The Dissertation Committee for Jack L. Weinbender

certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Remembering and Rewriting

Reframing Rewritten Bible through Memory Studies

Comittee:

Jonathan Kaplan, Supervisor

Jo Ann Hackett

John Huehnergard

Steven Fraade

Remembering and Rewriting

Reframing Rewritten Bible through Memory Studies

By

Jack L. Weinbender

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2019

For my teachers.

Acknowledgments

Remembering and Rewriting

Reframing Rewritten Bible through Memory Studies

By

Jack L. Weinbender, Ph.D.,

The University of Texas at Austin, 2019

SUPERVISOR: Jonathan Kaplan

Abstract

Contents

Abbreviations

AB	The Anchor Bible
AHR	*American Historical Review*
AnBib	Analecta biblica
AQ	*Anthropological Quarterly*
ARS	*Annual Review of Sociology*
AS	*Aramaic Studies*
ASR	*American Sociological Review*
BAC	The Bible in Ancient Christianity
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BMI	Bible and Its Modern Interpreters
BO	Biblica et orientalia
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BT	*The Bible Translator*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CaS	*Cahiers sioniens*
CBC	Cambridge Biblical Commentary
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CH	*Church History*
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CurBR	*Currents in Biblical Research*
DJD I	Barthélemy, Dominique, and Józef T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave 1.* DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955

DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EC	*Early Christianity*
EJL	Early Judaism and Its Literature
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel*
HS	The Heritage of Sociology
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTS	*HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
Int	*Interpretation*
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
JANES	*Journal of Ancient Near Eastern Studies*
JARMC	*Journal of Applied Research in Memory and Cognition*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBW	*Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JMH	*Journal of Modern History*
JS	*Journal for Semitics*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KS	*Kirjath Sepher*
LDSS	Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSTS	The Library of Second Temple Studies
MAARAV	*MAARAV: A Journal of Northwest Semitic*
ML	Meridian Library
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OPC	Oxford Philosophical Concepts
OS	*Ostkirchliche Studien*
OTL	Old Testament Library

OTP	Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983
PGI	*Politics, Groups, and Identities*
PHSC	Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and its Contexts
PMS	Publications in Mediaeval Studies
PNAS	*Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
PUPCM	Publicationes de la Universidad Pontificia Comillas Madrid, Series 1
QM	Qumranica Mogilanensia
RB	*Revue biblique*
RdQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
SA	Scriptores Aethiopici
SASLJS	The Samuel and Althea Stroum Lectures in Jewish Studies
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SDSS	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SemSt	Semeia Studies
SF	*Social Forces*
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SPAW	*Sitzungsberichte der Koniglich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*
SRB	Studies in Rewritten Bible
ST	*Studia Theologica*
STÅA	Studier i exegetik vid judaistik utgivna av Teologiska fakulteten vid Åbo Akademi
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia Post-Biblica
Text	*Textus*
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZKM	*Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

Chapter 1: The Rewritten Bible

In his seminal work *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies,* Geza Vermes introduced the term "rewritten Bible" into the discussion of Second Temple Jewish literature as part of a larger project to trace the development of haggadic traditions from the late Second Temple period into the rabbinic period. Vermes used the term rewritten Bible to describe a number of texts which closely follow portions of the biblical narrative but also augment, elide, and emend the text in ways which produced new literary works in their own right. According to Vermes, through this exegetical process, "the midrashist inserts haggadic development into the biblical narrative" in order to "anticipate questions, and to solve problems in advance."[1] Vermes traced these interpretive traditions historically and attempted to demonstrate an interpretive continuity between the Second Temple period and nascent Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity. Although the formal characteristics of these narratives differed from later midrash, rewritten Bible texts displayed the same kinds of "midrashic" tendencies. In Vermes's conception, therefore, the authors of rewritten Bible texts *implicitly* made use of interpretive traditions that later works such as the Talmud and Mishnah expressed *explicitly*.

Since the publication of *Scripture and Tradition,* Vermes's concept of rewritten Bible has

1. Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies,* StPB 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961), 95; See also idem, "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'," in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes,* ed. József Zsengellér, JSJSup 166 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 3–9.

taken on a life of its own and developed into its own discreet area of study as scholars from various related disciplines have reused, reinterpreted, and redefined the term.[2] The discussion of Rewritten Bible has become especially fruitful within the field of Qumran studies where new texts from the Second Temple period continued to be published throughout the late 20th century and where new material discoveries continue to this day. However, the idea of biblical rewriting has also been fruitfully applied to texts that have long been known to scholars such as Jubilees, Deuteronomy, Chronicles, and even the Synoptic Gospels.[3]

Although the scope and nuance of of the term rewritten Bible has shifted in the intervening years, the trajectory set by Vermes nearly sixty years ago has remained reasonably consistent. By focusing on the relationships that exist between Rewritten Bible texts and their scriptural *Vorlagen*, studies on Rewritten Bible texts have tended to discuss the topic primarily through the lens of biblical or scriptural interpretation by focusing on how the authors or editors of Rewritten Bible texts retained, emended, or excised material *from the biblical text.*

2. See especially the early discussions in Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It is Written—Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF,* ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99–121), George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus,* ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 89–156, and Daniel J. Harrington, "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies I: The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters,* ed. Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg, BMI 2 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 239–47.

3. On reading the Gospels as Rewritten Bible, see Mogens Müller, "Luke — The Fourth Gospel? The 'Rewritten Bible' Concept as a Way to Understand the Nature of the Later Gospels," in *Voces Clamantium in Deserto: Essays in Honor of Kari Syreeni,* ed. Sven-Olav Back and Matti Kankaanniemi, STÅA (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 2012), 231–42; Gert J. Malan, "Is Rewritten Bible/Scripture the Solution to the Synoptic Problem?" *HTS* 70.1 (2014): 1–10, and more recently Garrick V. Allen, "Rewriting and the Gospels," *JSNT* 41 (2018): 58–69

While these treatments are often very good, this preoccupation with the "biblical" text (or a particular "scriptural" text, using the more common terminology) I think has impeded the study of these texts as participants in a broader cultural discourse that extends beyond "biblical interpretation."

In this chapter I will trace the emergence and evolution of the concept of rewritten Bible from Vermes's use in *Scripture and Tradition* to the present focusing on three key questions and ideas which have shaped the scholarly discourse around rewritten Bible studies: 1) the terminology surrounding rewritten Bible, 2) what works should fall under the rubric of rewritten Bible and 3) whether rewritten Bible constitutes a literary genre, a process, or some combination of the two. Taking these questions into account, I will then offer my own suggestions on how the Rewritten Bible conversation can be augmented by the treatment of Rewritten Bible texts as participants in a broader cultural discourse through the lens of cultural and social memory studies.

1.1 SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION

The primary purpose of *Scripture and Tradition* was not to offer a clear definition of the term "rewritten Bible," but to lay the groundwork for the historical, diachronic, study of aggadic traditions, of which rewritten Bible makes only a small part.[4] As Vermes recounts, prior to the mid-twentieth century, the prevailing approach to the study of aggadic exegesis was to treat the aggadah as originating during the Tannaitic period. The aggadah were viewed as "the result

4. Vermes, "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'," 3.

of the adoption, and anonymous repetition, of popular interpretations by favourite preachers,"[5] the earliest of which were from the second century CE and were represented by Targums Onkelos and Jonathan. Furthermore, studies of ancient Jewish literature at this time focused on texts which modern Judaism considered authentic. As a result, a good number of earlier texts—for example, the apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and sectarian texts—were often categorically excluded from discussions of the origins of aggadic exegesis.[6]

A series of publications and discoveries beginning in the 1930's, however, began to undermine the notion that these early exegetical traditions began in the second century CE. Vermes credits this broadening of aggadic studies to a series of major studies and discoveries such as Rappaport's *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*,[7] Paul Kahle's Schweich Lectures at the British Academy on the Cairo Geniza (given in 1941, published 1947),[8] Kisch's new text edition of Ps. Philo's Liber antiquitatum biblicarum (1949),[9] the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1948) and Codex Neofiti (1956), as well as (and perhaps especially) Renée Bloch's work on midrash.[10] The overarching theme among these works was the evidence for continuity

5. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 3.

6. Ibid., 2.

7. Salomo Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus,* Veröffentlichungen der Oberrabbiner Dr. H.P. Chajes-Preisstiftung an der Israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien 3 (Vienna: Alexander Kohnt Memorial Foundation, 1930).

8. Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza,* The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1941 (London: Oxford University Press, 1947).

9. Guido Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,* PMS 10 (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1949).

10. Renée Bloch, "Écriture et tradition dans le Judaïsme: Aperçus sur l'origine du Midrash," *CaS,* 1954, 9–34; idem, "Methodological Note for the Study of Rabbinic Literature," in *Ap-*

between biblical interpretive traditions prior to the second century, and later aggadah. For example, Vermes notes that Rappaport's work on Jewish Antiquities identified substantial overlaps between Josephus's text and Rabbinic aggadah and suggested, therefore, that Josephus had drawn from an already living tradition of interpretation. The implication of his suggestion is that the aggadah of the second century were not novel exegetical works, but were themselves products of earlier exegetical traditions.

Building on these recent advancements, the explicitly stated purpose of *Scripture and Tradition* was to push the field beyond synchronic analysis of aggadah toward diachronic, historical analyses to trace the development of these exegetical traditions.[11] The book is eight chapters long and is divided into four parts.

The first section of *Scripture and Tradition,* entitled "The Symbolism of Words," is composed of three chapters which attempt to explain some of the processes by which localized symbolic interpretations were able to affect the interpretation of other, nominally related texts. In the first chapter, Vermes notes the divergent treatment of Gen 44:18–19 among ancient commentators and proceeds through a synoptic study of this passage in the Fragmentary Targum, Targum Neofiti, and the Tosefta of Targum Yerushalmi in order to argue for a relative chronology based on their use of shared interpretive traditions. He concludes that the Fragmentary Targum represents the most primitive work, whose interpretive strategy is

---

proaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice, ed. William Scott Green, trans. William Scott Green, with William J. Sullivan, BJS 1 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), 51–75; trans. of "Note méthodologique pour l'etude de la littérature rabbinique," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 43.2 (1955): 194–225; Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 3–7.

11. Ibid., 1; See also Bloch, "Methodological Note," 51–75.

essentially inner-biblical. He then argues that the Tosefta of Targum Yerushalmi depends on the Fragmentary Targum but offers a distinct interpretive stance and that the Targum Neofiti represents a later combination of these two traditions. In his second chapter, Vermes examines the symbolic use of the term "Lebanon" in the Hebrew Bible and other Jewish literature as a reference to Jerusalem and the Temple and how those symbolic meanings came to be. He identifies the Song of Songs as the intermediary text which helped to establish this tradition within post-exilic Judaism and that it occupies a unique position as the only biblical text which clearly uses the name Lebanon symbolically for the Temple. Importantly, Vermes shows that the symbolic use of Lebanon to represent Jerusalem and the Temple is rooted in *biblical* exegesis. This is a key idea for Vermes because it establishes a continuity between the production of the biblical text and its later interpretation. In chapter three, Vermes builds on his earlier work on the term "Lebanon" and examines other words which take on symbolic meaning in later Jewish texts: "lion," "Damascus," "*Meḥoqeq*," and "Man" and attempts to show that a similar process took place among the Dead Sea Scrolls texts and the targumic and midrashic materials.

It is in the second part of *Scripture and Tradition*—entitled "The Rewritten Bible"—that the topic of Rewritten Bible is first addressed directly. The section is composed of two chapters (four and five), both of which focus on the figure Abraham and the aggadic traditions surrounding his life. The purpose of these two chapters is to demonstrate a continuity of interpretive traditions from the late Second Temple period through to the early rabbinic period and beyond.

Vermes uses these two chapters to approach the topic from both ends of the chronological spectrum in what he refers to as "retrogressive" and "progressive" historical studies. In chapter four, Vermes embarks on what he calls a "retrogressive historical study" by which he means beginning with later, more developed traditions and working back toward their origins. In this case, Vermes begins with the 11th century CE text *Sefer ha-Yashar* and works backward to identify sections of the text which exhibit earlier traditions, most notably those in the Targums, Josephus, Jubilees, and (Ps.) Philo. The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate that even late texts can contain valuable information about earlier methods of exegesis. As Vermes puts it, "[Sefer ha-Yashar] manifests a direct continuity with the corresponding tradition of the time of the second Temple, but reflects also the influence of the haggadah of the Tannaim and Amoraim."[12] On the other hand, in chapter five, Vermes proceeds with a "progressive historical study," beginning with the oldest materials and working forward. Still focusing on the figure Abraham, Vermes treats in detail the relationship between Gen 12:8–15:4 and cols. XIX–XXII of the Genesis Apocryphon. Notably, Vermes treats Genesis Apocryphon as "the most ancient midrash of all"[13] and, rather dramatically declares it to be the "lost link between the biblical and the Rabbinic midrash."[14] For Vermes, the Genesis Apocryphon occupies a unique position just one step removed from inner-biblical exegesis. Accordingly, Vermes believed that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon was attempting "to make the biblical story more attractive, more real, more edifying, and above all more

12. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 95.

13. Ibid., 124.

14. Ibid., 124.

intelligible" and to "[reconcile] unexplained or apparently conflicting statements in the biblical text in order to allay doubt and worry."[15] According to Vermes, the Genesis Apocryphon's interpretation of Genesis was "organically bound" to the text of Genesis and the additions that *were* made sprung from the interpretation of the Bible itself and not whole-sale from the mind of the author. Where texts like Jubilees sought to systematically advance a theological vision, according to Vermes, the author of Genesis Apocryphon intended to simply "explain the biblical text," calling it illustrative of "the unbiased rewriting of the Bible."[16]

The third part of *Scripture and Tradition* is titled "Bible and Tradition" and is composed of a single chapter engaging in a lengthy analysis of the traditions surrounding the seer Balaam from Numbers 22–24. Vermes observes that while the majority of post-biblical texts treat Balaam as a villain, in *LAB* he is treated as a sort of tragic hero.[17] The more traditional portrayal of Balaam as a wicked prophet began within the nexus of biblical tradition itself. The various documentary strata of the Balaam story cast the prophet in differing lights, and it is the final stratum, the P layer, which got the final say—within the biblical text—about him. Vermes points out, however, that ignoring the Priestly additions yields a story somewhat similar to that of *LAB*. Thus, Vermes concludes that the exegetical traditions found in the later Targums and rabbinic works are simply the continuation of the exegetical strategies employed within the

15. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 126.

16. ibid., 126. I think this statement is demonstrably false, as I will argue in chapter three. The Genesis Apocryphon utilizes traditions tangential to Genesis which are not themselves contained within the biblical work. In fairness to Vermes, the early columns of Genesis Apocryphon were not available to him when he published *Scripture and Tradition* and it is in the earlier columns where this reliance on extra-biblical material is most easily seen.

17. Ibid., 173.

Bible itself, which he calls "biblical midrash or haggadah."[18]

The last two chapters make up the final section of Vermes's study, titled "Theology and Exegesis," and push the discussion to include early Christianity. Chapter seven is entitled "Circumcision and Exodus 4:24–26" but offers a subtitle of "Prelude to the Theology of Baptism," which gives some hint at the ultimate, if tacit, goal of the chapter. Discussing the topic of circumcision in Ex 4:24–26 and its treatment among the early exegetes, Vermes's primary observation is simply that the theology of circumcision and the exegetical traditions which surrounded it, were affected by historical forces and theological ideologies. For instance, he claims that Jubilees omitted the rather odd statement that God was going to kill Moses—who was saved by the circumcision of his son by Zipporah—because "[i]t was impossible for its author to accept that God tried to kill Moses as it was for him to believe that Moses neglected to circumcise his son on the eighth day after his birth."[19] Similarly, he notes that after the Bar Kokhba rebellion, the practice of circumcision was outlawed and so, "it is not surprising, therefore, to find the spiritual authorities of Palestinian Judaism emphasizing the greatness and necessity of this essential rite, and explaining away … every possible biblical excuse for delaying the circumcision of their children."[20] He ends the chapter by suggesting that the early Christian association of baptism with circumcision (citing Rom 4:3–4 and Col 2:11–12) was enabled by the traditional Jewish association of circumcision with blood sacrifice ("the Blood of

18. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 176.

19. Ibid., 185.

20. Ibid., 189.

the Covenant").[21] That Paul associated baptism with circumcision therefore, was "not due, therefore, to his own insight, but springs directly from the contemporary Jewish doctrine of circumcision which he adopted and adapted."[22]

Vermes makes a similar move in chapter eight, entitled "Redemption and Genesis XXII: The Binding of Isaac and the Sacrifice of Jesus." In it, he compares a number of ancient works' treatment of the Akedah and demonstrates how the (near-)sacrifice of Isaac became a prototype for the entire sacrificial system in later Judaism. The sacrifice of animals in the Temple functioned as a "reminder" to God of the faithfulness of Abraham. Furthermore, he shows the ways the tradition grew to focus on the willingness of Isaac to be sacrificed and his function as a proto-martyr. Thus, he ends the chapter by addressing the New Testament's portrayal of Jesus as a willing sacrifice to God and its putative relationship to the Akedah. Vermes makes the case that the redemptive theology of the NT—typically attributed to Paul—was not original to him. He writes:

> For although [Paul] is undoubtedly the greatest theologian of the Redemption, he worked with inherited materials and among these was, by his own confession, the tradition that "Christ dies for us according to the Scriptures."[23]

He then proceeds to push the origin of this theology back further into the first century CE, and, in rather dramatic fashion, suggests that the introduction of the Akedah motif into Christian

21. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 190.

22. Ibid., 191.

23. Ibid., 221.

theology—by means of the Suffering Servant—may have been by Jesus himself.[24]

Vermes concludes the chapter by discussing the Akedah and the Eucharist. Just as the whole sacrificial system pointed back toward the binding of Isaac in targumic exegesis, the eucharistic rite likewise was intended—according to Vermes—to point back to Jesus's redemptive sacrifice. Thus he concludes:

> Although it would be inexact to hold that the Eucharistic doctrine of the New Testament, together with the whole Christian doctrine of Redemption, is nothing but a Christian version of the Jewish Akedah theology, it is nevertheless true that in the formation of this doctrine the targumic representation of the Binding of Isaac has played an essential role.
>
> Indeed, without the help of Jewish exegesis it is impossible to perceive any Christian teaching in its true perspective.[25]

The arc of Vermes's study, therefore, is meant to establish a continuity between the earliest traditions of biblical interpretation with the later traditions of both Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity and to trace the evolution of those traditions historically. Rather than viewing the early rabbinic interpretations as *sui generis*, Vermes's larger purpose is to establish *continuity* between the earliest examples of biblical interpretation—even innerbiblical interpretation—and the exegetical work of the rabbis. Rewritten Bible texts, therefore represent an intermediary phase between innerbiblical interpretation and later explicit commentaries, all of which can be viewed on a single interpretive continuum.

---

24. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 223.

25. Ibid., 227.

1.1.1 Vermes's Use of Rewritten Bible

The fact that Vermes spent so little time explaining precisely what he meant by the term Rewritten Bible bears witness to the fact that Vermes thought the term was self-explanatory. Vermes makes this sentiment clear in his short retrospective on the origins of the term, expressing shock over the debate that his term prompted and the scholarly confusion surrounding it.[26] He writes:

> The notion [of Rewritten Bible], which over fifty years ago I thought was quite clear, seemed to the majority of the more recent practitioners nebulous and confused, and lacked methodological precision.[27]

Only a few scholars, according to Vermes, managed to remain true to his original vision.[28] Instead, many subsequent studies, according to Vermes, "moved the goalposts" to better "suit the interest of their inquiry."[29]

Yet, one cannot help but push back against Vermes here as scholars' desire to narrow the scope of the term is, I think, a reasonable impulse. After all, Vermes's use of Rewritten Bible covers texts written in several languages, across centuries, in no particular geographical region, and, while all the texts are "narratives," the formal similarities between Genesis Apocryphon,

26. The only other works that Vermes addresses the topic of Rewritten Bible (to my knowledge) is in Geza Vermes, "Bible Interpretation at Qumran," in "Yigael Yadin Memorial Volume," *ErIsr* 20 (1989): 184–91 and his contributions to Emil Schürer's multi-volume history, Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: 175 BC – AD 135,* ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black, 3 vols. (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986).

27. Vermes, "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'," 3.

28. He specifically references Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 99–121 and Moshe J. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Text* 22 (2005): 169–96.

29. Vermes, "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'," 4.

Jewish Antiquities, Jubilees, and the Palestinian Targums stop there. Vermes specifically laments the narrowing of the term Rewritten Bible to focus primarily on the Dead Sea Scrolls texts. Of course, when *Scripture and Tradition* was first published in 1961 (Vermes notes that the manuscript, in fact, was submitted for publication in 1959), only a small portion of the scrolls were published or accessible to more than a few specific scholars. But the field's subsequent preoccupation with the Qumran material, he suggests, is misguided.[30]

This sentiment is—it seems to me—a bit over-blown. On the one hand, Genesis Apocryphon and the Temple Scroll receive a lot of scholarly attention, but Jubilees and Jewish Antiquities do as well. Even so, whatever narrowing of the discussion of Rewritten Bible has occurred toward the Qumran scrolls is likely symptomatic of the "methodological [im]precision" attributed to *Scripture and Tradition* and the fact that Vermes did not clearly state what he meant when he used the term rewritten Bible. For example, Vermes's inclusion of the medieval Sefer ha-Yashar muddies the waters for those who wish to discuss Rewritten Bible as a process of scriptural interpretation which can be situated historically. On the other hand, his inclusion of the Palestinian Targums makes sense diachronically, but formally, the Targums are translations and not "new compositions" in the same sense that Jubilees or Genesis

30. I am sympathetic to what Vermes perceived as "moving the goalposts"—I think the context and purpose of how he used the term Rewritten Bible is often ignored—but it is worth pointing out that the reason the term Rewritten Bible is so often applied to the Qumran texts likely has less to do with a conscious, scholarly effort, and more to do with the fragmentation of the various fields that deal with the texts in question. A scholar with a background primarily focused on the New Testament or Hebrew Bible may not be as familiar with the texts and traditions of rabbinic Judaism that Vermes discusses in *Scripture and Tradition.* Perhaps ironically, it was this sort of fragmentation that *Scripture and Tradition* was written—at least in part—to overcome.

Apocryphon are. Within *Scripture and Tradition,* of course, Vermes treats these texts with due care and nuance—in the case of Sefer ha-Yashar, he endeavors to show that traditions preserved in the text can be traced back to the Second Temple period—but the fact that Vermes sought to situate haggadic developments diachronically while implementing a category that spanned such broad socio-religious (Qumran, Early Christian, Rabbinic, Medieval), chronological (1st – 12th centuries CE), and literary (translations, narrative, revelatory/apocalyptic, history?) horizons has given some scholars a reasonable challenge when attempting to use the term in their own work. Thus, simply because Vermes set the "goalposts" (to suit his *own* thesis, I might add), does not mean that others cannot or should not move them when appropriate, though hopefully along with a well-reasoned explanation for the change.

1.2 REWRITTEN BIBLE AND REWRITTEN SCRIPTURE

Since Vermes coined the term Rewritten Bible, a number of scholars have suggested that the term be modified to more accurately reflect the (now, well established) fact that there was no "Bible" in the late Second Temple period and that many of the works that would eventually make up the Hebrew Bible did not have stable textual witnesses that could be meaningfully "rewritten." Because of these difficulties, scholars have, in recent years, suggested alternate designations for the phenomenon under investigation, the most widely used of which is "rewritten *scripture*." Vermes's original term Rewritten Bible was a product of its time. It took for granted the existence of a canonical "Bible" that more-or-less resembled the Bible used by the rabbis in the early centuries CE and term rewritten scripture was intended to correct what

scholars perceived as an anachronistic reference to this canon of scripture during the late Second Temple period.[31]

Apart from the anachronistic reference to a "Bible," one of the primary objections to the use of the term Rewritten Bible is the implicit assertion that Rewritten Bible texts necessarily fall outside the Bible.[32] The notion that a rewritten biblical text by definition, could not be considered "Bible" itself runs contrary to, on the one hand, texts such as Chronicles and Deuteronomy which—for all intents and purposes—"rewrite" their biblical *Vorlagen* but are themselves a part of "the Bible" and on the other hand texts such as Jubilees and the Temple Scroll which likely were considered "scripture" among certain groups in antiquity and, in the case of Jubilees, continues to be in use by the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church.[33]

---

31. Jonathan G. Campbell, "Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment," in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes,* ed. József Zsengellér, JSJSup 166 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 49–81. See also Eugene Ulrich, "The Notion and Definition of Canon," in *The Canon Debate,* ed. Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 21–35 and idem, "Crossing the Borders from 'Pre-Scripture' to Scripture (Rewritten) to 'Rewritten Scripture'," in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes,* ed. József Zsengellér, JSJSup 166 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 83–104.

32. Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 61.

33. Although it is not quite accurate to refer to a "canon" of scripture in the same way that the Western Churches refer to it, the point stands that the books of Enoch and Jubilees were preserved by and remain in use for the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church. See Leslie Baynes, "Enoch and Jubilees in the Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam,* vol. 2 of *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam,* ed. Eric F. Mason et al., 2 vols., STDJ 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 799–818, Bruk A. Asale, "Mapping the Reception, Transmission, and Translation of Scriptural Writings in the EOTC: How and Why Some "Pseudepigraphical" Works Receive 'Canonical' Status in the Ethiopian Bible," *JS* 22.2 (2013): 358–75 and Roger W. Cowley, "The Biblical Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church Today," *OS* 23.4 (1974): 318–23. On the topic of the relative closedness of the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church's canon, See Bruk A. Asale, "The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Canon of the Scriptures: Neither Open nor

Yet, I am not at all convinced that substituting the term "scripture" for "Bible" meaningfully affects the way that scholars have continued to discuss the topic at hand. While I agree that "the Bible" as we know it from the early centuries CE did not exist during the late Second Temple period, I likewise find the strict reading of "Bible" to mean "the Hebrew Bible (as we know it)" unnecessarily rigid. To say that Jubilees was a part of the Qumran Community's "Bible" does not carry a vastly different nuance, it seems to me, than to say that the Qumran Community considered Jubilees to be "scripture." Insofar as a particular group—given a set of texts—can determine which it considers to be "scripture" it has, at least in common parlance, a "Bible." That said, I can appreciate the desire to fine-tune our terminology to reflect the scholarly discourse.

