

### *Chapter 3: Genesis Pseudepocryphon*

---

As one of the first seven scrolls discovered in the Judean desert beginning in 1947, the Genesis Apocryphon is one of the more well-studied works among the Dead Sea Scrolls. When the scroll was initially analyzed by scholars, it could not be fully unrolled and only a small portion of the outer layer of the scroll could be read. These visible portions, however, written in Aramaic, referenced the ante-diluvian Lamech, the father of Noah, and his wife, Batanosh, known from the book of Jubilees. The text appeared to be written in the first-person from the perspective of Lamech leading Trevor to conclude that the scroll was a copy of the so-called “Book of Lamech” listed as an apocryphal work by a 7th century CE Greek canon list.<sup>1</sup> Once the scroll was completely unrolled, however, it became obvious that the scope of the scroll contained more than just a first-person account from Lamech and instead contained additional first-person accounts from figures found in the Genesis stories including Noah and Abram. Thus, the more descriptive title, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, was given to the scroll by Avigad and

---

1. This fact led Trevor to refer to the scroll as the “Ain Feshkha Lamech Scroll” and Milik to refer to it as the Apocalypse of Lamech for the publication of the fragment in DJD 1. See John C. Trever, “Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from ‘Ain Feshkha,” *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10 and “Apocalypse de Lamech” in DJD I, 86–87

Yadin in 1956 for the publication of its *editio princeps* in 1956.<sup>2</sup> While the name Genesis Apocryphon remains in wide use, it is notable that the name has been criticized and a number of, perhaps more descriptive, titles have been suggested. “Book of the Patriarchs”,<sup>3</sup> “Memoirs of the Patriarchs”,<sup>4</sup> and כתב אבהן.<sup>5</sup> Fitzmyer suggests כתב אבהתא would be, perhaps, even more suitable.<sup>6</sup> In this chapter, I will retain the “traditional” title Genesis Apocryphon.

Although much of the scroll was very badly damaged, illegible, or missing, enough survived for Avigad and Yadin to make the generalized observations that Genesis Apocryphon followed the basic order and events of Genesis from the Flood into the Abram narrative. The events are generally (though, not exclusively) narrated in a series of three first person accounts (what I will refer to as “memoirs”<sup>7</sup>) by Lamech, Noah, and Abram, respectively and show a clear

---

2. Hebrew: מגילה היצונית לבראשית. See Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (1956).

3. Hebrew: ספר אבות. As suggested by Mazar in D. Flusser, review of *A Genesis Apocryphon*, by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *KS* 32 (1956): 379–83 (379 n. 2).

4. as suggested by T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*, 3 ed. (Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976), 358.

5. as suggested by Józef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*, trans. John Strugnell (London: SCM Press, 1959), 14 n. 1.

6. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 3 ed., BO 18a (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004), 16.

7. I will use the term “memoir” throughout this chapter as a way of referring to the distinct

affinity with the roughly contemporaneous works of 1 Enoch and Jubilees.<sup>8</sup> The literary relationship of Genesis Apocryphon to both 1 Enoch and (especially) Jubilees remains a matter of debate, with Avigad and Yadin suggesting that Genesis Apocryphon more probably preceeded Jubilees, while the prevailing opinion more recently seems to prefer the opposite.<sup>9</sup>

The name given to the Genesis Apocryphon in the *editio princeps* set the agenda for scholarly inquiry on the work into the modern era by connecting it to the biblical book of Genesis while simultaneously categorizing it as apocryphal. Much of the attention given to the Genesis Apocryphon, therefore, has focused on its literary genre and its relationship to the Bible and resemblance of the Targums and later midrashic works. As already noted, Vermes's

---

(mostly) first-person narratives found in the Genesis Apocryphon. This is simply a convenience term that highlights the formal characteristic of being written in the first person voice without any reference to the authenticity of the work and in alignment with the convention of referring to first-person narratives in the Bible as "memoirs" (e.g., the "Nehemiah Memoir" or the "Isaiah Memoir").

8. Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 16–37.

