precede them. The materials from Mikra are introduced as that which is ‘written’ (\(\text{ר}^\text{א}\)) in a particular book; or they are presented as that which God, or Moses, or one of the prophets has ‘said’ (\(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\), ‘spoken’ (\(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\)), ‘told’ (\(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\)), ‘taught’ (\(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\)), ‘announced’ (\(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\)), etc.). The first three terms are by far the most prevalent, and begin to reflect the diversity of citation formulae characteristic of Jewish texts of the period.\(^{26}\) In particular, one can note the emergence here of terms found in Pharisaic and classical rabbinic sources, such as the introduction of Mikra citations by \(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\) ‘(as it is written)’; \(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\) ‘(as is said)’; \(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\) ‘(Scripture [lit., “the wrt”] tells)’; and \(\text{ד}^\text{ג}\) ‘(Scripture [lit., “the teaching”] says)’. This latter is strikingly adumbrated in the scrolls in connection with the false teaching of the opponents (cf. 4QpNah 2:8).\(^{27}\) Sometimes the citation formulae are used in the scrolls without any further attribution (e.g., CD 9:2, 5; 15:6-7). More commonly, the writer indicates his source, either by referring to a specific ‘book’ (e.g., of Moses, 4QFlor 1:1; Isaiah, 4QFlor 1:16; or Ezekiel, 4QFlor 1:16), or to the

---

\(^{25}\) A seminal early study on the citations and their use is Fitzmyer, ‘Explicit Old Testament Quotations’. As I have not found his classification flexible or complex enough, it has not been used here. Earlier and contemporary studies on (explicit and implicit) citations in specific texts were done by Carmignac. See his ‘Citations, dans la “Guerre”’; and id., ‘Citations dans lcs “Hymnes”’. A more formal analysis is that of Horton, ‘Formulas of Introduction’.


\(^{27}\) See the proposal of Wacholder, ‘\(\text{Qumran}\) Attack’, with earlier literature cited.
name of an ancient authority (e.g., Moses, IQM 10:6; CD 8:14; Isaiah, CD 4:13-14, 6:7-8; Ezekiel, CD 3:21, 19:11-12; or Zechariah, CD 19:7).

Among the explicit citations, two broad types of use can be discerned. In the first, the citation follows a point previously made in the text and is used to justify it. It therefore functions, formally, as a prooftext. But what is of particular interest is that these citations can almost never be read according to their plain-sense. Due to their recontextualization, they must each be construed relative to the point which precedes them. This is not necessarily to say that the lemmata have exegetically sponsored the point at issue, but solely to indicate that the original sense of the prooftext must be disregarded in order to understand how the writer has exegetically appropriated it. The question as to whether Mikra citation sponsors or supports the new issue must be ascertained in each separate instance: no generalization is possible. Without engaging in the specifics of exegetical practice and technique here (see below), several instances can nevertheless serve to illustrate this important matter.

LEGAL CITATIONS. At the beginning of a long list of Sabbath rules in the Damascus Document, the covenanteer is told: ‘Let no man do work on Friday from the time when the orb of the sun is distant from the gate by its own fulness; for that is what He (God) said: Guard (שומר) the Sabbath Day to keep it holy’ (CD 10:14-15). Clearly, this citation from the Decalogue (Deut 5:12) has been adduced to justify sectarian rules concerned with determining the onset of the Sabbath day. The matter is not considered in the Mikra. But now, by determining that one should ‘guard’ the onset of the Sabbath by beginning it when the Sun is the distance of its own orb from setting, and relating that customary procedure to Deut 5:12, Mikra is used to support the ruling. Indeed, by reading שומר as ‘guarding’ the onset of the holy day, and not in terms of ‘heeding’ the Sabbath rest (the contextual consideration in the Decalogue and the succeeding rules of the Document), the new rule is impliedly shown to be ‘found’ in the Mikra. Presumably, the custom described here preceded the biblical proof; but the rule has been so presented (‘for that is what He said’) as to suggest that it has been exegetically derived from the older divine law.

At the conclusion of the Sabbath rules (11:17-19), the community is enjoined: ‘Let no man offer on the altar on the Sabbath except (יתן) the burnt-offerings of the Sabbath; for thus it is written: Apart from (רמז) your Sabbath-offerings.’ In this case, the legislist is concerned to restrict offerings on the Sabbath and to justify the innovation on the basis of Mikra (Lev 23:38). However, it will be observed that in its original context the adverb מלוב (‘apart from’) means something like ‘besides’: whereas in the new rule the term has been construed in a restrictive sense (as one can also see from the words which precede the citation). As in the preceding case, Mikra is ostensibly utilized to authorize the rule; and the passage is presented as if it represents the plain-sense of the Mikra, not its reinterpreted sense. Accordingly, one must be cautious in assuming that where the new rules are linked to Mikra they were in the first instance exegetically derived from them. It is just as likely that the prooftexts, even where an exegetical dimension is predominant, are secondary justifications of customary, non-biblical procedures. This seems all the more likely where different sectarian legal injunctions are justified by nonlegal texts (cf. CD 11:40; IQS 5:17-18). The more puzzling matter is why only certain rules are (exegetically) justified, ones which are certainly not the most obvious or (to judge by rabbinic procedures), even the most conducive.

NONLEGAL CITATIONS. As just noted, rules or directives to the community are sometimes justified by nonlegal citations. These are clearly of a post hoc nature. Thus IQS 5:7-20, which prohibits consociation with nonmembers in all matters, supports its injunctions of separation with two prooftexts. The first (at 5:15), after justifying nonrelations with nonsectarians with the moral exhortation ‘for he should be far (יזריך) from him in every matter (מכללה), goes on to justify that point with a Mikra citation: ‘for so it is written: “you shall be far (/vndר) from every false thing [from]’). This citation, which derives from the moral approbation to judges in Exod 22:7, is now used to support separation from persons who can transmit impurity to a covenanteer, simply on the basis of similar terms! The citation is thus made to serve an entirely new purpose: and the transformed reuse of the passage is not further explicated. In this respect, it stands apart from the second justification (at 5:17-18). For there further rules of noninvolvement are justified by a citation from Isa 2:22: ‘as is written: “cease (1%) from Man who only has breath in his nostrils, for by what does he merit esteem (בכותר)”; and this citation is exegetically justified by the comment: ‘for all those who are not accounted (ובתוכ) in his covenant, it is necessary to separate (from) them and all that is theirs.’ In this striking case, a citation which speaks of the vain-glory of mortal humans is reinterpreted on the basis of the verb מחשב (the standard term for being accounted a member, cf. 5:11) to support separation from the impure. Remarkably, too, the universal ‘Man’ of the Isaiah passage is now transformed to indicate particular men, nonsectarians, in fact.

This support of one justification through a quite explicit reinterpretation of it calls to mind IQS 8:13-15. In this passage, the covenanteers are told of their imperative to separate from evil and ‘to go to the desert, to prepare there the way of the Lord’. The language of this injunction is contrived to anticipate the supportive citation from Isa 40:3: ‘as is written: “in the desert prepare the way (of the Lord);’ straighten a highway to our God’’, Now the first clause of this citation is clearly a straightforward biblical justification of the covenantante’s decision to build a community in the Judaean wilderness. The second, however, is given a new meaning: for the word ‘highway’ is explicated to mean the ‘study (מכמלר)’ in the special manner of the sect. The original rhetorical parallelism has thus been broken-up and distributed with two different senses, a regular feature, in fact, of rabbinic aggadic midrash.
PROPHETIC CITATIONS. Certainly the foregoing citation-plus-commentary from the Rule Scroll may be understood as the rise of an ancient prophecy in the course of a rhetorical discussion. Many comparable instances can be found in the Damascus Document. There the rhetor repeatedly reviews the comments with explicit citations from Mikra, which are then reinterpreted (word-by-word) with respect to sectarian law and ideology. For example, in CD 3:18-4:4 the speaker describes how God ‘made reconciliation’ with sinful Israel and established a ‘sure house’, that those who hold fast to it have ‘eternal life’, as was promised to the prophet Ezekiel in Ezek 14:15. This passage is then explicado in terms of the sect, so that the special nature of sectarian triumphalism is justified through the Mikra. Or again, just following this passage, the sins ‘let loose’ within the post-exilic community are presented as that of which God ‘spoke by the hand of the prophet Isaiah son of Amoz.’ Isa 14:21 is cited and explicated with respect to archetypal sectarian sins: ‘whoredom’, ‘wealth’, and ‘pollution of the Sanctuary’ (4: 13-18). Through these boldly reinterpretated citations, the communal sense of history and destiny is justified and vindicated. Of the many other examples that occur, we may simply add at this point such passages as 7:9-10, where a Mikra citation adduced to justify a comment on the basis of its reinterpretation, is itself justified via another citation from Mikra. A parade instance where a series of Mikra citations, appropriately reconstrued, are used to justify sectarian hopes may be found in 4QFlor1-2.28

The second type of explicit citation in the scrolls presents Mikra first, with the comment or comments following thereafter. While there is little doubt in these cases that Mikra is being used, the citations occur in a variety of literary forms—and this effects the presentation of the lemmata. We may, accordingly, speak of the pseudepigraphic, the pesharite, the anthological, and the explicatory form in this regard. Specific exegetical examples will be considered below.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC FORM. In the Temple Scroll, related but different legal texts are variously integrated into thematic units, with their differences harmonized and exegetical innovations interpolated throughout. For example, in 11QTemp 11-29 a block of materials dealing with cultic festivals and procedures is culled from Num 28-29 (with elements from Lev 23 and other sources). Similarly, in columns 40-66 civil laws are culled primarily from the book of Deuteronomy (chapters 12-23), though with related Mikra texts worked-in. In either of the two units, the attentive reader can easily observe how the base text (Num 28-29 or Deut 12-23, respectively) organizes the diverse materials, and how the entire ensemble is reauthorized as the word of God in just this new form. They are thus pseudepigraphically represented as the instructions of God to Moses, even though Deuteronomic units where (in the Toraf of the Damascus Document) the four major Pentateuchal

28 On this see now Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran.

ANTHOLOGICAL FORM. Limited and also more extended types of anthological reuse of Mikra can be found among the Qumran scrolls, where Mikra is presented alone or before comments upon it. Among the more limited types, examples of a legal, liturgical, narrative, and prophetic character are known. Thus as part of the, phylacteries found at Qumran, the four major Pentateuchal

29 Discussion of the pseudepigraphic-features of 11QTemp appear in the Introduction (vol. 1) and throughout the notes of the critical edition of Yadin, Temple Scroll. A valuable discussion of various pertinent matters can be found in Brin, ‘Mikra in the Temple Scroll’.

30 On the formulary and its relation to Mikra and contemporary Jewish Literature, see Fishbane, ‘Qumran Peshar’, and id., Biblical Interpretation, 444-57, and notes.
sections used in Pharisaean tefillin (Exod 13:1-10;13:11-16; Deut 6:4-9;11:13-21) are also found along with several other passages, including the Decalogue.31 Clearly this liturgical collection is unified thematically: all four refer to teachings which should be spoken on the hand and frontlets between the eyes (Exod 13:9, 16; Deut 6:8;11:18); and presumably the addition of the Decalogue (introduced with the words ha-devarim ha’eleh, ‘these words’, in Exod 20: 1) to the ensemble is because Deut 6:4-9, which follows a recitation of the Decalogue (Deut 5:6-18), instructs the Israelite to bind ha-devarim ha’eleh to their arm and head. A hybrid anthology (of the versions in Exod 20 and Deut 5) has long been known in the form of the Nash papyrus,32 and now in 4Q149 a mixed text of the two versions of the Decalogue has been found in an ancient mezuzâ.33

The materials found in 4Q158 provide a different case. Here there are ensembles of running text which include a number of exegetical additions. Thus in fg. 1-2 of this siglum, sections from Gen 32 are juxtaposed to Exod 4:27-28, along with exegetical additions; although the meaning of this juxtaposition is not immediately apparent.34 More striking is the sequence in fg. 6-12, where the following ensemble is found: Exod 20:19-21; Deut 5:28-29; Deut 18:18-22 (fg. 6); Exod 20:12, 16, 17; Deut 5:30-31; Exod 20:20-26; 21:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10. Along with this running text a small number of exegetical additions can also be noted. Presumably, we have here an attempt to harmonize and integrate various texts on the theme and sequence of the revelation, the role of Moses, and the authority of his successors. In the text preserved here, this ensemble has been judged closer to the so-called Samaritan text than to the Masoretic.35 Indeed, it is striking that also in the received Samaritan text the Decalogue in Exod 20 is supplemented with materials from Deut 5 and 18, as well as from Deut 27:4-7. This latter is also transformed by an addition which legitimates the Samaritan sanctuary of Shechem. This matter is lacking in 4Q158, so that a

The anthological reuse of explicit Mikra texts in 11QTemp has several forms and variations.36 In this context, we shall focus on what appears to be the two most dominant classes: (a) the limited type of reuse, where two or more texts bearing on a specific legal topic are integrated to produce a new Tora rule (with and without exegetical comments); and (b) the more extended type of reuse, where a series of the former type are unified by an older Tora sequence (e.g., the sequence of laws in Deuteronomy) to produce a new Tora.

(a) The limited type. The rule in 11QTemp 66:8-9 provides an instructive case in point. There we read that ‘If a man seduces a young virgin who had not been betrothed — and she is permitted to him [in marriage] according to the law — and he lies with her and is caught, let the man who lies with her give 50 pieces of silver to the father of the maiden. And she shall become his wife because he raped her. He may never divorce her.’37 It is obvious that here the legist has harmonized two distinct formulations, one rule from Exod 22: 15, dealing with seduction, the other from Deut 22:28-29, dealing with rape, evidently because both deal with a young virgin who had not been betrothed. Combining related but essentially different rules, and rewriting them as one, is certainly not an innovation of our legist. Similar features are found within Mikra itself, along with exegetical comments similar to that added here (the emphasized phrase).38 What is distinctive here is the consistency of this anthological reuse of Mikra in order to produce new rules. Indeed, both the deliberateness and the dexterity of the procedure suggest that for the author of 11QTemp this was much more than a stylistic conceit. Presumably, this procedure is much more related to his concern for an authoritative representation of earlier revelations and authoritative rules. This comes through even more where the new law is presented through a vast texture of older rules (as, e.g., in the prescriptions concerning

31 Milik, Qumran Grotte 4; Yadin, Tefillim.
32 According to Greenberg, ‘Nash Papyrus’, the combination of the Decalogue and the Shema indicates that the text of the papyrus represents the Tora readings included in the daily morning liturgy of Second Temple times (cf. Tam. 5:1; ‘they recited the Decalogue, the Shema, etc.’).
33 See Milik, Qumran Grotte 4, 80.
34 According to Tov, ‘Harmonizations’, 17, they are juxtaposed ‘for no clear reason’. But it would appear that this semikhut parashiyot, or linkage of pericopae, may be due to several lexical and thematic considerations. For if we look at the preserved texts and their immediate context, there appears to be an (exegetical-homiletical?) attempt to draw a connection between several encounters: the mysterious divine encounters (attacks?) and the wounding of the leg in Gen 32:25-33 and Exod 4:24-26, on the basis of the common verbs naga and pagaah; and the fraternal encounters (reunions) in Genesis 33 (Jacob and Esau) and Exod 27:30-31 (Moses and Aaron), on the basis of the common verbs nashq and pagash, and the common verb liqra. Notably, Exod 4:24-26 is followed by vv. 27-31; and Gen. 32:25-35 is followed by ch. 33. The writer of this Qumran fragment was obviously struck by the multiple concordances (divine and fraternal encounters, with similar terminology, in both cases). Such correlations would suggest a whole area of exegetical imagination and interest.
35 But 4Q158 and the Samaritan text in question (analyzed by Tigay, ‘Documentary Hypotheses’) are not parallel anthologies, and derive from different traditions.
36 Brin, ‘Mikra in the Temple Scroll’, has offered a helpful list and analysis of types; the categorization of the ‘anthologized uses’ of Mikra offered by Kaufman, ‘Temple Scroll’, is much more nuanced but not, therefore, always more helpful. Limitations of space have led to a simpler classification here.
37 On the translation of toras as ‘who had not been betrothed’ I follow D.W. Halivni, ‘Note’. And see now his extended analysis of this rule against the background of ancient Jewish law and terminology in Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara, 30-34 and notes.
the festival of unleavened bread, which integrates citations from Lev 23:6-8; Num 17:10-16; 28:17-25; Deut 16:8; and Ezra 16:8).

(b) The extended type. A brief example of the ‘running anthology’ may be found in 11QTemp 51-52. The base text here begins with Deut 16:16ff. (rules about judges). After taking this up, the legist then provides some exegetical additions to it. Then, before continuing with the rules in Deut 16:21 (prohibiting the planting of sacred poles near the altar), the writer adds a new introduction which contains a summary of the laws which follow in 51:19-21. Upon returning to the base text of Deuteronomy, the writer cites Deut 16:21 and 22 (52:1-2) and then, quite unexpectedly, Lev 26:1 (52:2-3). This latter rule prohibits incising forms on altar stones, and is not mentioned in Deut 16:21-22.

The legist was evidently drawn to it by association: since the same phraseology is used in both Deut 16:22 and Lev 16:1 to prohibit the erection of stelae by Israelites. In this manner, the writer was able both to integrate related rules in one place and to produce a Scripture without duplication. This done, the text (52:3-4) continues with the Deuteronomic issues found in Deut 17:1. Once again, it is only after a complex series of associations to other Pentateuchal passages (including those dealing with vows) that the legist in col. 55 returns to his base text, now at Deut 17:2. Clearly, the ancient Tora of Moses was of very great importance to him. One might even conclude that the very ‘Mosaic’ form of 11QTemp reflected one of his principle ideological concerns: to preserve the older teaching while representing it in a new and reinterpreted form. That is, the legist was concerned to retain the ancient Tora, though in accordance with the truth of Mikra as he and his fellows understood it and practiced it. One might further suggest that just this (anthological) form was used by the author to justify his extensive exegetes and reuse of Mikra.

Expository form. There are a number of occurrences in the Damascus Document where a text from the Mikra is first cited in order to introduce a rule or idea, which latter is then subsequently explicated. In this way, it is again not Mikra se which commends assent by the covenanters, but Mikra as exegetically clarified. In the preceding section, we saw that Mikra was cited after the presentation of a new rule or idea in order to justify it or give it legitimacy. In the following cases, the citation also serves to justify the new rule or idea - though now the citation comes first and the explication follows. In these cases we have, in fact, something akin to proto-midrashic (legal and homiletical) discourses.

(a) In CD 9:2-5, after an apodictic rule dealing with judicial execution (9:1), which is neither justified or explicated, the legist turns to a new case: ‘And as to that which is said [in Scripture, Lev 19:18]: “You shall not take vengeance (בִּקְרָא) nor bear rancor against your compatriot (בְּרֵאשִׁי), and every person among the covenanters who will bring an accusation against his neighbor (הַחֲלוֹת), without [first] reproving [him] before witnesses, or brings it up when enraged, or tells his elders to make him contemptible: he takes vengeance (נְקָרָא) and (bears) rancor. For it is expressly written: “He takes vengeance (נְקָרָא) on his adversaries, and he bears rancor against his enemies” (Nahum 2:1).’