It could, however, be argued that the term "scripture" is no more ancient a term than "Bible." Scholars such as James VanderKam have done important work in trying to discern which texts may have been considered "authoritative scripture" at Qumran,[34] but the fact remains that such endeavors start with the assumption that the ancients utilized a notion at all similar to what we consider "textual authority." While there is good reason to believe that some texts were more important than others during the Second Temple period (e.g., the Pentateuch, Isaiah, et al.), the degree to which they considered them "scripture" is not at all clear. Thus, replacing the term Rewritten Bible with Rewritten Scripture, it seems to me, may very well shift the semantic burden from a well defined modern category of text to an ill-defined ancient

---

Closed," *BT* 67.2 (2016): 202–22.

34. James C. VanderKam, "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 5.3 (1998): 382–402.

category.

For the sake of simplicity, I will follow Vermes in this study and simply use the term "Rewritten Bible." In doing so, I realize that I am deviating from what has become the common scholarly terminology. Yet, I find some comfort in Vermes's own take on the matter, who writes, "Frankly, replacing 'Bible' by 'Scripture' strikes me as a mere quibble…I suggest therefore that we stick with the 'Rewritten *Bible*' and let the music of the argument begin."[35]

1.3 REWRITTEN BIBLE: A GENRE, PROCESS, OR SOMETHING ELSE?

One of the central issues with the term Rewritten Bible is whether it should be treated as a "genre" or as a "process" or "activity." Vermes, is not particularly helpful in clarifying the issue:

> The question has been raised whether the "Rewritten Bible" corresponds to a process or a genre? In my view, it verifies both. The person who combined the biblical text with its interpretation was engaged in a process, but when his activity was completed, it resulted in a literary genre.[36]

Within Vermes's schema of aggadic development, Rewritten Bible occupied a liminal space outside the genres of classical Jewish texts such as Targum and Midrash. Because these texts eluded categorization within established text categories, Vermes's treatment of Rewritten Bible as a discrete group was not unreasonable. A number of scholars have since upheld the categorical approach and argued for Rewritten Bible as a literary *genre*.

The parade example of this perspective is Philip Alexander's 1988 article "Retelling the Old Testament," which, although dated, remains the most widely cited exemplar of the "genre"

35. Vermes, "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'," 3–9 (original emphasis).

36. Ibid., 8.

perspective.[37] Alexander takes up four rewritten Bible texts (Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Liber antiquitatum biblicarum, and Jewish Antiquities) to determine whether there exists a set of concrete criteria by which scholars can admit or exclude texts from the category. Although I ultimately disagree with his conclusion that Rewritten Bible should be treated as a literary genre, his list of nine "principle characteristics" make a number of useful observations about the nature of Rewritten Bible texts generally and are summarized as follows:

1. Rewritten Bible texts are *narratives* which follow the order of the biblical text.

2. Rewritten Bible texts are "free standing" literary works that take on the same form as the text they rewrite. They do not comment explicitly on their *Vorlagen*, but weave interpretation into their seamless retelling.

3. Rewritten Bible texts are not meant to replace the biblical work.

4. Rewritten Bible texts cover a large portion of the biblical narrative and exhibit a "centripetal" relationship to the biblical text.

5. Rewritten Bible texts follow the biblical text's narrative ordering, but may omit certain, non-essential elements.

6. Rewritten Bible texts offer an interpretive reading of scripture which offer, quoting Vermes, "a fuller, smoother and doctrinally more advanced form of the sacred narrative"[38] and implicitly comment on the biblical text.

37. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 99–121; Vermes himself even put his stamp of approval on it, see Vermes, "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'," 4.

38. Citing Vermes in Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, 305.

7. Rewritten Bible texts are limited by their literary form which only allows a single interpretation of the biblical text that they rewrite.

8. Rewritten Bible texts are limited by their literary form which does not allow them to explain their exegetical rationale.

9. Rewritten Bible texts incorporate traditions and material not derived from the biblical text.

Despite Alexander's emphatic conclusion affirming the genre of Rewritten Bible, I find a number of these criteria to be unconvincing.

First, his criterion that the text be a *narrative* strikes me as arbitrary. While Vermes focused on Rewritten Bible as a narrative phenomenon, he has since noted that the reason for this was that his focus was on *aggadic* material, that is, non-halakhic interpretation, which by definition is non-legal. Coupled with the first half of his second observation—that Rewritten Bible texts take on the same form as the text they rewrite—these observations seem self-fulfilling and suffering from a sort of selection bias.[39] Alexander states that the author was "limited" by the genre of narrative to a single interpretation and could not provide his exegetical rationale illustrates the major, overarching assumption about Alexander's (and Vermes's) approach to these texts—that the essential function of the texts and the purposes of their authors are the same as the later exegetes.

39. Although, all of the texts he surveyed are narratives, this fact illustrates one of the major shortcomings in Alexander's method, specifically, that his conclusions were based on four texts "normally included in the genre."(Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 99) Therefore the selection of these four texts was the result of a deductive selection, in part, based on their narrative form.

Second, several of his criteria are comments about the intention of the author or purpose of the work, for example that the Rewritten Bible text was not "meant" to replace its *Vorlage*. Although I believe this to be fundamental to the discussion, as formal characteristics of a genre, Alexander does not address how one is to determine such purposes and intentions. In particular when discussing texts—as Vermes does—such as the Palestinian Targums, or (now) the so-called Reworked Pentateuch (4QReworkedPent)[40] Similarly, claiming that Rewritten Bible texts "implicitly comment" on their *Vorlagen* speaks to the *intention* of the author, which in the edge cases is not clearly demonstrable. Such claims overstep the issue of genre and have entered into speculation about the text's social function. Thus while Alexander does offer some concrete formal characteristics for Rewritten Bible, a number of his criteria are actually issues of textual *function*.

Alexander insists that "Any text admitted to the genre must display *all* the characteristics."[41] This principle seems needlessly rigid to me. Although these characteristics were inductively identified, Alexander offers no formal rationale for selecting his sample. The texts that he selects represent the *core* of what is generally accepted to be Rewritten Bible, but texts on the periphery of a genre by definition will not display *every* characteristic of the core texts. Thus, Alexander's criteria, from my perspective, should not be treated as prerequisites for inclusion to the category of Rewritten Bible (if we are to treat it as such), instead, they should

40. In fairness, 4QReworkedPent was not available to Alexander or Vermes. Yet, one still may wonder why the LXX or Samaritan Pentateuch are not included.

41. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 99–121 (119 n. 11).

be used to describe a sort of literary *Idealtypus* for Rewritten Bible.[42]

Moshe Bernstein, too, has upheld a Vermesian understanding of Rewritten Bible as a literary category and has argued that for the category to be useful to scholars, the boundaries must be clearly demarcated and reasonably narrow.[43] Notably, Bernstein never clearly articulates what it means for a category to be "useful." All the same, he writes that he set out to:

> examine the definition and descriptions of "rewritten Bible" proffered by Vermes and several subsequent scholars, in order to delineate the variety of ways in which the term is currently employed and to make some suggestions for how we might use it more clearly and definitively in the future.[44]

Bernstein begins by addressing the few small modifications that he makes to Vermes's list, namely that Bernstein does not understand the Targums to be examples of Rewritten Bible. He excludes Targums from his discussion "*ab initio*," as well as "biblical" books, (by which he seems to mean "Chronicles"), and includes legal texts such as the Temple Scroll. Despite this second exclusion, Bernstein acknowledges that "One group's rewritten Bible could very well be another's biblical text!"[45] Thus, Bernstein concedes that "matters of canon and audience may play a role," but does not address the topic further.

---

42. I have borrowed and adapted the well-known term *Idealtypus* from Max Weber. See Max Weber, *Economy and Society,* ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich, trans. Ephraim Fischoff (1922; repr., Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1978). For a concise summary of Weber's work, see Philip Smith and Alexander Riley, *Cultural Theory: An Introduction,* 2nd ed. (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 2009), 12–16.

43. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 169–96.

44. Ibid., 171–72.

45. ibid., 175. This seems particularly odd, since, an Ethiopian Christian may protest that Jubilees should be excluded as well.

Bernstein critiques scholars such as Nicklesburg,[46] Harrington,[47] and Brooke[48] for excessively expanding the use of the term Rewritten Bible at its "upper bound" (my term) to the point that they have weakened the term and have "not aided in focusing scholarly attention on the unifying vs. divergent traits of some of these early interpretive works."[49] Likewise, Bernstein critiques Tov for including reworked texts (e.g., 4QReworkedPent) and therefore expanding the "lower bound" of the category. While Bernstein avers that "Rearrangement with the goal of interpretation is probably an earlier stage in the development of biblical 'commentary' than supplementation with the goal of interpretation,"[50] he nevertheless distinguishes the former from the category Rewritten Bible and declares that "the definitions of 'rewritten Bible' furnished by Tov and Vermes are [not] even remotely compatible, and we need to choose between them simply for the purposes of clarity."[51] Bernstein, ultimately, argues that Vermes's category is worth keeping around, and admonishes the reader to maintain a narrow

46. Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 89–156.

47. Harrington, "Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," 239–47.

48. George Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 777–81.

49. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 179.

50. ibid., 183. I make special note of the fact that Bernstein places the term "commentary" in quotes to indicate that he is not saying that Rewritten Bible is formally "commentary." Yet, the overarching principle remains that Rewritten Bible is implicitly "commenting" on the biblical text. See also Fraade's work in this area: Steven D. Fraade, "Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash as Commentary," in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash,* ed. Carol Bakhos, JSJSup 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 59–78 and idem, "Between Rewritten Bible and Allegorical Commentary: Philo's Interpretation of the Burning Bush," in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes,* ed. József Zsengellér, JSJSup 166 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 221–32.

51. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 185.

definition of the category, because, in his own words, "the more specific the implications of the term, the more valuable it is as a measuring device,"[52] and conversely that "the looser the definition, the less precisely it classifies those items under its rubric."[53]

At the other end of the spectrum, a number of important scholars have treated Rewritten Bible as a "process" or "activity" rather than as a genre or category. These scholars also have tended to be more "expansive" when it comes to which texts should be discussed as "rewritten." Harrington, as noted above, is the parade example of those who wish to treat Rewritten Bible as a process. He states:

> Nevertheless, establishing that these books are not appropriately described as targums or midrashim is not the same as proving that they all represent a distinctive literary genre called "rewritten Bible." In fact, it seems better to view rewriting the Bible as a kind of activity or process than to see it as a distinctive literary genre of Palestinian Judaism.[54]

Instead, he observes that while texts such as Jubilees and *Assumption of Moses* both constitute a rewriting of the Bible, both "are formally revelations of apocalypses."[55] This is an important criticism of scholars who see Rewritten Bible as a distinct genre. Unlike, for example, the Gospels, which arguably have the same basic "form," the texts typically described as "rewritten" come in a variety of "forms" such as narratives (Genesis Apocryphon), apocalypses (Jubilees), and legal (Temple Scroll). In other words, a single *genre*—insofar as the word describes a literary *form*—is not sufficient to subsume the varied *forms* which all can be

52. Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 195.

53. Ibid., 195.

54. Harrington, "Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," 242–43.

55. Ibid., 243.

described as "rewritten."[56] More recently, Molly Zahn has attempted to move the conversation forward by interacting with modern genre theory—which is conspicuously absent from most discussions of "genre" and Rewritten Bible.[57] Zahn discusses the difficulty that Harrington addresses by noting that works may participate in multiple genres simultaneously. While older conceptions of genre "pigeonhole" texts to specific genres, modern genre theorists—she cites Fowler—now prefer to talk about texts "participating" in a genre. Citing Fowler, Zahn notes that "genres are less like pigeonholes and more like pigeons" and further augments the metaphor to suggest that genres are "more like flocks of pigeons." She writes:

> Just as a flock of pigeons might change shape, lose and add members, be absorbed into larger flocks of break apart into several smaller flocks, genres and their boundaries are not static.[58]

Zahn's contribution is nuanced and deserves to be taken seriously. The implication for Rewritten Bible is clear: although Jubilees is a revelatory text while the Temple Scroll is a legal

56. Anders Petersen has, more recently, attempted to bridge this genre/process gap by arguing that Rewritten Bible makes sense as a genre from an *etic*, scholarly, perspective, whether or not (he thinks not) such a genre existed in antiquity (i.e., as an *emic* category). Such distinctions, are useful, and I am in broad agreement insofar as Petersen accepts a classical definition of genre (see below). Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon: Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez,* ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306. Contra Petersen, see the recent work of Jozef Tiňo, "The Classification of Rewritten Scripture: A Plea for Retaining the Emic Perspective," *JSJ* 49.3 (2018): 330–49.

57. Molly M. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment," *JBL* 131.2 (2012): 271–88; Daniel Machiela noted the absence of genre theory in his 2010 article, as well, see Daniel A. Machiela, "Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism—A Review of Recent Developments," *JJS* 61.2 (2010): 308–20; Notable exceptions include George Brooke, "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Pesher," in "Rethinking Genre: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins," *DSD* 17.3 (2010): 332–57.

58. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture," 277.

text, they can both participate in their respective "formal" genres simultaneously with the supposed Rewritten Bible genre. Zahn also explores the "functional" aspects of genre. She notes that genres are "not simply systems of classifications developed and used by literary critics, but are fundamental to all human communication."[59] Thus, genres manifest as common patterns recognized by both the author and the reader which aid communication and in this way; genre functions as a sort of "literary body language."[60] By way of a modern example, it is quite common in modern films for such generically-mixed works exist. Mel Brooke's films, for example, are well-known for a particular genre of goofball comedy/farce set against the backdrop of some other well-known genre. Here I have in mind films such as *Young Frankenstein* (1974), *Blazing Saddles* (1974), *Spaceballs* (1987), and others, each of which participates in both a specific comedic genre as well as "Star Wars-esque," "Western," or "Classic Horror" genres, respectively. Even in these examples, however, there are formal characteristics in *both* genres which the audience can point to. Although the social function of farce is distinct from classical horror movies, the distinction between classical horror films and farces is not only defined by its social function.

Yet, it is not at all clear to me what we have gained by upholding Rewritten Bible as a genre by simply changing what we mean by "genre," however well rooted in theory.[61] If by

59. Zahn, "Genre and Rewritten Scripture," 280.

60. ibid., 276. See also Carol Newsom, "Rhetorical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods,* ed. Maxine L. Grossman (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 198–214 and Alastair Fowler, *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Mode,* revised (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 37–53.

61. Machiela critiques Zahn's approach for similar reasons. See Machiela, "Once More, with

Zahn's definition of "genre" we no longer are talking about formal characteristics to Rewritten Bible, what we are ultimately left with is a particular kind of relationship (rewriting) matched to a particular kind of biblical *Vorlage*. Although this more sophisticated approach to genre is certainly superior, it seems to me that the kinds of questions that remain to be answered regarding the *purpose* of Rewritten Bible fall at the outer limits of generic discourse and may require a different set of analytical and theoretical tools.

1.4 DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES OF REWRITTEN BIBLE

Early adopters of the Vermes's taxonomy experimented with applying the term Rewritten Bible to a wide range of Second Temple Jewish literature. The discussion about which texts should fall under the rubric of Rewritten Bible has continued into the present and remains a point of scholarly contention. Insofar as "rewritten" texts can be measured by how closely they resemble their *Vorlagen*, defining the boundaries of Rewritten Bible focuses on which texts are *too far* from their *Vorlagen* to meaningfully be considered "rewritten," forming what I will refer to as the "upper bound" and texts which are *too close* to their *Vorlagen* to be considered distinct literary works, forming the "lower bound." At the upper bound, for example, the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Book of Giants* clearly are rooted in the biblical tradition, yet most scholars do not consider them sufficiently dependent on the text of Genesis to be considered "rewritten." Although they take Genesis 6:1–4 as a point of departure, their narratives do not explicitly return to the biblical text in a concrete way. Conversely, at the lower bound, the Samaritan

Feeling," 308–20.

Pentateuch and the 4QReworkedPent, although they certainly modify their *Vorlagen* (and in that sense are "rewritten") are more often considered examples of alternate textual *editions* rather than rewritten works. Likewise, the Targums and LXX, as translations, are frequently excluded from discussions of Rewritten Bible at the lower bound because they were, presumably, meant to be perceived as the same literary work as their *Vorlagen*.

1.4.1 The Upper Bound

Vermes's use of the term Rewritten Bible grew out of the concrete examples of texts that exhibited the sorts of exegetical practices relevant to later aggadic traditions. As others adopted the term, however, the question of how to abstract the concept to something meaningful that could be applied to other texts was explored by a number of scholars.[62] These early applications of the term Rewritten Bible, like Vermes's use, did not tend to carry a technical nuance and instead focused on the ways that numerous texts reappropriated biblical stories, figures and themes in their own works.

In his 1984 article "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," George Nickelsburg discusses a number of texts which are "very closely related to the biblical texts, expanding and paraphrasing them and implicitly commenting on them."[63] We should note that, although the article does deal with Rewritten Bible, it includes a discussion of texts which even Nickelsburg

62. See especially Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 89–156, Harrington, "Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," 239–47, and more recent contributions such as Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls,* CQS 8; LSTS 63 (London: T & T Clark, 2007).

63. Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 89.

does not consider "rewritten" (as the title indicates) discussing texts which introduce wholly new material into the traditions of the Bible.[64]

Nickelsburg does, however, provide a list of texts which he loosely describes as examples of biblical rewriting: 1 Enoch, *Book of Giants*, Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Jewish Antiquities, the Books of Adam and Eve (*Apocalypse of Moses*, *Life of Adam and Eve*), and some Hellenistic Jewish Poets including Philo's *On Jerusalem*, Theodotus's *On the Jews*, and the *Exagoge* by one "Ezekiel the Poet of Tragedies." Compared to Vermes's list, Nickelsburg's represents a maximalist understanding of the Rewritten Bible phenomenon. The inclusion, especially, of 1 Enoch illustrates his tendency to include works that build off of the biblical text (in this case, Genesis 6:1–4), but do not track with the biblical narrative for long stretches.

One of the more interesting contributions that Nickelsburg makes to the conversation is his idea that biblical rewriting followed a trajectory from rewriting smaller units of the Bible—involving short stories that deal with particular events from the biblical text—to longer, more systematic, treatments which span multiple biblical books. His treatment of 1 Enoch (which is, at least in part, the earliest text that he deals with) is illustrative of this approach. Rather than dealing with 1 Enoch as a whole, Nickelsburg addresses the various rewritings of the flood narrative throughout 1 Enoch as well as in the Book of Giants (which is not formally a part of 1 Enoch, but has a clear connection to the work).[65] Setting aside for the moment that 1 Enoch is a composite work, we can appreciate that the flood story from Gen 6–9 is retold and

64. Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 89–90.

65. Ibid., 90–97.

to varying degrees reinterpreted throughout 1 Enoch.[66]

Although Nickelsburg generally accepts that the rewritten texts "comment" on the Bible, he notes that the posture toward the biblical text is also not uniform even among the agreed upon Rewritten Bible texts. For example, while the author of Jubilees's concerns are largely halakhic and the book makes explicit reference to the biblical text, the authority assumed by the author of Jubilees does not (at least rhetorically) originate in the exposition of the Torah, but in the "immutable heavenly tablets."[67] Nickelsburg thus states:

> This process of transmitting and revising the biblical text reflects a remarkable view of Scripture and tradition. The pseudepigraphic ascription of the book to an angel of the presence and the attribution of laws to the heavenly tablets invest the author's interpretation of Scripture with absolute divine authority.[68]

In contrast, Genesis Apocryphon seems to have very little interest in halakhic matters and instead seems to just elaborate on the story by giving detailed geographic information and providing the reader with more dramatic characters.[69] Finally, he observes that Liber antiquitatum biblicarum likewise differs with Jubilees in its omission of halakhic matters and its "highly selective reproduction of the text."[70] This selectivity also differs from the Genesis Apocryphon, which otherwise is "characterized by the addition of lengthy non-biblical

66. By my count, there are six retellings of the flood in 1 Enoch: 6–11; 54:7; 64–69; 83–84; 86–89; and 106–107.

67. Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 100–1.

68. Ibid., 101.

69. Ibid., 106.

70. Ibid., 110.

incidence."[71]

Ultimately, Nickelsburg differs from Vermes mainly in the way he views the Bible during the late Second Temple period. Although Nickelsburg observes that the preoccupation with certain texts suggests that they were held in high regard, he does not have the same interest in tying the exegetical practices of, for example, Jubilees, with earlier inner-biblical or later haggadic traditions. Because Nickelsburg treats Rewritten Bible as a process, he is able to highlight the fact that, for example, 1 Enoch does indeed "rewrite" certain pericopae from Genesis despite the fact that the whole book (which, we should note, is a composite text to begin with) does not maintain a "centripetal" relationship with the biblical narrative.

Daniel Harrington's 1986 contribution entitled "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies I: The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," adopts the term Rewritten Bible to talk about texts produced around the turn of the era by Palestinian Judaism that "take as their literary framework the flow of the biblical text itself and apparently have as their major purpose the clarification and actualization of the biblical story."[72] In this regard, he follows Vermes closely in how he imagines Rewritten Bible to function. Yet, compared to Vermes, he operates with a slightly expanded list of rewritten texts. In addition to Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, Ps. Philo's Liber antiquitatum biblicarum and Josephus's Jewish Antiquities, he also includes the *Assumption of Moses* and the Temple Scroll. Furthermore, he makes a point to suggest that a number of other texts may be able to be included in the list, including *Paralipomena of Jeremiah*, *Life of Adam and Eve/Apocalypse of Moses*, and *Ascension of Isaiah.*

71. Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 110.

72. Harrington, "Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," 239.

Harrington's major contribution is his explicit rejection of Rewritten Bible as a category or literary genre (more on this, below) in favor of a process-oriented approach. Because of this fact, Harrington takes a broad view of rewriting and allows, to some degree, that this process be understood similar to a reception history (although, this is my term, and not his). Harrington's inclusion of the Temple Scroll marked a significant deviation from Vermes's use of the term by including non-narrative material under the rubric of Rewritten Bible. While several of Harrington's other suggested text are not considered Rewritten Bible by many scholars, the inclusion of other non-narrative texts, in particular the Temple Scroll, has gained wide acceptance.[73] Building on the notion that Rewritten Bible could also include non-narrative material, George Brooke, in a more recent treatment of the topic, defines Rewritten Bible as "any representation of an authoritative scriptural text that implicitly incorporates interpretive elements, large or small, in the retelling itself."[74] Adopting a "loose" definition of the term, Brooke includes in his discussion biblical texts that rewrite other biblical texts such as Deuteronomy and Chronicles in addition to examples of texts which "rewrite" portions of each of the major divisions of the Hebrew Bible, most of which were found at Qumran.[75]

73. At the time that *Scripture and Tradition* was published, the Temple Scroll had not yet been published, so it is hardly fair to expect Vermes to include it in his discussion. That said, my understanding of Vermes's conception of Rewritten Bible—even taking into account the existence of works such as the Temple Scroll—would preclude the inclusion of the Temple Scroll from the category of Rewritten Bible. This is a point at which even those who broadly agree with Vermes, such as Moshe Bernstein, take issue with Vermes's definition. See Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 183–84.

74. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," 777.

75. Brooke categorizes the texts as follows: Reworked Pentateuchs, Rewritten Pentateuchal narratives, Rewritten Pentateuchal laws, Rewritten Former Prophets, Rewritten Latter Prophets, and Rewritten Writings. ibid., 778–80. See also idem, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets, and

The purposes of rewriting, according to Brooke, are manifold, but in each case the (re)writer augmented or repurposed an authoritative base text for some new context. He writes:

> The rewriting seems to have a variety of purposes, among which are the following: to improve an unintelligible base text, making it more comprehensible (11Q19); to improve a text by removing inconsistencies—often through internal harmonization (4QpaleoExod^{m}); to justify some particular content by providing explanations for certain features in the base text (1QapGen); to make an authoritative text serve a particular function, perhaps in a liturgical setting (4Q41); to encourage the practice of particular legal rulings (Jubilees); and to make an old text have contemporary appeal (Temple Scroll).[76]

While I am sympathetic to the more maximalist approaches of Nickelsburg, Harrington, and Brooke, none of these treatments offer any concrete criteria for delineating between Rewritten Bible and texts that merely allude to biblical stories. Philip Alexander has suggested that certain works which are primarily "expansive" (the Book of Giants, the Book of Noah) should not be considered Rewritten Bible because their relationship to the biblical text is "centrifugal"—that is, they take the biblical text as a point of departure while formally Rewritten Bible texts show a "centripetal" relationship to the biblical text—that is, they expand beyond the biblical text, but remain tightly coupled to the text *as it exists in the Bible.* Alexander writes:

Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries,* ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov (London: British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 31–40 and the important work of Falk, *Parabiblical Texts.*

76. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," 778.