9. *ibid.*, 38; cf. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 20–21. Fitzmyer cites Hartman's suggestion, built on Fitzmyer's own work, that the similarity between Genesis Apocryphon's and Jubilees's chronology of Abram's life. Because the chronology seems to have been closely tied to Jubilees's more rigid calendar, it follows that Genesis Apocryphon drew from Jubilees. See Louis F. Hartman, review of *Qumran Cave 1, The Genesis Apocryphon*, by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *CBQ* 28 (1966): 495–98.

treatment of Genesis Apocryphon focused on the role that it played in showing the continuity between the interpretation of Jewish scripture during the Second Temple period and the aggadic traditions of early rabbinic Judaism. In Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, StPB 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961), Vermes treats in detail the relationship between Gen 12:8–15:4 and Genesis Apocryphon cols. 19–22, ultimately declaring Genesis Apocryphon to be “the most ancient midrash of all” and the “lost link between the biblical and the Rabbinic midrash.”<sup>10</sup> The result of this framing (whether one considers it appropriate or not) has been that much of the scholarly attention paid to Genesis Apocryphon has focused on its relationship to Genesis and especially how its author(s) may have been addressing exegetical issues found within the (later) biblical work. Yet, as Fitzmyer observes, the roots of biblical midrash are now generally accepted to be found within the Hebrew Bible itself. Together with the fact that a number of targums have been found at Qumran makes the presence of targumic and midrashic qualities in Genesis Apocryphon less remarkable and, I think, frees us from any obligation to try and fit it cleanly within either category.<sup>11</sup> However, the treatment of Genesis Apocryphon as primarily exegetical (or in the case of Vermes, as midrash) tacitly implies that the purpose of Genesis Apocryphon was to explain or interpret Genesis. Put another way, Genesis Apocryphon is often treated as if its purpose in antiquity was to say something *about how to read Genesis*. Placing Genesis Apocryphon under the rubric of “biblical interpretation,” for example, does not, to my mind, adequately appreciate the potential for Genesis Apocryphon

---

10. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 124.

11. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 20.

to be a creative work in its own right.

What remains uncertain about the Genesis Apocryphon is what its function may have been for its original audience. I am in agreement with Fitzmyer that it seems unlikely that Genesis Apocryphon would have been used liturgically and that the general character of the work is “for a pious and edifying purpose,”<sup>12</sup> yet, I can not help but feel somewhat dissatisfied with this answer. How might Genesis Apocryphon have edified its readers? Works such as Jubilees and 1 Enoch, perhaps, have more obvious rhetorical aims, but for all its similarities to these texts, Genesis Apocryphon maintains a different character which has generally eluded commentators.

While I have no illusions that I will be able to offer a satisfactory answer to the question of Genesis Apocryphon’s specific purpose, approaching Genesis Apocryphon as an object of cultural memory, I believe, is a useful heuristic for addressing the problem holistically. The advantage that a memory approach has in addressing this problem is that it offers a way to talk about the manifold ways that Genesis Apocryphon both builds from its social location and speaks back into it at a number of “discursive levels.”

I have chosen to frame the discussion of Genesis Apocryphon around the ways that Genesis Apocryphon functions as social memory at three such discursive levels. First, and as a point of departure, I will discuss the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon engages with the biblical tradition. Second, I will discuss the ways that Genesis Apocryphon engages with its reader through the lens of genre and its shared formal characteristics with other similar texts.

---

12. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 20.

Finally, I will discuss Genesis Apocryphon as and work of pseudepigraphy and its direct engagement with the cultural memory of ancient Israel.

### 3.1 GENESIS APOCRYPHON AND BIBLICAL MEMORY

Although it is anachronistic to suggest that the “Bible” existed during the late Second Temple period, insofar as the texts and traditions that later formalized as the “Bible”—especially those contained in the Pentateuch—were certainly present in a reasonably stable and even privileged state, I think it is a mistake to jettison any discussion of RwB texts as they relate to the texts that would later become the Hebrew Bible. On the other hand, restricting our discussion to those later biblical texts would likewise not do justice to the wide variety of texts and traditions in existence during the Second Temple period which undoubtedly influenced Genesis Apocryphon. In an effort to strike a middle ground, therefore, I have opted to refer to “biblical memory,” by which I simply mean the confluence of stories and traditions which relate to those later formalized in the Hebrew Bible.<sup>13</sup> In this section, therefore, I would like to discuss the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon participated in biblical memory.