It will be observed that the concern of the rule, to establish procedures for reproving fellow sinners without rancor, does not follow directly from Lev 19:18, the opening citation. That Tora passage is rather explicated with reference to the sectarian rules which (presumably) preceeded it, but which it now serves to justify. In order to make his point, the exegete transforms the Mikra text into a more popular idiom. In his view, one who does not follow the rules of reproof, but delays this procedure, acts with vengeance (explained as rage) and rancor (explained as intent to contemn). There then follows a further passage, from Nahum 2:1, which justifies the explication and buttresses the first citation in a most interesting way. Most commentators read the Nahum citation as a direct and ironical use of Mikra; i.e. you, a covenantee, must not bear vengeance, etc., even though God (‘He’, understood as a euphemism for the Tetragram) does. But two points suggest a different explanation. The first point is that the citation from Lev 19:18 is already read by the legist in a narrow sense (the ‘compatriot’ is not any Israelite, but a sectarian); the second is that just before the second lemma the legist adds that one who does not follow the new procedure of reproof, and brings the accusation up later ‘takes vengeance (נְקָרָא)’. Since just this latter expression is also the (purported) reading of Nahum 2:1, which goes on to refer, vengeance, etc. with respect to Israel’s adversaries and enemies, one may justifiably understand this prooftext to serve an entirely new conclusion; viz., to neutralize the divine statement and reapply its content (viz., sanction) to the covenanters. The underlying argument would thus be as follows: since Scripture itself (in Nahum 2:1) says that vengeance and rancor are emotions directed against one’s enemies, it must follow that the exegetical reading of Lev 19:18 as condemnimg such practices towards one’s sectarian compatriots is fully justified. Mikra is thus exegetically used here to both establish and vindicate a new judicial procedure. Presumably, the procedure long preceeded this ‘midrashic proof’.

(b) A second example comes from the homiletical sphere. In CD 8:14-18, after a condemnation against those contemporaries who have falsely ‘built the wall’ (8:12-13), that is, who interpret and practice the Tora differently from the sect, the preacher quotes from Scripture: ‘And as for that which Moses said [to Israel]: “Not for your righteousness or uprightness of heart do you disposess these nations, but [rather] because He [God] loved your fathers and kept the oath”’ – this is the case (הָרַבָּא) with regard to the repentant ones of Israel who departed form the way of the people: because of God’s love for the ancestors …, He loves their decendents….’ As in the preceding case, Mikra is first adduced and then explicated. Ostensibly, the preacher has simply cited the
words of Moses. Closer examination, however, shows that Mikra has been reused in a more deliberate way. For in blending together (a selected composite from) Deut 9:5a and (a stylized rephrasing from) 7:8a the preacher has used the authority of the Torah in order to emphasize the nature of divine grace in the present era. The older words of Moses, dealing with the generation of Conquest, are now reapplied to the sectarian community and its anticipated displacement of the foreign oppressor then in the land. Indeed, those Jews who have repented and joined the community are told that their victory will not be the result of their own merit, but solely due to God’s love and promise to the ancestors. The preacher thus utilizes the Mosaic lemmata and redirects their meaning to his own day. The community is likened to the ancient generation of wandering in the desert: like them they will victoriously inherit the land; and, again like them, they will be vindicated because of God’s faithfulness to his ancient oath. Having reused Mikra in this exhortatory manner, the preacher closes with a repeated denunciation of the “builders of the wall” (8:18), itself an allusion to Ezek 13:10.40

REUSE OF BIBLICAL LANGUAGE

The sectarian ideology that it alone is the true Israel, heir of the ancient past, is no where so pervasive as in the predominance of biblical language and form throughout the scrolls. Indeed, virtually every page of text is replete with extensive uses of Mikra as a model of one sort or another. To explore this topic in detail would actually require a review of almost every line of sectarian composition. This is clearly beyond the scope of the present enterprise. We shall therefore limit ourselves here to three broad areas.

(1) Mikra as Model for Language. The dense re-use of biblical language is especially evident in the paraenetic sections of the Damascus Document,43 the prayers of the Hoduyot collection, and the discursive narrative of the War Scroll.44 The interweaving of passages from all the compositions of ancient Israel not only creates a thick archaic texture, dramatizing the biblical inheritance and character of the sect; but these passages also generate a network of intertextual associations that give special resonance to the sectarian composition. In fact, the implicit citations embedded in these texts produce a tableaux of interlocking allusions: a new biblical composition. Choosing somewhat randomly, let us simply cite one of the sentences that precedes the Deuteronomic language for religious anarchy (cf. Deut 12:8; Judg 21:25), just as stubborness of heart is a recurrent expression which conveys a censure of personal will and divine disregard (Deut 29:18; Jer 9:13). Then, too, the language of withdrawing (סנה) is used technically of removal from Israelite holiness (Lev 22:2) or towards pagan activity (Hos 9:10), and the choice of the verb ויבשל to express rebellion and the image פסנתר to convey (highhanded) intention, respectively convey the rebellion at Sinai (Exod 32:25) and the deliberate rejection of divine commandments (Num 15:30f.). Finally, the image of going in the way of the wicked recalls the idioms of Ps 1:1, where such sinners are juxtaposed to those who follow the Torah.

It is certainly not necessary to argue that the preacher of CD 8:7-9 had just the aforesaid passages in mind (though in several cases the language is unique) to recognize that his choice of expression is deliberately allusive and richly biblical. Little would be gained by dismissing this ‘biblical texture’ as so much linguistic archaizing or stylistic conceit. For to separate verbal form from ideological content would be unnecessarily artificial. Since the community believed itself to be the new Israel, it also came to express itself in this authoritative manner. Thus not only through explicit citations and applications, but also through a chain of textual allusions and associations, the authority of Mikra for the covenanteers’ self-understanding is dramatically asserted.

(2) Mikra as Model for Composition. In taking up this subject, it will be well to distinguish between more narrow and more extensive uses of compositional forms found in the Mikra. An example of the former is the liturgical recitation found in IQS 2:2-10. This liturgy is part of a ceremony of induction for initiates. In the course of the procedure, the priests bless the lot of those pure in practice while the Levites curse those that share the lot of Belial. What is particularly striking about these recitations is that the first is worked around a reuse of the Priestly Blessing found in Num 6:24-26, whereas the second is its inversion. The biblical form is particularly evident in the first case, though the lemmata are recited without citation formulae and supplemented asyndetically. Thus we read: 'May He (the Lord) bless you with all good; may He protect you from all evil; may He enlighten your heart with the wisdom of life; may He be gracious to you with everlasting knowledge; and may He raise up for you the face of his pious ones for everlasting peace (2:3-4).’ As in many cases in Mikra and early citations in CD 8:14-18, just considered. In 8:7-9 the preacher begins: ‘And they did each one what was right in his eyes and preferred each one the stubborness of his heart, and did not withdraw from the people [of the land and their sin], but rebelled highhandedly by walking in the ways of the wicked.’ There is nothing complicated about this rebuke: it is manifestly unified in both theme and concern. No complicated or ironic clash of images is found. Nevertheless, through its composite of textual allusions, a sharper charge is generated. For one thing, the imagery of doing what is ‘right in one’s eyes’ is standard Deuteronomic language for religious anarchy (cf. Deut 12:8; Judg 21:25), just as stubborness of heart is a recurrent expression which conveys a censure of personal will and divine disregard (Deut 29:18; Jer 9:13).
rabbinic literature, the ancient Priestly Blessing serves as the structure and basis for a new liturgical composition.\(^4\)

Another type of implicit use of Mikra deserves mention. And that is the ‘anthological’ composition found in many legal texts. As noted earlier, the Temple Scroll is particularly characterized by the coordination of related Mikra passages to expand or harmonize certain topics, and to authorize innovations through deliberate changes. For example, the rules of the paschal-sacrifice incorporate Exod 12:47-48; Num 9:3; and Deut 16:7 into a new legal mosaic. In addition, Exod 12:47, which explicitly states that ‘all the congregation of Israel shall do it (viz., the sacrifice)’, is supplemented by the remark (utilizing Mikra language concerning the valid age of priestly service): ‘from the age of twenty and upwards they shall do it.’ By this qualifying addition the previous assertion is manifestly undercut. But by weaving it into the known rules for the paschal rite, the author has also justified his procedure in the light of his (here implicit) ideology that Israel is a ‘kingdom of priests’. A more limited and also more subtle form of such legal creativity can be found in the Damascus Document.

For example, in the continuation of the aforementioned example regarding reproof (CD 9:6-8), the light indicates that vengeance involves withholding reproof ‘from one day to the next’ (דיין י利润率), he is drawing an analogy to the law of vows in Num 30:15 where the very same phraseology occurs. In this way, the legislist is able to innovate or justify a time-limit for proper reproof on the basis of the laws of Moses.” The Mosaic interpretation establishes an analogy: just as in the one case the vow of an unmarried or married woman is valid unless invalidated within a day by her father or husband (respectively), so is reproof valid only for the same period of time. The words מיקרא הם therefore no mere phrase. For the legislist of CD it is an operative legal expression intentionally used to justify his exegetical innovation. This procedure of legal validation is quite common to the Damascus Document, where the technique of explicit legal justification is used as well.\(^5\)

On a more extensive plane, the broad impact of a compositional form from the Mikra is attested in different genres of the sectarian scrolls. We have already mentioned the use of the legal sequence of the book of Deuteronomy on the composition and editing of the Temple Scroll. We may now add that Deuteronomy strongly influenced the style and structure of the Damascus Document, as well. Thus, like Deut 1-11, CD opens (l-8) with a collection of paraenetic reviews of the national past, and begins various subsections with the exhortation ‘(and) now hear’ (1: 1; 2: 1; 3: 14). This introductory statement is also found in Deut 4:1; 6:4; 9:1; 10:12. In addition, just as Deuteronomy follows its

\(^4\) See Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 329-34.

\(^5\) See the analysis of the rabbinc literature, and the overall treatment of Schiffman, Sectarian Law, ch. 4.

\(^6\) Schiffman, Sectarian Law, passim, and earlier in Halakha at Qumran, passim, has forcefully argued that the halakha (as against sectarian organization rules) was not only justified through the inspired interpretation of biblical texts, but derived from it as well.

\(^3\) Mikra as Model for Practices or Procedures. The dominant impact of Mikra on the covenanters is also evident in their reuse of it to determine the nature and structure of their judiciary, for example, or the ages of service of the officers of the covenant community in their encampments and during the final eschatological war. In this latter battle, the structural arrangement of the tribes is also modeled on the deployment of the tribes around the portable ark in the wilderness, as described in the opening chapters of the book of Numbers.

As a final example, we return to 1QS 2. It will be recalled that this text includes the blessings and curses of a covenant initiation ceremony. But the reuse of Mikra goes beyond a reuse of the Priestly Blessing and a mere allusion to the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy. For the blessings and curses are recited by cultic officers deployed in two groups, just as in the covenant ceremony described in Deut 27:9-26 (and enacted in Josh 8:33-34). Like the latter, moreover, the new covenanters respond to the recitation with the words ‘Amen, Amen’ (2:10). Accordingly, just as this ancient ceremony was prescribed in the wilderness and performed by the people of Israel and entered the land in the days of Joshua, so it now serves as the model for all those who would go out to the wilderness and enter the special covenant of the true Israel. This reappropriation of the ceremony by the sectarian community is both more bold and more consequential than the rhetorical reuse of it centuries earlier, by the prophet Jeremiah (11:1-5).

To conclude: virtually the entirety of Mikra is used and reused by the writers of the Qumran scrolls in order to author, reauthor, and ultimately to authorize their practices and beliefs. In any specific composition, many diverse texts might be adduced; just as many diverse texts might be adduced to support any one point. Indeed, the justification of a line of argument from several biblical sources at once demonstrates the wide-ranging literary imagination of the composers, and the authority of the totality of Scripture for them. Further, it is instructive to note that certain texts were variously employed in different genres. Thus the book of Isaiah was copied for itself, and reused both in pesherite comments found in CD and in special peshar-compositions. Comparably, the book of Leviticus was copied for itself (even in paleo-Hebrew script), translated into Aramaic in targum form (11QMelch), and reused to justify prophetic pronouncements ‘in 11QMelch’. And finally, the book of Genesis was copied for itself, rewritten in an expanded and legendary manner in Aramaic (11QGenApoc), and used for prophetic pronouncements. Quite evidently, the use of a text in one genre did not preclude its use in another; and the
predilection for certain texts overall (like Deuteronomy, Isaiah, or Daniel), as well as specific ones (like the diverse reuses of the prophecy in Num 24:17), suggests that within the sectarian communities there was something like a ‘canon-within-a-canonical’, something of a hierarchical preference for certain texts over others. However this be, the significant matter is not solely the use or reuse of given texts, but rather their employment by authoritative teachers in authoritative ways. It is to such matters that we now turn.

The Authority of Mikra

Several distinct, though related, levels of authority recur throughout the Qumran scrolls. To begin, it must be stressed that the principle source of authority of Mikra is that it is the revelation of God, ‘which He commanded through Moses and through all his servants the prophets’ (IQS1:3; cf. 8:15-16). There are thus two categories: the inspired words of Moses (the Tora) and the inspired words of the prophets (the predictions of the prophets). This bifurcation also covers the explicit citations of Mikra. As we have seen, the words or books of Moses and the Props (like Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah) are adduced both to justify new teachings anent the Tora of Moses, and to validate new understandings of the ancient prophecies. But this valorization of Moses and the Props should not obscure the central fact that God alone is the principle source of authority for the community. Indeed, it is precisely because of their revealed aspect (cf. IQS 8:15-16) that the teachings of Moses and the Props have any authority whatever. Thus, with respect to the inheritance of Mikra, the sectarians might speak of a twofold chain of authority: God and His authoritative spokesmen.

But as we have repeatedly observed, the authority of the Law and Prophecies for the sectarians cannot be separated from the way in which they were interpreted. It was, in fact, precisely in the special way that the old laws were reinterpreted or extended, the old predictions reapplied or decoded, and the institutions of ancient Israel restructured or regenerated, that the covenanteers of Qumran saw themselves as distinct from other contemporary Jewish groups. Moreover, just because these reinterpretations of the ancient revelations were claimed to be the true meaning of God’s word, a proper appreciation of the authority of Mikra for the sectarians would have to supplement the aforementioned chain of authority. In addition to a chain starting with God and through all his servants the prophets’ words ‘of the Tora (the revelations of God, ‘which He commanded through Moses, to do all that which has been revealed at each period, and which the prophets have revealed through His Holy Spirit.’ Significantly, the aforementioned CD passage concludes with the remark that ‘without [the “Staff” of Instruction] they [the sectarians; and all others] will not grasp [the meaning of the revelations of God] until there arises one who teaches righteousness (פונית) in the end of days.’

The role of the Teacher is equally important in the interpretation of the prophecies, as is explicitly remarked in a comment in 1QpHab 2:3-9. Here we read that ‘[.., the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God.’ These are words which explicate ‘all that which will come upon the final generation’, words ‘of understanding which God put in [his heart], to interpret ( all the words of His servants the prophets.’ Elsewhere, in the same text, we read that ‘God informed him [the Teacher] concerning all the mysteries (ד) of His servants the prophets .. which the prophets spoke; for the mysteries of God are wondrous (7:4-5,8).’ Indeed, the true meaning of the ancient prophecies were not even known to the authoritative spokesman of God who revealed them in past times. Only through the interpretations of the Teacher will the community know of the final day and their ultimate vindica-

46 Cf. e.g., Bruce, ‘Book of Daniel’; also Brownlee, The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls.
47 See CD 7:18-21;4QTest 9-11; and IQM11:5-7; also Test. Levi 18:3; Test. Judah 24:1; P. T. Taanit 4:2, 67d; Rev 22:16.
tion. Without them, the true intent of the prophetic ‘words’ will also not be grasped. Or, in the exultant words of one member: ‘You (God) have informed us about the final [times] of the (eschatological) Wars through Your Annotated Ones, the Visionaries of the Fixed Times’ (I QM 11:7-8).\(^{30}\)

**Rewriting of Tora Rules**

The cumulative impression of the Qumran scrolls, then, is that its primary text, Mikra, is the product of divine revelation; and that its own texts, which extend and develop the teachings of God, in various legal-sectarian collections and in various pesharite commentaries, are also the product of divine revelation. But here a certain qualification is necessary. For while one must agree that the authority for the various legal exegeses in the Damascus Document and the Rule Scroll lies in their being the product of divine inspiration through teachers and communal members, the authority of the legal exegeses in the Temple Scroll lies in their purportedly being an original revelation of God (i.e., not an inspired interpretation). One may therefore see in I1QTemp a quite different notion of exegetical authority: one which does not allow the interpretations of Mikra to appear separate from the Tora- be that through explicitly or implicitly justified exegesis, as commonly in CD – but deems it necessary to rewrite the Tora text itself.

The ideology of I1QTemp that all reinterpretations of the Tora must be part of the Tora, and not simply related to it through exegetical justifications or verbal allusions, is evident not only in the form of this text, a Tora revealed by God to Moses, but also through exegetical features within the text. Of principle interest here is the reworking of Deut 17:10 (‘and you will do according to the word which they shall tell you from the Place …’) in I1QTemp.\(^{34}\) The Pentateuchal source simply advises Israelites who proceed to the high courts to follow the adjudication of the priests and other judicial officials there. In I1QTemp a strikingly different reading is found: ‘and you will do according to the Tora which they shall tell you, and according to the word which they shall teach you from the book of the Tora, and tell you in truth from the Place …’ Clearly, the authority of the adjudicatory words of the Pentateuchal text have been transformed in the sectarian version to mean the words found in the Tora. Indeed, all instruction must proceed from these divine words, the Tora book at hand, I1 QTemp, not from the human words of the judicial officials. I1 QTemp is thus the true Tora, for in it all things are to be found. Certainly there is reflected here a different attitude towards writing new laws – no matter how justifiable be their relation to the ancient Tora – than that known from CD. Moreover, it is also quite possible that we also have here a critique of the early

\(^{30}\) The technical term ‘fixed times’ (te’udot) is also used in legal contexts; cf. IQS1:9.
The inspired interpretations at Qumran are also authoritative insofar as it is only these interpretations which carry the true divine intent of the Tora of Moses and the words of the prophets; i.e., it is only on the basis of the law as interpreted by the Teacher and Interpreter (and their inheritors), and only on the basis of the prophecies as interpreted by the Teacher, that God’s will can be fulfilled and known. The sectarians believed that only they were the bearers of the esoteric sense of the ancient revelations. Thus, whereas the Tora of Moses explicitly stated that ‘the hidden things (תורה נסתרה) are the Lord’s and the revealed things (תורה עתידה) are ours and our children’s forever, to perform all the words of this Tora’ (Deut 29:28), the ideology at Qumran was significantly different. There the ‘revealed things’ were for all Jews, but the ‘hidden things’ were for them alone. Indeed, on their view, God revealed to the sect the hidden interpretation of the Law by which all Israel, including even its great leaders, like David, unknowingly went astray (CD 3:13; cf. 4:13-6). By following the true meaning and practice of the Law, the sectarians believed that they would not sin and would be guaranteed salvation. ‘And all who will no according to the oath of God’s [true] covenant, there will be surety [גוחה] for them to save them from all the snares of Doom’ (CD 14:1-2); ‘those who perform the Tora [according to its true interpretation] ... [will be saved] because of their labor and trust in [the teachings of] the Teacher of Righteousness’ (4QpHab 8:1-3). The nonsectarians, on the other hand, will be doomed: ‘for they have not been numbered in the [true] covenant ... nor sought Him (God) by His Law, to know the hidden things by which they have gone astray for their guilt; and (indeed even) the revealed things they have transgressed insolently’ (1Q5:11-12).