> Rewritten Bible texts are centripetal: they come back to the Bible again and again. The rewritten Bible texts make use of the legendary material, but by placing that material within an extended biblical narrative (in association with passages of more or less literal retelling of the Bible), they clamp the legends firmly to the biblical framework, and reintegrate them into the biblical history.[77]

This "centripetal" relationship to the biblical text, I believe, should form the upper bound of what is called Rewritten Bible. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, works such as 1 Enoch, will not be treated because they do not exhibit this close centripetal relationship. On the other hand, I adopt a more expansive understanding of Rewritten Bible than that of Vermes and include works within the Hebrew Bible itself (Deuteronomy and Chronicles), as well as non-narrative works such as the Temple Scroll which, I believe, do exhibit a centripetal relationship to the biblical text.

1.4.2 The Lower Bound: Between Bible and Rewritten Bible

Another recent avenue of investigation has been to explore the boundaries between the biblical text, editions, translations, and rewritten biblical texts. Vermes, of course, utilized the targums liberally in *Scripture and Tradition*, but his goal was to blur the line between post-biblical texts. Most scholars treating RwB, however, are not inclined to include the targums among RwB. But the targums—and for that matter the LXX and Samaritan Pentateuch—do uniquely represent interpretive traditions. Furthermore, the instability of the biblical text during the late Second Temple period, as exhibited by the varied editions of Jeremiah found at Qumran and other

77. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 117.

liminal texts, such as 4QReworkedPent, has problematized the question of what may have constituted "Bible" (or, more properly, "scripture") at the time.

Unsurprisingly, Emanuel Tov has been at the forefront of this investigation. In his 1998 article, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," Tov's purpose is to specify the "fine line between biblical manuscripts and rewritten Bible texts."[78] By this, Tov means that he is concerned with what I have termed the "lower bound" of the definition of RwB, specifically, the distinction between a text *edition* and a distinct composition, which Tov considers "rewritten." The primary difference between these two categories of texts, according to Tov, is not how dramatically the daughter text diverges from its parent, but the *purpose* of the daughter text.[79] According to Tov, this purpose is mirrored in the putatively authoritative status of the "biblical" text vis-à-vis the rewritten text which, he says, is not authoritative (although, he seems to suggest that this is up for debate[80]). For example, he notes that the extant texts of Jeremiah, while widely divergent in length and order, still represent "biblical Jeremiah" which carries some authoritative weight. Tov is, however, careful to point out that the nature of this authority is not clear and "the boundary between the biblical and non-biblical texts was probably not as fixed as we would have liked for the purpose of our scholarly analysis."[81]

Carrying a similar trajectory, Michael Segal's 2005 article "Between Bible and Rewritten

78. Emanuel Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5.3 (1998): 334–54.

79. Ibid., 334.

80. Ibid., 337.

81. Ibid., 335.

Bible," in the tradition of Alexander, attempts to enumerate a series of criteria by which scholars can define the lower bound and distinguish between "editions" of biblical texts and "rewritten" texts.

Segal's understanding of the role of RwB is rooted in the conviction that a rewritten text is a "new" work that derives its own authority by means of its association with a biblical text. The new composition carries with it the purpose and any theological or ideological *Tendenzen* of the new author, builds off of the authoritative status of the underlying text.[82] Segal writes:

> Even though these rewritten compositions sometimes contain material contradictory to their biblical sources, their inclusion within the existing framework of the biblical text bestows upon them legitimacy in the eyes of the intended audience … the inclusion of this material within the framework of the biblical passages under interpretation transforms the ideas of the later writer into authoritative and accepted beliefs.[83]

And further:

> The nature of the relationship between rewritten biblical compositions and their sources constitutes a paradox. On the one hand, the rewritten composition relies upon biblical texts for authority and legitimacy. The author claims that any new information included in the later work already appears in earlier sources. But simultaneously, the insertion of new ideas into the biblical text, ideas that may even contradict the beliefs and concepts of the original biblical authors, undermines the very authority that the rewriter hopes to utilize.[84]

While I find Segal's characterization of Rewritten Bible texts to be problematic,his main

82. Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran,* ed. Matthias Henze, SDSS (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–28.

83. Ibid., 11.

84. Ibid., 11–12.

contribution to the discussion are his criteria for distinguishing between "biblical" and RwB texts. He distinguishes between "external" and "internal" characteristics.

External Characteristics

Segal also identifies two external characteristics of RwB texts: "language" and "relationship between the source and its revision."

1. Language: While he offers little rationale for this criterion, Segal categorically dismisses the possibility that any RwB text could have been written in a language other than its *Vorlage*.

2. The Textual Relationship between the Source and Its Revision: The underlying text must be "visible" in the RwB text. He uses the book of Chronicles as the parade example of this relationship and notes the caveats necessary in dealing with *Vorlagen* from this period (i.e., it is difficult to say what is "rewritten" versus what is just another variant in the *Vorlage*).

Segal notes that both of these criteria, in fact, apply to textual editions, as well as to RwB texts.[85] In other words, these are not "distinguishing" criteria, so much as the baseline for consideration. One may demur, however, that if a single criterion, such as language, categorically excludes several texts which meet all the other criteria (below; by this definition he excludes Genesis Apocryphon, Josephus's Jewish Antiquities, and Ps. Philo's *LAB*), perhaps the problem is with the criterion.

85. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20.

Literary Criteria for Rewritten Bible

It is the "Literary Criteria" which Segal, ultimately, believes provide the *definition* of RwB texts.[86] Segal provides six internal criteria:

1. Scope of the Composition: "Editions" of texts cover the same material as their source. In other words, one expects an edition of Genesis to cover the same material as the book of Genesis; pluses and minuses do not stray into other works. On the other hand, rewritten texts "do not generally correspond to the scope of their sources."[87] For example, he observes that Jubilees covers Genesis and part of Exodus, and Chronicles covers parts of Samuel and Kings. Oddly, he also notes that Ps. Philo—which is not written in Hebrew—runs from Genesis into 1 Samuel. He writes: "In all these examples the change in the scope of the composition created a new literary unit."[88]

2. New Narrative Frame: Several of the RwB texts include a framing narrative. His examples include the Temple Scroll and Jubilees, both of which re-frame the "biblical" material. In the case of both works, the Torah is assumed and the new work presumed to be a reflection of a second, direct revelation of the law to Moses, albeit by different means (and fragmentary, in the case of the Temple Scroll). In Jubilees, the angel of the Presence revealed this "second Torah" during Moses's second ascent (Exod 24). On the other hand,

86. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20.

87. Ibid., 20.

88. Ibid., 20–21.

the Temple scroll seems to begin in Exod 34.[89]

3. Voice: While biblical narratives are generally written in a "detached" third person style, Segal observes that both Jubilees and the Temple Scroll "change the voice of the narrator throughout."[90] As far as I can tell, what Segal means is that in these RwB texts, certain events which are narrated in the third person in the biblical text are re-framed as, for instance, direct discourse in the first person by an angel, or even by God.[91]

4. Expansion versus Abridgment: By-and-large, text editions are *additive*. That is to say, when there is a discrepancy between the amount of content (as opposed to the order), typically the shorter text is considered older. Segal is here concerned with editorial changes, and not with scribal errors, which, of course could go in both directions (through parablepsis et al.). This property, he contends, is rooted in the conviction of the scribes that in order to reproduce a text, one must reproduce the *entire* text.[92] Rewritten Bible texts, however, felt free to add *or remove* material because their authors understood themselves to be composing entirely new works.[93]

5. Tendentious Editorial Layer: "Editions" do not change fundamental ideology of the work.

89. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 22.

90. Ibid., 22.

91. This may seem like a minor quibble, but the "narrator" has a distinct and technical meaning in narrative criticism which should be maintained. I would note, however, that this sort of reframing is not unique to RwB, since, e.g., Deuteronomy does something similar (perhaps Segal considered Deuteronomy to be RwB?).

92. Ibid., 24.

93. Ibid., 24.

For example, differing editions of Jeremiah may differ but those differences do not change the fundamental ideology of the work. Likewise, expansion and addition to the work (e.g. additions to Daniel) are in line with the theological *Tendenz* of the shorter book. On the other hand, RwB texts freely alter the ideologies of the text, for example, Jubilees.[94]

6. Explicit References to the Source Composition: "Editions" cannot (in a meta-discursive sense) reference its base text while RwB texts can (e.g., Jubilees reference to the Torah).

Although I disagree fundamentally with Segal's conclusions, he makes a number of useful observations about several literary features which are common to Rewritten Bible texts. If one ignores his linguistic criterion, his literary criteria form a solid formal baseline for discussing Rewritten Bible texts. Thus, while Segal would categorically dismiss Genesis Apocryphon, Jewish Antiquities, Liber antiquitatum biblicarum, et al. for not being composed in Hebrew, in fact, his literary criteria fit these works very well.

More recently, Tov has returned to the topic of text editions and their relationship to the phenomenon of RwB.[95] Tov addresses three "strange" texts from the LXX which, for one reason or another, differ significantly from the preserved MT (3 Kingdoms, Esther, and Daniel). Evoking a number of Segal's criteria[96] for inclusion in the category of Rewritten Bible (which

94. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 25.

95. Emanuel Tov, "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere," in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006,* ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 369–93.

96. Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 10–28.

he acknowledges to be well accepted, if not terribly well defined), Tov suggests that these LXX texts likewise may exhibit 1) a new narrative frame, 2) expansion and abridgment, and 3) a tendentious editorial layer and therefore may be candidates for RwB.

It is important to think about what Tov and Segal are trying to accomplish in these articles: They are trying to connect scribal practices which allowed for exegetical additions and emendations to "authoritative texts"—dramatic examples of which are provided by Samaritan Pentateuch and LXX—to the practices which produced the *new compositions* which scholars refer to as RwB texts.[97]

What Tov's articles in particular demonstrate, however, is that the issue of authorial *intent* and *purpose* may be at the heart of the distinction between text edition and RwB. Of course, such intents are not things that can be objectively proven, but I can not help but feel that such considerations ought to factor into reconstructions of ancient practices, even if we must settle for speculation. Thus it may be that certain especially troublesome texts, such as 4QReworkedPent, cannot be meaningfully categorized as "edition" or "rewritten" based on formal characteristics at all. Instead, it may be that such distinctions, ultimately, must be addressed by how we reconstruct a text's function within its social context with due consideration to the fact that such contexts are not monoliths and differ across time and space. For example, I imagine that the author of Genesis Apocryphon did not consider himself to be creating a new edition of Genesis, nor do I imagine that the author's contemporaries understood it to be such. The same goes for Jubilees and Chronicles (for Samuel–Kings). On the

97. Although, one wonders why the Targums are not included here. Perhaps it is because Tov is arguing for Hebrew *Vorlagen* of these texts, while the Targums represent a translation.

other hand, the editors and translators of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Targums, and LXX presumably *were* producing texts whose social functions aligned with (albeit, not perfectly) the biblical text.[98] Therefore, what matters for our purposes is not, necessarily, what formal characteristics distinguish Rewritten Bible texts, but rather what social *function* such texts may have held in antiquity vis-à-vis the biblical text.

1.5 CONCLUSION

While each of these discussions has worked to expand and refine the study of Rewritten Bible, the basic trajectory set by Vermes—the conviction that Rewritten Bible reflects an effort by the writer to implicitly comment on the biblical (or some "scriptural") text—has remained surprisingly consistent.[99] This tendency to focus first and foremost on the exegetical qualities of Rewritten Bible reflects Vermes's original purpose for the term quite well, but given the current state of the discussion, I think it is worth reconsidering this central tenet. This is not to say, of course, that there is *no* exegetical purpose to *any* Rewritten Bible text, rather that given

98. I am not claiming that the social function of the LXX and (esp.) the Targums would have been identical or indistinguishable from their *Vorlagen*, however, the fact that both the LXX and Targums were at times used liturgically—in any capacity—speaks to a unique social function by comparison to Rewritten Bible texts. That Chronicles is used liturgically is only a function of the fact that it became a part of the Hebrew Bible on its own merits. Canonically speaking Chronicles does not derive its authority based on its relationship to Samuel–Kings.

99. Most general introductions to the topic treat it in this way. See Sidnie White Crawford, "The Rewritten Bible at Qumran," in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran,* ed. James H. Charlesworth, vol. 1 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. James H. Charlesworth, 3 vols. (North Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL, 2000), 173–95; Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," 777–81; Molly M. Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 323–36, idem, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts,* STDJ 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

a broader view of Rewritten Bible, it is worth considering that the phenomenon of rewriting, as a literary process, was not primarily concerned with nor necessarily tied to the *explication* of a scriptural *Vorlage*.[100] Campbell, for example, has recently suggested that the practice of rewriting may have extended beyond works with scriptural *Vorlagen* and may better be understood as a more general literary phenomenon of the late Second Temple period.[101] In his article, Campbell observes that the rewriting of non-scriptural texts has by-and-large been ignored by scholars or Rewritten Bible and offers a number compelling examples of Second Temple texts which rewrite non-scriptural material following the same basic process as Rewritten Bible. In particular, Campbell notes that while Jewish Antiquities 1–11 focuses on biblical material, Jewish Antiquities 12–13 offers a rewriting of the *Letter of Aristeas* and portions of 1 Maccabees. These rewritings maintain the "structure and flow" of their base texts, just like Rewritten Bible, but it is generally agreed that neither 1 Macc nor the *Letter of Aristeas* were viewed as scripture by Josephus, who, notably, provides us with one of the earliest lists of sacred writings from the period.[102] According to Campbell, "Josephus handles these compositions in the same way that he treats scriptural material in *Ant.* 1–11."[103] Furthermore, 4

100. See the work of Koskenniemi and Linqvist who similarly conclude that Rewritten Bible should be treated as rewritten *story*. They ask several of the same questions that I hope to address in this dissertation. See Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist, "Rewritten Bible, Rewritten Stories: Methodological Aspects," in *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24–26 2006,* ed. Antti Laato and J. van Ruiten, SRB (Turku, Finland: Åbo Akademi University; Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 2008), 11–39.

101. Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 49–81.

102. Steve Mason, "Josephus and His Twenty-two Book Canon," in *The Canon Debate,* ed. Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 110–27.

103. Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 70; See also Mason, "Josephus and His Twenty-two Book Canon," 126.

Macc 5–17 retells the story of the martyrdom of seven brothers along with their mother found in 2 Macc 3–7. As with Jewish Antiquities 12–13, 4 Maccabees follows the structure and ordering of the account in 2 Maccabees while augmenting the story and using it to advance the author's thesis as part of a philosophical treatise.

What these examples lack, as compared with Vermes's understanding of rewriting, is a tradition of *interpretation* (*aggadah* for Vermes) which can account for the changes between the *Vorlage* and the rewritten work. None of these examples is primarily concerned with clarifying their *Vorlage*. At best, we might speculate that the authors refined the stories to better suit their needs (making corrections, emendations, etc.), but we do not imagine that there was any expectation that these "interpretations" carry any kind of normative force in later understandings of the original account. In other words, there is no reason for us to assume that the author of 4 Maccabees intended his reworking of the story of seven brothers to affect the way that readers would understand 2 Maccabees.[104] On the other hand, this is precisely what Vermes was arguing for in *Scripture and Tradition:* that the activity of rewriting was meant not only to be descriptive of *how* the authors understood the biblical *Vorlagen*, but that the *purpose* of these rewritten texts in some way functioned *prescriptively* within the tradition of biblical interpretation, that is, according to Vermes, Rewritten Bible texts were, by definition, *about* the texts that they rewrote.

Although modern genre theory, as presented by Molly Zahn, has offered some avenue

104. I hasten to point out that the later account certainly *would have* affected readers' understanding of the story in 2 Maccabees, but here I am arguing that we do not imagine the *intent* of the author of 4 Maccabees to be affecting that change.

for discussing the classification of these texts based on *function*, it provides no means for analyzing the *function itself*. In other words, Zahn's work has opened the possibility that the function of a text may affect its generic profile and that at least one such function could be common to texts that we call Rewritten Bible. However, *what* that function was and how it operated within its social context falls outside the field of genre studies. Similar limitations cropped up in discussions of the boundaries between text editions and Rewritten Bible as framed by Tov. Thus the social role of Rewritten Bible as a literary phenomenon within Second Temple Judaism remains a central and relatively understudied area.

As away to address this topic, this dissertation will approach the phenomenon of Rewritten Bible through the lens of Social and Cultural Memory studies. Although concrete data for the function of Rewritten Bible is still lacking, Memory studies offers a set of theoretical tools and models for thinking about the transmission, adaptation, and generation of cultural "memory" based on observed anthropological behavior and social theory. This dissertation, therefore, is meant to be an attempt to pivot away from reading Rewritten Bible texts as primarily functioning "exegetically,"—by which I mean focused on the explanation, even if implicitly, of a particular text—toward reading rewritten texts as products of cultural transmission and adaptation through the lens of cultural and social memory theory. To be sure, biblical interpretation played a part in the production of these texts, but other social, cultural, and literary forces were at work behind these texts as well which have largely been ignored in favor of exegetical and interpretive discourses. In the next chapter, I will provide an overview of Memory theory and how it can inform the discussion surrounding Rewritten Bible.

Chapter 2: Memory Studies and the Rewritten Bible

Over the past several decades, a dramatic increase in scholarly interest toward the topic of "memory" has swept throughout the social sciences and humanities. The precipitous rise in scholarly literature dealing with topics of memory coupled with its proliferation in popular media discourses has prompted some in the field to refer to a "memory industry" and to describe the ubiquity of memory discourses as a "boom" fast-approaching a bust.[1] Yet, as Olick et al. make clear in their Introduction to *The Collective Memory Reader*, there remain a significant number of scholars throughout the social sciences and humanities who continue to find memory to be a useful heuristic and a compelling theoretical basis for their various and sundry analytical applications.[2]

Central to the discussion of social and cultural memory (more on these terms below) is the interplay between the ways that memories are both "stored" and "recalled" and the impact that social structures have on these two processes at both the individual and societal level. One

1. Graviel D. Rosenfeld, "A Looming Crash or a Soft Landing? Forcasting the Future of the Memory 'Industry'," *JMH* 81.1 (2009): 122–58; Jay Winter, *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the 20th Century* (New Haven: Yale Univerisity Press, 2006); David Berliner, "The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology," *AQ* 78.1 (2005): 197–211; Alon Confino, "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method," *AHR* 102.5 (1997): 1386–403.

2. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, "Introduction," in *The Collective Memory Reader,* ed. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3–62.

half of this equation deals with the how societies construct the memory of their shared experiences, how they "commemorate" people, places, events, etc. by imbuing such ideas with significance and social meaning. The other half of the equation deals with the way societies receive their own cultural memories into new contexts and how such new contexts affect the given society's understanding of their memories before being passed on to the next generation. Social and cultural memory, therefore, deal with the processes which one might otherwise call "traditions." For the purposes of thinking about Rewritten Bible, it is the latter half of the equation that is of primary concern. From this perspective, Rewritten Bible texts can be viewed as textual products which represent the thorough recontextualization of received memories which were central to Jewish identity during the late Second Temple period (e.g., the stories contained in Genesis). Moreover, the codification of these "rewritten" stories is also an example of the way that received memories themselves form the basis of commemoration for the next generation.

In this chapter I will outline the background and current state of memory studies with special attention to the work of Maurice Halbwachs and more recent contributions from Yosef Yerushalmi, Jan and Aleida Assmann, and Barry Schwartz in an effort to provide a theoretical foundation for my own discussion of Rewritten Bible.

2.1 THE WORK OF MAURICE HALBWACHS: A VERY BRIEF OVERVIEW

Although the topic of memory has been of interest to philosophers and thinkers since the antiquity,[3] as Olick and Robbins note, modern social-scientific approaches (which concern this study) almost exclusively trace their genealogy to the early 20th century work of sociologist Maurice Halbwachs.[4] Although Halbwachs's scholarly contributions were not limited to the topic of social memory (he also made contributions to statistics and probability theory, as well as sociological work on the topic of suicide and social morphology), the influence of his work in this area not only made a more lasting impact on the field of sociology than his other contributions, but it has also made a profound impact in a number of other fields such as history, anthropology, and biblical studies.[5]

Halbwachs published three primary works on the topic of memory, the first of which appeared in 1925 under the title *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire.*[6] This monograph, along with the concluding chapter of his second monograph—dealing with the remembered geography of the Holy Land—was excerpted and translated by Lewis Coser in a single volume under the title

3. Mary Carruthers, "How to Make a Composition: Memory-Craft in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages," in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* ed. Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 15–29.

4. Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices," *ARS* 24 (1998): 105–40. It should be noted, however, that Halbwachs was not the first or only person to do work on memory or the impact of social structures on memory. See Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy, "Introduction," 8–36.

5. Lewis A. Coser, Introduction to *On Collective Memory,* by Maurice Halbwachs, trans. Lewis A. Coser, HS (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 1–34.

6. Maurice Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* (F. Alcan, 1925).

On Collective Memory in 1992.[7] His third and final contribution, entitled *The Collective Memory,* was published posthumously in 1950 and was translated into English in 1980 with an editorial introduction by Mary Douglas.[8] This work simultaneously represents some of Halbwachs's most developed ideas (responding to critics such as Charles Blondel) while evincing an incompleteness which posthumous publications often suffer.[9]

The central contribution of Halbwachs's work was the notion that human memory is intrinsically and inextricably tied to social frameworks.[10] Humans are social beings and as such human activities, such as memory, are only usable within the context of a society. This focus on the *social* dimensions of memory betrays the deep influence that Émile Durkheim's work had on Halbwachs.[11] Unlike Durkheim, however, Halbwachs's approach was tempered by his desire to identify the physical location of memory within to be within the *individual.*[12] Although the

7. Several of the most important chapters of *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* were included in full. Likewise, the entirety of the conclusion of *La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte* was included. Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* trans. Lewis A. Coser, HS (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992); idem, *La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte: étude de mémoire collective* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1941).

8. Idem, *The Collective Memory,* trans. Francis J. Ditter Jr. and Vida Yazdi Ditter, with an intro. by Mary Douglass (New York: Harper & Row, 1980); trans. of *La mémoire collective,* Bibliothèque de sociologie contemporaine (Paris: University of Paris Press, 1950).

9. Ibid. As Coser observes, "One may doubt that the author himself would have been willing to publish it in what seems to be an unfinished state. The book nevertheless contains many further developments of Halbwachs's thought in regard to such matters as the relation of space and time to collective memory as well as fruitful definitions and applications of the differences between individual, collective, and historical memory." Coser, Introduction, 2.

10. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 37–38.

11. Coser, Introduction, 8–9.

12. To clarify, Halbwachs was not at all interested in the biological processes or locating within the brain where memory is stored, only that "collective memory" *is* stored biologically

term "collective memory" evokes an ethereal or metaphysical idea, Halbwachs's use of the term was intended to ensure that any discussion of memory remained in the concrete. Collective memory is the sum total of those memories kept by *individuals* withing a society. An individual's ability to retrieve and utilize a particular memory, however, is inextricably entangled with the individual's social context. According to Halbwachs memories require social frameworks to function.[13]

To illustrate this point, Halbwachs begins *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* by attempting to prove the negative. *Without* a social framework, he argues, memories are always incomplete. Because humans—for all intents and purposes—always exist within a society, it is the dream state that most closely approximates the complete isolation of memory from society.[14] Therefore, the way that the human brain deals with memories while dreaming can illustrate the (dis)function of memories lacking a social framework. Thus, he observes that "dreams are composed of fragments of memory too mutilated and mixed up with others to allow us to recognize them."[15] Because the mind lacks the ability to "check" itself against anything external while in a dream state, dreams do not contain "true memories."[16] This assertion is set against the "purely individual psychology" of Bergson and Freud which viewed *memory* as a location of social isolation.[17] Regarding the incompleteness of the dream state, he

---

but, more importantly, is socially conditioned.

13. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 38.

14. Ibid., 41–42.

15. Ibid., 41.

16. Ibid., 41.

17. See Keith Ansell-Pearson, "Bergson on Memory," in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,*

writes:

> Almost completely detached from the system of social representations, [the dream state's] images are nothing more than raw materials, capable of entering into all sorts of combinations. They establish only random relations among each other—relations based on the disordered play of corporal modification.[18]

The "system of social representations" that Halbwachs refers to is not limited, however, to macro structures such as familial, religious, or class groups. Although these structures certainly *do* make up an important stratum of social frameworks, Halbwachs envisions something much more fundamental which betrays his broadly structuralist perspective. Halbwachs uses the phrase "social representations" to refer to a system of shared "signs" that encompassed not only these macro structures, but every aspect of a group's social framework—a sort of "cultural *langue*." Although, Halbwachs does not use the language of semiotics, the analogy is helpful. Just as Saussurian semiotics argues that the concrete arbitrary sign is given meaning only by participating in the broader, shared *langue*, so too memories (read: "signs") require a framework to convey meaning, as do the concrete, individual expressions of remembrance (read: *parole*).[19] Halbwachs writes:

> It is in this sense that there exists a collective memory and social frame-

---

ed. Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 61–76 and Richard Terdiman, "Memory in Freud," in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates,* ed. Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 93–108.

18. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 42.

19. This is my terminology with reference to Halbwachs. Of course, it is borrowed from Saussure. See *Cours de linguistique générale: Édition critique,* ed. Rudolf Engler (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989). For a brief overview of these terms see Smith and Riley, *Cultural Theory,* 93–94.

> works for memory; it is to the degree that our individual thought places itself in these frameworks and participates in this memory that it is capable of the act of recollection.[20]

Memories, therefore, cannot be understood in isolation from their social frameworks and therefore should not be analyzed without consideration to the social context of the rememberer.

Of course, people participate in a plurality of social contexts, often simultaneously, and the experiences that are later to be recalled, too, must be situated within these frameworks. In order to bring these autobiographical memories to mind, according to Halbwachs, an individual attempts to mentally situate herself within those same frameworks.[21] For instance, I find it much easier to recall whether a particular university course I have taken occurred in the Fall or Spring semester, rather than which month or even year it occurred. The social framework that is the "academic year" remains a potent framework for my own memories; I imagine the "year" beginning in the Fall, and often refer to "next semester." On the other hand, my wife—who had the good sense to stop her formal education after one degree—no longer thinks in terms of semesters. Yet, when remembering events during her time at university, the semester once again becomes a useful framework for memory. It is for this reason that recent memories are more easy to call to mind: because the social frameworks that produced the memory (the people, places, customs, etc.) remain in close proximity for the rememberer and the effort required to situate the memory within the social frameworks that produced it is minimal.[22] This

20. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 38.