---

13. I would like to emphasize that I am not suggesting that “biblical memory” represents a qualitatively unique form of memory, only that the scope of the traditions under consideration relate to texts that later became the Bible, and, in all likelihood, held at least some sort of special privilege within the memory of many Second Temple Jews.

### 3.1.1 What was the Genesis Apocryphon Rewriting?

Although the Genesis Apocryphon is generally touted as one of the more clear-cut examples of the Rwb, it is noteworthy that its relationship to the biblical text is not, in fact, entirely uniform.<sup>14</sup>

The earliest columns of the Genesis Apocryphon (cols. 0–5), which are narrated from the perspective of Lamech (the “Lamech Memoir” by my terminology), Noah’s father, essentially offer a rewriting of 1 Enoch 106–107.<sup>15</sup> In this section, Lamech, recounts the birth of Noah and Lamech’s fear that his wife, Bitenosh, had conceived Noah by means of the עירין

---

14. Moshe Bernstein, “Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, vol. 94, STDJ (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 317–43.

15. George Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 2 ed. (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), 174. The birth of Noah seems to have been a matter of some interest; a number of other texts likewise discuss the exceptional qualities of Noah at his birth. See 4Q534 [4QBN<sup>a-d</sup>], 1QNoah<sup>a</sup> as well as James C. VanderKam, “The Birth of Noah,” in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of József Tadeusz Milik*, ed. Zdzisław Jan Kapera, QM 6 (Kraków: Enigma, 1992), 213–31. Note also Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Lamech Narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) and *Birth of Noah* (4QEnoch<sup>a</sup> ar): A Tradition–Historical Study,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, vol. 94, STDJ (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 253–71.

”Watchers.” Despite Bitenosh’s assurances, Lamech petitions his father, Methusaleh to ask *his* father, Enoch, for further assurance, which he ultimately gives. Although this section is fragmentary, its close resemblance to 1 Enoch 106–107 makes the scholarly reconstruction of the missing sections quite plausible. While it may be tempting to suggest that this section of Genesis Apocryphon represents a variant edition of 1 Enoch 106–107, rather than a rewriting, the fact that the version of the story preserved in Genesis Apocryphon is told in the first-person from the point of view of Lamech, while 1 Enoch 106–107 is told in the third-person, makes this suggestion highly unlikely. Moreover, because both 1 Enoch and Genesis Apocryphon were composed in Aramaic, the differences between the two tellings cannot be attributed to translational issues. In other words, although cols. 0–5 deal, nominally, with events in Genesis 5:28–29, for all intents and purposes, the story recounted in these columns is a retelling of events known from the Enochic tradition.<sup>16</sup>

---

16. It is not clear what the precise relationship between the Enochic traditions and the Genesis Apocryphon actually were. Here I have more-or-less assumed the priority of 1 Enoch, but I wish to leave ambiguous whether Genesis Apocryphon represents a rewriting of the *text* of 1 Enoch, or whether they simply draw on a common tradition. Thus, I have chosen to refer to the tradition “known from” 1 Enoch, rather than 1 Enoch itself. See Stuckenbruck’s treatment of these traditions in Stuckenbruck, “The Lamech Narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” 253–71; Nickelsburg’s concise but thorough treatment of the similarities and differences in of these texts is also quite helpful. See Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 173–74 as well as Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 122–23.



The second major section of Genesis Apocryphon begins with a superscription identifying What follows as a *כתב מלי נוח* [פרשגן] or “[A copy of] the Book of the Words of Noah” (5.29) and continues through col 17 (and, likely, onto the beginning of 18).<sup>17</sup>

Although this section accounts for the bulk of the scroll, significant portions are missing or unreadable. This “Noah Memoir” begins with a description of Noah’s righteousness<sup>18</sup> (affirmed even in-utero) and his early family life (5.29–6.9), followed by a vision predicting the flood (6.9–7.9) which comes about due to the evil behavior of the Nephilim. Cols. 7–8 are highly fragmentary, but most likely described the events of the flood, while cols. 9–12 (which

---

17. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 174–75; Regarding the superscription, see Richard C. Steiner, “The Heading of the ‘Book of the Words of Noah’ on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a ‘Lost’ Work,” *JSJ* 2 (1995): 66–71. On the topic of the existence of a so-called “book of Noah” see Devorah Dimant, “Two ‘Scientific’ Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*, ed. Peter W. Flint James C. VanderKam and Emanuel Tov, VTsup 101 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 230–49 and Cana Werman, “Qumran and the Book of Noah,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*, ed. Estelle Glickler Chazon, Michael Edward Stone, Avital Pinnick et al., STDJ 31 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–82.