There is a second significant divergence between Deut 29:28 and sectarian ideology. For whereas the Pentateuchal passage refers to the performance of the ‘revealed things’ of the Tora ‘forever’, the sectarians believed that the ‘hidden things’ constituted a new revelation of interpretations of the Law. The original Law, with its conventional and traditional interpretations, was thus not abrogated but rather superceded through innovative and ongoing revelations of its meaning. It was thus not the ‘revealed things’ alone which had authority over sectarian practice, but the ancient revelations as understood through the inspired interpretation of its ‘hidden’ sense. Thus the ‘chain of authority’ mentioned earlier is also a ‘chain of ongoing divine revelations’. Initially the Tora of Moses was revealed (and also the words of the prophets); subsequently, through the founding teachers and ongoing study of the covenanters, the hidden meanings of the Law (and Prophets) were revealed. This sectarian position is repeated in various forms. The Damascus Document, for example, refers to a hidden ‘book of the Tora’ which had been sealed up in the Ark since


94 Wacholder, Dawn of Qumran, 117, has interpreted this as referring to 11Q5Temp.
Tora and the Teacher of Righteousness, and their repentant followers (the ‘hidden things’; the ‘mysteries’), for the establishment of a New Covenant and the salvation of the New Israel faithful to it; and Period Three, when, after the sin and destruction of nonsectarians, God would reveal His New Instruction (possibly the Temple Scroll) through the one who would teach righteousness, for the salvation of all (CD 20:20).

The Interpretation of Mikra

As we have seen, the sectarians believed themselves in possession of the True Interpretation of Mikra during the epoch of wickedness. In a sustained and repeated image, this revelation of true interpretations for the faithful is likened to a well of living water. Thus, at the outset of the Damascus Document, the people are told how ‘God revealed’ to those ‘who were left over’ after the exile, ‘and who held fast to the commandments’, ‘hidden things regarding which all Israel had gone astray ... His righteous testimonies which man shall perform and live thereby ... and they digged a well for much water’ (CD 3:12-16). Later on it is stressed how God ‘raised’ up ‘men of understanding’ and ‘wisdom ... and they digged the well, ... with the staff the Well is the Law ... and the Staff is the Seeker (שומרי מילה) of the Law’; for ‘without’ this Well and Teaching no one can ‘grasp’ the true meaning of the Tora (CD 6:2-11). Thus the sectarian can exult: ‘You have established within my heart a true foundation, waters of well for those who seek it (赍וה; IQH 6:9);

while nonsectarians, even those who ‘have forsaken the well of living water’ will be bereft on the Day of Judgement (CD 8:21a).

A vigorous dedication to the interpretation of Mikra was thus cultivated by the sectarians. They were concerned to observe the laws according to their ‘exact meaning (כִּפָּרְכֵּר, CD 6:14, 16, 20); for in the Tora of Moses ‘everything is stated precisely ((nn מִשָּׁם; CD 13:1-2)’; just as they were concerned to ‘determine (פִּשָּׁמַד) the seasons’ precisely, for such is ‘stated precisely (קִדְמָטֵּר) in the book of the Divisions of the Periods’ (CD 16:2-3). With this knowledge the community was distinguished from all others. ‘For everything hidden from all Israel’ might be ‘found by one who seeks (נָחַק) [Scripture] properly’ (ZQS 8:11-12); but all others will be confounded, ‘for ... they have not sought Him (נָחֲקִי) [God] according to His Law to know the hidden things’ (ZQS 5:11). The sectarians regarded themselves as ‘scholars (נַיִם) of the Law’ (ZQM 10:10; cf. IQH 2:17); but considered all others, ‘who seek (יָשָׂר) facely’ (CD 1:18), as ones ‘whose falsehood is in their study (נַיִם)’ (QP Nah: 2:8). Similarly the sectarians regarded their interpret-

ers of prophecies as ‘visionaries (נָחֲק) of truth’ (IQH 2:15); but considered the interpretations of all others, who do not interpret ‘by the Holy Spirit’, as ‘visionaries (נָחֲק) of deceit’ (IQH 4:10) and ‘falsehood’ (4:20). Such polemical point-counterpoint underscores the centrality of true interpretation in the proper understanding and performance of Mikra.

In earlier sections, we had the occasion to indicate the various literary forms utilized for the sectarians for the interpretation of Mikra (lemmatic, anthropological, and pseudepigraphic forms, among others), as well as several of the techniques employed in their vast exegetical enterprise (scribal, legal, homiletical and prophetic). In order more fully to appreciate—this achievement, a more specific focus on the techniques of interpretation will be offered. These techniques will be considered in a somewhat formal way, with examples drawn from earlier sections, where the texts were cited.

SCRIPAL EXEGESIS

In the course of scribal transmission, several types of exegesis were registered in the scrolls, most probably on the basis of prolonged study and reflection. Concern for divine honor or sanctity, for example, resulted in euphemistic renderings of the Tetragram. Thus in IQS 8:14, the citation from Isa 40:3 renders the Tetragram with four dots (‘the way of * * *’); whereas just earlier, where this citation is alluded to with an interpretation (to go to the wilderness), the Divine Name is rendered by the pronoun hwh (8:13-14), a circumlocution also found in CD 9:9 and Tannaitic sources (M. Sukka 4:5). On the other hand, in CD 15:1 the sectarians prohibited the substitutions alef we-lamed (for El, Elohim) and alef we-dalet (for Adonai) in oaths, as comparably in other Tannaitic regulations (M. Shevuot 4:13). In one notable instance, CD 8:16 restylizes Deut 7:8 in order to avoid the divine Name; and an attempt to avoid anthropomorphic renderings results in the substitution ‘before the Lord’ for ‘the eyes of the Lord’ in IQS 53:7-8 (55:12-14), a change common in Targum Onkelos and Yonatan, and quite possibly in the masoretic text as well.

With respect to the substance of lemmata, scribes might indicate ‘sense’ by means of paragraphing, as in the ‘unit’ IQSa 51:17-52:6. Relatedly, scribal sense might be achieved via phrasing. Thus, in the aforementioned citation, from Isa 40:3 in IQS 8:14-15, the deletion of the introit ‘a voice calls’ allows the teacher to use the verse to exhort the sectarians “to prepare a way in the wilderness”, i.e. to establish a community there. A similar verse-division is found in the medie-
LEGAL EXEGESIS

As we have seen, the legal regulations of the covenanteers are found in different genres; in topical collections, like the Damascus Document, and in biblical-style collections, like the Temple Scroll. In addition, these legal regulations are presented in diverse forms: with and without explicit justifications from Mikra, and within and alongside full or abbreviated Mikra citations. Quite certainly, a highly developed range of hermeneutical techniques were utilized, and it is to a review of some of these that we now turn. Admittedly, these techniques are incorporated within the regulations without conceptual elaboration or terminology. It will nevertheless be of some historical interest to categorize them along the lines and terms found in the more developed Tannaic and Amoramic traditions. For by doing so, the place of Qumran interpretation within the context of ancient Jewish exegetical techniques can be more formally and comparatively observed.

1. Linguistic precision. Earlier, we had occasion to refer to the citation of Deut 5:12 (‘Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord’) in CD 10:14-15, in connection with a determination of the onset of the holy Sabbath day; and to the citation of Lev 23:28 (‘Apart from [מכב] your Sabbath-offerings) in CD 11:17-19, in connection with a concern to restrict sacrifices on the Sabbath to the special burnt-offering of the Sabbath. In the first case, the citation preceded the sectarian determination; in the second, it followed it. Nevertheless, in both cases a ruling of Mikra was used to justify the new regulation on the basis of a diyyuq, or close linguistic examination. In CD 10:14-15 the unspecific and admonitory verb בְּשֵׁמוּר shall be constructed to mean ‘be watchful’ (with respect to the setting sun; i.e., the temporal boundaries of the day), not merely ‘be heedful’ or ‘attentive’. Similarly, in CD 11:17-19 the broadly inclusive adverb מַלְכָּר is reinterpreted more restrictively to mean ‘except’. In this instance, the semantic nuance of the word is not at stake; it has rather undergone a complete change of meaning in this later period. Hence the diyyuq here is somewhat akin to the more formal rabbinic וָאֵלָתְיָא technique, where a later meaning of a word replaces an earlier one (i.e., the word under discussion ‘means, in fact, x’).

2. Analogical extension or correlation. Quite frequently in the masoretic and Samaritan versions extensions to laws are formally marked by technical terms. Similar procedures are found in the Qumran scrolls. Thus, in connection with a denunciation of forbidden marriages, CD 5:8-10 cites a version of Lev 18:13 ‘And Moses said: you shall not approach your mother’s sister; she is your mother’s kin’, a rule which prohibits marriages between nephews and aunts. In Mikra, the opposite is not stated; and the Pharasaic ruling accordingly permitted marriages between nieces and uncles. However, our sectarian believed that proper understanding of the meaning of Scripture led the nation to practice zenut, ‘harlotry’, by which was meant incest. The proper ruling is therefore given straightforwardly along with the operative principle: ‘now the rules of incest are written in Mikra with reference to males, and apply equally to women (lit. ‘and like them [ הב學習, viz., the males] are the women’). Only given here, this far-reaching principle may be assumed to have been operative elsewhere in Qumran exegesis. It would be an instance of what the rabbis called revivra, by which a feature of the written text – here, the masculine pronoun – was understood to ‘include’ something else.

Another type of legal exegetical extension may be found in the anthology of 11QTemp 52:1-3. In it, a reference to the law in Deut 16:21 prohibiting the erection of stelae is followed by a citation from Lev 26:1. It was pointed out earlier that the link between these passages is the occurrence of the same prohibition in the same language. But the legist had further reason to cite Lev 26:1 here, since this latter also prohibits incising forms on altars. Thus the Deuteronomic rule is extended on the basis of the priestly rule which is partly
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66 The locus classicus is Mekhilta de-R. Yishmael, Beshallah 1, p. 179 (ad Exod 17:9). Further on this matter, based on evidence in Minhah Shai, See Blau, ‘Massoretic Studies’, 139.
67 See Elmer, ‘Ambiguous Scriptural Readings’.
69 For the phenomenon in the Hebrew Bible, see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation. Part 2.
70 E.g. Mekhilta de-R. Yishmael, Bo 6, p. 20 (ad Exod 12:9); and ibid. Yitro 4, p. 21 (ad Exod 20:1).
71 For the Masoretic Text, see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 170-87; for the Samaritan Text see Daube, ‘Zur frühaltmudischen Rechtspraxis’, 148.
identical to it in language. Such terminological analogies, known as *gezera shawa* in rabbinic literature, served as the basis to correlate legal formulations and extend one of them on the basis of the other. If we were to articulate the preceding exegesis in rabbinic terms, the following hermeneutical proof might be stated: since Lev 26:1 and Deut 16:21 both prohibit the erection of stelae using similar language (א), though only the former text explicitly prohibits altar incisions (י) we must infer this prohibition also in the latter text. Thus again, on the basis of a linguistic feature, more is attributed to a given passage than directly, or explicitly, stated.

In the case of CD 9:6-8, cited earlier, the legislator also drew and analogy to the latter, in order, on that basis to establish a ‘Mosaic’ regulation with respect to the sectarian law of reproof. Such a use of the Mikra to support new regulations is closer to the rabbinic hermeneutical technique called *zeker la-davar*. A related instance of this form of intertextuality is CD 10:17-20. Hereby, the covenanteer is admonished to obey the Sabbath and: ‘not speak a foolish or empty word (יزاد)’, ‘not lend anything (יד)’ and ‘not engage in business (יד)’ nor arranging deals (יד).’ Couched in the language of the Mikra, the sectarian rules seem only loosely to be derived from it. Further attention to the phrase יزاد suggests that the legislator has exegetically generated his specific new rules on the basis of the principle of *gezera shawa*. For just as יزاد is used in Deut 32:47 with כל (‘empty word’), and in Deut 15:2 with משל (‘lend’), and in Deut 17:2 with מושפל (‘judgement’), so are these three terms found in CD 10:17 as well. In this way, the explicit uses of these terms in Deuteronomy serve to extend the sense of the phrase יزاد in Isa 58:13 and thereby generate new Sabbath rules.

3. **Topical specification or restriction.** Exegetical concerns to restrict or more carefully delineate an older rule may be found both in the stylistic course of sectarian rule formation and in the way Mikra rules have been reformulated. The formulation of the law in CD 9:17-22, dealing with the witnesses, may exemplify the first category. Here we find an opening statement made in generalizing terms (‘[in any muttered concerning which a person might transgress against the Lord and his neighbour, alone, witnesses [it]’), followed by a specification of the type of delict (‘if it is a capital case’), along with subsidiary considerations (including such a transgression before two witnesses), and then a further specification of the delict (‘[whereas] concerning property [cases]’, along with subsidiary considerations (including the number of witnesses). The development is thus from the general to the specific; or, in rabbinic terms, from *kelal* to *perat*.

With respect to the formulation of the laws themselves, we noted earlier that 11QTemp 17:6-9, dealing with the rules of the paschal-sacrifice, the generalizing formulation of this practice in Exod 12:47 (addressed to the entire congregation of Israel) has been restricted to persons ‘twenty years of age and older’. Such a ‘delimitation’, or *mi’utu*, is presumably supported by the use of the identical phrase (ָנוהער Laws, ‘they shall do it’) in both cases. The exegetical logic would thus be as follows: just as in the citation from 11QTemp the phrase *אעטתו לעשטו לצבarendra* serves to restrict cultic practice, so must this sense be inferred in the first case as well. By writing the restriction into the formulation of the law, the sectarian legist merely makes this hermeneutical technique explicit. In other instances, the exegetical qualification is not based on linguistic correlations between Mikra citations, but on conceptual restrictions, not specified in Mikra but now introduced into the new formulation. The insertion of the explication ‘and she is permitted to him according to the law’ in 11QTemp 66:8-11, noted earlier in connection with the anthological conflation there of Exod 22:15-16 and Deut 22:28-29 (dealing with marriage after seduction and rape), is a case in point.

**HOMILETICAL EXEGESIS**

In the category of ‘homiletical exegesis’ we shall by-pass those exegetical features which do not pertain to eschatology per se, and focus on nonlegal exegesis which occurs either within nonlegal discourses or serves to justify legal matters.”

1. **Nonlegal justifications, **Earlier, 1QS 5:7-6:1 was referred to in connection with citations used to justify restrictive contact between sectarians and non-sectarians. Two nonlegal sources are adduced. In the first case, Exod 22:7 (admonishing judges to refrain from ‘any manner of falsehood’) was cited to support the rule to keep apart from non-sectarians ‘in every matter (לכל דבר, 5:15)’; in the second Isa 2:22 (admonishing hearers to keep apart from mankind for it is of no account (ב yaşında)’ is cited to support separation from

---

73 See also Slomovic, ‘Understanding’ 9-10.
74 For the technical terms of Isa 58:13, see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 304n, 31; and for inner-biblical reuse of Isa 58: 13-14, ib., 478f.
those not ‘accounted (נريفש, נָרִיצה) among the sectarians (5:11, 17–18). Notably, both legal admonitions are justified by manifestly nonlegal statements. Moreover, the terminological links between each rule and citation are conceptually unrelated; so that it is only on the basis of their exegetical extension that they serve their new purpose. Other instances of this phenomenon, e.g., CD 9:2-5 (discussed earlier) and 11: 18-21, are no less striking from a hermeneutical point of view. Presumably, these are all cases of exegetical justification ex post facto, and are not indicative of the exegetical derivations of laws from nonlegal sources by sectarian logists. This latter practice was forbidden by the rabbis.

2. Puruetic or liturgical reapplications. Among the sources treated earlier, three types may be recalled here. The first type involves the theological reuse of the Priestly Blessing in IQS 2:2-10. There the liturgical language of Num 6:24-26 was cited and reapplied in light of the sect’s theology. The result is a new prayer achieved by means of covert exegesis. The lemmata and theological attributions are stylistically integrated in this new recitation, with no attempt to distinguish the one from the other. Moreover, the relationships between the lemmata (e.g., ‘May He [the Lord] bless you’) and their extensions (here: ‘with every good’) are simply introduced dogmatically. No philological relationships connect them. The same structure is also characteristic of exegetical reuses of the Priestly Blessing in Mikra and rabbinic literature.78

In two other instances, more subtle techniques of interpretation are involved. The first of these, CD 8:14-18, is part of a hortatory reprise from Deut 9:5a and 7:8a. As indicated earlier, the way Mikra has been cited, abbreviated, and blended here thoroughly transforms the force and application of the paraenesis. The ancient divine words are now transferred from the generation of the first conquest to the sectarians themselves: the new Israel. In this way, the older text which stated that the land was inherited as a result of God’s love for the Patriarchs, and His promise to them, is also changed. It is now because of the penitent faithfulness of an earlier generation of Jews that God determines to extend His love to their sectarian successors. The old Deuteronomic sermon has thus been exegetically redirected to contemporary times.

In another instance, Deut 1: 13 has been recited and exegetically reworked in CD 6:2-3 in order to justify the sectarian’s arrangement of courts and councils. The original Deuteronomic reference to the appointment of ‘men of understanding’ and ‘men of wisdom’ as judges is now formulated so that such persons portrayed as coming from the Aaronids and Israelites, respectively. In addition, the men are not chosen by other men, as in the Mikra, but are ‘raised up’ by God Himself; and these delegates are not inferior to some superior judge, like Moses in Deut 1:7, who alone will be ‘informed’ (lit., ‘I [God] will make him understand [נָרִיצה]’ of the verdict, but they will themselves be ‘informed’ (lit. ‘made to understand [נָרִיצה]’) the divine will. Even more significantly, the subsequent lines make clear that such divine inspiration leads to the new (sectarian) interpretations of Tora by which they might judge and teach the people. And so, through consummate exegetical dexterity, an entirely different model of leadership and judgement is presented: not one accomplished by wise and discerning men, with divine oracular intervention in rare instances; but one accomplished by interpreters of the Tora, with continuous divine inspiration through them.79

PROPHETIC EXEGESIS

The reinterpretation of prophecy is a major exegetical feature of the Qumran scrolls, and is represented in a wide variety of genres: the War Scroll; the Damascus Document; the (11 Q) Melchizedek and (4Q174) Florilegium anthologies; and, of course, in the pesher-literature.80 Naturally, the style of interpretation varies in relation to the genre used. Thus in IQM, single verses from Mikra are reapplied globally to a new situation; in 11QMelch and 4QFlor, multiple verses from Mikra are grouped together and reapplied to specific topics on the basis of related thematics; and in thepesher-literature and pesherite comments in CD, successive verses from one bok of Mikra (the prophets or psalms), or single verses from one book, are atomized into their verbal components and successively reapplied to a new situation.81 But it should also be noted that the methods of interpretation used overlap these genres, and present a more unified picture. Thus the terminology (תודנה, ‘its interpretation is’, and variants) and atomizing style of the pesher-literature are also found in 4QFlor, even as this structural form occurs with different technical terms (e.g., נרף, ‘it means’) to link lemmata to interpretations in the pesherite comments in CD.82

In addition, many of the exegetical techniques employed in prophetic reinterpretations occur in legal and homiletical contexts. Withal, the types of verbal exegesis used in the prophetic reinterpretation of Mikra do have a distinctive character. As most of these latter go against the plain-sense of the passage at hand, it is reasonable to assume that they have been developed in order to understand the true (viz., contemporary) intent of the ancient oracles, meanings which the interpreter of Habakkuk actually claims to have been unknown even to their original speakers (IQpHab 7:1-2). For the sectarians, both the techniques and the meanings derived thereby originate with the inspired tutelege of the Teacher of Righteousness. Indeed, their knowledge of them constitutes their hope in imminent divine vindication.