21. Ibid., 38.

22. Ibid., 52.

notion is a central part of Halbwachs's thesis and provides a point of departure for his more in-depth studies of collective memory in the family, religion, and social classes.

2.1.1 A Note on Halbwachs's Terminology

There is a grand tradition of imprecise and overlapping terminologies within memory studies going back to Halbwachs himself. For example, on page 40 of *On Collective Memory*, Halbwachs uses each of the terms "collective memory," "social memory," "social frameworks of memory," and "collective frameworks of memory" and it is not entirely clear how Halbwachs is distinguishing between them. The way that he is able to use the terms almost interchangeably has led some in the current discussion to treat them as synonyms. As Anthony Le Donne observes, "In fact, ['social' and 'collective' memory] are currently used synonymously with such frequency that their nuances vary from author to author."[23] Yet, Le Donne points out, Halbwachs actually uses these terms with slightly different nuances. On the one hand, Halbwachs uses the term "social" memory when he is describing the way social structures affect memory, while on the other hand "collective" memory tends to refer to the content of memories which are transmitted between individuals and common to those of a particular group.

In other words, when Halbwachs uses the term "social" memory, he is referring to the social frameworks in which individual memory participates, i.e. how society provides the

23. Anthony Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 42 n.8.

framework that makes individual memory possible.[24] On the other hand, when he uses the term "collective" memory, he tends to refer to shared memory, "the shared cultural past to which individuals contribute and upon which they call; but ultimately a past that transcends individual memory."[25] The two ideas work together and mutually influence one another. As Hübenthal puts it, "The difference [between social and collective memory] lies in the perspective: *social memory* is using the framework, *collective memory* is establishing it."[26] Hübenthal's use of the active verb "establish" is intentional: for Halbwachs, collective memory is not a passive social accretion, but an actively constructed part of the group's common identity which *speaks to the concerns and needs of the community in the present.* Social frameworks shape the way that people remember. The retrieval of memories is shaped by those same frameworks, and as those frameworks shift, so too do the memories that are recalled in those societies.[27]

In his later work, Halbwachs distinguishes between two kinds of memory which can be

24. Sandra Hübenthal, "Social and Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis: The Quest for an Adequate Application," in *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis,* ed. Pernille Carstens, Trine Hasselbalch, and Niels Peter Lemche, PHSC 17 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012), 175–99.

25. Chris Keith, "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One)," *EC* 6.3 (2015): 354–76. See also Hübenthal, "Social and Cultural Memory," 180.

26. Ibid., 180.

27. For a modern assessments on the malleability of human memory and the effects of social networks on the formation of collective memory, see Alin Coman et al., "Mnemonic Convergence in Social Networks: The Emergent Properties of Cognition at a Collective Level," *PNAS* 113.29 (2016): 8171–76; Jeremy K. Yamashiro and William Hirst, "Mnemonic Convergence in a Social Network: Collective Memory and Extended Influence," *JARMC* 3.4 (2014): 272–79; Alin Coman et al., "Mnemonic Convergence: From Empirical Data to Large-Scale Dynamics," in *Social Computing, Behavioral–Cultural Modeling and Prediction,* ed. Shanchieh Jay Yang, Ariel M. Greenberg, and Mica Endsley (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2012), 256–65.

identified by the experiential-relation of the rememberer to the object of memory: autobiographical and historical memory.[28] Autobiographical memory refers to the sort of memories which are the result of individual, subjective experience, while historical memory refers to those which fall outside the experience of the individual. Elsewhere Halbwachs refers to these as "internal" and "external" memory. Autobiographical memory is rooted in the individual, sensory experiences which provide a full, "thick" memory—to borrow from Geertz[29]— while historical memory offers only a thin, schematic overview and by definition is never "experienced" by the rememberer.

Although Halbwachs distinguished between these two forms of memory, he nevertheless emphasized their interrelatedness. In particular, Halbwachs notes that autobiographical memory necessarily is dependent upon historical memory, insofar as our lives participate in "general history."[30] For example, memories of a more indirect nature are able to shape autobiographical memory by shaping the social frameworks which produced them and the frameworks into which they are recalled. The quintessential example for Americans of my age would be the events of September 11, 2001. Although comparatively few people directly witnessed the events (I was asleep on the West Coast when the first plane crashed), the impact that those events had (and continue to have) on the orientation of American national memory is unquestionably a part of many people's lived experience, including my own and would

28. Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory,* 52.

29. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic, 1973), 3–30. See also Smith and Riley, *Cultural Theory,* 189–92.

30. Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory,* 52.

therefore constitute a part of America's current "collective memory." Although the incoming undergraduate class at the University of Texas at Austin, many of whom will have been born after 2001, have *no* autobiographical memory of these events, it is, nonetheless, a part of the collective memory of their society at large. On the other hand the War of 1812 is not a part of any living person's autobiographical memory and its impact on the collective memory of most Americans is likely restricted to a few popular media references, or localized to specific geographical regions with a close connection to major events in the conflict (e.g., New Orleans).[31]

The memories of historical events, likewise, are shaped by the social frameworks of the rememberer. The events of September 11, 2001 in the memory of most Americans are now further shaped by the socio-political discourses surrounding the United States' continued military presence in the Middle East and its controversial pretexts for engagement in the region, especially with the invasion of Iraq in 2003. Likewise, although no living person has an autobiographical memory of the American Civil War, the construction of certain confederate monuments on the campus of the University of Texas at Austin during the Jim Crow era, and their subsequent removal in August of 2017, illustrates how historical memory can be (consciously, in this case) reshaped and restructured as the remembering society changes.[32]

It is the way that these remembered events change over time that makes social memory

31. Such as Jimmy Driftwood's *The Battle of New Orleans*, best known as performed by Johnny Horton which topped *Billboard* charts in the US, Canada, and Australia in 1959 and was recently acknowledged to be one of the Top 100 Western songs of all time. See, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Battle_of_New_Orleans.

32. See https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/21/us/texas-austin-confederate-statues.html.

studies so interesting for the historian. Halbwachs's own work in the area of history is best seen in *The Legendary Topography of the Holy Land*, where he focuses on the ways that memories relate to particular geographic sites. Notably, Halbwachs is not interested in "doing" history. Rather, Halbwachs's study focuses on the way that the geographical sites in and around the Galilee and Jerusalem were imbued with significance based on their putative connection with significant events related to Jesus, the Apostles, and early Christian communities.

Halbwachs makes a number of observations about the way that memories are formed and the ways that they interact. His first observation comes in contrasting the portrayal of Jesus within the Gospels with what must have been the lived experience of the Apostles.[33] The involvement of the apostles in the day-to-day life of Jesus in some sense would have prohibited them from achieving the kind of "necessary detachment" to write something like the the Gospels. In other words (and to use Halbwachs's later terminology), the memory of Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels is almost necessarily informed by *historical* rather than autobiographical memory.[34] Indeed, Halbwachs rightly observes that the Gospels present Jesus and his ministry "as if Jesus's whole life was but a preparation for his death, as if this was what he had announced in advance."[35] Although the religious significance of Jesus's death continues to be remembered as a central component of Christianity, surely Jesus's mother remembered

33. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 193–98.

34. Ibid., 194.

35. Ibid., 198.

the death of her son differently than the way the Church later commemorated it.[36]

Halbwachs, drawing on the Pauline epistles, observes that the earliest recollections of Jesus make no mention of the location of his death (Jerusalem) nor of his ministry (Galilee). He writes:

> In the authentic epistles of Paul, we are told only that the son of God has come to earth, that he died for our sins, and that he was brought back to life again. There is no allusion to the circumstances of his life, except for the Lord's Supper, which, Paul says, appeared to him in a vision (and not through witnesses). There is no indication of locality, no question of Galilee, or of the preachings of Jesus on the shores of the lake of Gennesaret.[37,38]

Halbwachs's point is that within the narrative of the Gospels, the location of Jesus's death—by virtue of the social and political reality of the day—*had* to occur in Jerusalem.[39] Whether or not it actually did, or whether or not that information was explicitly handed down

36. Regardless of whether Halbwachs's conception of Early Christianity would be considered sound today, the idea that the Gospels represent several collective remembrances of Jesus's life, ministry and death each bearing marks from their own *Sitz im Leben* (to borrow from the form critics) seems relatively uncontroversial. A number of studies on the Jesus and early Christian memory have come about in the past several years. See Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus;* Rafael Rodríguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance, and Text,* LNTS (London: T & T Clark, 2010). For an overview of the modern impact of Halbwachs (and memory studies more generally) on the field of Historical Jesus studies, see Keith, "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research," 354–76 and idem, "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part Two)," *EC* 6.4 (2015): 517–42.

37. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 209.

38. Notably, the only Jesus scholar with whom Halbwachs interacts is Ernest Renan, a figure whose work has survived mostly as a punching-bag for later scholars and as an example of overt anti-Semitism in biblical scholarship. See Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008), 39

39. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 211.

to the authors of the Gospels is irrelevant for the purposes of collective memory. Sacred places become sacred through the process of memory *construction*, not simply through the transmission of autobiographical experience. They are spaces where significant ideas within the collective memory of a group can take concrete form. He writes, "Sacred places thus commemorate not facts certified by contemporary witnesses but rather beliefs born perhaps not far from these places and strengthened by taking root in this environment."[40] Localizing historical memory, therefore, functions as a way to move abstract ideas into the real world and reinforce fundamental components of the group's collective memory.

Perhaps more interesting is Halbwachs's treatment of the ability for memories to coalesce and split over time. Halbwachs makes the observation that, according to tradition (i.e., the collective memory of the Church), certain places in the Holy Land mark the location of *several* significant events. From an historical perspective Halbwachs, obviously, doubts that these assertions are accurate—even assuming the events indeed occurred at all—but finds the clustering of these events to be more than just coincidence. For example, he writes:

> One is surprised to find on the shores of the lake Gennesaret, near the Seven Fountains, the place where apostles were chosen, the Sermon on the Mount, the appearance of Jesus on the waters after the Resurrection—all in the same place.[41]

Halbwachs's assumption is that there was something about the location *itself*, some "earlier consecration,"[42] which attracted these memories to particular locales. Extending this

40. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 199.

41. Ibid., 220.

42. Ibid., 220.

rationale further, we can appreciate the fact that for Christianity, the significance of Jerusalem is not limited to the significance of the city as the location of Jesus's death, but rather by the prior significance of the city for Judaism.[43] Within the collective memory of Christian tradition, one might say that Jerusalem is not significant because it is the location of the Passion and resurrection of Jesus, but that the Passion and resurrection of Jesus happened in Jerusalem *because Jerusalem was significant.* Halbwachs writes:

> The Christian collective memory could annex a part of Jewish collective memory only by appropriating part of the latter's local remembrance while at the same time transforming its entire perspective of historical space.[44,45]

One might object to this suggestion by noting that, supposing Jesus *actually was* crucified in Jerusalem, one hardly needs to re-appropriate Jewish tradition or attribute this remembrance to some special process. Yet, it is worth pointing out in cases where the historical data are lacking (or, perhaps, where eyewitness accounts certainly did not exist), this same basic phenomenon occurred. For example, Halbwachs points to the birth narratives of the Gospels, in particular that of Matthew, where Jesus is described as being born as a descendant of David in the town of Bethlehem (Matt 1:20; 2:1). Although there is no reason to think that Jesus was *actually* born in Bethlehem, Halbwachs rightly observes, "the authors of the gospels

43. In addition, Jerusalem was the location of the leadership for the earliest Christian Church according to Gal 1:18 (and attested throughout Acts).

44. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 215.

45. Because the earliest Christians were Jewish, it stands to reason that the collective memory of *earliest* Christianity was rooted in broader Jewish memory. In later periods—especially during and after the so-called parting of the ways (however problematic this term has become)—Halbwachs is certainly correct. Regarding the current discussion on the Jewish–Christian schism see Joshua Ezra Burns, *The Christian Schism in Jewish History and Jewish Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 19–60.

seem entirely to have invented this poetic history which has occupied a considerable place in Christian History."[46] In fact, Jesus's entire portrayal in the Gospel of Matthew is an exercise in collective remembrance which is structured on the foundational narratives of the Hebrew Bible: the slaughter of innocents (Matt 2:16–17), and Jesus's portrayal as a lawgiver "on the mount"(Matt 5:1–7:29), and framed as the fulfillment of Jewish prophecy (Matt 1:23; 2:6, 18 *et passim*).

The inverse of this phenomenon is also observable. According to Halbwachs while some events converge to particular locations, other events diverge among several sites. One expression of this process is the way that significant events are themselves divided providing the opportunity for each portion of the event to be separately localized. For example, Halbwachs notes how the memory of specific important events, such as the Passion, may be split and localized at a very fine level of detail:

> Around Golgotha and the Holy Sepulcher, for example, we find the rock of anointing, the rock of the angel, the rock of the gardener, the place where Jesus was stripped, etc.[47]

The proliferation of these micro-sites of memory, according to Halbwachs, aide and reinforce the collective memory through repetition. Furthermore, the added detail serves in "renewing and rejuvenating an ancient image."[48]

The same event may also be localized in multiple places. Halbwachs describes several traditional locations of the Cenacle (the "Upper Room" from the Gospels), including the Mount

46. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 214.

47. Ibid., 220.

48. Ibid., 220.

of Olives, Gethsemane, and the Grotto of Jesus's teaching. These traditions coexisted into the fourth century, yet, later, the site was moved to the Christian hill of Zion. Likewise, Halbwachs notes that there were two locations for Emmaus and two different mountains on which Jesus is said to have appeared in Galilee after his resurrection. While it runs counter to conventional modern conceptions of the past, that seemingly contradictory traditions are able to coexist within a society—or even within the memory of a single individual—is well documented. Halbwachs points out that autobiographical memory, however, does not allow for this kind of fragmentation. We all realize that the same event from our own past can not have happened in two locations simultaneously. Yet, Halbwachs points out that should that same person belong to two groups who disagree on a particular remembered event from history (one that the individual did not personally witness), individuals are generally able to hold such memories together (if in tension) without the need assert one or the other. The same is true of complex social entities such as religious groups who are themselves composed of smaller sects which may possess their own unique collective memory. Halbwachs writes:

> A community must often accommodate itself to contradictions introduced by diverse groups so long as none of these groups prevails, or so long as the community itself does not find a new reason for decisively settling the issue. This is especially true when the community faces a controversy about its rites, which are an anchor for its component groups.[49]

---

49. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, 224.

2.2 THE MEMORY BOOM

Halbwachs's work, while not ignored, would not make its most significant impact until well after his death. It is frequently argued that the so-called "memory boom," which began in the 1980's in the wake of the "theory boom," picked up Halbwachs's terminology and central ideas in an attempt to deal with the perceived insufficiency of traditional historiography to deal with the sorts of major, traumatic events which characterized the mid 20th Century.[50] Works such as Yosef Yerushalmi's *Zakhor* and Pierre Nora's *Les Lieux de mémoire* are typically cited as the foundational works of the modern memory boom.[51]

In *Zakhor,* Yerushalmi is quick to identify the tension between what traditional cultures and societies remember about their past and how the discipline of history treats the past. For remembering groups, what is preserved in the collective memory is what is useful for the edification of that group—whether through religious ritual, family stories, or some other combination of received traditions. Of course, prior to the enlightenment, this was the default mode of understanding the past for most people, and remains so for many social groups,

50. Karl Galinsky, "Introduction: Memory and Memory Studies," in *Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity,* ed. Karl Galinsky (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 1–39. See also Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy, "Introduction," 29–36. One cannot help but speculate that—at least in the English-speaking world—the translation of *The Collective Memory* in 1980 contributed to the popularity of Halbwachs's terminology.

51. Kerwin Lee Klein, *From History to Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011), 112–13; Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory,* SASLJS (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982; repr., New York: Schocken, 1989); Nora's massive project has been abridged and translated into English as Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past,* ed. Lawrence D. Kritzman, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, 3 vols., European Perspectives (New York: Columbia University Press); trans. of idem, ed., *Les Lieux de mémoire,* 7 vols. (Paris: Gallimard).

including those within modern, Western societies. In particular, Yerushalmi addresses this tension for the Jewish historian—a vocation which, he notes, is a recent phenomenon.[52] Although, ancient Israel and Judah, clearly, were concerned with matters of the perceived past—much of the Hebrew Bible is preoccupied with narrating events from the perceived past—these codified traditions are preserved in a plurality of socio-religious groups for a complex set of purposes spanning cultural, social, and theological modes of discourse which are fundamentally at odds with the discipline of history.[53] Thus, the biblical command to "remember," is not a command to keep tedious notes of historically accurate events, but a cultural and theological imperative to maintain the foundational narratives of the community. Yerushalmi writes:

> There the fact that history has meaning does not mean that everything that happened in history is meaningful or worthy of recollection. Of Manasseh of Judah, a powerful king, who reigned for fifty-five years in Jerusalem, we hear only that "he did what was evil in the sight of the Lord" (II Kings 21:2).[54]

52. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor,* 81–103.

53. I am aware of the problematic nature of this statement. Contemporary approaches to historiography are emphatically *not* attempting to write "objective history." Yet, referring only to "Modernist" historiography does not give due consideration to the fact that common discourse around the idea of "history" is largely influenced by Modernism. Even taking into account that contemporary historiography has moved beyond discussions of "objectivity" the methodological underpinning of historical discourse remains fundamentally different, if only by the existence of its own meta-discourse. As Daniel Pioske puts it, "from the recounting of a culture's sanctioned memories is consequently the historian's determination to isolate and compare disparate testimonies about the past with other past traces that may corroborate or discredit their claims." Daniel Pioske, "Retracing a Remembered Past: Methodological Remarks on Memory, History, and the Hebrew Bible," *BibInt* 23.3 (2015): 291–315.

54. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor,* 10.

In other words, what was remembered about Manasseh by the biblical tradants were those details which were useful for their socio-religious projects. The rules and methods of this process—remembering what is important and forgetting what is not—are generally not explicit or transparent.

The discipline of history, on the other hand, generally attempts to uphold a certain set of explicit methodological and theoretical criteria which—while not exempt from distortion by the subjectivity of the historian—can be corroborated or contradicted by evidence and argumentation.[55] While the historian participates in the collective memory of her own society, her reconstruction of the past attempts to approach the topic from the outside. The historian, too, (re)constructs the past, but the goals of the historian are, as Yerushalmi puts it, to recreate "an ever more detailed past whose shapes and textures memory does not recognize."[56] Even the most theory-conscious historian cannot help but struggle in avoiding older discourses about "what really happened," particularly when stated over and against memory in the form of received tradition. All of this is not to say that modern history writing is in any meaningful sense "objective," nor that the historian is able to remove herself from her own socio-political context. So, although memory and history both offer reconstructions of the past, it is important to affirm that their modes of doing so are radically different and for different purposes.[57]

55. Pioske, "Retracing a Remembered Past," 12–13.

56. Yerushalmi, *Zakhor,* 94; See also Peter J. Verovšek, "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: The Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm," *PGI* 4.3 (2016): 529–43.

57. See esp. Paul Ricoeur, *Memory, History, Forgetting* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 497. As Pioske observes, "The epistemological tension observed by Ricoeur between memory and history is thus understood as the outcome of two processes that, though having the similar intent of re-presenting former phenomena, nevertheless pursue and mediate the

Thus the memory "boom" has, in some circles, been viewed as anti-historical and an attempt at "resacrilization of the past" to counter the disenchantment brought about by modern historical consciousness.[58] Kerwin Klein, for example, traces the origins of scholarly interest surrounding memory and lists five narratives that others have offered as explanations for the origins of memory discourse in society generally:

> We have, then, several alternative narratives of the origins of our new memory discourse. The first, following Pierre Nora, holds that we are obsessed with memory because we have destroyed it with historical consciousness. A second holds that memory is a new category of experience that grew out of the modernist crisis of the self in the nineteenth century and then gradually evolved into our current usage. A third sketches a tale in which Hegelian historicism took up pre-modern forms of memory that we have since modified through structural vocabularies. A fourth implies that memory is a mode of discourse natural to people without history, and so its emergence is a salutary feature of decolonization. And a fifth claims that memory talk is a belated response to the wounds of modernity.[59]

Although Klein finds none of these "fully satisfying," it is noteworthy that the general trend among these narratives corroborates the thesis that memory represents a "reaction" against history in some form.

Whatever combination of these causes may have ultimately brought about the memory boom, the problem remains, according to Klein, that memory has come to dominate historical discourse as a "therapeutic alternative" to history in place of a rigorous scientific

---

past through quite disparate means." Pioske, "Retracing a Remembered Past," 12.

58. Winter, *Remembering War,* 282.

59. Kerwin Lee Klein, "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse," in *From History to Theory* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011), 112–37; repr. of "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse," *Representations* 69 (2000): 127–50.

methodology.[60] As Winter puts it, "It is a fix for those who cannot stand the harshness of critical thinking or historical analysis."[61] Although I think Klein under-appreciates the value of the memory discourse as a meaningful mode of inquiry, I am in fact, quite sympathetic to his critique overall. As methodologies for querying the past, memory and history operate on different sets of hermeneutical and epistemological foundations, which is, I think, one of Yerushalmi's main points. However, what Klein does not address is the way that, for modern Westerners, history *is* our collective memory (or at least, heavily influences our collective memory). This is what Nora means when he says that "We speak so much of memory because there is so little of it left."[62] And for Klein, this is a good thing—historical consciousness is uniquely valuable as a scientific endeavor and jettisoning this critical posture toward the past is tantamount to abandoning the enlightenment.

For modern historians studying the cultural memory of other modern people, it is easy to conflate the historical consciousness of the historian subject and that of the object. Such historical work relies on court documents, news articles, eyewitness accounts, and other documentary evidence that operates within an historical consciousness that closely resembles that of the historian. As a result, the historian can utilize her own historical intuitions when interacting with her sources. In Halbwachs's terms, the social frameworks (in this case the understanding of the way "history" is done) of the historian and their object of study are quite

60. Klein, *From History to Theory,* 137.

61. Winter, *Remembering War,* 283 (summarizing Klein).

62. Pierre Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," in "Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory," *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–24.

similar. For example, reading news reports from the mid-twentieth century does not require the historian to dramatically reorient her understanding of what "news" is. On the other hand, when studying ancient history, the intellectual distance between the source and the historian is, often, much more pronounced. Reading "historical" texts from antiquity often requires a kind of hermeneutical suspicion that is different from that used by scholars reading texts from the recent past.[63]

In fact, biblical scholars in particular have been dealing with this problem since the enlightenment. The tension between memory and history is played out clearly in both modern Jewish and Christian circles vis-à-vis historical-critical study of the Bible. Insofar as the Bible forms a major portion of both Jewish and Christian collective memory, historical-critical approaches to the biblical text continue to be met with fervent opposition in more conservative traditions. Parallels to what Klein describes within the discipline of history can be seen within biblical studies as well. Consider, for example, the way that Brevard Childs's canonical approach attempted to "overcome the long-established tension between the canon and criticism."[64] For Childs, writing an introduction to the Old Testament in the traditional manner (i.e., as an historical-critical introduction) was insufficient for use in churches or synagogues because it bypassed a fundamental aspect of the biblical text, the canon. Although he does not use the language of memory in his discussion of canon (though, it should be noted he made an

63. For example competent readers of modern newspapers know to bring a different set of suspicions to "news" articles versus editorials. Similarly, historians can read personal correspondence with a different kind of suspicion than monumental inscriptions.

64. Brevard S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 45.

important early contribution to the idea of memory in the biblical tradition which, I imagine, is not a coincidence[65]), here we can see that the various canons of scripture in use by Christians and Jews throughout the world nevertheless function as a form of collective memory by constructing and filtering what should and should not be remembered by the community.

The tension between history and memory is most problematic—as evidenced by Childs—when the historian participates within the collective memory of the community under investigation. This is why both Childs and Yerushalmi express their discomfort and dissatisfaction while attempting to operate with one foot in each world. This is the central critique of Klein: historians operate from the outside looking in (an etic approach), while practitioners of memory operate from within (an emic approach). Yet, this etic/emic distinction only makes sense when memory is placed on equal footing with history as a means of interrogating the past. From this perspective, I wholeheartedly agree with Klein that such an approach undercuts the epistemological foundations of modern historical inquiry. However, Klein does not address memory as the *object* of historical study. I think this is what makes Yerushalmi's approach so intriguing. Although he acknowledges his precarious position as a Jewish historian, Yerushalmi discusses memory *as an historian* and it is this approach which I think is the most fruitful avenue of memory research. Thus, this dissertation will treat memory as a phenomenon which can be studied historically rather than as a source of information about the past.

65. Brevard S. Childs, *Memory and Tradition in Israel,* SBT 37 (London: SCM Press, 1962).

Halbwachs's did not see any reason to assume that the remembered past had any meaningful connection to the "actual past." Because memory is always constructed in the present for use in the present, the "actual past" does not carry any meaningful influence on this (re)construction. It was in his *La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte* that Halbwachs makes this case most forcefully, and I think he does so quite convincingly. Halbwachs's understanding of memory as a phenomenon of the present has thus earned him the label of "presentist" or "constructivist" over and against a number of more recent theorists who wish to attribute some normative force to the past.[66]

2.3.1 The Presentist Perspective

This presentist mantle has been donned by a number of more recent scholars, perhaps most notably by the German scholars Jan and Aleida Assmann.[67] Where Halbwachs distinguished between autobiographical and historical memory, Jan Assmann describes what he calls communicative and cultural memory (German: *kommunikatives* and *kulturelles Gedächtnis*, respectively).[68] Rather than focus on the relationship of the rememberer to the experience (viz.