18. vanderkam:righteousness-of-noah

are slightly less fragmentary) describe the Ark's putting in on Mt. Ararat, God's instructions to and blessing of Noah (including the prohibition of consuming blood), and Noah's subsequent interest in viticulture. Cols 13–15 recount a dream-vision in which Noah is depicted as a cedar tree with shoots representing his sons, including a fragmentary explanation of the dream. Finally, cols. 16–17 describe the division of the land by Noah to his sons.

As with the Lamech Memoir, the Noah Memoir clearly draws from traditions outside of those preserved in Genesis. This fact was acknowledged even from the scroll's initial publication.<sup>19</sup> Although the flood account in Gen 6:9–9:17 is a longer and more developed story in its own right than is the account of Noah's birth (which the Lamech Memoir takes as its point of departure), characterizing cols 6–17 of Genesis Apocryphon as *primarily* a rewriting of the Genesis flood story does not give due consideration to the additional traditions which influenced its composition. The mention of the Watchers (Aram: עִירִין) and the Nephilim in cols. 6–7 especially bear a thematic resemblance to the Book of Watchers in 1 Enoch 6–11.<sup>20</sup> and the explicit reference to the “the [Book] of the Words of Enoch” in col. 19.25 suggests that the Genesis Apocryphon was familiar with 1 Enoch, or at the very least a tradition of enochic writings.<sup>21</sup>

---

19. Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 38.

20. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*, 174.

21. It is worth noting, of course, that this reference occurs in the latter Abram section which some have argued originates in a different source than the first two memoirs. See esp. Bernstein, “Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” 317–43 and Moshe J. Bernstein, “Is the Genesis

More plain, however, is the Noah Memoir's connection to the book of Jubilees, which seems to offer a consistent point of contact with this section of the Genesis Apocryphon.<sup>22</sup> In fact, it was the explicit identification of Lamech's wife Bitenosh which first prompted Trevor's initial identification of the (unopened) scroll with the so-called Book of Lamech.<sup>23</sup> An exhaustive treatment of the parallels between Jubilees and Genesis Apocryphon is outside the scope of this chapter, however, I will list four of the most significant points of contact between the Noah Memoir and Jubilees as observed by Daniel Machiela in his treatment of the works' relationship, which I have reproduced in part with a few modifications and corrections:<sup>24</sup>

1. Noah makes an expiatory ( $\sqrt{kpr}$ ) offering "for the whole earth" (1QGenApoc ar 10.13: וכל ארעא כולהא || Jubilees 6.2)
2. Noah's engagement in viticulture and celebration of its fruits on Mt. Lubar (1QGenApoc ar 12.13–15; Jubilees 7:1–2)

---

Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?" AS 8 (2010): 107–34.

22. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 20.

23. Trever, "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from 'Ain Feshkha," 8–10.

24. TODO: MAKE SURE ALL THESE REFS ARE GOOD. Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*, STDJ 79 (Leiden: Brill), 13. Machiela also includes the observations about Lamech's wife, Bitenosh and the length of time Abram and Sarai are in Egypt. Because these events fall outside the Noah Memoir, I have omitted them here.

3. The division of the earth to Noah's offspring (1QGenApoc ar 16–17; Jubilees 8:10–9:15)
4. The building of Hebron (1QGenApoc ar 19.9; Jubilees 13.2)

Thus, without detailing each related theme and detail, the scholarly consensus since the initial publication of Genesis Apocryphon has been that 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Genesis Apocryphon all participate in overlapping or adjacent traditions.<sup>25</sup>