1. Dogmatic links between lemma and interpretation. Hereby, the claim is simply asserted that a certain contemporary event was alluded to by the ancient

78 See above n. 43.

79 The institution in Deut 1:17 is itself a reinterpretation of older texts; see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 245.

80 On this phenomenon in the Hebrew Bible see ibid., Part 4.

81 For the techniques and terms, see Fishbane, ‘Qumran Pesher’; and now also Horgan, Pesherim, Part 2, passim.

82 Examples related to these assertions will be given below.
prophets, or that the meaning of a prophetic text is this or that. For example, Num 24:17-19, which promises that a star shall come forth from Jacob who will defeat Israel's enemy, is cited in 1QM 11:6-7; and Isa 31:8, which announces that Asshur shall 'fall with the sword not of your hand', is cited in 1QM 11:11-12, both times in connection with contemporary events; but in neither case is any verbal or textual justification for such reapplication provided. Presumably, such reuse derives from inspiration. Similarly, in the course of interpreting Amos 5:26-27, it is simply asserted that 'the king' (in the phrase 'sikkut your king') is (אֶדֶם) 'the congregation', and that 'the kiyyun of the images' are (דַּי) 'the books of the prophets'. To be sure, the basis for this reinterpretation is the larger interpretative context of CD 7: 10ff.; but, again, no ostensible textual basis for these rereadings is provided.

2. Direct verbal links between lemma and interpretation. In the course of reapplying a lemma to a new context, the interpreter may repeat a key word from the lemma (sometimes even retaining its grammatical form). Thus, in Hab 1:5, the prophet encourages the ancient Israelites with the pronouncement that God will soon do wonders for them, which you will not believe (יֵשָׁרֶת ה' לְךָ; when it will be told (יָשָׁרֶת)'; while in 1QpHab 2:3-10 this very same verse is utilized to criticize those Jews who do 'not believe (יֵשָׁרֶת ה' לְךָ) in the covenant of God' or the prophetic words which God has 'foretold (יָשָׁרֶת)'. In other cases, a repeated word can serve as the basis for a paraphrastic expansion and reapplication of the lemma (e.g., 3:7-10); or repeated words can link several citations which are utilized to support a given theme (e.g., the common verb shu'vah serves to link the citations from 2 Sam 7:10-11 and Exod 15:17-18 ancient a New Temple in 4QFlor 1:2-7; and the common nouns הַחוֹרֶת in Ps 1:1 and Isa 8:11, and מִזְבַּח in Ps 1:1 and Ezek 37:23, serve to link these passages on the topic of sectarian separateness in 4QFlor 1:14ff.). The exegetical dynamics of the latter have some resemblance to the gezera shawa technique, considered earlier. Of related interest is the exegetical use here of one Scriptural lemma to explain another.83

3. Transformed verbal links between lemma and interpretation. After Amos 5:26-27 is cited in CD 7: 14-15 ('and I have exiled the sikkut [פסוק] of your king ... from My tent [תָּקֵדָם] to Damascus') to support a statement of an exile northward (itself justified by a citation from Isa 7:17), the text abruptly continues with a pun on the pagan object sikkut, when stating that 'the books of the Tora are the Tabernacle (סְקֻקִּת [תֵּבָנִית]) of the King.' This reinterpretation is itself immediately justified by a citation from Amos 9:11: 'as He (God) said: "I will raise up the tabernacle (תָּבֹא) of David that is fallen". ' Once again, one Scriptural passage is adduced to support another; though it will be clear that in this case the intertextual chain becomes conceptually more torturous. For one thing, the pagan objects are reinterpreted as the Tora, and an image of exile is reinterpreted by one of eschatological hope; for another, the pagan object of a 'star' (in Amos 5:26, though not explicitly cited in CD 7:18-20)84 is reinterpreted as the Teacher of Righteousness, and this last on the basis of a citation from Num 24:17! The tendentious proofs notwithstanding, Scriptural texts have hereby become pretexts for new ideological agenda. The verbal puns powerfully serve to carry the logic of rhetoric forward to these goals.

In addition to puns, which fairly abound as a hermeneutical technique, a more radical use of the letters of the lemmata can be found. Here we may call attention to what the rabbis called serus, or the 'rearrangement' of letters in order to achieve new applications of Mikra. For example, in 1QpHab 2:5-6 the word הִנֵּה (‘work’) in the lemma is transposed as הֵנִי (‘transgression’) in the pesher. In this light, we may now add that the aforesaid passage from Amos 5:27 (‘from My tent [תָּקֵדָם] to Damascus’ does not conform to the Mikra itself (which reads: ‘from beyond [תָּקֵדָם] Damascus’), so that the purported lemma is actually a reinterpretation of the passage on the basis of a hermeneutical rearrangement of the letters. One can only marvel at the exegetical tour de force involved, and the exegetical confidence of the new readings, even to the extent of introducing the citation from Amos 5:26-27 (a 1st person divine pronouncement with the formulaic introit: ‘us He said’).

4. Typological reinterpretations. In 1QM II:11-12, noted above, a passage from Isa 31:8 was adduced to support sectarian hope in a victorious eschatological war. Quite clearly, the appearance of Asshur in Mikra is now understood as a cipher for contemporary enemies of the covenanteers. In a similar vein, it is generally agreed that references to the Kittim in pesher Nahum refer to the Romans; and that, in the same text, ‘Judah’ = the sectarians, ‘Menasseh’ = the Sadducees, the ‘Deceiving Interpreters’ = the Pharisees, and the ‘lion’ = Alexander Jannaeus.85 These and other examples thus combine to suggest that the sectarians also read Mikra with an eye to deciphering its tribal and other references in terms of the groups and figures of the day, and that they further believed that these meanings were part of the divine intention regarding them from the beginning, only now correctly decoded.

Conclusion

In the scrolls from Qumran and its environs which we have analyzed in the preceding pages, Mikra is the literary expression of divine Truth: at once the unique resource of past revelations, and the mediating source of all subsequent ones. As found in Mikra, God’s Word is an illimitable Word of Truth: for the ancestors of ancient Israel, as well as for their legitimate inheritors, the Qumran covenanteers, who alone understand it rightly. There is thus Mikra and its

---

83 On this text, see the exegetical comments of Slomovic, ‘Understanding’, 7ff; and Brooke, Exegesis at Qumran, passim.

84 The explicit interpretation is based on the second half of the verse, as commonly in rabbinic midrash.

85 On this, see Flusser, ‘Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes’.
Interpretation. We may understand this conjunction in two ways: as continuity and as correlation. As a matter of continuity, Mikra is succeeded by the interpretations of it. In this regard, the Qumran covenanteers are both the heirs of ancient Israel and progenitors of the great culture of biblical interpretation which (in large part) constitutes Judaism. Like the former, the Israelites of old, the sectarians interpreted ‘biblical’ traditions (laws, theology, prophecies) in sophisticated ways, with technical terms and procedures.6 But unlike this earlier ‘biblical’ interpretation in ancient Israel, which was incorporated into Mikra itself, and as part of the older genres of composition, the sectarians, similar to early Jewish practice, further developed exegetical techniques and terms, produced new ‘nonbiblical’ genres within which Mikra was interpreted (including rewriting the Pentateuch, as in 11QTemp), and looked to Mikra as an authoritative collection of completed books whose contents were recurrently cited.7 However, unlike their ancestors and contemporaries, the sectarians viewed the relationship between Mikra and Interpretation as a continuity of divine revelations; viz. the revelations to Moses and the prophets were succeeded by exegetical revelations to the authoritative teachers of the sect. Thus, for the covenanteers, each period had its teachers and its books: ancient Israel had the teachings of Moses and the prophets, preserved in Mikra; and they had the inspired teachings of the Teacher and Seeker, and various new works. As the discourse on new interpretation in CD 7 makes clear, God produces ‘an instrument for His [ongoing] work.’

Turning, in conclusion, to Mikra and its Interpretation as a matter of correlation, the preceding perspective is reinforced. For the sectarians, as for contemporary Judaism, generally, there is no Mikra without its interpretation; indeed, there is only the Mikra through its legitimate and proper interpretation. On this point everything hinged. For to practice the word and will of God in society, one had first properly to understand it; and to know the plan and purpose of God in history one also had first properly to understand it. The Interpreter of the Tora and the Teacher of Righteousness, as well as all their subsequent delegates and followers, safeguarded these true understandings, the ‘hidden things’ of the Law and the ‘mysteries’ of the prophets, and gave the Qumran fellowship definition and distinction. The yahad, or ‘community’, was thus a community by virtue of its style of ‘biblical’ interpretation – and the practical consequences derived therefrom. Further, the members constituted a true community, to be vindicated by God in the End to Come, also only by virtue of their ‘biblical’ interpretation, and the practical consequences derived therefrom. For the sectarians, then, all others practiced and hoped in vain, because their interpretation of Mikra was itself vanity: without authority in technique, and so without

authority in result. Fathfully, the sectarians believed that outside their authoritative use and interpretation of Mikra there was no salvation.
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Chapter Eleven

Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Devorah Dimant

Introduction

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The corpus designated as the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament includes various Jewish writings of different origin and character, that have, nevertheless, certain common features which distinguish them from other contemporary bodies of literature such as the Ancient Versions, the rabbinic midrashim, the Qumran sectarian writings and some of the Jewish Hellenistic works. One of these is the extensive use made of biblical language, style and literary genres in a specific way. For unlike most of the writings of other corpora, the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic compositions take up styles and forms of the biblical literature. They may, therefore, be seen as aiming to recreate the biblical world, while other literatures, inasmuch as they employ biblical materials, usually aim at interpreting it. But while specific aims and literary forms vary, all post-biblical writings draw upon the biblical tradition and interpret it in various ways. The numerous exegetical affinities between these writings show that they share a common exegetical tradition and this fact ought to be taken into account in any research on the subject."


2 In fact, many works traditionally not included in the corpus belong there by virtue of their literary character. Thus, for instance, a non-sectarian work found at Qumran which properly belongs to the Pseudepigrapha, namely the Genesis Apocryphon (cf. below), was included in two recent selections of Qumranic, chiefly sectarian, literature, see Dupont-Sommer (ed.), Écrits Intertestamentaires, 383-99, and Knibb (ed.), Qumran Community, 183-202.

3 This conclusion was forcefully stated by Vermes, ‘Qumran Interpretation’, 49. He well illustrates this principle by his own investigations. But here lies another pitfall; to set out from unresolved difficulties of a given biblical episode in order to review the solutions offered to them in later writings is to look for common interpretive aims. Such an investigation usually entails playing down or disregarding the specific function of a biblical text in individual compositions. Cf. Vermes’s approach in ‘Bible and Midrash’, 59-91.
Yet while biblical elements in other bodies of literature have received more attention, little has been done on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Apart from scattered comments in monographs, commentaries and various articles, few works have been devoted entirely to this aspect in the literature under discussion. Much pertinent material may be found in various studies, but they have never been assembled and systematized.

DEFINITIONS AND METHOD

Every systematic treatment of the study must tackle the problem of methodology. Until recently the work done on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha was mostly concerned with identifying and analysing diverse biblical elements. Studies of the wider functional contexts of such elements are only gradually beginning to be published. But such studies are few and of limited scope and methodology, with only occasional comparisons with other bodies of literature. This only enhances the need for a more rigorous and comprehensive methodology which takes into account both the general and specific literary features of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.

One of the major weaknesses of previous investigations is their inductive approach, method and definitions being generalized from a close analysis of specific individual cases. Such an approach tends to concentrate on elements of content at the expense of the formal and functional. The result is a limited and fragmentary methodological framework, which has to be modified with each new text. The present chapter is based on the fundamental characteristics of the literature under discussion and its use of biblical elements. The definitions and method proposed here are all derived from these fundamental notions.

Thus, instead of defining only what a certain biblical element implies in a given context, the stress will be on how it is said and why. Our approach will be to outline the architecture and structural patterns, and the compositional techniques, inasmuch as they help to identify biblical elements and define their functions. Such a functional approach is especially helpful when analysing the works of composite literary character which make up the bulk of the corpus.

The functional-structural form of analysis also suits the character of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha as written compositions. Unlike early biblical literature, these works were composed mostly by individual authors, as is evident from their unified plan and purpose. To a large extent, this is true even of writings with a complex literary history, such as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; for even in such cases we are dealing with a history of written documents. It is clear that these works were conceived as written compositions, and were produced in a literate milieu. As a rule they have no oral prehistory, a stage assumed for many of the biblical literary complexes.

PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

A thorough and systematic application of the functional analysis outlined above would demand a full understanding of the literary genres and forms employed, and their social and historical background. Such a task, however, is far beyond the size and scope of the present chapter. It would also demand a summary of results of research hardly yet begun. The present survey, therefore, cannot pretend to be more than programmatic and suggestive. It will not be able to go

---

4 This is especially true of expositionary genres, such as the midrash, the pesharim and Philo’s commentaries. Understandably, research on these works has tended to concentrate on the exegetical implications of the use of Mikra, and less on its function within the structure of the work. A change in this orientation has recently been seen in works such as Nichiporetzky, Commentaire Cazeaux, La Trame. For the pesharim cf. the older works of Elliger, Studien; Bruce, Biblical Exegesis, and more recently Browner, Pesher of Habbakkuk, 23-36; Horgan, Pesharim, 229-59; Nitzan, Pesher Habakkuk, 27-79; cf. Dimant, ‘Qumran Sectarian Literature’, 504-08. The non-expositional literature most extensively researched is the s. Cf. the reviews by Kaiser, Use of the Old Testament, and Moody Smith, ‘Use of the Old Testament’.

5 Much material may be found in the volumes of the series Jiidische Schriften aus hellenistisch-romischer Zeit (JSHRZ) and the Anchor Bible – Apocrypha. Various monographs and articles on individual issues will be referred to throughout the chapter.

6 Some of the materials were assembled by Zink, Use of the Old Testament. The work is hampered by a confused methodology. Of much relevance to the present enquiry is the recent survey by Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, which concerns inner-biblical interpretation. The author has assembled an impressive amount of data and provides many new insights into them. The weakness of the work lies in the absence of an overall comprehensive formal framework. It seems to me that the work falls short of a dermo 381ff.

7 This is the typical attitude of the current commentators, even the most recent ones (cf. n. 5).

8 Cf. e.g. the studies of Hartman, Asking for a Meaning, on I Enoch, and Sheppard, Wisdom, on Ben Sir and Baruch.

9 This is especially true of in certain studies. Cf. e.g. monographs such as Guinoy, Use of the Old Testament; Freed, Old Testament. See also n. 4. Thus, for instance, much was made of the affinity of the so-called Formula Quotations in the Gospel of Matthew to the Qumranic Pesharim. Cf. the influential monograph by Stendahl, School of St. Matthew, esp. pp. 183-202; cf. Ellis, below, pp. 692ff.

10 Cf. for instance the attempts to define the genre ‘midrash’, as represented by Bloch, ‘Midrash’ and Wright, Literary Genre.

11 Elements proposed by Hartman (‘Survey’, 333-34) for the definition of the apocalyptic genre are also relevant for the present discussion. Hartmann stresses that the constituents of a genre are not only linguistic (style, vocabulary and phraseology) or propositional (typical themes and motifs) and their structure of presentation, but also ‘the functional relations between the elements’.

12 Cf. the comments on the apocalyptic genre by Koch, Rediscovery, ET, 23-28 (esp. 27f.). Many works, such as testaments, narratives or wisdom discourses, interweave smaller units of different forms into their framework: thus we find prayers and tests in narrative works (cf. e.g. Tobit 3-14 and Hmac 1-2) or in wisdom discourses (cf. e.g. Wis 7-9), and autobiographical accounts in apocalyptic works (cf. 1 Enoch 83). There is also an inverse phenomenon: testaments include wisdom discourses or apocalyptic predictions, and are framed in a narrative. In fact, the tendency to create complex literary forms is operative in the biblical literature itself. Cf. Fishbane, Biblical interpretation, 271-73, who notes the similar phenomenon of Mischgaugung in the biblical law.

As a rule, genres referred to in current literature the use of biblical elements in stylistic functions are not sufficiently differentiated. Biblical materials are always as theological elements received most of the scholarly attention, the reader may find in compositional use biblical elements are interwoven into the work without external formal markers; in expositional use they are presented explicitly as such, with a clear external marker. These two distinctive functions have different aims. In the exposition the divine word is introduced in order to interpret it as such, while the composition is employed when the biblical element is subordinated to the independent aim and structure of its new context.

These two fundamentally different attitudes to the biblical material find expression in corresponding different literary genres and styles. Thus, we find literary genres in which the exposition predominates, while others prefer a composition. In the first type, the aim is to explain the biblical text. This usually involves a fixed terminology and special syntactical patterns, in order to separate the biblical elements from their exposition. Thus one often finds the biblical materials presented in lemmata, clearly distinct from the expositional

For the present, there exist systematic attempts to define literary genres only of the genre ‘testament’ and the genre used by the apocalyptic literature. Cf. von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten 1; Collins, ‘Jewish Apocalypses’. See also Hartman, ‘Survey’.

As theological elements received most of the scholarly attention, the reader may be referred to current commentaries. Problems of style and phraseology need a separate study, which would involve, among other things, complex textual investigations which cannot be embarked upon here. A similar distinction between ‘creative description’ and ‘creative exposition’ was advanced by Heinemann, Darkehei ha-Aggada. 164-64, 176. Another distinction along similar lines, between texte explicuit and texte continué was suggested by Perrot in discussing the literary genre of the Biblical Antiquities. Cf. Perrot (ed.) Pseudo-Philon, 2, 24-27.

The distinction between expositional and compositional genres permits a better appreciation of the distinctive character of the midrashic texts and the compositional texts. Thus, for instance, the Genesis Apocryphon, which was judged by many to be a targum or a midrash (cf. the survey of scholarly opinions by Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 7-11), is clearly a narrative composition utilizing the biblical text as part of its own running story, and not a midrash or a targum. To apply the term ‘midrash’ to works of the type ‘rewritten Bible’ as done by Wright, Genre Midrash, 52ff. and Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, 67-126 is misleading.

For the present, there exist systematic attempts to define literary genres only of the genre ‘testament’ and the genre used by the apocalyptic literature. Cf. von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten 1; Collins, ‘Jewish Apocalypses’. See also Hartman, ‘Survey’.

As theological elements received most of the scholarly attention, the reader may be referred to current commentaries. Problems of style and phraseology need a separate study, which would involve, among other things, complex textual investigations which cannot be embarked upon here. A similar distinction between ‘creative description’ and ‘creative exposition’ was advanced by Heinemann, Darkehei ha-Aggada. 164-64, 176. Another distinction along similar lines, between texte explicuit and texte continué was suggested by Perrot in discussing the literary genre of the Biblical Antiquities. Cf. Perrot (ed.) Pseudo-Philon, 2, 24-27.

The distinction between expositional and compositional genres permits a better appreciation of the distinctive character of the midrashic texts and the compositional texts. Thus, for instance, the Genesis Apocryphon, which was judged by many to be a targum or a midrash (cf. the survey of scholarly opinions by Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 7-11), is clearly a narrative composition utilizing the biblical text as part of its own running story, and not a midrash or a targum. To apply the term ‘midrash’ to works of the type ‘rewritten Bible’ as done by Wright, Genre Midrash, 52ff. and Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, 67-126 is misleading.