66. Coser, Introduction, 27–30.

67. See esp. Jan Assmann, "Memory and Culture," in *Memory: A History,* ed. Dmitri Nikulin, OPC (New York: Oxford University Press), 325–49; idem, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); and Aleida Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

68. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization,* 36; For a concise terminological crash-course, see Hübenthal, "Social and Cultural Memory," 182–83.

whether the memory is "autobiographical"), this terminology essentially distinguishes between synchronic and diachronic processes of memory. On the one hand, communicative memory represents a synchronic, or "horizontal" memory shared by a society at a particular chronological horizon based on direct communication between individuals. According to Assmann, this memory has a temporal horizon of 80–100 years—limited by spatial (where people are) and chronological (how long people live) factors. He writes:

> A typical instance would be generational memory that accrues within the group, originating and disappearing with time or, to be more precise, with its carriers. Once those who embodied it have died, it gives way to a new memory.[69]

On the other hand, at the end of this crucial period, as particular memories begin to drop from current discourse and lose relevance; as those individuals with direct connections to the events, people, and places which the memories involve die off, the remembering community will either forget or transform the memory for long-term transmission in the form of *cultural memory*. The canonization of memory at points during this period is a conscious, *constructive* activity by a remembering group.[70]

Where Halbwachs's terminology took as its point of departure the psychological perspectives of Freud[71] and Bergson,[72] Assmann's taxonomy is rooted in ethnological research on oral traditions, specifically that of Jan Vansina and his notion of a "floating gap" between the

69. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization,* 36.

70. Ibid., 45.

71. Terdiman, "Memory in Freud," 93–108.

72. Ansell-Pearson, "Bergson on Memory," 61–76.

present and the distant past.[73] Vansina observes that in oral cultures often there is an abundance of common knowledge about current goings-on and a similar abundance of shared knowledge about the distant past (esp. with regard to origin stories and the like), but there often exists a gap for the not-so-distant past. The proportion of collective knowledge, therefore, is unevenly distributed between two chronological poles of memory, although members of the society in question may not perceive it as such in their own reconstructions of the past.[74] In other words, from the perspective of the remembering society, often there exists a continuity between the distant past (often legendary or mythic) and the near-past (a few generations, at most) where in reality a good deal of the not-so-recent past has fallen from memory. Memory of the near-past—those things which, while not necessarily "autobiographical" to every rememberer, nevertheless are reinforced by those with autobiographical memory—is categorized as "communicative" because it is memory that it generated and spread in the present by those with direct access to the events in question. Those memories which are deemed significant enough to not be forgotten—those which will make up cultural memory—undergo a process by which they are transformed from "factual into remembered history," and may take the form of myth or legend.[75] Thus, according to Assmann, myth and legend cannot be distinguished from "history" as a part of cultural memory. The significance of an event is not tied to whether or not it is "factual," but by its "truth" seen through its

73. Jan Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).

74. ibid., 23–24. As Assmann observes (Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization,* 35), "In the cultural memory of a group, both levels of the past merge seamlessly into one another."

75. Ibid., 37–38.

continued relevance to the remembering community in the present.[76] Assmann writes:

> Myth is foundational history that is narrated in order to illuminate the present from the standpoint of its origins. The Exodus, for instance, regardless of any historical accuracy, is the myth behind the foundation of Israel; thus it is celebrated at Pesach and thus it is part of the cultural memory of the Israelites. Through memory, history becomes myth. This does not make it unreal—on the contrary, this is what makes it real, in the sense that it becomes a lasting, normative, and formative power.[77]

Assmann's understanding of the relationship of the actual past to a society's cultural memory, therefore is not concerned with the discussion of the historicity of cultural memory. Although Assmann does not dismiss cultural memory as a source for historical inquiry, like Halbwachs, his primary interest is in exploring the constructive, presentist aspects of memory.

2.3.2 The Continuity Perspective

Critics of Halbwachs's presentist posture (and the similar approaches of Jan and Aleida Assmann) agree that memory is malleable but argue that there are constraints placed upon memory which mitigate unbounded fictionalization of the remembered past. This so-called "continuity" (or "essentialist") perspective—primarily associated with the American sociologist

76. Paul Veyne offers a particularly stimulating discussion of the perception of the past and its relationship to myth. He concludes his book with the insightful quote, "The theme of this book was very simple. Merely by reading the title, anyone with the slightest historical background would immediately have answered, 'but of course they believed in their myths!' We have simply wanted also to make clear that what is true of 'them' is also true of ourselves and to bring out the implications of this primary truth." Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination,* trans. Paula Wissing (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 128–29.

77. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization,* 38.

Barry Schwartz—insists that the "actual" past carries some normative force in the shaping of collective memory in addition to the "received" past.[78] Critiquing Halbwachs, Schwartz writes:

> Unfortunately, this [Halbwachs's presentist] perspective has problems of its own. It promotes the idea that our conception of the past is entirely at the mercy of current conditions, that there is no objectivity in events, nothing in history which transcends the peculiarities of the present.[79]

At the heart of the so-called "continuity" approach is the conviction that while memories are always conditioned by the present, there is a limit to the amount of distortion acceptable to the remembering community. As Michael Schudson puts it, "The past is in some respects and under some conditions, highly resistant to efforts to make it over."[80]

In fact, I think the conceptual distance between the presentist and continuity perspectives is not as great as it may initially appear. Neither Halbwachs nor Assmann assert that there *cannot* be any historical value to cultural/collective memory, nor that such memory cannot be used for historiographical purposes. For example, in *La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte,* Halbwachs takes seriously that the figure of Jesus *did* exist as an historical person while making it clear that he does not accept the Gospels at face value as

78. Schwartz has made numerous contributions to the field of memory studies. See esp. Barry Schwartz, "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory," *SF* 61.2 (1982): 374–402; idem, "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington," *ASR* 56.2 (1991): 221–36; and idem, *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Note also the SBL volume specifically interacting with his work: Tom Thatcher, ed., *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz,* SemSt 78 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014).

79. Schwartz, "The Social Context of Commemoration," 376.

80. Michael Schudson, "The Present in the Past versus the Past in the Present," *Communication* 11.2 (1989): 105–13.

historically accurate (he explicitly compares his basic approach toward the historicity of the Gospels as similar to that of Ernst Renan, which is problematic, as noted above).[81] Throughout the work, Halbwachs does talk about the "actual" past and allows for the possibility that the Gospels do refer, at least partially, to real events. In other words, he does not make the argument that the Gospels were fabricated of whole-cloth and instead takes the position that the "actual past" is irretrievable and unknowable and that historical memory has no obligation to align with the actual past as such. On the other hand, Schwartz and the continuity perspective never argue that memory is *accurate*, but instead that memory ought not be treated as *entirely* arbitrary. In other words, the two perspectives both agree on the central premise that memory is shaped by society in the present, but they each approach the question of memory's connection to the actual past from opposite ends of the epistemological spectrum.

This difference in perspective, I think, is attributable to the respective fields that Assmann and Schwartz deal with in their own research. As an Egyptologist dealing with literatures from the ancient Near East, Assmann necessarily is reliant on scant documentary evidence that may or may not have any supporting evidence whatsoever. The same can be said of other ancient fields such as biblical studies, Assyriology and Classics. Under these circumstances, the historian *must* approach her sources with an appreciation for the intellectual gap that exists between the historian her source, particularly when not corroborated by an independent alternate source. On the other hand, Schwartz, as an Americanist, is able to marshal a plethora of contemporary sources for reconstructing the

81. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory,* 205–6.

collective memory of the antebellum United States. What each scholar is able to assume about his sources speaks to their instincts toward the reliability of those sources. Furthermore, Schwartz deals with a comparatively disenchanted society whose historical consciousness more closely resembles our own, while Assmann deals with societies for whom myth and legend are not distinguished from history. Their historical methodologies may be the same, but the *kinds* of sources that each field deals with creates a different set of scholarly instincts for dealing with the idea of memory and its relation to the actual past.

Because this dissertation deals with the way that early Judaism interacted with its own received collective memory (rather than how it created those memories to begin with), I will tend to interact with the topic of collective memory from the perspective of Halbwachs and Assmann. This is not to say that I am entirely unsympathetic to Schwartz's critique of a purely presentist approach, only that the particulars of this project preclude the need to discuss the relationship between memory and the "actual" past.

2.4 MEMORY AND REWRITTEN BIBLE

Having laid the theoretical foundation of modern memory studies, we may now turn our attention to the particulars of this study, namely, addressing the way that social memory studies can meaningfully augment the scholarly discussion surrounding Rewritten Bible.[82]

At this point it should be fairly obvious how the Hebrew Bible may be convincingly

82. See also George J. Brooke, "Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture," in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes,* ed. József Zsengellér, JSJSup 166 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 119–36.

framed as both the product and progenitor of collective and cultural memory during the late Persian and Early Hellenistic periods. In Halbwachs's terms, the biblical text represents the common, collective memory of Second Temple Judaism which formed the basis for Jewish collective identity as a people of the land which Yahweh promised to Abraham and into which Yahweh lead the people of Israel, "with a might hand and an outstretched arm" after their miraculous escape from the land of Egypt and subsequent desert wanderings. Bracketing any discussions of the historicity of these biblical narratives, by the late Second Temple period they would have been perceived as the true and central foundation narratives to any number of Jewish groups both in and out of Persian Yehud and Roman Palestine. In Assmann's terms, the biblical texts—and in particular the stories of the patriarchs, Exodus, and Conquest narratives—carried "a lasting, normative, and formative power,"[83] which can be observed concretely by their preservation both in antiquity (e.g., at Qumran as well in translation) and into the modern era.

The process of textual interpretation, therefore, is itself a mnemonic process. Just as memories are recalled into and shaped by a set of social frameworks which may be alien to their original context, so too the interpretation of texts and traditions is shaped by the social frameworks of the interpreter. Because any single text or narrative represents only a sliver of the thick nexus of ideas that is collective memory, not only is a text always read into new social circumstances, but it is always read into a new literary context and discursive arena. No two readings of a given text will every be the same. Each reading is affected by the collective

83. Assmann, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization,* 38.

memory of the reader(s) which is constantly adapting and in flux as new memories are added and others are forgotten.

Rewritten Bible, therefore, can be understood as a set of snapshots revealing the ways that the collective memory of Second Temple Judaism was being used within Jewish communities (or, at the very least within some scribal circles) to shape remembering communities' identities. This shaping, however, was not a passive process, but elicited creative, constructive participation to not only "read" the past, but to rewrite it as well. These texts themselves would have contributed to the collective memories of their respective groups. The disparate ways that Rewritten Bible texts were passed on or jettisoned from various religious groups in antiquity illustrate the ways that new memories can be added to a group's cultural memory and be adopted as a part of its historical self-understanding. The three texts which I will treat in this dissertation each meet a different outcome. Chronicles—which I have framed (loosely) as a rewriting of Samuel–Kings—was adopted by both Jews and Christians in antiquity as a part of their cultural memory and became a part of both traditions' canon of scripture. The Genesis Apocryphon, on the other hand, seems to have not survived within Judaism beyond the first century CE (although, it may have impacted some later traditions). Finally, Jubilees was not retained in Jewish circles, but *was* passed on within certain segments of early Christianity and remains in liturgical use by the Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church.[84]

Simply labeling these Rewritten Bible texts as examples of social or cultural memory, however, is rather uncontroversial. Such an assertion hardly requires a dissertation-length

84. Baynes, "Enoch and Jubilees," 799–818; Asale, "Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church," 202–22.

study and the task has already been sufficiently accomplished, to my mind, by Brooke.[85] Thus, this dissertation will attempt to go beyond simply labeling Rewritten Bible texts as exemplars of memory and instead attempt to offer a description of the processes by which Rewritten Bible texts functioned within the collective memory of Second Temple Judaism(s). Many of these processes already exist within the scholarly discourse surrounding Rewritten Bible. For example, from the perspective of textual production, the topics of biblical interpretation, inner-biblical exegesis, and scribal culture are not new to the topic of biblical or Qumran studies. But each can provide valuable insights into the ways that groups of individuals understood and recalled their cultural memory and what in particular they found most valuable about their cultural memories. Approaching Rewritten Bible through the lens of social memory studies attempts to take a step back and address their *function* as the means by which Second Temple Judaism experienced its past in its present. Social memory studies, therefore, is not an alternative to more traditional modes of analysis, but a complement.

Memory studies, therefore, provide a rich toolbox for thinking about and addressing the kinds of *functional* questions which we raised in the first chapter. Discussing the "purpose" or "function" of a text is tantamount to discussing how a text can be both the product of and and participant in collective memory of its society. In other words, framing Rewritten Bible texts within the discourse of social and cultural memory means treating Rewritten Bible texts as more than creative "exegetical" works but also as cultural products which participate in social structures and discourses with concerns other than the explication of sacred texts. Thus, the

85. Brooke, "Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture," 119–36.

following three chapters will offer readings of three Rewritten Bible texts understood from the perspective of memory studies with the aim of addressing questions of *function* with respect to the pluriform collective and cultural memories of late Second Temple Judaism(s).

Chapter 3: Chronicles

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Scholars of the Hebrew Bible have long observed that the book of Chronicles is a derivative work of Samuel–Kings reflecting the concerns and religious sensibilities of the late Persian or Early Hellenistic Periods. For example, in his classic work on the history of ancient Israel, Julius Wellhausen begins his treatment of the history of traditions within Judaism with a lengthy discussion of the book of Chronicles. In his treatment of the book, Wellhausen argues that the history of Israel as portrayed in Chronicles differs from that portrayed in Samuel–Kings due to the chronological distance of the works and the intervention of the Priestly Code into the theology of Second Temple Judaism.[1] Chronicles, according to Wellhausen, provides a clear example of the way that ancient Israel's traditions evolved over time. Just as the legal material of the Hexateuch developed over the centuries, so too the traditions of the historical books were subject to the changing theologies of later centuries. While the particulars of the relationship of Samuel–Kings to Chronicles and the nuances of

1. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel,* trans. J. Southerland Black and Allan Menzies, ML 6 (New York: Meridian, 1957), 171–72; trans. of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (Berlin: Reimer, 1883). See also John W. Wright, "From Center to Periphery: 1 Chronicles 23–27 and the Interpretation of Chronicles in the Nineteenth Century," in *Priests, Prophets and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp,* ed. Eugene Ulrich et al., JSOTSup 149 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 20–42.

priestly influences on the Hebrew Bible remain subject to scholarly debate, the broad consensus remains that 1) Chronicles was written sometime in the late Persian or early Hellenistic periods, 2) it heavily utilized Samuel–Kings as a literary source, and 3) it bears an ideological *Tendenz* influenced by (though not identical to) the final layers of the Pentateuch.[2]

The scholarly discourse surrounding the formation of the Hebrew Bible has increasingly turned to memory studies as a robust framework for describing the processes by which the biblical traditions were produced and transmitted.[3] Wellhausen chose to begin his treatment of the history of traditions with Chronicles because of the relative security with which scholars are able to date Samuel–Kings and the major Pentateuchal strata vis-à-vis Chronicles. For the very same reason, Chronicles likewise has played an important role in early applications of memory theory within biblical studies.[4] While Chronicles is not the *latest* book in the Hebrew

2. For a thorough and reasonably recent summary of the *status quaestionis*, see Gary N. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* AB 12 (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 72–89. See also Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary,* OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993); idem, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought,* trans. Anna Barber (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009; repr., idem; *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought;* 2nd revised ed.; BEATAJ 9 [Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997]); Roddy Braun, *1 Chronicles,* WBC 14 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986) and R. J. Coggins, *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles,* CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

3. Jacob L. Wright, *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014); Joseph Blenkinsopp, *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013); John W. Rogerson, *A Theology of the Old Testament: Cultural Memory, Communication, and Being Human* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2010); Philip R. Davies, *Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical History–Ancient and Modern* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008); Ronald S. Hendel, *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); Mark S. Smith, "Remembering God: Collective Memory in Israelite Religion," *CBQ* 64.4 (2002): 631–51.

4. Ehud Ben Zvi, "Chronicles and Social Memory," *ST* 71.1 69–90; idem, "Reading Chronicles

Bible, it is uniquely situated at the end of the traditioning process preserved in the Hebrew Bible. In some ways, therefore, Chronicles gets the last word on a certain set of traditions surrounding the monarchic period, in particular those of David, Solomon, and the kings of Judah.

Although it is broadly agreed upon that Chronicles exhibits a hypertextual relationship to Samuel–Kings, treating Chronicles as an exemplar of Rewritten Bible (Rewritten Bible) is somewhat less common.[5] The ambivalence of scholars towards treating Chronicles as Rewritten Bible is rooted, unsurprisingly, in the confusion surrounding the definition of the term. Knoppers, for example, takes special care to treat the question of whether Chronicles should be understood as Rewritten Bible in the introduction of his commentary and notes, from the very beginning, that he will answer the question based on what he understands to be the essential elements of Rewritten Bible.[6] He writes:

---

and Reshaping the Memory of Manasseh," in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography,* ed. Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 121–40; Ehud Ben Zvi, "Toward a Sense of Balance: Remembering the Catastrophe of Monarchic Judah / (Ideological) Israel and Exile through Reading Chronicles in Late Yehud," in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography,* ed. Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013), 247–65.

5. Though, not particularly *un*common. See Campbell, "Rewritten Bible," 49–81; Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," 323–36; Bernstein, "Rewritten Bible," 169–96. Alexander considers Chronicles to be a "prototype" of Rewritten Bible, see, Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 100. I have adopted the terminology of hyper-/hypotext from Genette. In this case, to say that Chronicles is a "hypertext" of Samuel–Kings is to say that it is derivative, but not a commentary on Samuel–Kings. See Gérard Genette, *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree,* trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 5.

6. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9,* 129–34.

> They [Rewritten Bible] select from, interpret, comment on, and expand portions of a particular biblical book (or group of books), addressing obscurities, contradictions, and other perceived problems with the source text. Rewritten Bible texts normally emulate the form of the source text and follow it sequentially. The major intention of such works seems to be to provide a coherent interpretive reading of the biblical text.[7]

Knoppers observes that, while Chronicles exhibits most of the specific literary moves which Rewritten Bible is known for (expanding, harmonizing, and augmenting its *Vorlage*), the presence of material which is entirely unique to Chronicles cannot be attributed to a purely exegetical or explanatory impulse. In addition to the narrative additions within Chronicles, the genealogies of 1 Chr 1–9 have no corollary in Samuel–Kings, and can hardly be considered a rewritten form of the Pentateuch.[8] Thus, while Knoppers affirms that certain portions of Chronicles "may be profitably compared with a number of rewritten Bible texts,"[9] ultimately he concludes that Chronicles "is more than a paraphrase or literary elaboration of the primary history"[10] and thus Rewritten Bible cannot can account for Chronicles as a whole, instead suggesting that it should be treated as its own work.[11]

While Knoppers's assessment is fair given the definition that he supplies for Rewritten Bible, in the preceding chapters of this dissertation, I have argued that similar extra-exegetical qualities exist within the Rewritten Bible corpus which push us to consider the function of

7. Knoppers, *1 Chronicles 1–9,* 130.

8. Ibid., 132.

9. Ibid., 131.

10. Ibid., 134.

11. Ibid., 131–34.

Rewritten Bible as more than a method for explaining sacred texts. The rationale for why Rewritten Bible cannot account for the complexity of the whole book of Chronicles, according to Knoppers, is the same basic argument that I have made for why an *exegetically* focused definition of Rewritten Bible is insufficient to account for the complexity of even the literature that scholars *traditionally* consider to be Rewritten Bible. In other words, Knoppers's argument for why Chronicles should not be considered Rewritten Bible is the same essential argument that I am making for Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees. The same case could just as easily be applied to Josephus's Jewish Antiquities, the Temple Scroll, and others. The difference between my thesis and Knoppers, however, is that where he sees disjunction between Rewritten Bible and Chronicles, I am arguing that all of these texts represent the same fundamental social and cultural processes of memory and that memory theory offers a degree of abstraction for talking about these processes which highlights their similarities.

3.2 SITES OF MEMORY IN THE BOOK OF CHRONICLES

Within the memory of ancient Israel, it is unquestionably the case that the figure David was a prominent mnemonic site for ancient Israel and the book of Chronicles engages with that mnemonic site extensively.

Chapter 4: Narrative, Genre, and Pseudepigraphy: The Genesis Apocryphon as Cultural Memory

Since its initial discovery and publication, the Aramaic text known as the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen ar) has been associated in various ways with the book of Genesis. As one of the first seven scrolls discovered in the Judean desert beginning in 1947, the Genesis Apocryphon is also 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, written in Aramaic, referenced the antedeluvian Lamech, the father of Noah, and his wife, Bitenosh, 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.[1] Once the scroll was completely unrolled, it became obvious that 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, *Genesis*

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 ʿAin Feshkha," *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10 and "Apocalypse de Lamech" in DJD I, 86–87

Apocryphon, was given to the scroll by Avigad and Yadin for the publication of its *editio princeps* in 1956.[2] While the name Genesis Apocryphon remains in wide use, it is notable that the name has been criticized and a number of alternative titles have been suggested; most notably: "Book of the Patriarchs",[3] "Memoirs of the Patriarchs",[4] and כתב אבהן[5] 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 (Gen 6) into the Abram narrative (ending in Gen 15). The events are generally (though, not exclusively) narrated in a series of first person accounts—what I will refer to as "memoirs"[6]—by Lamech, Noah, and Abram, respectively and show a clear affinity with the roughly contemporaneous works of 1 Enoch and

2. Hebrew: מגילה חיצונית לבראשית. See Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 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. T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation,* 3rd ed. (Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976), 358.

5. Józef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea,* trans. John Strugnell (London: SCM Press, 1959), 14 n. 1. Fitzmyer suggests כתב אבהתא would be, perhaps, even more suitable. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 3rd ed., BO 18a (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004), 16.

6. I will use the term "memoir" throughout this chapter as a way of referring to the distinct (mostly) first-person narratives found in the Genesis Apocryphon. The term is meant to highlight 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").

Jubilees.[7] 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 preceded Jubilees, while the recent prevailing opinion seems to prefer the opposite.[8]

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 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 *Scripture and Tradition*, Vermes treats in detail the relationship between Gen 12:8–15:4 and Genesis Apocryphon cols. XIX–XXII, ultimately declaring Genesis Apocryphon to be "the most ancient midrash of all" and the "lost link between the biblical and the Rabbinic midrash."[9] The result of this framing (whether one considers it appropriate or not) has been that much of the scholarly attention paid to Genesis

7. Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 16–37.

8. ibid., 38; cf. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 20–21. Fitzmyer cites Hartman's suggestion, building on Fitzmyer's own work, treating the similarity between Genesis Apocryphon's and Jubilee's chronology of Abram's life. Because the chronology seems to have been closely tied to Jubilee's uniquely structured 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.

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

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.[10] 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 frees us from any obligation to try and fit it cleanly within either category.

Although few scholars insist on rigidly defining Genesis Apocryphon as either targum or midrash, the treatment of Genesis Apocryphon as primarily *exegetical* tacitly implies that the purpose of Genesis Apocryphon was to explain or interpret Genesis. Put another way, the discussions surrounding Genesis Apocryphon are often preoccupied with gleaning information about how Second Temple Jews read *Genesis*—treating Genesis Apocryphon from the perspective of "biblical interpretation." While there is no question that such an approach has been fruitful, treating Genesis Apocryphon as *only* or even *primarily* an example of biblical interpretation, I think, cannot offer a comprehensive reading of the work. In this chapter, therefore, I will focus on the ways that the author of Genesis Apocryphon engages with a constellation of discourses surrounding events and characters *known from* the book of Genesis, as well as those from other texts not as biblical *interpretation*, but as processes of *memory*.[11]

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

11. 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."Fitzmyer. (ibid., 20) 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

From the perspective of cultural memory, therefore, Genesis Apocryphon operates within a stream of traditions and participates in discourses surrounding early foundational figures in Jewish tradition: Lamech, Noah, and Abram. As such, it is both the recipient and progenitor of cultural memory whose participation in the mnemonic process affected the memory itself. Thus, building on the theoretical framework of chapter two, Genesis Apocryphon may be understood to have taken part in three discrete mnemonic processes: 1) the reception of cultural memory, 2) the reshaping of memory by contemporary social frameworks, and 3) the active construction, codification, and reintegration of memory for future transmission. These three distinct processes are observable within the text of Genesis Apocryphon. In this chapter, therefore, I have chosen to frame the discussion of Genesis Apocryphon around these processes. First, and as a point of departure, I will discuss the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon functions as the recipient of cultural memory through its engagement with what I refer to as "biblical memory." Second, I will discuss the ways that Genesis Apocryphon was shaped by the social frameworks which inherited it through a discussion of literary genre and shared formal characteristics with contemporary texts. Finally, I will discuss how Genesis Apocryphon participated in the construction of cultural memory through its use of pseudepigraphical discourse.

---

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 good place to start. 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 cultural memory and speaks back into it.