The final surviving columns of the scroll, cols. 19–22, represent the longest and most complete sustained narrative preserved in Genesis Apocryphon. Moreover this section of the text maps very closely to Genesis 12:10–15:14 which retells the stories of Abram and Sarai's sojourn in Egypt (|| Gen 12:10–20), Abram's subsequent conflict with Lot (|| Gen 13:1–18), the Elamite campaign (|| Gen 14:1–24), and the beginning of Abram's vision (|| Gen 15:1–4). Genesis Apocryphon's retelling of these stories follow the chronology of Gen 12–15 very closely, but Genesis Apocryphon embellishes and augments the narrative throughout. Like the Lamech and Noah Memoirs, this section of the Genesis Apocryphon is largely written as a first-person narrative, this time in Abram's voice. The transition between the Noah Memoir and the Abram memoir is missing, so there is no superscription or title for this section. Moreover, although the narrative begins in the first-person, beginning in 21.23, the narrative transitions to the third person and remains so through the end of the surviving portion of the scroll.<sup>26</sup>

---

25. avigad-yading1956; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 20–22; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 110–16; Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 8–19.

26. It is worth pointing out that the final surviving sheet of parchment was not the final

This latter portion of the Abram Memoir at times borders on a word-for-word translation of Genesis into Aramaic which has provided occasion for a number of (especially early) scholars to compare Genesis Apocryphon with the Targums.<sup>27</sup>

The similarity of these retellings to their putative biblical *Vorlage*<sup>28</sup> prompted some (esp. early) scholars to suggest that Genesis Apocryphon represented a sort of prototype for the later Pentateuchal Targums.<sup>29</sup> While this may be a fair assessment for the very end of the scroll, the freer sections that precede it, and especially the earliest portions that deal with Lamech and Noah, really cannot reasonably be considered even “paraphrases.” Thus most treatments of Genesis Apocryphon have tended to discuss the the work, following

---

sheet of the scroll originally. Avigad and Yadin note that although only four sheets of the work were present, the seam between the fourth and (what would be) the fifth sheets is visible on the edge of the fourth sheet. Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 14.

27. Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (New York: Schribner’s, 1961; repr., Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 193.

Though, he notably amended his opinion later **BLACK::TODO**

28. Of course, we cannot be certain that the *Vorlage* of Genesis Apocryphon was, in fact, the same as the MT. That said, relative stability of (especially) the Torah texts during the Second Temple Period is widely accepted. For the purposes of this section, I will work under the assumption that the MT represents a very close approximation to the text that the authors/editors of Genesis Apocryphon were familiar with.

29. *Ibid.*, 193.

Vermes, in terms of its relationship to the genre of “midrash.”<sup>30,31</sup>

---

30. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*.

31.

## Bibliography

---

- Avigad, Nahman, and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*. 1956.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Józef T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Bernstein, Moshe. "Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*." Pages 317–43 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Vol. 94. STDJ. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Is the *Genesis Apocryphon* a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?" *AS* 8 (2010): 107–34.
- Black, Matthew. *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. New York: Schribner's, 1961. Repr., Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-Called Book of Noah and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3-4." Pages 230–49 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, James C. VanderKam and Emanuel Tov. VTsup 101. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*. 3 ed. BO 18a. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004.
- Flusser, D. Review of *A Genesis Apocryphon*, by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin. *KS* 32 (1956): 379–83.
- Gaster, T. H. *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*. 3 ed. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976.
- Hartman, Louis F. Review of *Qumran Cave 1, The Genesis Apocryphon*, by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. *CBQ* 28 (1966): 495–98.
- Machiela, Daniel A. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17*. STDJ 79. Leiden: Brill.
- Milik, Józef T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- Nickelsburg, George. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2 ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005.

- Steiner, Richard C. "The Heading of the 'Book of the Words of Noah' on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a 'Lost' Work." *JSS* 2 (1995): 66–71.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Lamech Narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) and *Birth of Noah* (4QEnoch<sup>a</sup> ar): A Tradition–Historical Study." Pages 253–71 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. Vol. 94. STDJ. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Trever, John C. "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from 'Ain Feshkha." *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10.
- VanderKam, James C. "The Birth of Noah." Pages 213–31 in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik*. Edited by Zdzisław Jan Kapera. QM 6. Kraków: Enigma, 1992.
- Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Werman, Cana. "Qumran and the Book of Noah." Pages 171–82 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Estelle Glickler Chazon, Michael Edward Stone, Avital Pinnick et al. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.