14 For the present, there exist systematic attempts to define literary genres only of the genre ‘testament’ and the genre used by the apocalyptic literature. Cf. von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten 1; Collins, ‘Jewish Apocalypses’. See also Hartman, ‘Survey’.

15 As theological elements received most of the scholarly attention, the reader may be referred to current commentaries. Problems of style and phraseology need a separate study, which would involve, among other things, complex textual investigations which cannot be embarked upon here. A similar distinction between ‘creative description’ and ‘creative exposition’ was advanced by Heinemann, Darkehei ha-Aggada. 164-64, 176. Another distinction along similar lines, between texte explicuit and texte continué was suggested by Perrot in discussing the literary genre of the Biblical Antiquities. Cf. Perrot (ed.) Pseudo-Philon, 2, 24-27.

17 The distinction between expositional and compositional genres permits a better appreciation of the distinctive character of the midrashic texts and the compositional texts. Thus, for instance, the Genesis Apocryphon, which was judged by many to be a targum or a midrash (cf. the survey of scholarly opinions by Fitzmyer, Genesis Apocryphon, 7-11), is clearly a narrative composition utilizing the biblical text as part of its own running story, and not a midrash or a targum. To apply the term ‘midrash’ to works of the type ‘rewritten Bible’ (as done by Wright, Genre Midrash, 52ff. and Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, 67-126) is misleading.

18 The lemma-and-comment form was widespread in the Ancient East in interpreting dreams and omens, and was adopted by apocalyptic literature as exemplified by the Book of Daniel (Cf. Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 446-57) and the Qumranic Pesherim (cf. Horgan, Pesharim, 230-37, 244-45). Alexander, ‘Rabbinic Rules’, compares the lemmatic structure of the rabbinic midrash with the literary structure of the paraphrastic Aramaic targums. He rightly stresses their different literary character, in spite of their similarity. Cf. above, ch. 6.

19 In current literature the use of biblical elements in stylistic functions are not sufficiently differentiated from other types of uses.
Likewise, for procedures employed in explicit exposition we shall use the current 'hermeneutical rules', such as those used in the rabbinic midrash and the Qumran pesharim. Philo utilized other 'hermeneutical rules', mainly allegory, which was borrowed from the Hellenistic philosophical exposition of Homer. The use made of biblical elements in rhetorical as well as in compositional contexts involves a variety of exegetical techniques which have not been properly studied until now. In the present discussion the techniques involved in rhetorical use will be termed 'exegetical procedures', while those used in compositions will be termed 'interpretative procedures'.

Another helpful distinction is that between narrative and discourse as genres or literary forms. One of the results of the present study is a clear distinction between how biblical elements work in narrative and in discourse. From this perspective it does not matter whether the discourse or the narrative operates as the main or the subservient genre. We will often find, for example, that biblical elements function in the same way in the testament genre, be it a large testament comprising an entire work or a small one forming only a subordinate unit in a larger work of a different genre.

Finally, these definitions are offered as a framework for the analysis of specific texts. But as the literature under discussion rarely includes pure exposition, the latter will not be discussed. The chapter will be devoted mainly to the use of biblical elements in compositional use, either in rhetorical or other contexts.

Explicit Use of Mikra

The explicit use of Mikra in our literature means that the biblical elements are introduced with an explicit reference to their source. Such a use consists mostly of explicit biblical quotations, or references to biblical personalities and circumstances. Both types are made explicit by overt references; either by naming the biblical source of the quotation or by mentioning a name or circumstances taken from a specific and recognizable context. Both types use special stylistic devices in order to refer the reader to the function and meaning intended.

A survey of the available material reveals that these usages often occur in discourses in order to illustrate and prove a point as a part of a rhetorical argument. In these contexts the expositional function of the biblical quotation or reference, as well as its exegetical contents, form part of rhetorical argumentation.

**Explicit Quotations**

Explicit quotations are biblical phrases of at least three words, more or less accurately reproduced, and introduced by special terms and explicit references to the source. In our literature such quotations are relatively few and occur mainly in the non-biblical narrative, for the literary character of the pseudepigraphic or biblical narrative excludes such quotations (cf. below). Typical cases are to be found in what may be termed 'free narrative', namely, narrative which does not rework a biblical story. In the literature at hand such are most of the narrative books of the *Apocrypha*, fictional as well as *historical*.23

The following is a list of explicit quotations in the Apocryphal narrative books:

**Pentateuch**
- Gen 2:18
- Gen 34:7
- Gen 49:7
- Exod 15:17
- Exod 20:17
- Exod 23:7
- Lev 26:44
- Lev 26:29
- Deut 30:20
- Deut 32:59
- Deut 32:36
- Deut 33:3
- Amos 8:10
- Isa 43:2
- Ezek 37:13
- Ps 79:2-3
- Ps 34:20
- Prov 3:18

**Prophets**
- Tobit 2:6
- 4 Macc 2:19
- 2 Macc 1:29
- 4 Macc 2:5
- Susanna 53
- 2 Macc 10:26
- 3 Macc 6:15
- Bar 2:2
- 4 Macc 18:19
- 4 Macc 18:18
- 2 Macc 7:6
- 4 Macc 17:19

**Psalms**
- 1 Macc 7:16-17
- 4 Macc 18:15

**Writings**
- 4 Macc 18:16

---

20 On the use in the pesharim of hermeneutical rules similar to the ones used by the rabbinic midrashim cf. Dimant, ‘Qumran Sectarian Writings’ 505-07; Brooke, *Exegesis*, 8-79; Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 139-208 offers a collection of disparate materials with no conceptual framework.

21 This similarity comes out well when comparing biblical elements in units of different size but of the same genre.

22 The commonest of these arguments is the so-called Rule of Justice, that is ‘identical treatment of beings or situations which can be integrated in the same category’. Cf. Perelman-Olbrechts-Tyteca, *Traité de l’Argumentation*, 294-95.

23 On the basic structural identity of historical and fictional narratives cf. Ricœur, ‘Narrative Function’. A comparison between the narrative function of books considered historical, as 1Macc and 2 Macc, and that of historical novellae such as Tobit and Judith, should be made the subject of an illuminating study.

24 2 Macc 7:6 was analyzed in Dimant, ‘The Problem of a Non-Translated Biblical Greek’.
The picture emerging from these instances may be summarized as follows:

a. All explicit quotations from the Tora are used in discourses of various types.

Two of the quotations from the Prophets and Psalms appear in narratives.

b. The explicit quotations from the Tora always cite a real speech in the original, made either by God or by Moses, and one by Jacob (4 Mac. 2:19). Accordingly they are introduced by formulae including verbs of saying or speaking.

c. The Tora quotations cite laws (Tob 8:6; Sus 53, 4 Mac. 2:5) or divine promises. In fact, in their manner of introducing explicit quotations the Apocrypha books follow closely the biblical books themselves.

While the general character of the quotations in our literature is still close to biblical usage, 4 Mac is different. This work is not a proper narrative, but a philosophical encomium, which uses the story of the Jewish martyrs in the time of Antiochus IV to illustrate a philosophical principle, namely, that reason should govern emotions. Most of the quotations from the Pentateuch follow the pattern of explicit citations in other works. They use similar terminology of introduction and they occur in discourse as part of the argument. But 4 Mac employs the quotations in a deliberative discourse, and it evokes the biblical text not in order to demand the fulfilment of the Law or a divine promise, but in order to interpret it in the light of certain philosophical ideas.

A special case is presented by the catalogue of references and quotations in the final speech of the mother, in which she evokes the education of her children by their dead father (ch. 18). The quotations are from the Tora, the Prophets and the Writings (Proverbs), and used as scriptural proof of the ethical religious principles of the father. Both the exegetical purpose and the form of the quotations differ from other books and closely resemble the types of quotations most frequent in expository genres such as the rabbinic midrash. This may reflect a later usage more frequent at the time of the composition of 4 Mac, during the first century C.E.

In our literature the paucity of explicit quotations from books other than the Tora is striking compared with the profusion of implicit quotations and allusions from almost all the biblical books. This may be explained by the different usages involved: the explicit quotations present the sacred word as such, while the implicit quotation is just one of the elements of the literary composition. A similar situation is to be observed in the biblical literature itself: explicit quotations are rare and appear chiefly in late biblical books, while implicit quotations in compositional use are current in most of the later biblical writings.

**EXAMPLES**

_Tobit 8:6 (= Gen 2:18)_

_Cf._: so ἐπόησας τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἐπόησας (ἰδωμα) αὐτῷ βοηθῆν στήριγμα Ἐκέκο τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξ ἀμφότερον ἐγένετο τὸ σπέρμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἐξ ἐλέους ὅτι Οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπων μόνον, ποιήσουμεν αὐτῷ βοηθῆν ἔμισσον αὐτῷ.

**Translation**

_You_ made Adam and made (νεότε) for him a helper and a support, and _You_ said: 'It is not good for the man to be alone; let us make him a helper like him_.'

---

25 Judith 9:2 is analyzed in detail below, p. 397.
26 In biblical literature, too, divine speech is quoted in various prayers, e.g. Gen 32:10, 13, Exod 33:12, Num 11:21, Jer 32:25.
27 ‘Say’ (εἰλεχθεὶν) in Tob 6:6, Jdt 9:2, 3 Mac 6:15, referring to a divine speech, and 2 Mac 1:29 referring to Moses. Cf. also Tob 2:6 referring to the prophet Amos. The word ‘explain’ (δοκοειπείν) is used in 2 Mac 7:6, 10:26 of the Tora and of Moses.
28 Explicit quotations of the Tora are rare in biblical literature. There is only one case which conforms to the criteria defined above, namely 2 Kgs 14:6 (< 2 Chr 25:4), citing Deut 24:16.
29 Another type of scriptural reference does not involve a quotation in the sense defined above, but serves as a scriptural support for a particular deed, and is accompanied by the expression ‘according to the Tora of Moses’. Cf. 1 Kgs 2:3, 2 Kgs 23:21, Ezra 3:4, Neh 10:35, 2 Chr 30:5, 18; 31:3, 34:21, 35:12. In some cases the verse adduces scriptural support and then goes on to employ it in a composition. In this way the verse serves to indicate the conformity of an action to the Tora by referring to the pertinent verse. Cf. Josh 8:31 using Deut 27:7-26, Neh 8:14 presents an interesting case, for it employs all the relevant verses (Lev 23:34, 39 + Deut 16:13) in an abbreviated way. The same technical term for scriptural support occurs also in the Apocrypha. Cf. e.g. Tob 1:8, 7:13, 1 Mac 3:56, 4:47, 53.
30 A major Stoic tenet. The definition of the literary form of the work is debated. The earlier view defined it as a philosophical diatribe of which the second part is an encomium for the martyrs. Cf. Zimmerman, ‘Philosophische Dichtung’ in Fishbane’s collection of data in Biblical Interpretation, a mine of examples for previous biblical books by later ones, though his method of classification is different. Cf. pp. 109-12 for explicit quotations, 307-14 for implicit quotations and pp. 138-43 for allusions.
31 As the reading of the Septuagint confirms to the criteria defined above, namely 2 Kgs 14:6 (< 2 Chr 25:4), citing Deut 24:16.
32 As the reading of the Septuagint confirms to the criteria defined above, namely 2 Kgs 14:6 (< 2 Chr 25:4), citing Deut 24:16.
33 It should be noted in this context that 4 Mac already employs the term _nometo_ in the late sense as a technical name for the Pentateuch. Cf. Redditt, ‘Concept’, 251.
34 Cf. Gilbert, ‘Wisdom Literature’, 318. For a mid-first century date cf. Bickermann, _Studies_ 1, 276-77; Anderson ‘4 Maccabees’ 534; Schürer, rev. ed. 3.1, 591. The rhetorical Asian style of the work also points to the first or second centuries. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, _Quatrieme Livre_, 178-79.
35 Fishbane’s collection of data in Biblical Interpretation is a mine of examples for _the_ use of previous biblical books by later ones, though his method of classification is different. Cf. pp. 109-12 for explicit quotations, 307-14 for implicit quotations and pp. 138-43 for allusions.
36 Text following Hanhart, ed. _Tobit_.
37 As the reading of the Septuagint confirms to the criteria defined above, namely 2 Kgs 14:6 (< 2 Chr 25:4), citing Deut 24:16.
38 This is also the reading of the Palestinian Targums, the Syriac and the Vulgate, and also Jubilees, _ibid_. Apparently no Hebrew variant lies behind the translation, but a common exegetical tradition of a difficult word in the masoretic text (יהודה). On the difference between the rendering here and that of the received text of the Septuagint cf. _Hanhart, Texte_ . _Tobit_, 34-35, n. 5.
39 Mainly following the rendering of Zimmerman, _Book of Tobit_, 93, 95.
40 The translation follows the interpretative rendering, but does not reconstruct a Vorlage. Cf. n. 36.
This is taken from the prayer of Tobias, son of Tobit, uttered just after his exorcising the demon from his bride Sara, and before the consummation of the marriage. The prayer apparently functions in the story as a Blessing of the Bridgroom’s, as it was probably practised in Israel during the Second Commonwealth.  

The prayer consists of four parts:  
(a) 8:5—An opening address of praise to God.  
(b) 8:6—Evoking the creation of Adam and Eve (quotation).  
(c) 8:7a—Statement of deeds and intentions of Tobias and Sara.  
(d) 8:7b—Request for long life together.  

The prayer forms a carefully constructed argument: first, Tobias affirms the sovereignty of God over the created world by referring to the praise offered him by the entire creation. Then Tobias evokes particular divine acts of creation, the creation of Adam and Eve. He goes on to quote the divine words which give the reason for the creation of the woman. By evoking these acts Tobias points to the laws governing human existence as laid down by the creative acts and sanctioned by God. These laws prescribe that human beings should live in couples in order to support each other and procreate. Tobias then states that his marriage conforms with the divine law that man should live with a wife, as expressed in Gen 2:18. Tobias terminates his prayer by a request for long life together, for obedience to the law.  

A closer look at the function of biblical elements in the prayer reveals some significant features: the prayer refers to the divine actions and divine speech by using the same biblical verse, Gen 2:18, but in each case it is employed differently: in depicting the action the biblical textual elements are introduced in an implicit manner, while the speech is introduced through an explicit and accurate quotation. One may wonder what is the precise function of the quotation as distinct from the depiction. The answer may lie in the understanding of the speech as a divine commandment, distinct from the act of creation. Tobias is thus saying that his conduct agrees with what was laid down by the creative deed as well as with an express command of God. In this way the understanding of the biblical verse as a divine command becomes part of the entire argument.

---

40 The prayer occupies a central place in the chiastic-concentric structure of the Book of Tobit. By virtue of this position the quotation also acquires a central place in the work.  
41 The request expressed in the prayer involves several rhetorical arguments such as that of the part and the whole (for establishing the identity of Tobias and Sara with Adam and Eve), and the Rule of Justice (to request an equal treatment for Tobias and Sara as for Adam and Eve). For these arguments cf. Perelman-Olbrechts-Tyteca, *Traité de l’Argumentation*, 294-97, 311-15.
Toh 2.6 (= Amos 8:10)

Text\(^ {45}\)

G:\(\text{καὶ ἐμνήσθην τῆς προφητείας Ἄμως καθὼς εἶπεν Στραφθοῦσαι αἱ ἱεραί ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος, καὶ πάσαι αἱ εὐφροσύναι ὑμῶν εἰς θῆλην καὶ ἐκλαυσα}.

Translation\(^ {47}\)

And I recalled the prophet Amos, as he said:

‘Your feasts shall be turned into mourning
and all your joys into lamentation’,

(and I wept.)

The quotation occurs at the end of the episode in which Tobit tells how on the eve of the Feast of Shavuot he has buried a Jew left dead in the market. The quotation is introduced by the term ‘recall’ (ἐμνήσθην), which equates the verse with the preceding situation. This is also indicated by the terms used: the ‘feasts’ of the verse are identical with the feast in the story, and the mourning of the prophet is equated with the weeping of Tobit. Thus Tobit is made to read his own situation into the prophecy of Amos, and sees in his own circumstances its fulfilment.

This is another example of the use of actualization as an exegetical principle, here applied to a prophecy.

1 Macc 7:16-17 (= Ps 79:2-3)

Text\(^ {46}\)

καὶ ἐνεπίστευτον αὐτῷ, καὶ συνέλαβεν ἔξω τῶν ἔξωσεν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἡμέρας μιὰ κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ὅταν ἐγέμφην αὐτὸν κρέας δούλων σου καὶ αἰμα αὐτῶν ἐξέχεαν κύκλῳ ἱεροσύλλημα, καὶ σὺ πάντας ὑπατεῖται.

Translation\(^ {49}\)

And they believed him; but he arrested sixty of them and put them to death in a single day, in accordance with what he wrote: ‘The flesh of Your Hasidim and their blood
They did shed around Jerusalem,
And there was no one to bury them’.

---

\(^{45}\) Text following Hanhart, ed. Tobit.

\(^{46}\) For textual variants of the Septuagint cf. Hanhart, Text, 35.

\(^{47}\) Mainly following Zimmerman, Book of Tobit.

\(^{48}\) Text following Kappler, ed. Maccabaeorum Liber 1.

\(^{49}\) Translation following Goldstein, 1 Maccabees. For a detailed literary analysis cf. recently Martola, Capture and Liberation, 47-48, 259-67.

---

This verse offers another example of the exegetical procedure of actualization. But in this case the quotation is taken from a psalm and is applied to a real historical event. The introductory formula ‘in accordance with’ establishes a relationship between the written word and the historical event. Such relationship rests primarily on an exegetical equation between the Hasidim mentioned in the psalm with the historical Asideans. As a result, also the contemporary situation is read into the psalm, which is apparently considered as a prophecy.\(^ {50}\)

In both purpose and method this quotation is strikingly reminiscent of the Qumranic pesharim.\(^ {51}\)

It is also noteworthy that in the above instances the quotations occur in narratives. Yet they obviously do not belong to the plot. The quotations express, in fact, reflections on the events taking place in the plot, put either in the mouth of one of the protagonists, or, as is the case in 1 Macc, expressed by the author himself. In this sense they may be viewed as belonging to a discourse, and not to the narrative.

Another point of interest is the fact that the quotation of Psalm 79 is slightly curtailed, omitting some details. Yet it functions precisely as do exact quotations. This shows that a precise reproduction of the text cited was not imperative; it was enough to quote the essentials, and sometimes it was deemed necessary to alter some details in accordance with the context.\(^ {52}\)

**EXPLICIT MENTION OF PERSONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES**

The use of biblical elements includes mention of persons and circumstances. Such cases serve as markers announcing a biblical context. Although this type of biblical reference is not followed by a formalized exegesis, the exegesis is present, embedded in the rhetorical context.

Of this there are mainly two types in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: catalogues of biblical persons, and isolated references to persons or circumstances. These two types often occur in ‘free narrative’. A third type of explicit mention of biblical persons or circumstances occurs in genres such as ‘rewritten Bible’ and pseudepigraphic biographies, and will be discussed below.

---

\(^{50}\) In the Psalms scroll from Qumran II QPλ 27: 11 David is considered a prophet who composed the psalms under divine inspiration. This explains why the Qumranites wrote pesher-like commentaries on the biblical prophecies as well as on psalms. David may have been seen as a prophet already by the Chronicler and Nehemiah, both giving him the prophetic title ‘the Man of God’ (2 Chr 8:14; Neh 12:24, 36).