4.1 GENESIS APOCRYPHON AND BIBLICAL MEMORY

Although it is anachronistic to suggest that the "Bible" existed during the late Second Temple period, the "biblical" texts found at Qumran provide evidence to support the idea that many of the texts and traditions that were later formalized as the "Bible" were present in a reasonably stable and even privileged state near the turn of the era. In other words, while I wish to push the discussion away from what I see as a preoccupation with the relationship between Rewritten Bible texts their putative biblical counterparts, I do not mean to deny the reality that certain "biblical" texts certainly held uniquely privileged positions within the religious and social milieu of Second Temple Judaism. Therefore, I think it is a mistake to jettison any discussion of Rewritten Bible 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 Genesis Apocryphon as it relates to "biblical memory," a term which deserves some unpacking. By biblical memory, I have in mind the constellation and confluence of stories and traditions—irrespective of any notion of authority or canon—which participate in the cultural memory which became formalized in the Hebrew Bible.[12] This rhetorical move is meant to blur the line between the Rewritten Bible text's putative biblical "*Vorlage*" and the broader cultural perception—both official and popular—of the

12. 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.

events and characters with which the Rewritten Bible text deals. In this section, therefore, I will discuss the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon participated in biblical memory through a discussion of its relationship to both the biblical text and other Second Temple texts such as Jubilees and 1 Enoch.

4.1.1 What was the Genesis Apocryphon Rewriting?

Although the Genesis Apocryphon is generally touted as one of the more clear-cut examples of the Rewritten Bible, it is noteworthy that its relationship to the biblical text is not, in fact, entirely uniform.[13]

The earliest columns of the Genesis Apocryphon (cols. 0–V), 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.[14] 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 "Watchers." Despite Bitenosh's assurances, Lamech petitions his father, Methuselah, to ask *his*

13. Moshe J. 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, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 317–43.

14. George Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah,* 2nd 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 [4QBNoah$^{a\text{-}d}$], 1QNoah^{a} s well as James C. VanderKam, "The Birth of Noah," in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Jósef 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^{a} 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, STDJ 94 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 253–71.

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–V 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 and *not* the book of Genesis.[15]

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" (col. V, 29) and continues through col. XVII (and, likely, onto the beginning of col. XVIII).[16]

---

15. 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 "Lamech Narrative," 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.

16. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah,* 174–75; Regarding the

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[17] (affirmed even in-utero) and his early family life (col. V, 29–VI, 9), followed by a vision predicting the flood (col. VI, 9–VII, 9) which comes about due to the evil behavior of the Nephilim. Columns VII–VIII are highly fragmentary, but most likely described the events of the flood, while cols. IX–XII (which 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. Columns XIII–XV 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. XVI–XVII 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

---

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.

17. James C. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms,* ed. John J. Collins and Nickelsburg George W. E., SCS 12 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980), 13–32.

publication.[18] 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 either cols. 0–V or cols. VI–XVII of Genesis Apocryphon as *primarily* a rewriting of the Genesis does not give due consideration to the additional traditions which influenced its composition. The extended treatment of Lamech's reaction of Noah's birth in cols. 0–V, including the mention of Lamech's wife Bitenosh betray the scrolls extra-biblical sources (esp. 1 Enoch and Jubilees, respectively; more on this below). Moreover, the mention of the Watchers (Aramaic: עירין) and the Nephilim in cols. VI–VII evinces a clear thematic affinity to the Book of Watchers in 1 Enoch 6–11.[19] Moreover, the explicit reference to the "the [Book] of the Words of Enoch" in col. XIX, 25 suggests that the Genesis Apocryphon was familiar with 1 Enoch, or at the very least a tradition of enochic writings.[20]

Especially 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.[21] 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.[22] Although an exhaustive treatment of the parallels between Jubilees and Genesis

18. Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 38.

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

20. 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 idem, "Is the Genesis Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?" *AS* 8 (2010): 107–34.

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

22. Trever, "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from ʿAin Feshkha," 8–10.

Apocryphon is outside the scope of this chapter, it will suffice to note a few of the most significant points of contact between the Lamech and Noah Memoirs and Jubilees. James VanderKam has recently offered a detailed, yet concise, summary of these similarities and differences, which, while too long to reproduced in full, can be summarized as follows:[23]

1. Several personal and geographic[24]names which are never mentioned in the Bible show up in both Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees (including Bitenosh, which is a part of the Lamech Memoir).

2. Both Jubilees and Genesis Apocryphon utilize "Jubilees" as a significant chronological unit (Genesis Apocryphon to a lesser degree than Jubilees).

3. Several shared stories, themes, and phrases such as 1) "in the days of Jared," 2) Enoch remaining accessible after his departure from normal terrestrial life, 3) Noah making atonement for the "whole earth," and 4) stories recounting Noah and his vineyard.

23. See James C. VanderKam, "Some Thoughts on the Relationship between the Book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon," in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke,* ed. Ariel Feldman, Maria Ciotată, and Charlotte Hempel, STDJ 119 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 371–84. For additional treatments of this topic, see also 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) and James L. Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation,* JSJSup 156 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 305–42 previously published as idem, "Which Is Older, Jubilees or the Genesis Apocryphon? An Exegetical Approach," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008),* ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 257–94

24. Mahaq Sea (col. XVI, 9; Jubilees 8.22), Tina River (col. XVI, 15; Jubilees 8.12), Mount Lubar (col. XII, 13; Jubilees 5.28), Erythrean/Red Sea (col. XVII, 7; Jubilees 8.21), and Gadeira (col. XVI, 11; Jubilees 8.26).

4. The "division of the earth," while different in several specifics are strikingly similar and offer, perhaps, the most compelling case for a direct, genetic relationship between the two texts.[25]

The striking similarities between the early columns of Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees (and to a lesser degree, 1 Enoch) over and against the biblical text, complicates the characterization of Genesis Apocryphon as Rewritten Bible or strictly exegetical in nature. In other words if Genesis Apocryphon drew from Jubilees (or if they drew from some common source) I think it is fair to scrutinize whether this section of Genesis Apocryphon should be considered a rewriting of *Genesis*. What is clear, instead, is that for the author of the Genesis Apocryphon, the memory of the flood (and adjacent characters and events) did not center on the biblical account. The question could, therefore, be asked whether cols. 0–XVII—the bulk of the scroll—would meet the generic criteria of Rewritten Bible according to the definitions of Bernstein and other more conservative commentators. My guess is that if cols. XIX–XXII had also been lost, Genesis Apocryphon would more commonly be categorized as "parabiblical" like 1 Enoch.[26]

---

25. See also Machiela's extensive treatment of this section where he argues for the theory that both texts could be drawing from a shared cartographical source in *Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon,* 105–30. See also Philip Alexander, "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi' of the Book of Jubilees," *JJS* 38 (1982): 197–213.

26. Notably, this is the preferred nomenclature of Fitzmyer, though he also considers Genesis Apocryphon to be "a good example of the so-called rewritten Bible." Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 20.

The Abram Memoir (Columns XIX–XXII)

The final surviving columns of the scroll, cols. XIX–XXII, represent the longest and most complete sustained narrative preserved in Genesis Apocryphon, here referred to as the "Abram Memoir." More so than the previous sections, the Abram Memoir maps very closely onto the events narrated in Genesis.[27] These columns parallel Genesis 12:10–15:14, retelling 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 follows the chronology of Gen 12–15 very closely, but 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, however, the phrase "I, Abram" shows up a number of times, making it clear who the narrator is. This fact is complicated, however, by the fact that, although the narrative begins the in the first-person, beginning at col. XXI, 23 the narrator transitions to the third person and remains so through the end of the surviving portion of the scroll.[28] This inconsistency, perhaps more than any other feature of Genesis Apocryphon, has complicated its generic classification.

27. On the particular text tradition that the Genesis Apocryphon builds from, see James C. VanderKam, "Textual Affinities," *JBL* 97.1 (1978): 45–55.

28. It is worth pointing out that the final surviving sheet of parchment was not the final sheet of the scroll originally. Avigad and Yadin note that although only four sheets of the work were present, the seem between the fourth and (what would be) the fifth sheets is visible on the edge of the fourth sheet. *Genesis Apocryphon,* 14.

The earlier portions of the Abram Memoir strike a balance between fidelity and innovation with regard to the *biblical* text that the other sections lack. For example, the narrative of Abram and Sarai's descent into Egypt is clearly and recognizably built from the story preserved in the Hebrew Bible. The events and chronology of the story map directly onto Gen 12:10–20, but the Genesis Apocryphon offers—in addition to the first-person point of view—a number of expansions that seem plainly to be innovative or, as Vermes would put it and example or prototype of "midrash."[29] Numerous small additions and emendations occur throughout the retelling such as making explicit how long Sarai and Abram lived in Egypt prior to Sarai's notice by Pharoah's princes, how long Sarai was with Pharoah, numerous geographical and personal names, etc. A number of these details, as with earlier sections of Genesis Apocryphon, are also found in Jubilees, which again illustrates the close (if poorly understood) relationship between the two texts.

More noticeable are the larger expansions present in the Genesis Apocryphon such as Abram's portentous dream (col. XIX, 14–17), the *waṣf* put on the lips of Pharoah's princes about Sarai (col. XX, 2–8), Abram's prayer following Sarai's abduction (col. XX, 12–16), the details of Pharoah's afflictions (col. XX, 16–21), Harkenosh's discussion with Lot (col. XX,

29. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 124. Notably, the characterization of Genesis Apocryphon as Rewritten Bible is typically based on an analysis of the Abram Memoir. Although the earlier portions of the scroll were known, Vermes's treatment of Genesis Apocryphon only dealt with cols. XIX–XXII. Together with the fact that these are the best-preserved and most complete columns, this fact has, I think, impacted the characterization of Genesis Apocryphon as a whole, perhaps unfairly. On the characterization pre-rabbinic texts as "midrash," see Paul D. Mandel, *The Origins of* Midrash*: From Teaching to Text* (Leiden: Brill, 2017), esp. 298–305; idem, "The Origins of Midrash in the Second Temple Period," in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash,* ed. Carol Bakhos, JSJSup 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 9–34.

21–XX, 24), and Abram's intervention on Pharoah's behalf (col. XX, 24–32).[30]

The explanation of these expansions, according to Vermes—which has been adopted by most treatments of Genesis Apocryphon—is as a means of "correcting" or otherwise supplementing the biblical text in order to engage the reader and to *explain* the biblical text.[31] Vermes writes:

> The author of GA does indeed try, by every means at his disposal, to make the biblical story more attractive, more real, more edifying, and above all more intelligible. Geographic data are inserted to complete biblical lacunae or to identify altered place names, and various descriptive touches are added to give the story substance…To this work of expansion and development Genesis Apocryphon adds another, namely, the reconciliation of unexplained or apparently conflicting statements in the biblical text in order to allay doubt and worry.[32]

By contrast, the latter portion of the Abram Memoir, beginning at col. XXI, 23 at times borders on a word-for-word translation of Genesis into Aramaic with comparatively few significant changes. This quality provided occasion for a number of (especially early) scholars to compare Genesis Apocryphon with the Targums.[33] Although the change from first-person to third-person is, perhaps, the most significant literary shift that occurs in the Genesis

30. Other changes from later in the memoir include a description of Abram walking the length and width of the land as well as a notable abbreviation of Abram and Lot's conflict in Gen 13:5–12.

31. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition,* 126.

32. Ibid., 125.

33. 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 "Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus," in *In Memoriam Paul Kahle,* ed. Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer, BZAW 103 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1968), 17–28.

Apocryphon, other literary features of the Abram Memoir agree against the Lamech and Noah Memoirs in such a way that gives reason to suppose the Abram Memoir makes up a literary unit.[34] It is not clear, however, why there seems to be such a dramatic difference in narrative voice beginning at col. XXI, 23.

4.1.2 Exegesis and Memory

Modern treatments of the Genesis Apocryphon have tended to speak about the work as "Rewritten Bible" as a third category somewhere between Targum and Midrash, with a preference to the latter.[35]

Yet, as I have illustrated, although portions of the Genesis Apocryphon relate clearly to the text of Genesis (notably, the Abram Memoir), much of the earlier portions of the scroll only nominally relate to Genesis, and instead show an affinity to the traditions associated with

34. Specifically, Moshe Bernstein has noted based on the divine names that are used throughout the work that the primary division is between the Lamech/Noah Memoirs and the Abram Memoir; the earlier sections utilizing a specific set of divine titles and the latter section(s) using a different set. See Moshe J. Bernstein, "Divine Titles and Epithets and the Sources in the Genesis Apocryphon," *JBL* 128 (2009): 291–310; See also Falk, *Parabiblical Texts,* 97. Regarding the genre(s) and unity of Genesis Apocryphon more generally see Bernstein's later work "Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," 317–43 and "Is the Genesis Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?" 107–34.

35. Craig A. Evans, "The Gensis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible," in "Mémorial Jean Carmignac," *RdQ* 13 (1988): 153–65; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 19. Esther Eshel has proposed the term "narrative midrash," but I am in agreement with Harrington and Bernstein in eschewing later categories such as "midrash" for these pre-rabbinic sources. See Esther Eshel, "The Genesis Apocryphon: A Chain of Traditions," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008),* ed. Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref, STDJ 93 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 182–93; Cf. Harrington, "Bible Rewritten (Narratives)," 242; Bernstein, "Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," 317–43 (327 n. 33, 328–29).

1 Enoch and Jubilees. Thus, characterizing the work as a whole as focused primarily on the explanation of Genesis (as Vermes suggests), seems to me to be ill-founded. Indeed, the disjunction between the various parts of Genesis Apocryphon have been observed by numerous scholars, even by those who broadly accept the Genesis Apocryphon to be a literary unity, but such discussions still seem to focus on generic classification.[36]

To illustrate this difficulty, I would like to focus on Moshe Bernstein's treatment of the "Genre(s)" of the Genesis Apocryphon.[37] Bernstein's basic thesis is to note that the Genesis Apocryphon, as a composite work, must be treated as multigeneric, rather than simply as "rewritten Bible" or "parabiblical" or the like because, as noted above, the Genesis Apocryphon does not relate uniformly to the biblical text. The difficulty, for Bernstein, comes when one must decide how to characterize the work as a whole. While works such as Jubilees and Pseudo-Philo could be viewed as works that have been uniformly "rewritten" (that is, that the entirety of the work is a single rewriting), works such as Genesis Apocryphon (he also includes the Temple Scroll) could be viewed as "a series of mini-rewritings of limited scope."[38] According to such a characterization, Bernstein writes, "we have no choice but to refer to Part I [the Lamech and Noah Memoirs] as 'parabiblical' and Part II [the Abram Memoir] as 'rewritten

36. Notably Bernstein, "Is the Genesis Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?" 107–34 and Falk, *Parabiblical Texts.* Cf. Eshel, "The Genesis Apocryphon," 182–93.

37. As argued in Bernstein, "Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," 317–43.

38. ibid., 336. I am reminded here of Nickelsburg's similar sentiment regarding the ways that 1 Enoch rewrites the flood story several times, arguing that the phenomenon of rewriting moved from smaller units of rewriting to larger, more systematic rewritings. See Nickelsburg, "Bible Rewritten," 89–90.

Bible"' based on the fact that, while the Abram Memoir rewrites portions of Genesis, the Lamech and Noah Memoirs really only take Genesis as a point of departure for their stories (and may, in fact, be rewriting other texts).[39] To refer to the entirety of Genesis Apocryphon as Rewritten Bible or as two different kinds of Rewritten Bible is, according to Bernstein, unacceptably imprecise. While I am happy to accept a multigeneric characterization of Genesis Apocryphon (and any number of other texts), I think Bernstein has sidestepped a more fundamental question by suggesting that the relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and its sources is best addressed as an issue of genre. The assumption made by Bernstein is that there was a qualitative difference between the sources utilized by Genesis Apocryphon[40] which forms the basis of his characterization of Genesis Apocryphon as "multigeneric." This pluriformity is in tension with his larger assertion affirming the unity of the work.

It seems to me that the situation may be better analyzed in reverse, namely that the genre of Genesis Apocryphon is consistent and it its the assumed qualitative distinction between its sources that should be interrogated. After all, formally speaking, Genesis Apocryphon is composed of three (broadly) first-person accounts told from the perspective of three significant patriarchs. In other words, rather than characterizing Genesis Apocryphon as a work that utilized both "biblical" and "non-biblical" sources, it is just as reasonable to begin with the assumption that Genesis Apocryphon's method is consistent and that the use of "non-biblical" sources actually points to the possibility that Jubilees and 1 Enoch were just as

39. Bernstein, "Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," 337.

40. While I am sympathetic to viewing Genesis Apocryphon as secondary to Jubilees and 1 Enoch, here, I am simply stating this as Bernstein's position.

legitimate of sources as Genesis. One possible inference from this observation could be that these other works may have been on equal footing as Genesis and enjoyed some special "scriptural" (or otherwise authoritative) position for the author of Genesis Apocryphon or that such categories were not operative at this time.[41] To be clear, the terminology of "Rewritten Bible" is not what is at stake here, but rather the way that we imagine the relationship(s) between the Genesis Apocryphon and the traditions that surround it.

Although 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,[42] what remains unclear is the nature and directionality (if any) of these relationships. While Avigad and Yadin suspected that Genesis Apocryphon was a source for 1 Enoch and Jubilees,[43] it is now widely acknowledged that no definitive evidence has yet been assembled to argue one way or another.[44]

Thinking about Genesis Apocryphon in terms of cultural memory means thinking about

41. See esp. the work of Eva Mroczek in *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 114–55.

42. Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 38; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 20–22; Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times,* 110–16; Machiela, *Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon,* 8–19.

43. Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon,* 38.

44. At the risk of over-simplifying the issue, Fitzmyer, Kugel, VanderKam, and Nickelsburg tend to see Genesis Apocryphon as secondary to Jubilees, while Machiela, Werman, and Segal have argued the reverse. See VanderKam, "Some Thoughts," 371–84, Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 20–22, Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah,* 174, Kugel, *A Walk Through Jubilees,* 305–42. Cf. Michael Segal, "The Literary Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees: The Chronology of Abram and Sarai's Descent to Egypt," *AS* 8.1 (2010): 71–88, Machiela, *Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon,* 140–42, and Werman, "Qumran and the Book of Noah," 171–77.

its composition not simply in source-critical terms, but rather as the synthesis of traditions which, regardless of whether they were considered religiously "authoritative," were operative within the *cultural discourse* of late Second Temple Judaism. In other words, viewing Genesis Apocryphon as the product of cultural memory means taking seriously the idea that the combination of traditions in Genesis Apocryphon should not primarily be understood as the genius of an author/editor, but rather that the author/editor should be viewed as the instrument by which cultural memory was codified as text. Of course, we must allow for singular, creative contributions of the author/editor of Genesis Apocryphon, but even those original contributions should not be treated as if they arose out of a vacuum.[45] The cultural memory that surrounded the book of Genesis—the biblical memory of Genesis—was more broad than the text of Genesis alone and included traditions that we know from Jubilees and 1 Enoch (whether or not they were directly informed by the *texts* of Jubilees and 1 Enoch). The fact that these traditions coexist within the Genesis Apocryphon speaks to the notion that these traditions participated in the same set of discourses, which I have called "biblical memory," and that the author of Genesis Apocryphon viewed all such sources as useful for his narrative purposes.

45. Such conscious contributions are examples of memory construction. If from this perspective, one supposed that the author of Genesis Apocryphon was responsible for the synthesis of these traditions, the Genesis Apocryphon would represent another iteration of the process of memory construction and reintegration into the cultural memory of Second Temple Judaism.

4.2 ABRAM IN THE DIASPORA: THE LITERARY FRAMEWORKS OF GENESIS APOCRYPHON

Having discussed how the Genesis Apocryphon functioned as the *recipient* of a cultural memory that was broader than the text of Genesis, we may now turn our attention to the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon was adapted to address its audience within the frameworks of their *social* memory. This section will focus on the way that the Genesis Apocryphon was shaped by the social frameworks of its compositional milieu, specifically the ways that contemporary cultural discourses and literary forms molded the biblical memory of Genesis (specifically, the Abram narrative) into a meaningful participant in the collective memory of Second Temple Judaism.

As I have already noted, the narrative of the Genesis Apocryphon is not simply a straight-forward retelling of Genesis from the perspectives of Lamech, Noah, and Abram, but participates more broadly in the "biblical memory" of Genesis (which includes related tradition like those represented in 1 Enoch and Jubilees). However, what is most compelling about Rewritten Bible texts very often is the *ways* that they adapt biblical memory. These adaptations can come at the level of story—by adding, removing, or rearranging events—or at the level of narrative discourse by describing events differently or with different emphases. In the case of Genesis Apocryphon, and in particular in the account of Abram's descent into Egypt in cols. XIX–XX, the biblical narrative has been recast as a (first-person) Hellenistic novella in a similar vein to other well-known Second Temple Jewish works such as the narrative portions of Daniel (including the Greek additions), Esther, Tobit, and (arguably) the so-called Joseph novella of

Genesis 37 and 39–50.[46]

46. See especially Lawrence Wills work on the Jewish novels and novellas in antiquity: *Ancient Jewish Novels: An Anthology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) as well as his important earlier works *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995) and idem, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990).

(XIX 7) ○○○[ובנית תמן מדבח]ּא וקרית תמן ב[שם]אֵל[הא] ואמרת אֹנתה
הוא (8) אֵל[הי א]ל[ה ע]ל[מיא] ○○○[ ]○○○ עד כען לֹא דְּבְקתה לטורא
קדישא ונגדת (9) ל○○○ והוית אזל לדרומא ○○○ ואתית עד די דבקת לחברון
ול[ה זמנא] אֹתְבֵ[נ]יאת חברון ויתבת (10) [תרתין שנין ת]מן *vacat*

והוא כפנא בארעא דא כולא ושמעת די ע[בו]רָא הָ[וא] במצרין ונגדת (11)
ל[מעל] לארעֹ מצרין [ ]○○○[עד די דבק]ת לכרמונא נהרא חד מן (12)
רֹאשֵׁי נהָרָא ○○○[ ]עד כען אנחנא בגו אַרְעֲנָא [וח]לפת שבעת ראשי נהרא
דן די (13) ○○○[ ]א כען חלפנא אַרעֲנא ועלנא לארע בני חם לארע מצרין

(14) *vacat* וחלמת אנה אברם חלם בלילה מעלי לארעֹ מצרין וחזית בחלמי [וה]א
ארז חד ותמרא (15) כחדא צמ[חו] מן שָׁרָ[ש חד] ובני אנוש אתו ובעון למקץ
ולמעקר ל[א]רזא ולמשבק תמריא בלחודיהה (16) ואכליאת תמרתא ואמרת
אל תקוצו ל[א]רזא ארי תרינא מן שרש [ח]דְּ עֲמָחָ[נ]א ושביק ארזא בטלל
תמרתא (17) ולא [אתקץ] *vacat*

ואתעירת בליליא מן שנתי ואמרת לשרי אנתתי חלם (18) חלמת [אנה וא]דחל
[מן] חֲלמָא דן ואמרת לי אשתעי לי חלמך ואנדע ושרית לאשתעיא לה חלמא דן
(19) [וחוית] ל[ה פשר] חלמא [דן ו]אמ[רת] ○○○ די יבעון למקטלני ולכי למשבק
[ב]רם דא כול טבותא (20) [די תעבדין עמי] בכול אָתָרְ די [נהך לה אמרי] עלי
די אחי הוא ואחי בטליכי ותפלטֹ נפשי בדיליכי (21) [יבעון] לאע[ד]יותכי מני
ולמקטלני ובכת שרי עֹל מלי בליליא דן (22) [ ]○○○[ ]
ופרעו צ[ען] שרי למפנה לצען (23) [עמי והסתמרת י]תירא בנפשה די
לא יחזנה כול [אנש חמש שני]ן ולסוף חמש שניא אלן (24) [אתו] תלתת
גברין מן רברבי מצרי[ן] די פרע[ו] צע[ן] על מל[י] ועל אנתתי והווא יהבין
(25) [לי מתנן שגיאן ובעו] ל[י] ל[אודעא] טבתא וחכמתא וקושטא וקרית
קודמיהון ל[כתב] מלי חנוך (26) [ ] בכפנא די [ ]○○○
ולא ○○○ין למקם עד די ○○○ מלי (27) [ ]ל[ ]במאכל שגי ובמשתה[
]חמרא (28) [ ]

(XX 1) ○○○[ ]○○○ (2) ○○○[ ] כמה ○○○ ושפיר
לה צלם אנפיהא וכמא (3) [נ]עֵימ וְכְמָא רקיק לה שער ראישה כמא יאין להון
לה עיניהא ומא רגג הוא לה אנפהא וכול נץ (4) אנפיהא ○○○ כמא יאא לה
הדיה וכמא שפיר לה כול לבנהא דרעיהא מא שפירן וידיהא כמא (5) כלילן
וחמיד כול מחזה יד[י]הא כמא יאין כפיהא ומא אריכן וקטינן כול אצבעת

ידיהא רגליהא [6] כמא שפירן וכמא שלמא להן לה שקיהא וכל בתולן וכלאן די יעלן לגנון לא ישפרן מנהא ועל כול [7] נשין שופר שפרה ועליא שפרהא לעלא מן כולהן ועם כול שפרא דן חכמא שגיא עמהא ודלידיהא [8] יאא וכדי שמע מלכא מלי חרקנוש ומלי תרין חברוהי די פם חד תלתהון ממללין שגי רחמה ושלח [9] לעובע דברהא וחזהא ואתמה על כול שפרהא ונסבהא לה לאנתא ובעא למקטלני ואמרת שרי [10] למלכא דאחי הוא כדי הוית מתגר על דילהא ושביקת אנה אברם בדילהא ולא קטילת ובכית אנה [11] אברם בכי תקיף אנה ולוט בר אחי עמי בליליא כדי דבירת מני שרי באונס *vacat*

[12] בליליא דן צלית ובעית ואתחננת ואמרת באתעצבא ודמעי נחתן בריך אנתה אל עליון מרי לכול [13] עלמים די אנתה מרה ושליט על כולא ובכול מלכי ארעא אנתה שליט למעבד בכולהון דין וכען [14] קבלתך מרי על פרעו צען מלך מצרין די דברת אנתתי מני בתוקף עבד לי דין מנה ואחזי ידך רבתא [15] בה ובכול ביתה ואל ישלט בליליא דן לטמיא אנתתי מני וי֯דעוך מרי די אנתה מרה לכול מלכי [16] ארעא ובכית וחשית בליליא דן שלח לה אל עליון רוח מכדש למכתשה ולכול אנש ביתה רוח [17] באישא והואת כתשא לה ולכול אנש ביתה ולא יכל למקרב בהא ואף לא ידעהא והוא עמה [18] תרתין שנין ולסוף תרתין שנין תקפו וגברו עלוהי מכתשיא ונגדיא ועל כול אנש ביתה ושלח [19] קרא לכול ח̇כ̇י̇מ[י] מצרין ולכול אשפיא עם כול אסי מצרין הן יכולון לאסיוֹתה מן מכתשה דן ולאנש [20] ביתה ולָא יְכְלוֹ כֻל אָסִיָא ואשפיא וכול חכימיא למקם לאסיותה ארי הוא רוחא כתש לכולהון [21] וערקו *vacat*

באדין אתה עלי חרקנוש ובעא מני די אתה ואצלה על [22] מלכָא וֹאסמוך ידי עלוהי ויהה ארי ב[ח]לם ח̇ז[ני] ואמרְ לה לוֹט לא יכוֹל אברם דדי לצליָא על [23] מלכא ושרי אנתתה עמה וכען אזל אמר למלכא וישלח אנתתה מנה לבעלהא ויצלה עלוהו ויחה

[24] *vacat* וֹכְדי שמע חרקנוש מלי לוט אזל אמר למלכא כול מכתשיא ונגדיא [25] אלן די מתכתש ומתנגד מרי מלכא בדיל שרי אנתת אברם יְתיבו נה לשרי לאָבְרם בעלה [26] ויתוך מנכה מכתשָא דן ורוח שחלניא וקרא [מ]ל[כ]א לי ואמר לי מא עבדתה לי בדיל [שר]י ותאמר [27] לי די אחתי היא והיא הואת אנתתך ונסבתהא לי לאנתה הא אנתתך דְבְרה אזל ועדי לך מן [28] כול מדינת מצרין וכען צְלי עְלי וֹעְל ביתי ותתגער מננה רוחא דא באישתא וצְלית עלוֹהי מְגְדפא [29] הו וסמכת ידי עְל [ראי]שה ואתפלי מנה מכתשא ואתגערת [מנה רוחא] בְאישתא וחי וֹקם וֵיהב [30] לֵי מלכא ב[יומא] דנא מנתנ[ן] שגיאן וימא לי

מלכא במומה די לאֹ ○○○[ ]הא ואתיבֿ לי [31] לשׂרי ויהב לה מלכאֿ [כסף וד]הב
שׂגיא ולבוש שגי די בוץ וארגואן ו[ ] [32] קודמיהא ואף להגר וא[ש]למה לי
ומני עמי אנוש די ינפקוֹנניְ ול○○○ מן מצרין *vacat*

The reading of Genesis Apocryphon cols. XIX–XX as a Hellenistic Jewish novella has recently been very thoroughly explicated by Blake Jurgens, who has further argued that the utilization of Hellenistic literary motifs and structures in Genesis Apocryphon altered the overall presentation of the pericope for the purpose of edifying Jews living in the Hellenistic world in the shadow of empire.[47] Although much of Jurgens's paper is based on long-established observations about the literary influences on Genesis Apocryphon, he makes an important discursive turn toward the audience by claiming that the Genesis Apocryphon was meant to be useful to readers:

> By imbuing its story with literary tropes and techniques similar to those found in Dan 1–6, Esther, and other Jewish texts arising out of the Hellenistic period, the author successfully attends to the narratival ambiguities of Gen 12:10–20 through interpretive expansion upon the latent exegetical links of the text while concurrently modifying the narrative to appeal to contemporary literary expectations.[48]

Thinking in terms of social memory, however, we can appreciate the way that the stories that the Genesis Apocryphon retells are "remembered into" the social context of Hellenistic Judaism and are fitted into contemporary social frameworks by the utilization of common literary techniques. In other words, the changes that Jurgens identifies as authorial

47. Blake A. Jurgens, "A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh's Court: The Literary Relationship Between Abram's Sojourn in Egypt in 1QapGen 19-20 and Jewish Fictional Literature," *JSJ* 49.3 (2018): 1–34.

48. Ibid., 27.

decisions intended to engage with readers can also be framed as *determined by* the social location of the author and the literary tools available to him. In other words, as societies change over time, new kinds of literary forms overtake older ones and older stories take on new meanings for new contexts. This adaptation into new forms and meanings is socially determined and should be understood as an example of how social frameworks (in this case, literary frameworks), shape memory *in the present.*

4.2.1 Abram in the Diaspora

One of the primary features of Jewish Hellenistic novellas is their setting. Jurgens notes that, typically, these Jewish novellas are set in the diaspora, which invariably place the Jewish (or, in Tobit and Judith's case, Israelite) protagonist under the hegemony of a foreign power. In the case of Genesis Apocryphon, although not properly "diaspora," Abram is a sojourner in a foreign land and is under foreign hegemony. Moreover, from a modern perspective, these stories have a tendency to commit rather egregious factual errors about certain historical particulars such as the names of rulers (Judith 1:1; Dan 4; Tobit) and geographic items (Tobit 5:6). Likewise, Genesis Apocryphon seems to utilize details which almost certainly were inventions of the author (or an earlier tradant) such as referring to "Pharaoh Zoan" (we know of no such figure) and Herqanos, a name popular in the Ptolemaic period, but not attested otherwise as well as referring to the "Karmon River" (probably the Kharma canal), as the one of the seven heads of the Nile river, which it is not.[49] These details, according to Jurgens, are

49. Jurgens, "A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh's Court," 7; See also Daniel A. Machiela, "Some Egyptian Elements in the Genesis Apocryphon: Evidence of a Ptolemaic Social Location?" *AS* 8 (2010): 47–69; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 197–99.

meant to create a sense of verisimilitude and authenticity within the narrative. Thus, although the story of Abram's sojourn in Egypt as narrated in the biblical text engages with discourses of the *foundation* of Israel, the narrative of the Genesis Apocryphon seems to be turning the story to engage with the contemporary discourses around the idea of *diaspora.* In other words the way that Abram's sojourn in Egypt was remembered in the Second Temple period, at least in part, took on new meaning for those sojourning in the diaspora and for those living in the land under foreign hegemony.

4.2.2 Abram in the Court of a Foreign King: Literary Genre as Social Framework

If we place the pericope of Abram's journey into Egypt in Genesis Apocryphon under the rubric of diaspora literature, the final scene in the pericope bears a striking resemblance to the so called court contest narratives well-known from (especially) the book of Daniel.[50] Such narratives, as observed by Collins and others, follow particular narrative progressions with common features.[51] Jurgens has convincingly argued that the Genesis Apocryphon's retelling of Abram's sojourn in Egypt fits such a progression by comparing this pericope to to Dan 2, 4, and 5 as well as Gen 41. The resemblance is quite striking. Although based on the earlier work of Collins and Humprheys, Jurgens offers his own outline, which can be summarized as

50. Other court contest narratives include the Joseph Cycle (Gen 41)

51. John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993), 38–52; W. L. Humphreys, "A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel," *JBL* 92 (1973): 211–23; John J. Collins, "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic," *JBL* 94 218–34; Wills, *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King.* See also Susan Niditch and R. Doran, "The Success Story of the Wise Courtier: A Formal Approach," *JBL* 96 (1977).

follows:[52]

- The foreign king has a problem that he is unable to solve.
- The king's own personnel are charged with solving the problem
- The king's personnel are unable to solve the problem
- The Jewish protagonist is asked to solve the problem
- The Jewish protagonist is able to solve the problem
- The Jewish protagonist is rewarded by the king

The biblical account, however, offers a rather anemic description of the events, but leaves open the specifics of how Pharoah came to know about Abram and how the monarch was relieved from the plagues. It is easy to imagine how the author of Genesis Apocryphon would conceive of Abram's interaction with Pharoah in Gen 12 as analogous to other well-known court contests from Israel's biblical memory, despite the fact that the biblical version offers almost no detail. Gen 12:17–20 reads:

Genesis 12:17–20

(12:17) וַיְנַגַּע יְהוָה אֶת־פַּרְעֹה נְגָעִים גְּדֹלִים וְאֶת־בֵּיתוֹ עַל־דְּבַר שָׂרַי אֵשֶׁת אַבְרָם׃
(18) וַיִּקְרָא פַרְעֹה לְאַבְרָם וַיֹּאמֶר מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ לִּי לָמָּה לֹא־הִגַּדְתָּ לִי כִּי אִשְׁתְּךָ
הִוא׃ (19) לָמָּה אָמַרְתְּ אֲחֹתִי הִוא וָאֶקַּח אֹתָהּ לִי לְאִשָּׁה וְעַתָּה הִנֵּה אִשְׁתְּךָ קַח
וָלֵךְ׃ (20) וַיְצַו עָלָיו פַּרְעֹה אֲנָשִׁים וַיְשַׁלְּחוּ אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ׃

(Gen 12:17) Now, Yahweh afflicted Pharoah and his house with terrible plagues on account of Sarai, the wife of Abram. (18) And Pharoah called for Abram and he said, "What is this that you have done to me? Why did you not tell

52. Jurgens, "A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh's Court," 21.

me that she was your wife? (19) Why did you say, 'she is my sister' such that I took her as a wife? Anyhow, here is your wife. Take her and go. (20) And Pharoah gave his men orders about him and they sent him away along with his wife away and everything he owned. (My translation)

From an innerbiblical perspective, the Genesis Apocryphon's description of Abram and Pharaoh's interaction might be thought of as a synthesis or exegetical harmonization with the Abimelech doublet in Gen 20, which offers a much more detailed account of the Abimelech's confrontation with Abram/Abraham (Genesis 20:8–18):

(Gen 20:8) וַיַּשְׁכֵּם אֲבִימֶלֶךְ בַּבֹּקֶר וַיִּקְרָא לְכָל־עֲבָדָיו וַיְדַבֵּר אֶת־כָּל־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה בְּאָזְנֵיהֶם וַיִּירְאוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים מְאֹד: (9) וַיִּקְרָא אֲבִימֶלֶךְ לְאַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר לוֹ מֶה־עָשִׂיתָ לָּנוּ וּמֶה־חָטָאתִי לָךְ כִּי־הֵבֵאתָ עָלַי וְעַל־מַמְלַכְתִּי חֲטָאָה גְדֹלָה מַעֲשִׂים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יֵעָשׂוּ עָשִׂיתָ עִמָּדִי: (10) וַיֹּאמֶר אֲבִימֶלֶךְ אֶל־אַבְרָהָם מָה רָאִיתָ כִּי עָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה: (11) וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם כִּי אָמַרְתִּי רַק אֵין־יִרְאַת אֱלֹהִים בַּמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה וַהֲרָגוּנִי עַל־דְּבַר אִשְׁתִּי: (12) וְגַם־אָמְנָה אֲחֹתִי בַת־אָבִי הִוא אַךְ לֹא בַת־אִמִּי וַתְּהִי־לִי לְאִשָּׁה: (13) וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִתְעוּ אֹתִי אֱלֹהִים מִבֵּית אָבִי וָאֹמַר לָהּ זֶה חַסְדֵּךְ אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשִׂי עִמָּדִי אֶל כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר נָבוֹא שָׁמָּה אִמְרִי־לִי אָחִי הוּא:

(Gen 20:8) Abimelech rose early in the morning and called all his servants and spoke all these things in their ears. And the men were very frightened. (9) So Abimelech summoned Abraham, and said to him, "What have you done to us? How have I sinned against you such that you have brought terrible guilt upon me and my kingdom? You have done things to me which should not be done." (10) And Abimelech said to Abraham, "What were you thinking that made you do this thing?" (11) Abraham said, "I thought 'Surely there is no fear of God at all in this place, and they will kill me because of my wife. (12) Also, honestly, she is my sister; the daughter of my father but not the daughter of my mother and she *became* my wife. (13) And when God caused me to wander from my father's house, I said to her, 'This is the kindness you must do for me: at every place when we enter there, say "He is my brother."'"

(Gen 20:14) וַיִּקַּח אֲבִימֶלֶךְ צֹאן וּבָקָר וַעֲבָדִים וּשְׁפָחֹת וַיִּתֵּן לְאַבְרָהָם וַיָּשֶׁב לוֹ אֵת שָׂרָה אִשְׁתּוֹ׃ (15) וַיֹּאמֶר אֲבִימֶלֶךְ הִנֵּה אַרְצִי לְפָנֶיךָ בַּטּוֹב בְּעֵינֶיךָ שֵׁב׃ (16) וּלְשָׂרָה אָמַר הִנֵּה נָתַתִּי אֶלֶף כֶּסֶף לְאָחִיךְ הִנֵּה הוּא־לָךְ כְּסוּת עֵינַיִם לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר אִתָּךְ וְאֵת כֹּל וְנֹכָחַת׃ (17) וַיִּתְפַּלֵּל אַבְרָהָם אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים וַיִּרְפָּא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־אֲבִימֶלֶךְ וְאֶת־אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאַמְהֹתָיו וַיֵּלֵדוּ׃ (18) כִּי־עָצֹר עָצַר יְהוָה בְּעַד כָּל־רֶחֶם לְבֵית אֲבִימֶלֶךְ עַל־דְּבַר שָׂרָה אֵשֶׁת אַבְרָהָם׃

(Gen 20:14) Then Abimelech took sheep and cattle, and male and female slaves, and gave them to Abraham, and restored his wife Sarah to him. (15) Abimelech said, "See, my land is before you. Settle where it seems good to you." (16) But to Sarah he said, "Look, I have given your brother a thousand pieces of silver; it is your exoneration before all who are with you; you are completely vindicated." (17) Then Abraham prayed to God; and God healed Abimelech, and also healed his wife and female slaves so that they bore children. (18) For Yahweh had completely closed all the wombs of the house of Abimelech because of the word of Sarah, Abraham's wife. (My translation)

While the Gen 12 account is very terse, the Gen 20 account includes a dream-revelation (20:6–7), specifies that the plagues that afflicted the monarch impeded his sexual activities (specifically with Sarah), and describes Abraham praying over Abimelech and his household to heal them. Similar details are given in the Genesis Apocryphon's account which likewise includes a dream-revelation, notes that the plague were sexual in nature, and describes Abram praying over Pharoah and his household for healing.

However, while these similarities may indeed represent some kind of literary conflation between the two accounts,[53] at the level of genre and structure, conflation with Gen 20 cannot

53. From a memory perspective I would prefer to account for the Genesis Apocryphon's adoption of certain details from Gen 20 in more passive terms where the specifics of the Gen 12 story are, where absent, supplied from another well-known, typologically similar, source. It is also, perhaps, worth noting that this doublet has traditionally been attributed source crit-

account for the Genesis Apocryphon's reframing as a court-contest. For example. the dream-revelation in Gen 20 is given to Abimelech, rather than to Abram as in Genesis Apocryphon. Moreover although Abraham prays for healing for Abimelech and his household in a very similar fashion to the way he is portrayed in Genesis Apocryphon praying for Pharoah, in Gen 20, he does so only after Abimelech effectively "pays him off." It is the revelation given to Abimelech in a dream which causes him to "repent" in Gen 20, while in Genesis Apocryphon, the miraculous healing of Pharoah and his household functions as the sign and catalyst for Pharoah's rich rewarding of Abram. Although this difference may seem subtle, the primary feature of the court-contest is the demonstration of God's power through the protagonist which leads to the foreign king's repentance/conversion and the rationale for his rewarding of the protagonist. In other words, while it may have been that the Genesis Apocryphon used details from Gen 20 to supplement the account from Gen 12, Genesis Apocryphon's framing of Abram's contest with Pharoah cannot be solely attributed to a harmonization of the Gen 12/20 doublet. Thus, drawing on details from, or perhaps just inspired by, the Abimelech doublet in Gen 20, the author of Genesis Apocryphon was able to reframe this portion of the Abram narrative to conform to the common court-contest pattern, which, as Jurgens rightly notes, surely would have been an effective and entertaining adaptation by comparison to the account from Genesis.

---

ically to different hands (Gen 12 = J; Gen 20 = E) See Samuel R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament,* ML 3 (New York: Meridian, 1956), 15 .

4.2.3 Other Literary features and Motifs

A number of other generic and literary motifs which diverge from the Genesis account, but which are at home in the Second Temple period can be identified in this portion of the Genesis Apocryphon as well.

Abram as Oracle

Although the Abimelech story in Gen 20 includes a dream-revelation, it is noteworthy that in Genesis Apocryphon, Abram himself is given the dream as a means of warning him about how the Egyptians would attempt to kill him on account of Sarai's beauty. Where the biblical text credits Abram's intuition for anticipating the Egyptians' desire for Sarai (though, we are left to wonder whether he would have been killed had the ruse not been realized), the Genesis Apocryphon describes Abram receiving a portentous dream vision characteristic of other Second Temple literature.[54]

Although dream-visions are not unique to the Second Temple period, their ubiquity within Jewish literature from the Second Temple period is indisputable. In his treatment of the Dream-Visions among the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls, Andrew Perrin describes both Abram and Noah as being "recast as a dreamer[s]" within the Genesis Apocryphon.[55] While Noah is not

54. Marianne Luijken Gevirtz, "Abram's Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon: Its Motifs and Their Function," *MAARAV* 8 (1992): 229–43; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1,* 184; Marianne Dacy, "Plant Symbolism and the Dreams of Noah and Abram in the Genesis Apocryphon," in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown,* ed. Shani Tzoref, PHSC (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013), 217–32

55. Andrew B. Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls,* JAJSup 19 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 52–57. See also Esther Es-

described as a dreamer within the biblical text, within the Genesis Apocryphon, he seems to have been the recipient of as many as five dream-visions.[56] Restricting the discussion to Abram, however, Perrin suggests that the insertion of a dream-vision into the story on the eve of Abram and Sarai's descent into Egypt functioned as part of a larger project to "extend Abram's prophetic credentials in light of Gen 20:7."[57]

Fitzmyer notes that the component parts of this dream—"cedar" (Aramaic: ארז) and "date-palm" (Aramaic: תמרא)—are derived from Ps 92, which declares "the righteous will flourish like the date palm (Hebrew: כַּתָּמָר); like a cedar (Hebrew: כְּאֶרֶז) in Lebanon he will grow" (Ps 92:13). The identification of Abram and Sarai with the cedar and date-palm, respectively, is plain enough by the parallel to what happens next in the narrative. The interpretation is supported by the grammatical gender of the terms ארז (masc.) and תמרא (fem.) which correspond to the gender of the characters. Although grammatical gender does not correspond to natural gender, the identification of Sarai with the date-palm is supported further by the use of "Tamar" as a feminine personal name within the Bible (Gen 38:6; 2 Sam 13:1; 14:27).

---

hel, "The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006,* ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al., STDJ 80 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 41–61 and Daniel A. Machiela, "Genesis Revealed: The Apocalyptic Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana,* ed. Daniel K. Falk et al., STDJ 91 (Leiden: Brill), 205–21.

56. Perrin, *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation,* 53. Elsewhere in the Enochic literature dreams weight heavily in the events surrounding the flood, if not always given to Noah (1 Enoch, Book of Giants, etc.).

57. Ibid., 55.

The dream itself provides an allegorical vision that credits the date-palm (Sarai) with saving the cedar (Abram) from the people seeking to destroy it. Although there is a question whether the beginning of col. XIX, 14–15 should read והא אזר חד ותמרא כחדא חמחו מן שרש חד "a cedar and a date-palm *growing from a single root*" (so DJD), or והא אזר חד ותמרא חדא יאיא שגי "a cedar and a date-palm [which was] *very beautiful*" (so, Fitzmyer), all editions understand col. XIX, 16 to read ארי תרינא מן שרש חד זמחנא "for the two of us grow from a single root." Thus, the purpose of the dream is to show Abram the way that he should avoid being "cut down and uprooted" by the Egyptians, namely, by claiming that he and Sarai "sprung from the same root," viz. are siblings. This interpretation is also offered by Abram himself in col. XIX, 19–21.

Significantly, the later Genesis Rabbah connects the this section of Genesis with Ps 92 and utilizes the cedar/date-palm imagery as well, albeit in a different manner. Specifically, during its treatment of the description of the plagues which God inflicted on Pharoah, Genesis Rabbah begins with a citation of Ps 92, "The righteous will flourish like the date-palm (Hebrew: תמר); like a cedar (Hebrew: ארז) in Lebanon he will grow" and this comparison to date-palms and cedars makes several digressions. First, building on the idea of righteousness, Genesis Rabbah observes that both cedars and date-palms are "straight" trees, largely without crooks and crotches.[58] The second digression focuses on the ability of date-palms to produce fruit

58. Although the Psalm uses the typical term for "righteousness" (Hebrew: צַדִּיק), another common biblical term for a person who acts in an upright manner is "straight" (Hebrew: יָשָׁר). The author of Genesis Rabbah seems to be playing off of this association. Furthermore, according to Genesis Rabbah, tall trees cast long shadows; the length of these shadows represent the fact that the reward for such righteous people will only come later.

(including through grafting) and the usefulness of, especially date-palms for all manner of practical concerns. Genesis Rabbah then extends the comparison to the whole of Israel:

> As no part of the palm has any waste, the dates being eaten, the branches used for Hallel, the twigs for covering [booths], and bast for ropes, the leaves for besoms, and the planed boards for ceiling rooms, so are there none worthless in Israel, some being versed in Scripture, some in Mishnah, some in Talmud, others Haggadah. (Gen. Rab. 41.1)

The final comparison makes the claim that, like dealing with Israel, climbing these tall trees is perilous. The proof, for Genesis Rabbah, brings us back to the verse at hand. That Pharaoh was plagued by Yahweh when he took Sarai for himself demonstrates the danger in engaging with Israel as an adversary. What is significant here is that the authors of both Genesis Apocryphon and Genesis Rabbah connect Ps 92 with this section of Genesis, but importantly, they do so with different sets of interpretive "evidence." In other words, the two texts agree on the *fact* of the connection between Ps 92 and the story in Gen 12, but they arrive at their interpretations through different means. [59] Yet, the fact that Ps 92 and Gen 12 are explicitly connected in both Genesis Apocryphon and Genesis Rabbah seems more than a coincidence. Thus, while Genesis Apocryphon's use of the cedar/date-palm imagery may rely on some previous tradition, the dream revelation itself is best understood as an example of the

59. Perhaps based on the Psalm's later reference to bearing children in one's old age:

> Planted in the house of Yahweh; they will flourish in the courts of our God
> They will still bring forth fruit in old age; they will be full of sap and green
> (Ps 92:14–15)

author of Genesis Apocryphon utilizing the literary tropes of his own time and place.

4.2.4 Conclusions

The recasting of Abram's sojourn as "diaspora," his conflict with Pharaoh as a court-contest along with the portrayal of Abram and Noah as dreamers can be understood in terms of social memory as the author of Genesis Apocryphon pressing the stories of Genesis into existing literary genres. Insofar as "genres" can be understood as commonly understood literary conventions—a social "contract" of expectations between the author and her audience—they are socially defined and, for our purposes, function as what Halbwachs would call "social frameworks." As Abram's sojourn in Egypt could take on new meanings within the context and social framework of diaspora Judaism during the Second Temple period, so too the common trope of the court-contest—well-known from the book of Daniel—provided a new framework into which the story of Gen 12 could be read. Thus, Jurgens's basic premise—that these stories are "updated" for a new audience—takes for granted what the memory approach makes explicit: Second Temple Jews had their own ways of thinking about the way that God interacted with the ancients, and how pious Jews acted in particular circumstances. These social frameworks provided new structures for understanding the stories that they inherited from the biblical tradition. Thus, rather than only thinking about how the author was trying to "fix" the biblical account, from the memory perspective we can imagine the author of Genesis Apocryphon not only interpreting the biblical tradition, but making efforts to contextualize it within his own literary frame of reference.

4.3 GENESIS APOCRYPHON AS PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

While the Genesis Apocryphon can be seen engaging with its received cultural memory through its sources and engaging with its contemporary social memory at the level of literary form and genre, the Genesis Apocryphon also participates in the construction of cultural memory going forward. Although *all* literary and cultural products can participate in constructing cultural memory, in this section, I will argue that Genesis Apocryphon's pseudepigraphic form participates in this constructive act differently than other forms of literature, in particular the biblical text.[60]

4.3.1 The Hebrew Bible as a Baseline

The vast majority of the Hebrew Bible is narrated in the third-person omniscient and is formally anonymous. There are, of course, exceptions to this generalization, most notably within the prophetic corpus (such as Isa 6–8), the so-called Nehemiah Memoir (Neh 11–13), and perhaps works such as Deuteronomy and Song of Songs. But for the lion's share of the biblical text, the the author (and narrator) operates invisibly.

The rhetorical force of this particular authorial voice, as observed by Erhard Blum, is significant for the function of the Hebrew Bible's participation in the collective memory of the communities that claim it as their own. Although the implied author does occasionally engage directly with the reader by offering explanatory observations (for example where the author inserts phrases like "this is why…" or "…until this day"), for all intents and purposes, the author

60. I continue to reiterate that although the term "biblical" is anachronistic for the late Second Temple period, it is a usefully concise term for my purposes.

presents as both *reliable* and *authoritative* without a hint of subjectivity. As Blum puts it, "In this sense the narrative does not distinguish the depiction from the depicted."[61] Put another way, the text does not acknowledge that it *has* an author, it simply *is*. The rhetorical effect of this invisible, omniscient author is to collapse the knowledge gap between the reader and the events narrated by removing the author from view. This move, according to Blum, allows the text to convey "an unmediated truth claim which is not based on the author's distinguishable critical judgments and convictions."[62] The effectiveness of this implied author, according to Blum, is tied to the pragmatics of the text, that is, tied to the context of the biblical narratives as scripture (though, Blum does not refer to "scripture" *per se*). The implied audience of the biblical narratives by-and-large can be understood as group-insiders for whom the biblical text worked to reinforce group identity.