\(^{52}\) Note e.g. 2 Macc 10:26 where the quotation is put into indirect speech. This procedure is also found in implicit quotations.
1. List of historical examples

The lists under discussion are known as ‘lists of examples’ or ‘catalogues of paradigms’. These are concise references to historical precedents grouped in a sequence of examples in a special literary structure, which is usually considered a distinct literary form. Seven such lists occur in our literature:\(^{54}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Macc 2:49-64</td>
<td>(in exhortation within (testament))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Macc 2:1-8; 6:4-8</td>
<td>(in prayers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Macc 16:18-23; (18:11-13)</td>
<td>(in admonition)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wis 10:1-21</td>
<td>(in hortatory sapiential diatribe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir 16:6-10</td>
<td>(in sapiential exhortation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ezra 7:106-110</td>
<td>(in polemical dialogue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Test. Naphtali 3)</td>
<td>(in hortatory testament)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rhetorical nature of these lists comes through clearly in their function, structure and form. Such lists always occur in discourses. Most of the examples are found in exhortations, and are tinged with sapiential elements and terminology.\(^{56}\) Only two of the examples, both figuring in 3 Macc, occur in prayers. As a rule, such lists are introduced by a concise formulation of the central idea dominating the list. Then follow historical figures arranged in chronological order; each characterized by the facet of its career, relevant to the principle given in the introduction. Often introduction and examples are linked by terminology and structure.\(^{57}\)

\(^{53}\) Also known as Beispelreihen. Cf. Lampe, ‘Exemplum’; Berger, ‘Gattungen’ 1147-48. On this point Berger bases himself almost exclusively on the analysis of Schmitt, ‘Struktur’. Schmitt concluded for Wis that the list in question is modeled after the catalogues of historical examples in Greek and Hellenistic literature. This conclusion is fully adopted by Berger and applied to the genre in general. A similar argument was recently advanced in connection with Sir 44-50 by Lee, Studies, 29-48, 241-45. Yet it should be noted that Wis is the exception to the rule, being a Greek work, and overtly drawing upon Hellenistic rhetoric and philosophy. This is by no means the case for other works of this form.

\(^{54}\) Berger, ibid. adds to the lists also ApZeph9:4 (in the enumeration of Winternute, ‘Apocalypse of Zephaniah’, 514). But it is questionable whether this list belongs to the present literary form, as it lacks the fundamental structure and rhetorical purpose common to all the other lists. For similar reasons the catalogue of the Praise of the Fathers in Sir 44-50 should not be included here (cf. Schmitt, ‘Struktur’, 1, n. 1) despite the arguments of Lee, Studies, 29-48.

\(^{55}\) Although not included in our literature, the list in CD 2:14-21 contains all the features of the genre, and should in fact, be discussed with them. The same is true of Heb 11 and 1 Clement 4:5-6, 9:2-12:8 ad deduced by Berger, ‘Gattungen’. Of special note is the affinity between the lists in Sir 16:1-12 and CD 2:3-11 which have discussed in detail in my dissertation Fallen Angels, 146-51. Berger has compared the two lists in respect to the use of the term ‘stubbornness of heart’. Cf. Berger, ‘Hartherzigkeit’. See also the comments on the literary structure of the lists by Lee, Studies, 29-48.

\(^{56}\) The character of the lists as examples of conduct makes them suitable for sapiential admonitions; cf. Berger, ‘Gattungen’, 1146.

\(^{57}\) Cf. the analysis of Wis 10 by Schmidt, ‘Struktur’, 13-19, which is valid for the remaining lists.

Each of these lists gives examples to buttress the argument presented in the larger discourse. The role of the historical or mythical example in rhetorical argument was well-known in the ancient world, and was used extensively in biblical as well as in classical literature.\(^{58}\) This role consists of three functions: the example establishes a general rule, or illustrates a rule already in force, or is a model or anti-model in order to recommend or condemn a certain type or behaviour.\(^{59}\) Our lists use examples in the second and third functions, usually combined. Such a combination is to be found mostly in discourses of a hortatory nature, whereas in prayers the examples are used only as illustrations.

In the hortatory and liturgical contexts of our lists we find that the principle most frequently advocated is that of divine justice, as expressed in reward and punishment. This is the subject of the lists in 1 Macc 2:49-64, 3 Macc 2:1-8, 6:4-8 and Sir 16:6-10 (Compare CD 2:14-3:12).

A closely related theme is the one recommending pious action found in 1 Macc 2:49-64, 4 Macc 16:18-23 and Sir 16:6-10. Wis 10:1-21 propounds a similar rule, when it equates wisdom with justice and urges the adoption of wise action. Only 4 Ezra 7:106-110 stands apart in that its list may be seen as an illustration of the Prayer of the Righteous, and not as a model of them.

An interesting feature of these lists is that they include both wicked and righteous figures. Thus 1 Macc 2, 4 Macc 16 and 4 Ezra 7 produce lists of righteous figures, while 3 Macc 2 and Sir 16 (and also CD 2-3) present lists of the Wicked. In both cases the rhetorical result is to illustrate divine justice and pious conduct by either adhering to the model of the Righteous in order to receive their recompense, or by shunning the sins of the Wicked for fear of punishment. In two cases we even have a combined list: in 3 Macc 6:4-8 the wicked gentle rulers Pharaoh and Sanherib and their respective punishments are contrasted with the suffering righteous who were miraculously saved – Daniel and his three friends, and Jonah. In Wis 10:1-21 the list achieves a perfect symmetry by matching seven righteous alternating with seven wicked.\(^{60}\)
EXAMPLE

1 Macc 2:49-64

The long list of biblical precedents forms the major part of Mattathias’ testament on his deathbed. After a narrative introduction modelled on the Testament of Jacob (Gen 49), Mattathias depicts the difficult circumstances. He admonishes his sons to be zealous for the Tora (ζηλώσατε τῷ νόμῳ) and to keep the Covenant of the fathers. Then follow figures from biblical history whose lives attest to their zeal and their recompense. Thus the list illustrates the principle, and serves as its model. The catalogue of various traditional merits can be viewed as exemplifying the principle ‘be zealous for the Tora’.Clearly the author conceives the good deeds enumerated in his sequence as zeal for the Tora. Thus the term ‘zeal’, central to the religious ethos of this passage (cf. at the end of the testament 2:58 ζηλώσατε γίγνεσθαι and in 2:24, 26-27 ζηλώσατε τῷ νόμῳ) covers a wider range of acts and gives the term a large and comprehensive meaning.

The actual list is introduced by the phrase: 'remember the deeds of our fathers, a typical way of introducing historical precedents. The examples are all structured in the same way: the merits of the heroes on one hand, and their recompense on the other. Each good act is introduced by the preposition εν and a substantive standing in the dative, while the recompense is usually indicated by a finite verb. All the good deeds are models of the rule at the beginning of the list and winding it up (inclusio τοῦ νόμου/τοῦ νόμου in w. 50, 68).

Although the examples use biblical elements, they seldom use quotations but prefer to reformulate the biblical circumstances. Yet in addition to the names, the author gives one or two terms, taken from the original biblical text, as shown in the following list:

Abraham – ‘found faithful when tested’ the formula is used of Abraham also in Sir 44:20 lxx, and is composed of an allusion to Gen 22:1 ‘God tested’ (lxx: ἐπείρασεν), and to Neh 9:8 ‘you have found his heart faithful to you’. The second part of the verse is a slightly altered reproduction of Gen 15:6 (influenced by the formula applied to Phineas in Ps 106:31).


61 Text according to Kappler, ed. Maccabaeorum Liber I For translation cf. Goldstein, J Maccabees.
62 For the testament form of this passage cf. the analysis of von Nordheim, Die Lehre der Alten 2, 5-8.
63 For a detailed analysis of the motif of zeal in Num and in 1 Macc cf. Martola, Capture and Liberation, 208-2 1.

Phineas – ‘zeal’ – the Greek here reproduces the Hebrew usage of ליפש (ra'yeh) said of Phineas in Num 25:13. (The expression ‘a Covenant of Priesthood forever’ is also taken from Num.) The same expression is used of Elijah and Mattathias himself (2:26). It is also used of the chief virtue which Mattathias recommends to his sons at the beginning of his testament.


David – ‘the throne of kingdom forever’ – cf. 2 Sam 7:13w.

Elijah – ‘zeal’ – cf. 1 Kgs 19:10. Interestingly, the author here adds ‘for the Tora’, not found in the biblical parlance, but typical of our work. ‘was taken up as if into heaven’ (ἀνελήμφθη ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν), a precise reproduction of the LXX to 2 Kgs 2:11 (καὶ ἀνελήμφθη ἡ λίμνη...ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν; compare Sir 48:9 ὁ ἀνελήμφθησεν).

Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael – ‘maintained their faith’, ‘were saved’ – cf. Dan 3:23 MT.


The techniques of evoking biblical circumstances, as used in this type of literary form, may be described as introducing an explicit element, a name of a biblical figure, summarizing the most typical aspect of its life, and finally sprinkling it with terms taken from the original source.

A comparison between the lists of examples and the explicit quotations brings out their differences and similarities: while quotations are made explicit by an introductory formula, the lists are made explicit by details from the biblical materials, such as names or characteristic features, and often both. In addition, such lists use terms from the original contexts, and though they are not proper quotations, they evoke the biblical text.

The exegetical purpose of such lists is clear from the rhetorical use of the lists. It always involves the actualization of major biblical tenets within an argument, serving the aim of a larger literary unit, such as prayer or admonition.

2. Isolated References

The use of biblical circumstances as examples is not limited to lists, but is also found in isolated instances. Such cases are very similar to the lists of historical examples, and they often appear in prayers or discourses.

65 The Greek of 1 Macc uses here the term ἐκκλησία which regularly translates the Hebrew ליפש, while the story of Num 14 employs the term הָרְשָׁע normally translated in the LXX by ἐκκλησία. But undoubtedly 1 Macc had in mind the story of Num
The Rape of Dinah (Gen 34)

The story of the Rape of Dinah (Gen 34) offers a good example of a whole biblical context in a rhetorical function. It is used in three texts: Judith 9:2-4, Jub 30 and Test. Levi 2:1-2:5.66

In all three instances the original biblical episode is evoked by the same technique: by introducing names and events of the original story, and by re-employing elements of style and terminology. Of special interest is the fact that all three make reference to the four central terms; two are taken from the biblical context: the defilement (of Dinah)67 and the sword (by which the sons of Jacob killed the Shechemites).68 Two additional ones, vengeance and zeal,69 do not occur in the original Dinah story but refer to other biblical contexts, and are essential to the interpretation of Gen 34 in these writings. At the same time the writings differ both in treatment and in presentation because of different literary forms and ideological interests. All three adduce the story of Dinah in discourses and make a rhetorical use of it. But there are important differences between Jub and Judith and Test. Levi. Judith is a ‘free narrative’ and therefore the choice of biblical elements is in itself revealing. Test. Levi is a pseudepigraphon attributed to the biblical figure of Levi, and therefore is more closely bound with the biblical narrative, but it still has a considerable freedom in reworking biblical materials. Whereas Jub systematically reworks the narrative of Genesis. The author is, therefore, working within the framework of the Genesis stories. Consequently the message of Jub is conveyed more by rework-

66 The Rape of Dinah is mentioned by other contemporary authors: it is briefly related by LAB 8:7, and retold in more detail by Josephus, Ant.1:337-40 (cf. the discussion of Franxman, Genesis, 206-08). The Jewish epic poet Theodotus devoted a detailed discussion to Gen 34 in his lost writing On the Jews. Cf. the recent translation and discussions: Fallows, ‘Theodotus’, 785-89, esp. 786; Walzer, Poetische Schriften, 154-71, esp. 159-61. Cf. van der Horst, below pp. 526-28; Pummer, ‘Genesis 34’, 177-88. A review of the sources mentioning Gen 34 is found in Gutman, Beginnings 1, 251-55.

67 Cf. the masoretic text of Gen 34:5, 13, 27 in the rendering of the LXX μαύρινυ; it is taken up by Test. Levi 7:3 (cf. de Jonge, ed. Testaments, 32) and also by the term θλίψαμα (6:3). Cf. the notes ad loc. by Hollander-de Jonge, Testaments, 147. The term occurs also in Jub 30:2; 4, 6, 13, 14 (cf. the Latinpolluere and the Ethiopic Ḥgḥṣ and Ḥḥḥḥḥ. Cf. Charles, Ethiopic Version, 110-13; see the Vulgate and the Ethiopic version to Gen ad loc.) Judith 9:2 echoes the motif with three similar terms: μιαμα, πλέκων and θλίψαμα. Note also the occurrence of the term ‘shame’ (παθήματι) in Gen 34; 14, rendered by ἀνοντίαν in the LXX and reproduced by Jdt 9:2 and Jub 30:12-13.

68 Compare Gen 34:25-26 with Jdt 9:12. Test. Levi 5:3, 6:15, and 30:5. Death by the sword is often considered a divine punishment. Cf. Lev 26:25, 33, 37; 2 Sam 12:10; Isa 1:20, 34:6; Jer 12:12, 47:6; Ezek 6:3, 11:8, 29:8. Note I Enoch 14:6 where the Giants are annihilated by the sword. This form of death is prescribed also for the Wicked on the Day of Judgment (e.g. 1 Enoch 91:12, 99:16).


67 For the literary methods of Jub, in particular cases cf. recently Endres, Biblical Interpretation. The methodological introduction on pp. 15-17 is disappointing.

68 Cf. the discussion on explicit quotations above. For text see Hanhart, ed. Judith. A new translation has been made by Moore, Judith.

69 Cf. the comments of Haag, Sunder, 44-45, Enslin, Book of Judith, 122.

In Jubilees the Rape of Dinah is in the main narrative taken over from Genesis. Like the entire narrative, it forms part of the angel’s revelation to Moses on Mount Sinai. The main features of the episode are briefly related, accentuating the role of Levi and playing down that of Simeon, in line with the general priestly tendencies of the work. But the true significance of the episode is revealed in one of the additions of the rule prohibiting mixed marriage between Israelites and gentiles (Jub 30:12-21). This rule is read into Lev 18:21, which prohibits an Israelite to offer his offspring to Moloch. Although the author of Jub quotes Lev, he is prevented from stating so explicitly because the pseudepigraphic framework situates the story at a point before the Torah was written. The quotation is, then, said to come from the Heavenly Tablets (Jub 30:8-10).

The story of Dinah at once illustrates the rule, exemplifies transgression of it and shows its punishment. Here too, the wording of Gen 34:7 ‘and this shall not be done’, is seen as a reaffirmation of the rule and its validity for the future, but it is not explicitly quoted, due to the peculiar literary form. The avengers, Simeon and especially Levi, are seen as righteous and zealous for God when they took vengeance on behalf of their sister (30:23). As a reward for such zeal, Levi receives the Priesthood for his offspring (30:18-19).

The Testament of Levi 2:1-2:5-7
In this work the episode of Dinah is mentioned in a narrative section in which Levi tells his sons of his youth. The story of Dinah is evoked by the names and circumstances of the protagonists (2:1-2; 5:3-4; 6:3-11). The story is linked to the promise of priesthood to Levi (5:2), as is clear from the sequence of the episodes. Levi officiates as priest only after killing the Shechemites, which indicates the motif of the priesthood as a reward for Levi’s zeal. These motifs are also indicated by the verb ‘to be zealous’ (ṣaphōn) which is said of Levi (6:3).

The events connected with the Rape are mentioned only in passing, and only as far as they are relevant to the life and mission of Levi.80

Summary – Comparison of the three
The comparison between the three texts shows that the same technique of reference was employed in different contexts and for different purposes: all three summarize some of the essential events of the episode, selected according to the aim of each work. In Judith it serves to build an analogy between Dinah and Judith; in Jub the biblical story serves as an admonition against mixed marriage, while in Test, Levi it is adduced in order to enhance the merits of Levi.

These common traits show that all three have recourse to the basic biblical tradition of the defilement of Dinah the Israelite by gentiles. All three turn the crime of Shechem into the sin of all the inhabitants of Shechem. All three omit (Judith, Jub) or play down (Test. Levi) the circumcision of the Shechemites related in Genesis.81 Jub and Test. Levi render the crime even graver by making Dinah a girl of twelve. Finally, all three play to various degrees on the analogy of the story to the episode of the sinful association of Israelites with the Midianite women, and the zealousness of Phineas on this occasion, which earned him the High Priesthood for eternity.82 Though this episode is not mentioned explicitly, the thematic and terminological allusions to it are clear: the context of illicit sexual intercourse between Israelite and a gentile, the immediate act of vengeance by killing the sword, and the definition of the motive as an act of zeal for God. But while Jub and Test. Levi associate the motif of sexual offence and the zeal for God with Levi and the priesthood, Judith connects it with Simeon and a military victory. Interestingly, 1 Macc 2 uses the same analogy with Phineas, but without apparent connection to sexual abuses. It shows that the motif of zeal was also used independently of the sexual motif.83

Finally, it should be noted that the context of Phineas is alluded to here in a way characteristic of allusion in general (cf. below). It consists of using typical motifs together with typical terms belonging to these motifs in their original context. It is important to note here that this device is employed by both explicit and implicit usages of biblical elements.

80 The materials about Levi and his role in the story of Dinah are taken from the biographical part of the Testament. Hollander-de Jonge, Testaments, 131 see chapters 2-7 as an independent source used by the redactor of Test. Levi.

81 Much was made of this omission by scholars who wished to see in the use of Gen 34 in the present work an anti-Samaritan polemic. Cf. most recently Coggins, Samaritans, 88-93. For older literature cf. Pummer, ‘Genesis 34’, 177. But the evidence for such an interpretation is meagre. More plausible is to see it as a polemic against contact with gentiles in general, as argued by Collins, ‘Epic’ 99.

82 For the entire issue cf. the discussion of Hengel, Die Zeloten, 151-59, 181-88.

83 Apparently 1 Macc 2 combines the models of Phineas and Elijah, both of whom are zealous for God (cf. above).
The aim of the above review was to analyse the explicit usages of biblical elements. It was shown that in our literature such explicit usages always occur in rhetorical contexts and are of two types:

a. quotations and
b. mention of biblical persons and events.

Both types are introduced in a formal way, thus referring the reader to their scriptural source and the authoritative nature of its contents. In quotations it is the divine word which is evoked, and therefore the quotation actually stands for the divine speech. In explicit mention of biblical persons or circumstances it is the event or deed which is evoked, and therefore the reference stands for the divine action. Accordingly, the divine speech is represented with a quotation, while the divine action is represented with the depiction of an event.

The usages described above are not identical to the use of biblical elements in an expository role, such as, for instance, the explicit quotations in the pesherim or in rabbinic midrash. But the two clearly have close affinity: both functions present biblical materials as authoritative, and in an explicit, formal way, and both involve an intended and explicit exegesis of the passage quoted. In this both usages differ radically from the implicit usages of Mikra.

Implicit Use of Mikra – Composition

While explicit use of Mikra is relatively rare in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphal writings, the use of biblical elements in compositions is most extensive and varied. In fact, it is through such usage that this literature acquires its characteristic style and flavour.

Biblical elements are used in compositions when they are integrated into the structure and style of a different work. Unlike elements in exposition, they are not presented in order to be interpreted, nor are they added as representing divine speech or action. Accordingly, their presence is not indicated by explicit formal markers. Their identification depends on the ability of the reader to recognize the biblical elements and to see their meaning in the new writing. In order to build up the intended meaning, and to refer the reader to the underlying biblical source, various techniques are employed in our literature. Three ways of using biblical elements in composition may be discerned: a. implicit quotations; b. allusions; c. motifs and models. The two first types involve textual elements, while the last involves thematic elements. Often two or three types of functioning are combined to refer to one biblical context. Also, these types are exploited by various literary procedures and forms, and to various purposes.

The implicit quotation is one of the most characteristic features of the narrative works in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. It may be defined as a phrase of at least three words, which stems from a specific recognizable biblical context. When used in compositions these quotations are not introduced formally, but are interwoven into the new text. The manner and frequency with which such quotations are used are conditioned by the literary form, aims and techniques of individual writers.

Implicit Quotations in Narratives

In our literature there are three kinds of narratives: the dominant form in the Apocrypha is the ‘free narrative’, created mainly of non-biblical materials. In such narratives non-explicit quotations are used to lend a biblical character to an episode.

Two additional forms of narrative may be discerned: the Biblical Expansion and the Pseudepigraphic Biography. The Biblical Expansion consists of retelling a story by borrowing from the original text and expanding it in various ways. There are at least two variations of the Biblical Expansion: one is a narrative which follows closely the sequence and the text of a given biblical episode, using large segments of the actual biblical text. This form, termed as ‘Rewritten Bible’, is adopted by works such as Jubilees, The Biblical Antiquities, the Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch 6-11. Another variation of the Biblical Expansion is freer in the adaptation of the biblical text. It usually takes up the main lines of a biblical story, and embellishes it with large aggadic expansions and other additions, sprinkled with occasional implicit quotations from the

---

84 The implicit quotation presents a major problem of definition. Especially thorny is the problem of making a distinction between quotation and a biblical collocation (An analogous problem is presented by the distinction between allusion and reminiscence). Here a quotation or allusion is recognized by its inclusion of specific elements which refer to a particular source, while the collocation or locution is always general and occurs in more than one instance.

85 For a similar distinction on different grounds cf. Nickelsburg, ‘Bible Rewritten’ 89. In Charlesworth’s edition of the Pseudepigrapha these works are termed ‘Expansions of the “Old Testament” and Legends’ (OTP2, 5-475) and the editor had clearly in mind a narrative genre.

86 In Charlesworth’s collection additional works are included, such as the Lives of the Prophets. In narrative techniques and interpretative use of biblical materials Josephus’s Jewish Antiquities shares numerous features with the Biblical Story and some scholars define it as ‘rewritten Bible’. Cf. for instance, Harrington, ‘Palestinian Adaptations’ 239-40. But see the analysis of Attridge, Interpretation.
original context. Such a form is adopted by works like the Life of Adam and Eve and Joseph and Aseneth. 87

A third type of narrative may be called Pseudepigraphic Biography. It appears mostly in pseudepigraphic works, from revelations to treatises and wisdom discourses. 88 As a rule, pseudepigraphic works consist of discourses of various types, pronounced by the chief protagonist, set in a narrative framework. As the works of our literature are usually attributed to biblical figures, the biographical frameworks constitute biblical stories of a special kind. 89

Implicit quotations in Biblical Expansion (‘Rewritten Bible’)

Since the term ‘rewritten Bible’ was coined by Geza Vermes more than two decades ago, 88 there has been a growing tendency to group under this heading an ever increasing number of works, narrative as well as others. 90 This results in a blurring of the specific literary character of the individual works grouped under this heading, and of their specific methods of rewriting biblical materials. Thus, works such as Jubilees, LAB, the Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch 6-11, are sufficiently distinctive to be included in a special category. But in order to create more precise terms of reference, a more restrictive definition of the term ‘rewritten Bible’ will be adopted here, 92 to include only narrative works. 93

87 Perhaps the variations of form are due to historical development. Works reworking the Hebrew Bible more closely are on the whole earlier than those freer in their adaptations. But this may also be accidental, and perhaps the apocryphal works from Qumran, still unpublished, will shed light on the question. Works of the type rewritten Bible were continued to be composed into the Middle Ages, cf. the midrash Sefer Ha-Yashar. Cf. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, 67-126. Characteristically, Vermes discusses ‘rewritten Bible’ works as part of the aggada (cf. most recently in Schürer, History, rev. ed. 2, 346ff.), thus indicating their common exegetical traditions, but blurring their distinct literary and historical origins.

88 Cf. the recent discussion on pseudonymity by Meade, Pseudonymity.

89 For an illustration of the method and form of pseudepigraphic biography cf. my analysis of the framework of 1 Enoch in ‘Biography of Enoch’.


The functions of the biblical materials in works considered as ‘rewritten Bible’, are defined in relation to their role within the compositional structure. Thus, a distinction should be made between materials used for the narrative sequence and the axis of the main plot, and those used in digressions of various types. In choosing to write a Biblical Expansion the author adopts the position of the original biblical writer. He is thus prevented from presenting biblical quotations as such, especially if the quotations are taken from the main sequence of his own rewritten biblical story. Instead, he interweaves the quotations into his own text, and the contents themselves refer the reader to the source. But in digressions from the main plot, sometimes the need arises for a quotation from other biblical contexts. In such cases authors have recourse to various manners of presentation. In Jub, for instance, the author introduces formal quotations of the Torah as quotations of what is written on the Heavenly Tablets or what is said by the angels. 94 The LAB employs another device, putting the quotations in the mouth of one of the protagonists. 95

Implicit quotations are usually accompanied by biblical elements used in other ways, such as allusions and motifs. Together, and in addition to various aggadic expansions, embellishments and interpretative supplements, they create the stylistic mixture of biblical elements so typical of the Biblical Expansion. 96

Example

1 Enoch 6-11

1 Enoch is a collection of five writings ascribed to the biblical patriarch Enoch. Literary analysis shows that these five are independent compositions, though they draw on common aggadic traditions on Enoch. 97 The writings are assembled and arranged into one collection so as to reflect the legendary biography of Enoch: his youth, his exploits with the angels, and his final translation into Paradise. 98 The first piece, the so-called Book of the Watchers, 99 relates events belonging to Enoch’s life. This part in itself is a compilation of disparate
literary pieces, arranged again, according to the sequence of Enoch’s biography: 1-5 is an introductory discourse on the End of Days; 6-11 relates the story of the Fallen Angels, 12-16 concerns Enoch’s dealings with the Fallen Angels, and 17-36 consists of two voyages in the universe where Enoch makes in the company of the angels (17-19; 20-36). It has been observed that chapters 6-11 stand out both in content and form. Unlike the other units of the Book of the Watchers, they are not written as a biographical narrative told by Enoch in the first person, but as a third-person narrative with no mention of Enoch. Instead, Noah is the hero of this little piece. This led scholars like R.H. Charles to attribute these chapters, together with additional sections, to a lost Book of Noah. In any case, the section stands out as a fragment of an ancient Biblical Expansion of the type of ‘rewritten Bible’.

The story told in 6-11 is based on Gen 6: 1-4 by quotations not given en bloc, but distributed among large aggadic and interpretative expansions. Each implicit quotation initiates a new development in the story. Thus, chapter 6 depicts the circumstances and intentions of the protagonists, while chapter 7 relates their deeds and the results.


6:3-6 – An expansion, the deliberations of the angels, makes clear their intentions and shows that their leader Shemahaza instigated the Angels to swear to carry out their intention.

6:7 – A list of the twenty heads of the angels winds up this section.

7:1 – Another implicit quotation of Gen 6:4 opens the second stage of the plot, the deeds and their consequences. The quotation gives only the intercourse of the Angels with the women. The expansion added here tells of the magic which the Angels taught the women.

7:2 – A further quotation from Gen 6:4 relates the birth of the Giants, the offspring of the unlawful union.

7:3-6 – The next section is an expansion describing the iniquity of the Giants and the ensuing suffering of men.

8 – Two parallel versions of the Angels’ teachings to the women and the ensuing corruption of mankind give the outcome of the Angel’s intercourse.”

9-11 – The remaining portions are expansions depicting the judgements on the Angels and their offspring. Though this part of the story does not use actual quotations, it alludes to Noah and his role in this context (10:1-3; cf. Gen 6:13ff.) in a succinct mention of the ‘son of Lemech’, and the approaching flood. The technique is identical with the mention of historical events discussed above.

The foregoing summary brings out clearly the technique of the Biblical Expansions, as it is practised in the present story. The biblical quotations set the narrative framework, the characters and the plot. The expansions provide motives, explanations and embellishments to the actions and events. Sometimes, as here, there are additional figures and actions, subservient to the main plot.

Although the quotations and the expansions are combined in a single text, they differ in their relation to the biblical source and employ different methods of adaptation. The implicit quotations use mainly two techniques: exegetical substitutions and slight editorial alterations. In 6-11 there are two typical examples of exegetical substitutions: the Angels and the Giants. Neither is mentioned in the original biblical story, but at a stage as early as our story the Sons of God were identified as the Angels, while the offspring of the Angels and the women, the Heroes, were identified with the Giants. The Enoch story thus gives the original story a new, more explicit meaning. Such explicitness is achieved also by slight manipulations of the quotation itself. Our author, for instance, emphasizes the temptation presented by the women, so he has accen-

---

106 For a detailed analysis of the nature of these chapters as introduction, cf. Hartman, Askingfora Meaning, 138-45.

107 Stone, ‘Apocalyptic Literature’, 396-401. In spite of the many discussions recently published on these chapters there is very little on its literary form. They are particularly suited for a comparative table. Milik adduces examples of rewriting, expounding and supplementing the biblical text.
tuated their beauty by advancing the relevant adjective from the quotation of the second biblical verse to the quotation of the first verse, and by adding another adjective to the same effect.

While the implicit quotations are reworked in a way as to preserve their essential lexical and syntactical structure, in the expansions the author is free to shape them according to the narrative plot and his own aims. It is often done by adding details to a general picture or group which figured in the original context. A good example of this method is offered by the personality of Shemiahaza and his role in establishing the deliberate nature of the crime.\(^{106}\) Shemiahaza is not entirely invented, for he could be considered as one of the Angels referred to in the bible as ‘the Sons of God’. The actual expansion on the teachings of the Angels provides motives for the corruption of mankind before the flood. The other long expansion in the second part of the story makes more explicit the theme of divine providence, and shows that the flood fits into a system of punishments for each of the crimes mentioned.\(^{107}\)

**IMPLICIT QUOTATIONS IN ‘FREE NARRATIVE’**

While in Biblical Expansions the implicit quotations rework the main biblical text, in the ‘free narrative’ implicit quotations are used to imitate biblical styles and forms. This technique is characteristic of Apocryphal works translated from Hebrew or Aramaic, and it was probably at home in the cultural and literary milieu of Israel, where the traditions of the biblical narrative were still alive.\(^{108}\) Such a technique is used when the author wishes to draw an analogy between his story and a biblical one. Many examples of this are found in works such as Tobit, Judith, Susana\(^{111}\) and 1 Macc, all of which stem from a Semitic original.\(^{109}\) This characteristic is especially clear when the Greek 2 Macc, using a Hellenistic model of historical writing, is compared to 1 Macc, using a biblical model.\(^{110}\) 1 Macc emerges as particularly rich in implicit quotations and biblical allusions.\(^{111}\) The example chosen below will illustrate a quotation of a special type, which may be termed a conflated quotation.

---

\(^{106}\) In legal terms the crime was committed intentionally (‘*bemézid*’).

\(^{109}\) This is not, then, a story on the origin of evil, as most scholars would have it, but on the primordial sinners and their punishment.

\(^{110}\) This is why the true nature of such a style comes out in reconstructions of the Hebrew originals. For such attempts cf. e.g. Grin, *Book of Judith*, Neuhau, *Studien*, 40-75. In this respect, of interest are also the Hebrew translations of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha found in the edition of A. Kahana (1937).

\(^{111}\) See the detailed analysis in my ‘The Problem of a Non-Translated Biblical Greek’.

\(^{112}\) In itself the use of Hellenistic models should not hinder the author from employing biblical quotations, usually in the Septuagint version. This is well illustrated by the Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Maccabees and Joseph and Asmeneth.

\(^{113}\) This is revealed through the Hebrew retrersions, as made by Neuhaus, *Studien*. The same phenomenon can be observed in the poetic passages of 2 Macc.
quotations in discourses can originate from almost every possible biblical context. Two examples will be given below, one taken from a prophetic discourse, the other from wisdom proverbs.

**EXAMPLE**

*Judith 8:16 (= Num 23:19)*

ήμεις δὲ μὴ ἐνεχυρίσετε τὰς βουλὰς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔσται ἀνθρώπος δ ἐκ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἀνθρώπων διακρίνεται οὐκ ὃς ἔσται ἀνθρώπως διακρίνεται.

**Translation**

But as for you, cease speaking to force the counsels of the Lord our God: for God is not as a man to be threatened nor as a son of man to be cajoled.

The example is from Judith’s address to the elders of Bethulia. The speech aims at persuading them to change their course of action. The address may be divided into six parts:

a. Judith contests the deeds of the elders - 8:11.

b. It is not fitting, she argues, for frail and ignorant humans to impose conditions on their creator (8:12-14).

c. Rejecting the elders’ course of action Judith recommends trust in God, for He is not influenced by lies or entreaties (quotation from Num 23: 19 in the LXX version) (8:14c-17).

d. Unlike their ancestors, contemporary Israelites are faithful to the Tora, and consequently the danger of exile and desecration of the Temple by the Assyrians should not be seen as punishment but as a test. Therefore God is to be trusted (8:18-25).

e. Historical precedents show that the Just were put to test in a similar way (the three patriarchs) (8:26).

f. Conclusion: God teaches through test, and therefore the present danger is only a test from which God will rescue those who trust him (8:27).119

This short outline shows that implicit quotation is placed in a crucial point of the argument. On its authority rests the central statement about the nature of God as immovable and uninfluenced like humans. This same statement serves in argument. On its authority rests the central statement about the nature of God

---


118 The quotation is reproduced from the Septuagint with a slight lexical variation. The translation of Judith interchanges the verbs of the two strophes, ἀπειλῆται and διακρίνεται. Hanhart, *Text...Judith*, 84-85 estimates that the substitution διακρίνεται is ‘to turn by entreaty’. Lidell-Scott, *Lexicon*, 396, replacing in Judith the verb διακρίνεται of Num, suits the context and is therefore original.

be defined as a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts, using a special signal referring to the independent external text. These signals may consist of isolated terms, patterns and motifs taken from the independent text alluded to. 128

The technical procedure by which the allusion is triggered is similar in all types of allusions. It consists of interweaving into a new composition motifs, key-terms and small phrases from a specific and recognizable biblical passage. The reader is referred back to the original context by the combinations of these elements, even though no explicit mention of the original context is actually made. In our literature there are two types of allusion: allusion to isolated verses, and allusion to one or two running biblical texts. 129

**EXAMPLES**

**Isolated allusions**

The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-6:21130

The Wisdom of Solomon is a work originally written in Greek: by a Jew in Alexandria, perhaps active in the second half of the first century B.C. 131 It appears as a discourse of king Solomon, 132 centring upon divine justice, the fate of the Just and the Wicked, and the role of wisdom and divine justice in the life of Solomon and in the history of Israel. The work consists of three parts, forming a tightly knit unity:

1:1-6:21 – an exhortation to the rulers of the world;
6:22-10:21 – Solomon’s prayers for wisdom and wisdom as the saviour of the Just;
11:19 – God dispenses justice to wards the Israelites and the Egyptians during the Exodus. 133

The composition combines the refinement of a Hellenistic rhetoric and the acumen of a biblical exegete, and serves as an excellent illustration of the use and influence of both biblical and Hellenistic literary traditions. The traces of biblical modes of expression are especially apparent in the two first parts, which are in fact modelled on specific biblical traditions. 134 For the purposes of the present discussion the first part is of special interest, for it employs a peculiar system of biblical references closely connected with its form and ideas.

The Exhortation is built in a concentric chiasmus, each part of which is defined by an inclusion:

a. 1:1-15 – Exhortation to the judges to seek justice and wisdom;
b. 1:16-2:24 – The blasphemous speech of the Wicked;
c. 3;
d. 4 – Reward for the Just and punishment for the Wicked;
e. 5:1-23 – The remove of the Wicked;
f. 6:1-21 – Exhortation to kings to seek justice and wisdom. 135

The chiasmus is clearly indicated both by the formal inclusion and the contents. In addition, a special system of inner cross-references is created by the use of identical or similar terms in parallel units of the chiasmus. It establishes close interlinks between the sections and weaves a subtle and ironical play of inversions. Inversion also operates on the level of the biblical allusions.

**Allusions in 1:1-15, 6:1-21**

The opening verses of these two sections provide a good illustration of the author’s technique. They are linked by style, words and subject. They exhort ‘the judges of the earth’ (1:1a) and ‘the judges of the ends of the earth’ (6:1b) to exercise justice and wisdom. The address to the rulers is echoed by words like ‘kings’ (βασιλεῖς = 6:1), ‘the mighty’ (χριστούς = 6:2a; δυνατοὶ = 6:6b) and ‘tyrants’ (τύραννοι = 6:9a). The two verses are further linked by biblical allusions. Both verses include words from Ps 2:10 (LXX). 136 Thus the text of Wis alludes to Ps 2, integrating it and commenting upon it. Ps 2 is selected apparently because it urges kings and judges to exercise wisdom. The address to rulers as a literary model may be explained also by an indirect polemic against Hellenis-

128 A slightly adapted version of the definition of allusion is proposed by Ben-Porat, ‘Poetics’, 107-08.
129 Cf. below. The Temple Scroll provides an interesting illustration of the technique of reworking or alluding to one or two major biblical texts.
133 On the last section of the book cf. Gilbert. La critique des dieux. For the unity of the book cf. Wright ‘Structure’; Winston, Wisdom, 9-14; Larcher. Livre de la Sagesse I. 100-07. In the book’s overall framework, chapter 10 forms a separate unit consisting of a list of Just saved by Wisdom. It bridges the second and third parts of the work.
135 For details the reader is referred to the thorough analysis of this system and the structure of the first part by Perrenchion (who does not concern himself with biblical allusions). Cf. idem, ‘Struttura...di Sapienza 1.1-15’ and ‘Struttura...di Sapienza 1,16-2,24 e 5,1-23’. Cf. also Bizetti, Libro della Sapienza, 51-67, especially for additional lexical interlinks within the units of the chiasmic framework.
136 Compare Ps 2:10a-b και νῦν, βασιλεῖς, συνέταται Τούρανοι τήν γῆν with Wis 6:1a-6b Αρχήσατε οὖν, βασιλεῖς, ἄκουστε ἀληθῶς. The expression τούρανος is used in Ps 2:10b and Wis 6:1a. The form παναθεόνεσθε in Ps 2:10b is echoed in Wis 6:1b παναθεοθησθεντε. Wis 1:1 echoes also Ps 45:8 (LXX) and other verses. These affinities were observed by most commentators, and in special detail by Skehan, Studies, 149ff. In my judgement this type of allusion should not be termed ‘midrash’, as is done by Schaberg, ‘Midrashic Traditions’, 76.
the theories of kingship. The author of Wis betrays knowledge of such theories on more than one occasion.\(^{137}\) While the allusion to Ps 2:10 is articulate, others are hinted at in a more discrete way. Thus, an allusion to Prov 8:15 is suggested by the similarity of ideas, style and general tenor. In Prov 8:15 Wisdom asserts that through her kings rule and judges do justice. If forms part of a larger Wisdom discourse, included in the series of apantial addresses of Prov 1-9. This verse thus converges with the style and themes of the opening diatribe in Wis. Actually, most of the words of Prov 8:15 are spread over Wis 1:1 and 6:1, 6.\(^{138}\) In a general way, the first chapters of Wis are clearly inspired by Prov 1-9 and incorporate many of their elements.\(^{139}\)

These verses illustrate two procedures of biblical allusion: one employs a specific and characteristic phrase from the original in addition to the affinity of context, while the second method plays on accumulating less defined elements reminiscent of the original.

Another interesting allusion is contained in the second part of Wis 1:1, which urges the reader to seek God with ‘simplicity of heart’. The Greek ἐν ἐλαττώσει καρδίας is found in the LXX only once more, in describing the attitude of David towards the building of the temple (1 Chr 29:17-18). The author of Wis adds another allusion by combining the ‘simplicity of heart’ with ‘love if righteousness’, a combination only found in the speech of David in 1 Chr 29:17 (LXX).\(^{140}\) This is another example of the first method described above. It exemplifies the relation which the allusion establishes between the old and the new texts, and which is one of both dependence and innovation.\(^{141}\)

From the same context comes another allusion made by Wis 1:1, namely 1 Chr 28:9 (LXX). In this verse David instructs his son Solomon to seek God, so that

God may be found by him. In this he offers his own formulation for a basic biblical tenet, namely that God is found only when sought in earnest. This rule is expressed in biblical parlance by the pair ‘seek/find’ God, and occurs in various formulations.\(^{142}\) In Wis the formulation of the Chronicles is taken up, as is clear from the association of ‘love of righteousness’ with ‘simplicity of heart’ (Wis 1:1c-2a). Again, the relation between the two verses is explained by the association of motifs: David’s admonition to his wise son is a context which suits well the author of a pseudepigraphic diatribe of Solomon.\(^{143}\)

**Allusions in 1:16-2:24 and 5:1-23**

These two sections form two discourses of the Wicked. The first gives the philosophy of the Wicked by which they justify their way, the second represents their repentance and admission of their error. Here the author achieves a particular vividness both by the discourse form and by a subtle and ironic play of cross-references and allusions.\(^{144}\) A striking example of this is the depiction of man by the Wicked. In the first speech man is said to consist of three elements, corresponding to natural ones: the breath (πνεῦμα) of the nostrils is like msoke (καπνὸς); the reason (λόγος) resembles a spark (σπείρθη), setting in motion the heart, which being extinguished, the body turns into ashes; and finally the spirit (πνεῦμα), which is dispersed like air (ἄε) (2:2-3). The breath, reason and spirit are a mixture of biblical and Hellenistic elements, characteristic of Wis. The breath in the nostrils is taken from biblical description of the creation of man.\(^{145}\) The logos as a spark setting the body in motion and the spirit animating it, are taken from a popular version of Stoic ideas.\(^{146}\) But the main targets for the irony of the author are the images of smoke, spark and air. In the first speech they emphasize the brevity of human existence in order to justify a life of self-indulgence. In the speech of penitence each is turned into an image of brevity for the life and hope of the Wicked. Moreover, in an ironic twist the three images are combined into suggesting a


\(^{139}\) Cf. the list of elements shared by Prov and Wis in my ‘Pseudoitim’. 251-52 and my comments on pp. 247-58. Cf. also Skehan, Studies, 172.

\(^{140}\) Cf. the LXX: καὶ ἔγνων καρδίας. Cf. also Prov 8:15 (LXX). Two examples are offered by 1: 12 alluding to Isa 5:18 (LXX). For this and other references to Isa 5 and 28 cf. Amir ‘Figure of Death’. For the more general use of Isa in Wis see Skehan, ‘Isaiah’, 163-71. On the use of Isa 44 cf. Gilbert, *La critique des dieux*. 64-75, 210-11. Other indications show that the author had recourse also to the Hebrew text of various biblical books, cf. Larcher, *Études*.\(^{141}\) A description of the same phenomenon in Mikra offered by Skehan may be applied equally well to the literature under discussion: ‘It is of course a familiar fact that the later Old Testament writings in several instances draw much of their message from an appeal to the acknowledged sacred authority of the earlier inspired books. This appeal is rarely a matter of formal quotation, but is made by means of allusions, reworkings of the material found in the older books, inferences and examples drawn from the same sources’ (Studies, 163).


\(^{144}\) The use of a discourse put in the mouth of fictitious opponents in order to refute it is a well-known rhetorical procedure, cf. e.g. the Wicked’s words in Isa 5: 19, 28:15; Ps 10:6,12; 5; Prov 1: 11-14; Job 21:14-15, all of which are used by the author of Wis. On the use of the same device in the Hellenistic diatribe cf. Capelle-Marrou, ‘Diatribe’ and the review of Stowers, *Diatribe*, 72-77. Cf. Lachter, Studies, 114ff. A full and detailed analysis of our sections is found in Perrinchnio, ‘Struttura…di Sapienza…1,6-2,4:5,1-23’, 2-43, esp. 33.

\(^{145}\) The general context shows that here πνεῦμα is used in a concrete sense, and in fact reproducing Stoic terminology for the heat-generating spirit which animates the body. Cf. Winston, Wisdom, 117ff. Larcher, *Le livre de la Sagesse* 1, 217ff. At the same time the author is playing on the biblical terminology πνεῦμα: Gen 2:7, rendered in the LXX by πνεῦμα and used by Wis in 2:22, as well as on the image of the air (ἄε) used by the Wicked.

\(^{146}\) Cf. Gen 2:7 LXX: καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε τούτον αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα.
burning fire: the smoke dispersing in the air and the spark produced by the blaze. Finally, the ashes of the body are all that remains. In fact, without being aware of it, the Wicked are drawing a picture of their own doom in fire, instead of their self-image as prosperous. This is not only an ironical inversion of the Wicked’s own words, but also of the later depiction of the Just as eternally shining.

Inversion is also achieved by playing on biblical allusions in a peculiar way. Thus, the image of smoke for the brevity of human life already occurs in the biblical sources. But it is taken up in Wis 5:14c to describe the Wicked’s hope which is ‘dispersed like smoke by the wind’. The Wicked intended to speak of the breath of life as smoke, but it is their own hope which was dispersed like smoke. Moreover, in structure and words Wis 5:14c parallels another description of the Wicked’s hope, which will be ‘like chaff carried in the wind’ (Wis 5:14a). Both share the word ‘wind’ (νέφος), which is an ironic pun reflecting both on the terms ‘air’, ‘breath’ and ‘spirit’ in Ps 2:2c; 2:3b and their inversions in Wis 5:1 la, c; 5:12a. The image of chaff in the wind is used in biblical passages as a metaphor for the fate of the Wicked (Ps 1:4; LXX, Isa 5:24; LXX). By using similar words and structure for the chaff and the smoke, the author of Wis equates the two; in this way he forms new interpretative links between the two biblical pictures.

Allusions in 3-4

The next example continues the picture of fire, which is carried through into the central sections of the chiastic structure, chapters 3-4. These chapters depict the contrasting behaviour and fate of the Just and the Wicked. The example analysed here is taken from 3:7: ‘And in the time of their visitation they shall shine (burn/radiate), and as sparks (σπόροι) in the stubble they will run to and fro’.  

The term ‘spark’ makes here its second appearance; see 2:1f. above. In both instances it is used figuratively. The Wicked employ it as an image for the λόγος as the cause for the movement of the hearth; while in 3:7 it is an image of the brilliance of the souls of the Just in their blissful state at the time of recom pense. Evidently, the author plays again an ironic turn on the Wicked. The Wicked see themselves as moved by the logos like a spark, which in fact will

140 Cf. Ps 102:4 (LXX) and of the quick disappearance of the Wicked Hos 13:3; Ps 37:20, 68:3.  
141 The image is biblical, said of enemies (Isa 17:13, 29:5; Ps 18:43, 35:5, 83:14) or the Wicked (Hos 13:3, Ps 1:4; Job 21:18). Wis combines the Greek of Isa 29:5 and Ps 1:4.  
142 Note in this connection Hos 13:3, which assembles at least three of the elements appearing in the Wicked’s speech: cloud, chaff and smoke, all of which refer to the short existence of sinners.  
143 The term employed is ἐπινίκτος, which translates the Hebrew ἐπινίκτος in the sense of recompense in general and the final recompense in particular. Cf. e.g. Isa 10:3; Jer 8:12, 10:15; Hos 9:7. Note the similar term of the Sectarian scrolls: ἐπινίκτος, ἐπινίττον, ἐπινίκτοται, e.g. 1Q54:19, CD 7:21.  
144 καὶ τὸ καρπὸν ἐπινίκτοτος ἀνάλογως καὶ ως σποράς ἐν καλαμίᾳ διαδραμοῦντα.  
145 It is not clear when this will happen. Some would understand it as taking place after a bodily resurrection. Cf. Larcher, Etudes, 322-23.
such allusions the context itself often provides an explicit reference to the source. 160

Allusions to disparate biblical contexts as well as to one running biblical text are to be found in narrative as well as paraenetic discourses of various kinds. In fact, these allusions often serve wider literary purposes. Thus, for instance, a pseudonymous attribution can be, and is, established with the aid of systematic allusions to the biblical accounts of the pseudepigraphic personage, and often involves a re-interpretation of the biblical material. A system of allusions is often used to introduce an analogy with a pattern of biblical motifs (cf. the case of Tobit below). And finally, allusions to and reworking of a biblical text is the procedure by which the author of the new text expresses his dependence on tradition. 161

Here the difference should be noted between imitating biblical style for literary or for exegetical purposes. In purely stylistic usages biblical elements usually retain only general characteristics and cannot be recognized as pointing to one specific context, while elements used for exegetical purposes are always anchored in specific contexts.

Allusions to one text

This mode of using allusions consists of drawing mainly from one or two texts and is often used to create a new text in biblical forms and genres. Thus, for instance, most of the prayers and hymns of the Second Temple Period take biblical prayers and the Psalms as models. 162 In the same way most of the compositions written as testaments employ the patterns of the biblical testaments of Jacob (Gen 49) and Moses (Deut 31-34). 163 A similar phenomenon is to be observed in narrative compositions, either of the type ‘rewritten Bible’ or of the type ‘free narrative’, where various biblical stories serve as models. Other examples are offered by works written as prophetic visions. 164

In all these cases the adherence to a certain text proves to be linked with the nature of the work and its affinity with certain biblical themes or figures. Not surprisingly, this type of allusion is revealed as one of the main literary vehicles for building up pseudepigraphic frameworks. 165

MODELS AND MOTIFS

The referential value of the motifs in the functioning of allusions has already been pointed out. In itself, a term taken out from its original context is deprived of its power of reference without the support of a relevant context or motif. But the relationship between the motif and the specific terminology belonging to it can be reversed: the motif is carried out and articulated by certain terminology and phraseology belonging to it. This phenomenon is especially clear in a cluster of motifs which are organized to form a model.

In the literature under discussion motifs are used with or without their characteristic phraseology. Often such phraseology is used to enhance the referential value of the motif.

EXAMPLE

The model of Job in Tobit

The book of Tobit offers a good example of reworking biblical narrative models and motifs. It has often been observed that the author of this work attempts to re-create the religious ethos and atmosphere of the patriarchal narratives by evoking various motifs of the Genesis stories. 166 In this context he also exploits the narrative elements of the book of Job, perhaps placing him too in ancient patriarchal times. 167

That Job is a model is indicated first of all by the similarity of the main motifs

---

160 For example cf. below, the analysis of Tobit.
161 Cf. the discussions of Robert and Bloch on anthological style: Robert, ‘Littéraires (Genres)’; Bloch, ‘Midrash’.
162 This is true of many of the prayers and hymns in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Cf. e.g. Tobit 12; Judith 17; 2 Macc 24-29; 1 Macc 21-20; Dan 3:24ff. (LXX) and the collection known as the Psalms of Solomon. Similar methods can be detected in psalmic compositions at Qumran such as the Hodoyot and the apocryphal psalms. Cf. most recently the comments of Schuller, Non-Canonical Psalms, 32-38.
164 Cf. Kvanvig, ‘Henoch’. Kvanvig has shown that 1 Enoch 14 depends on Ezek 1. It is certainly related also to the Throne vision in Dan 7, as may be clearly seen from the analysis of Kvanvig, but it is less clear in what way. One cannot argue any more for a simple dependence of 1 Enoch on Dan 7, for the Qumran Aramaic fragments of 1 Enoch suggest that 1 Enoch 14 may be earlier than Dan 7. This was the position of Glasson, re-formulated in ‘Son of Man Imagery’. Kvanvig, ibid. 119-120 reaches the same conclusion. Emerton, ‘The origin’ 229-30, following others, suggests that the two draw upon a common source.
165 An illustration of this procedure is offered by the way Wis attributes its discourses to Solomon. Cf. my discussion in ‘Pseudonymity’.
166 For the use made by Tobit of Gen 24 cf. the discussion of Deselacs, Das Buch Tobit, 292-302.
167 This view is already attested in the Septuagint version of Job, according to which he is identified with Jobah, the Edomite king, one of the descendants of Abraham (Gen 36:33-34; cf. the final section of the Greek Job). The rabbis variously placed Job in the days of Abraham, of Jacob or of Moses. Cf. P.T. Sot 5 (20c) and B. T. Bava Batra 15a.
attached to Tobit and Job. The author of Tobit follows both the contents and sequence of the motifs of the Book of Job:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motifs</th>
<th>Job</th>
<th>Tobit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The hero is pious and righteous</td>
<td>1:1, 8</td>
<td>1:6-12, 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2:3</td>
<td>2:2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is prosperous</td>
<td>1:2-3</td>
<td>1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is deprived of his possessions</td>
<td>1:14-19</td>
<td>1:15-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is crippled by illness</td>
<td>2:7-8</td>
<td>2:9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His wife works for others</td>
<td>31:10</td>
<td>2:11-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is provoked by his wife</td>
<td>2:9 (LXX)</td>
<td>2:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(note LXX)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He prays and wishes to die</td>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>2:1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 et passim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His final vindication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restitution of health and wealth</td>
<td>42:11-15</td>
<td>14:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He dies in old age, blessed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with offspring and wealth</td>
<td>42:16-17</td>
<td>14:11-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to similarity of contents, the author sometimes interweaves details from the actual text of Job. A striking example is provided by Tobit's conversation with his wife. This episode follows the impoverishment and illness of Tobit, just as the dialogue of Job and his wife occurs after the loss of his children, fortune and health. Moreover, Tobit models his episode on the Greek version of Job, not on the Hebrew. This is clear from additions in Tobit and Septuagint of Job 2:9a, but absent from the Hebrew. The Septuagint quotes Job's wife as complaining that she is forced to work as a servant in other houses. This detail, probably based on the Hebrew of Job 31:10, is taken up by Tobit 2:11, where it is stated that Tobit's wife was hired as a servant in other houses.168 The entire scene between Tobit and his wife takes place against this background: Tobit's wife receives a kid as a gift from her masters, without telling her husband. Tobit discovers the kid and doubts his wife's explanation. His disbelief provokes a sharp rebuke from his wife, echoing the rebuke of Job's wife.169 This throws Tobit into profound despair, leading him to wish for death, a wish which he expresses in his prayer, echoing the discourse in Job 3.

168 Compare the term λατρεύω (= 'servant, maidservant', Lidell-Scott, Lexicon, 1032) used by Job 2:9 of Job's wife with the term employed by Tobit 2:11 of Tobit's wife: ἄμμωρερ = 'was hired to work', 'served'; Lidell-Scott, Lexicon, 688). The entire verse runs as follows: 'Now at that time Anna my wife was hired to work in women's quarters (thus G1; cf. Lidell-Scott, Lexicon, 363 for 'quarters'; G2 reads 'in women's works'). For text cf. Hanhart, Tobit.

169 In the original Hebrew Job's wife scolds her husband (2:9): 'Are you still holding fast your integrity? Curse God and die!' These words are echoed in the retort of Tobit's wife (2:14): 'And where are your acts of kindness? Where are you righteous deeds? Behold, your humiliation is well-known'. These words could have been uttered by Job's own wife.

170 These affinities with the story of Job are notable because they are present without any explicit reference to Job or the Book of Job. Moreover, the materials of the plot are not taken from Job or a similar biblical figure, but are independent of them. The use made by Tobit of biblical motifs differs, then, in purpose and form from that of narratives of the rewritten Bible or pseudepigraphic biography type. In the case of a 'free narrative' like Tobit, the author achieves a Job-like plot. The referential value lies in the coincidence of motifs and some of the terms, but it leads to a comparison between the new and old texts, and not to an integration of the old in the new, as was the case in the pseudepigraphic or 'rewritten Bible' narratives.

Summary and Conclusions

We have attempted to describe use of biblical elements in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The method of presentation consisted of a general definition and categorization, each category illustrated by specific cases. After a general distinction between biblical elements used in expositional and compositional functions, the discussion centred upon the various types of compositions in our literature. These were found to be of two major types: biblical elements used in explicit or implicit ways. The explicit uses were employed in rhetorical contexts, namely in various types of discourse, and for various rhetorical purposes. The uses in compositional functions occur in all types of contexts and genres. In explicit rhetorical uses the biblical elements stand for the divine authority and are presented as such. In implicit compositional uses biblical elements are part of the materials forming the texture of the composition. Authors employing biblical elements in this way aim at re-creating the biblical models and atmosphere, and identify themselves with the biblical authors.

These two modes of approach to biblical elements are not incompatible. They exist side by side in the various types of literature composed during the Second Temple Period.

170 Cf. the expression ἤρποςεξαφλύω in Gen 38:20 and Tobit 2:12(G2).
Chapter Twelve

Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo

Yehoshua Amir

Introduction

In the present study we are concerned with the specific question of the place and treatment of Mikra within Philo’s extensive oeuvre. General questions on the understanding of Philo will be touched upon only insofar they seem inescapably relevant to the difficult subject of Philo’s views on Scripture.

We shall in this essay leave open the question whether Philo is to be regarded primarily as a philosopher, who uses the Bible as a vehicle for a religious philosophy, nourished by Stoicism and Plato, which may be characterized as late Stoic or middle Platonic, or whether, on the contrary, he is to be seen as a Bible exegete who places both his general education and the entire mass of contemporary thought in the service of the absolutely true doctrine of Divine revelation, set down above all by Moses in the Pentateuch. To take these two possibilities as alternatives is, I think, to pose the question in a wrong way. Both ways of looking at the problem have their own inner justifications, and each complements the other. The truth is surely that Philo’s thought-process oscillates between the two foci which were given him at the outset, namely the reliability of the word of Divine revelation as formulated by Moses, and the convincingness of the doctrine which emerged from the philosophical disc-

---

1 A good survey of Philo’s activity as a writer and a look into the world of his thought, can be found in Borgen, ‘Philo of Alexandria’.

2 Since the 19th century there has been a widespread notion among scholars, though as time goes on it takes milder and milder forms, that Philo was only using the biblical text as a pretext in order to pass Greek philosophical doctrines off as Jewish with the help of an artificial exegesis. His purpose has been variously fathomed as a wish to give the despised Jewish religion a little philosophical prestige in the eyes of a Hellenistic audience (Schwartz, in ‘Aporien im 4. Evangelium’, advocates this view in especially provocative form), or, on the contrary, as an attempt to make acceptable to a Jewish audience the suspect philosophy, and more than suspect mysticism, of the Hellenistic milieu (a position last taken by Goodenough in By Light, Light).

3 This classification is seen as the essential one by, e.g. I. Heinemann, Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung.

4 This view has been emphatically followed through by Dillon, The Middle Platonists.

5 On this subject see Mendelson, Secular Education.

6 Wolfson, Philo, may be regarded as the most prominent representative of this view. The same orientation is demanded by Völker, Fortschritt und Vollendung, and worked out with strict consequence by Nikiprowetzky, Le commentaire.