Of course, the "unmediated truth claims" of the biblical text *were*, in fact, mediated and reinforced by those who (orally or otherwise) transmitted the tradition from one generation to another.[63] Individuals within the community—teachers and religious leaders and even parents—become the voice of the biblical text as it is passed on. In other words, one might say that the narrator of the biblical text is the community itself—its collective memory. Blum writes:

---

61. Erhard Blum, "Historiography or Poetry? The Nature of the Hebrew Bible Prose Tradition," in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004), September 2004),* ed. Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold, WUNT 212 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 25–45.

62. Ibid., 33.

63. Ibid., 33.

> If we assume that the traditional literature was primarily transmitted through oral means, than the narrator who is speaking supplies the material with a personal presence; he is not present as an author who judges and evaluates his sources from a critical distance, but as a 'transmitter' who participates in the tradition itself and is able to lend it credence through his own personality, his standing, and/or his office.[64]

In other words, the authoritative claims of "biblical" texts are actually made by their communities and not by the text itself. Thus, the way biblical texts participate in the collective memory is determined by their *use*—how their *readers* frame their function and how the text relates to the collective memory.

4.3.2 On Pseudepigraphy and the Pseudepigrapha

Because significant portions of the Genesis Apocryphon are written in the first person as though written by Lamech, Noah, and Abram, Genesis Apocryphon may be formally included in the literary category of pseudepigraphy. Before moving on, however, it is worth taking a moment to clearly define what is meant by "pseudepigraphy," "pseudepigrapha," and related terms.[65] In the simplest terms, pseudepigrapha are texts which are fictively purported to be

64. Blum, "Historiography or Poetry?" 33.

65. The topic of pseudepigraphy has received a large amount of very sophisticated attention in recent years. See especially Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity;* Eibert Tigchelaar, "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures,* ed. Eibert Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 1–18; Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Pseudepigraphy and/as Prophecy: Continuity and Transformation in the Formation and Reception of Early Enochic Writings," in *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity,* ed. Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas, TSAJ 146 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 25–42; idem, "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha'," *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36; idem, "Pseudepigraphy, Authorship and the Reception of 'the Bible' in Late Antiquity," in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006,* ed. Lorenzo DiTo-

written by figures (typically) from the ancient past.

The ancient use of the term pseudepigrapha denoted spurious texts which Church leaders believed to be intentionally misleading about their authorship.[66] Thus, the term has tended to carry a somewhat negative connotation, even when such a connotation is not warranted. Implicit in the negative use of the term is the assumption that "false" attribution was malicious, or at the very least intentionally misleading. Yet, the number of (esp. Jewish) pseudepigraphical texts discovered within the past century provide good reason to question the assumption that pseudonymous authors' intentions were to deceive their readers.[67] On the contrary, the sheer number of pseudepigraphical works now known to us suggests that the historical reality and social function of pseudepigraphical works was not simply a matter of being "falsely attributed."

At the other end of the spectrum, because so many early Jewish texts seem to fall into the category of pseudepigrapha, in some scholarly discourse, the term "pseudepigrapha" has

---

mmaso and Lucian Turcescu, BAC 6 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 467–90; Hindy Najman, "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez,* ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, JSJSup 122 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 529–36; idem, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism,* JSJSup 77 (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

66. See esp. Eusebius's *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.2 where the Bishop of Antioch, Serapion, refers to the *Gospel of Peter* among the a number of works "falsely attributed": γάρ, ἀδελφοί, καὶ Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀποστόλους ἀποδεχόμεθα ὡς Χριστόν, τὰ δὲ ὀνόματι αὐτῶν ψευδεπίγραφα ὡς ἔμπειροι παραιτούμεθα, γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐ παρελάβομεν. "For we, brothers, accept both Peter and the other apostles as Christ, but we skillfully reject those falsely ascribed writings, knowing that they were not handed down to us."

67. Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity,* 53–58; See also Reed, "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha'," 403–36.

become generalized to encompass any text written in around the turn of the era which did not make it into the canon of rabbinic Judaism or early Christianity. Bernstein observes, for example, that although the first volume of James Charlesworth's two-volume *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* contains a number of formally pseudepigraphic works, the second volume includes many which do not meet the formal definition of pseudepigrapha.[68] This expansive practice is not particularly helpful for clarifying the term and so I will attempt to restrict my usage to a more clearly defined set of criteria.

Moshe Bernstein, in his discussion of the phenomenon of pseudepigraphy distinguishes between "authoritative" pseudepigraphy and "decorative" pseudepigraphy.[69] By "authoritative" pseudepigraphy, Bernstein refers to texts that *portray themselves* as being written by a particular figure. Portions of 1 Enoch (in particular the latter three books, Astronomical Writings [72–82], Dream Visions [83–90], and the Epistle of Enoch [91–107]), which present themselves as if they were written by Enoch himself, are prime examples of "authoritative" pseudepigraphy. The Genesis Apocryphon, too would fall into this category. Psalm 23, on the other hand, although attributed to David, was presumably not *actually* written by David. Moreover, whoever did write Ps 23, (again, presumably) did not intend to write it *as if* it had

68. Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions," 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), 1–26. See also James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,* 2 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983)

69. He also identifies a third form, "convenient" pseudepigraphy which is located somewhere between the two. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls," 3–7.

been written by David. Rather, the Psalm was simply *attributed* to David, along with many others, in part due to the tradition of David being a musician.[70] Thus, Ps 23 could be classified as "decorative" pseudepigraphy. Thus, the difference between "authoritative" and "decorative" pseudepigraphy can, in some sense, be boiled down to the notoriously difficult issue of authorial intent—whether a text was *intended* to be read as pseudepigrapha or whether the work was anonymous, and later attributed to an explicit author.

Less clear-cut examples, however, require a more nuanced treatment. For example, Deuteronomy is not generally referred to as among the pseudepigrapha, yet, from a literary perspective, it is framed as הדבִרם אשׁר דבר משׁה אל־כל־ישׂראל "the words which Moses spoke to all Israel" (Deut 1:1a). Although the whole narrative is not written in the first person, long sections of the book are treated as verbatim recountings of Moses's speech. Was Moses the author of Deuteronomy? Traditionally, most critical scholars have dated Deuteronomy to the late monarchic period and thus have eschewed the traditional attribution. But whether Deuteronomy was *written* as pseudepigrapha or just attributed to Moses after the fact is difficult to say with certainly and the matter is further complicated by the editorial processes that the book likely underwent through the centuries.[71] What we *can* say is that there are concrete literary cues within Deuteronomy which make the attribution to Moses easier.

---

70. See, for example 2 Chr 23:18 and Ezra 3:2,10. James Luther Mays, "The David of the Psalms," *Int* 40.2 (1986): 143–55; Nahum M. Sarna, "The Psalm Superscriptions and the Guilds," in *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History presented to Alexander Altmann on the occasion of his seventieth birthday,* ed. Siegfried Stein and Raphael Loewe (University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1979), 281–300

71. Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007), 143–72.

Framing Deuteronomy as "the words which Moses spoke," while not formally "pseudepigrapha" participates in the construction of memory in a similar fashion as pseudepigrapha proper.

4.3.3 Pseudepigrapha, Genesis Apocryphon, and Memory Construction

If we take seriously Blum's characterization of the way that the anonymous, third-person omniscient biblical text may have engaged with the collective memory of Israel based on formal, narratological features within the text, it stands to reason that the Genesis Apocryphon as first-person pseudepigraphy would engage that collective memory in a different way, despite the fact that the stories within the Genesis Apocryphon are found in the book of Genesis. In other words, the literary form of the Genesis Apocryphon affects how it relates *back* to the biblical memory, and how it can be used in the further *construction of* that memory.

The pseudepigraphic quality of Genesis Apocryphon shapes the way that the text engages with the remembered past by describing the biblical story through the mouths of important figures.[72] This explicitness changes the way that the reader understands how the text fits into the collective memory by shifting the locus of authenticity onto the text's putative author and away from the mediating figures within the community. In other words, as an example of pseudepigraphy, the Genesis Apocryphon can be thought of as a set of fictional *primary sources* that bypass the received tradition. As these sources are used and enter into the

72. Here "story" refers to the abstract sequence of actions which the narrative describes. The *way* a story is recounted, on the other hand, is referred to by narratologists as *narrative discourse.* Thus, the Genesis Apocryphon's change from third-person omniscient to a pseudepigraphical first-person narrative can be understood as a change in *narrative discourse* which, broadly, retains the same *story* as that of the biblical text. See H. Porter Abbott, *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative,* 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 13–27, esp. 18–19.

discourse of the broader biblical memory, they are able to function not simply as "alternate" versions of events but as qualitatively distinct contributions to the tradition as it is passed on to the next generation.[73]

Of course, referring to pseudepigraphy as "fictional primary sources" may overstate these texts' importance or otherwise misunderstand how "authentic" these texts were thought to be by various and sundry religious groups in antiquity. On the one hand, it could be that readers understood that such novel fictional adaptations took certain artistic license with their biblical *Vorlagen*. By way of analogy, modern adaptations of biblical narratives into film are expected to deviate to a certain degree from their source material, despite the fact that the Hebrew Bible remains a sacred, authoritative text for many modern Jews and Christians. Such adaptations are not, typically, understood to be superseding the Bible because viewers understand intuitively that there is a qualitative difference between their scriptures and a movie. On the other hand, there certainly are examples of pseudepigraphical texts which ultimately *did* become authoritative for certain religious groups.[74] My point here is not to suggest that there were multiple ways to understand pseudepigraphical writing in antiquity so much as to point out that discussions of "false" or "authentic" attribution are generally from

73. On analogy to Hindy Najman's notion of "Mosaic Discourse," here I am saying that the Genesis Apocryphon is participating in a broader "biblical" discourse insofar as it participates in discourses surrounding Lamech, Noah, and Abram. See Najman, *Seconding Sinai,* 1–40.

74. For example, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church includes 1 Enoch among its scriptures. Tobit, too may, under certain rubrics, be considered pseudepigrapha, which is included within the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox deuterocanon. Insofar as deutero- and trito- Isaiah were penned as is written by Isaiah, they too could be considered pseudepigrapha. And, of course, a number of the so called "disputed" Pauline letters within the Christian New Testament likely were not penned by Paul and are properly pseudepigraphical.

later periods and do not tell us anything meaningful about *why* such a text was written or *how* it would have been understood by its original readers.

The Genesis Apocryphon, of course, was never considered "scripture" so far as we know, but that does not mean that it did not participate in the broader biblical memory, even if only in the popular imagination. But even at the level of the popular imagination—even as an entertaining fiction—the Genesis Apocryphon participated in how its society conceived of the Genesis narratives. Regardless of whether the memoirs in Genesis Apocryphon were thought to be "authentic," they represent both an interpretive understanding of biblical memory and an original contribution to that memory.

4.4 CONCLUSIONS

As I have demonstrated, Genesis Apocryphon may be understood to have taken part in three discrete mnemonic processes: 1) the reception of cultural memory, 2) the reshaping of memory by contemporary social frameworks, and 3) the active construction, codification, and reintegration of memory for future transmission.

First, Genesis Apocryphon functions as the recipient of cultural memory through its engagement with what I refer to as "biblical memory." I argued that Genesis Apocryphon drew from more than just the biblical text and instead drew from a whole constellation of traditions and stories surrounding the early figures of Lamech, Noah, and Abram. Although the nature of the relationship(s) between 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Genesis Apocryphon is not well understood, what is clear is that the cultural memory that surrounded the book of Genesis—the biblical

memory of Genesis—was more broad at the time that the Genesis Apocryphon was composed than simply the text of Genesis. The cultural memory from which Genesis Apocryphon drew included additional traditions adjacent to the text of Genesis that we know from Jubilees and 1 Enoch whether or not Genesis Apocryphon itself drew from the *texts* of Jubilees and 1 Enoch and vice versa.

But the presentation of these traditions was not a straight-forward synthesis of their content. The author of the Genesis Apocryphon utilized generic and thematic elements common to the social location in which it was written. Although the account of Abram's encounter with Pharoah in Gen 12 is a rather anemic narrative, the Genesis Apocryphon does not simply fill-out missing details but recasts the final confrontation as a court-contest in the tradition of Daniel and Joseph. Even the Abraham/Abimelech doublet in Gen 20, although a more detailed narrative, cannot account for this transformation. Instead, I have proposed that the utilization of the court-contest (as well as the depiction of Abram as a dreamer and his sojourn as diaspora) was a way for the author of the Genesis Apocryphon to not only make his narrative entertaining, but to fit it into the extant social frameworks (read: genres) of the late Second Temple period.

Finally, I discussed how Genesis Apocryphon participated in the construction of cultural memory through its use of pseudepigraphical discourse. By participating in the genre of pseudepigraphy, the author of the Genesis Apocryphon engaged in the further construction of biblical memory by presenting the text of the Genesis Apocryphon as a first person narrative. Although we cannot know specifically how the Genesis Apocryphon was received by its

audience in antiquity, the fact that it presents as a "primary source" for the stories of Genesis (or, more precisely, the stories which participate in the biblical memory of Genesis) was meant as a queue to the reader for how to understand the Genesis Apocryphon's claim to authority, whether that claim was minimal (as with a modern film-adaptation where the audience expects certain artistic license) or genuinely intended co-opt the authority of its pseudonymous author (as with Paul's disputed letters).

As a product of memory, the Genesis Apocryphon fits this three-fold schema well. Treating Genesis Apocryphon simply or even primarily as a way of explaining the book of Genesis does not do justice to the complex and varied processes and traditions that informed the production of Genesis Apocryphon nor adequately account for the plurality of purposes for which the Genesis Apocryphon could have been intended. Instead, memory studies offers a way to talk about how Genesis Apocryphon was able receive, recontextualize, and codify the received traditions about Genesis (remembered) for himself and his contemporaries.

Chapter 5: Restructuring the Past: Remembering Genesis in the Book of Jubilees

The work now referred to as the book of Jubilees was believed to have been lost forever by European scholars prior to the mid 19th Century. The work was "rediscovered," however, in 1844 when Heinrich Ewald published a description of an Ethiopian (Geʕez) manuscript under the title "the Book of the Division" **መጽሐፈ ኩፋሌ** [*masḥafa kufālē*].[1] Because the name followed the common convention using a work's first few (key) words as its title (in this case, **ዝንቱ፡ ነገረ፡ ኩፋሌ** [*zentu nabara kufālē*]), Ewald suggested that this manuscript may have been a copy of the work known from antiquity as both τά Ἰωβηλαϊα, "the Jubilee," and Λεπτὴ Γίνεσις, the "Little Genesis."[2] Although the work had been in continuous use within Ethiopian Christianity since antiquity, prior to Ewald's publication, European scholarship only knew of the work through secondary references in a few classical sources.[3]

1. All translations are my own. Geʕez citations are from VanderKam's critical edition, *The Book of Jubilees,* 2 vols., CSCO 510-11; SA 87–88 (Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

2. Heinrich Ewald, "Ueber die Aethiopischen Handschriften zu Tübingen," *ZKM* 5 (1844): 164–201.

3. VanderKam offers a concise summary of the various late-antique citations and allusions in his commentary, most notably in the works of Epiphanius (*Panarion*, *Measures and Weights*) and Syncellus (*Chronography*). James C. VanderKam, *Jubilees: A Commentary,* 2 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2018), 1:10–14. See also Annette Yoshiko Reed, "Retelling Biblical Retellings: Epiphanius, the Pseudo-Clementines, and the Reception-History of Jubilees," in *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity,* ed. Menahem Kister et al., STDJ 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 304–21 and Anne Kreps, "From Jewish Apocrypha to Christian Tradi-

The work was published (supplemented with a second manuscript) by August Dillmann in 1859[4] and by R. H. Charles in 1895, who included two additional manuscripts in his edition (totaling four).[5] More recently, VanderKam's 1989 edition utilized twenty-seven copies of the text[6] and since its publication over twenty more copies have been cataloged and imaged.[7]

With the exception of the "rediscovery" of the text for European scholarship, the most significant find for the study of Jubilees was the discovery of several Hebrew fragments among the Dead Sea Scrolls. These fragments attest to the work's antiquity and confirmed that the original language of Jubilees was Hebrew and not Aramaic, as Dillmann originally supposed.[8] The Ethiopic text is a granddaughter translation of the Hebrew through Greek, though Greek

---

tion: Citations of Jubilees in Epiphanius's Panarion," *CH* 87.2 (2018): 345–70. It is also probable that more recently discovered text, such as the Damascus Document (CD) refer to the book of Jubilees as "the Book of the Divisions of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks" Heb. ספר מחלקות העתים ליובליהם ובשבועותיהם. It seems almost unimaginable that CD was not referring to Jubilees, though, some have questioned the notion. See Dimant, "Two 'Scientific' Fictions," 242–48.

4. August Dillmann, *Maṣḥafa Kufālē sive Liber Jubilaeorum* (Keil: C.G.L. van Maak; London: Williiams & Norgate, 1859).

5. Robert Henry Charles, *Maṣḥafa Kufālē or the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895).

6. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees,* 1:xiv–xvi.

7. Ted Erho, "New Ethiopic Witnesses to Some Old Testament Pseudepigrapha," *BSOAS* 76 (2013): 75–97. VanderKam helpfully lists the twenty-seven manuscripts he used for his critical edition in the introduction of his commentary where he also notes the additional manuscripts photographed since its publication. See VanderKam, *Jubilees,* 1:14–16.

8. August Dillmann, "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis," *JBW* 3 (1850–1851): 1–96. Though, as VanderKam notes, he seems to have changed his mind later and supposed a Hebrew original. idem, "Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuch-Textes," *SPAW* 15 (1883): 323–40; VanderKam, *Jubilees,* 1:1 n. 1.

manuscripts of the text have been found.[9] This fact was convincingly demonstrated by Dillmann who observed several Greek forms preserved as transliterations in the Ethiopic text.[10] By the end of the 19th century, however, partial copies of Jubilees had also been uncovered in Latin, which similarly appear to have come through the Greek. Finally, although no direct manuscript evidence has been found, Jubilees scholars posit that a Syriac translation of the Hebrew was made in antiquity. This suggestion is tenuous, but is based on a number of Syriac citations of Jubilees which do not show any linguistic influence (loan words, etc.) from Greek.[11] Despite all of these finds, however, the Ethiopic text remains the only tradition to preserve Jubilees in its entirety. Thus, in my treatment of Jubilees, I will be relying primarily on the Ethiopic text, supplemented by the Hebrew and other versions when available.

The book of Jubilees offers a rewriting of the book of Genesis and the first part of Exodus (Gen 1–Exod 12).[12] The prologue gives a short description of the work as an account concerned with the division of time into units of years, weeks, and jubilees given to Moses when he ascended Mt. Sinai to receive the "stone tablets":

(Prologue) **ዝንቱ ፡ ነገረ ፡ ኩፋሌ ፡ መዋዕላተ ፡ ሕግ ፡ ወለስምዕ ፡ ለግብረ**

9. See especially VanderKam's treatment of the textual history of Jubilees in *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees,* HSM 14 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 1–18.

10. Specifically: δρῦς, βάλανος, λίψ, σχῖνος, and φάραγξ. Dillmann, "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis," 88. Charles later added ἡλιου to the list. Robert Henry Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1902), xxx.

11. See especially E. Tisserant, "Fragments syriaques du Livre des Jubilés," *RB* 30 (1921): 55–86, 206–32 and Charles, *Book of Jubilees,* xxix but also A. M. Ceriani, *Monumenta Sacra et Profana,* 2 vols. (Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1861–1863), 2:ix–x and Charles, *Maṣḥafa Kufālē,* x.

12. VanderKam, *Jubilees,* 1:17.

፡ ዓመታት ፡ ለተሳብዖቶሙ ፡ ለኢዮቤልውሳቲሆሙ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ኩሉ ፡ ዓመታተ ፡ ዓለም ፡ በከመ ፡ ተናገሮ ፡ ለሙሴ ፡ በደብረ ፡ ሲና ፡ አመ ፡ ዐርገ ፡ ይንሣእ ፡ ጽላተ ፡ እብን ፡ ሕግ ፡ ወትእዛዝ ፡ በቃለ ፡ አግዚአብሔር ፡ በከመ ፡ ይቤሎ ፡ ይዕርግ ውስተ ፡ ርእሰ ፡ ደብር ።

(Prologue) *zəntu nagara kufālē mawāʕəlāta [la-]ḥegg wa-la-səmʕ la-gəbra ʕāmatāt la-tasābəʕotomu la-ʔiyyobēləwəsātihomu wəsta kʷəllu ʕāmatāta ʕālam ba-kama tanāgaro la-Musē ba-dabra Sinā ʔama ʕarga yenšāʔ ṣəllāta ʔəbn—ḥəgg wa-təʔzāz—ba-qāla ʔagziʔabḥēr ba-kama yəbēlo yəʕrəg wəsta rəʔsa dabr.*

(Prologue) These are the words[13] of the division of the days for the law and for the testimony for the event[s] of the years; for their weeks, for their Jubilees in all the years of the world just as he spoke (them) to Moses on Mount Sinai when he went up to receive the tablets of stone—the law and the commandment—at the command of God, as he had said to him that he should ascend to the top of the mountain.

As an important aside, it is noteworthy that this prologue as well as the first chapter of the book of Jubilees are preserved among the Qumran fragments (specifically 4Q216), and, indeed 4Q216 is one of the oldest Jubilees fragments. Thus, this early prologue was almost certainly a part of the work in its earliest form. Although superscriptions were often added much later, in this case, we have no reason to doubt that the prologue/superscription and framing narrative of the work were not a part of the most ancient versions.[14]

The bulk of the book (Jubilees 2:1–50:13) is dedicated to the recounting of the events of Gen 1–Exod 12 with special concern for halakhic matters and the division of time according to

13. Lit. "This is the word." I've chosen to follow VanderKam and others by rendering this construction in the plural based on the probable underlying Hebrew אלה הדברים. See VanderKam, *Jubilees,* 125

14. See ibid., 1:125; idem, "Moses Trumping Moses: Making The Book Of Jubilees," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts,* ed. Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller, STDJ 92 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 25–44.

"weeks" of years (7-year units) and "Jubilees" (49-year units). The particulars of the revelation are mediated by the "Angel of the Presence" (Eth. መልአከ ገጽ [*mal'aka gaṣṣ*]) who dictates the content of the "heavenly tablets" (1:27; Eth. ጽላተ፡ሰማይ [*ṣəllāta samāy*]) to Moses to record what they revealed about the structure and terminus of the cosmos.[15] The treatment of Moses as a scribe places him within a chain of tradition—along with Enoch and Noah—which emphasizes writing and written works as essential sources of tradition and revelation.[16] Finally, the work closes with a terse statement declaring "Here the account of the division of time is ended" (Jubilees 50:13; Eth. ተፈጸመ ፡ በዝየ ፡ ነገር ፡ ዘኩሉ ፡ መዋዕል ። [*tafaṣṣama ba-zeyya nagar za-kufālē mawāʕel*]). Thus the main body of the work is presented as a revelation given to Moses by Yahweh, framed by a brief prologue and epilogue which situates the story during Moses's first 40-days atop Mt. Sinai when Moses first receives the Tablets of Stone (Exod 24:12).[17]

Like the Genesis Apocryphon, the book of Jubilees engages in a form of rewriting which participates in the construction of (biblical) memory through pseudepigraphical discourse. Jubilees builds clearly from the biblical material (Gen–Exod 12; with the kinds of adaptations, harmonizations, and emendations we expect of Rewritten Bible) and bears clear influences from

15. Florentino Garcia Martinez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," in *Between Philology and Theology: Contributions to the Study of Ancient Jewish Interpretation,* by Florentino Garcia Martinez, ed. Hinidy Najman and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, STDJ 162 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 51–69; trans. of Florentino García Martínez, "Las Tablas Celestes en el Libro de los Jubileos," in *Palabra y Vida: Homenaje a José Alonzo Díaz en su 70 Cumpleaños,* ed. A. Vargas–Machuca and Gregorio Ruiz, PUPCM 58 (Madrid: Ediciones Universidad de Comillas, 1984), 333–49.

16. See especially Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority," *JSJ* 30.4 (1999): 379–410.

17. VanderKam, *Jubilees,* 1:129.

other Second Temple traditions such as the Astronomical Book of Enoch (1 Enoch 72–82). In this respect, Jubilees bears many of the same kinds of qualities that I worked with the previous chapter such as the sources of tradition, generic features, and narrative framing.[18] Although not framed as a first-person account, Jubilees also portrays itself as the product of first-hand experience: the author presents his work as the result of God's repeated command to Moses to "write down all that you hear" (1:5, 7, 26) and to record the content of the Heavenly Tablets dictated to him by the chief angelic being (2:1). Thus the author takes on the persona of Moses and proffers his work as a faithful record of Moses's experience atop Mt. Sinai and is therefore also counted among the pseudepigrapha. The rewritten account of "biblical history" from Gen 1–Exod 12 is, like Genesis Apocryphon, *drawn from* biblical memory and *speaks back into* biblical memory through the process of rewriting.

Taking the book of Jubilees as my point of departure, in this chapter I will attempt to differentiate the *manner* that Rewritten Bible texts may have engaged with the cultural memory. In the previous chapter, I suggested that the pseudepigraphical quality of Genesis Apocryphon engaged with the cultural memory differently than other non-pseudepigraphical texts, but left open the question of how, specifically, readers were intended to understand the

18. One might argue, for example, that the genre of Jubilees is that of Apocalypse. In at least the most formal sense, this is the case, although, notably Todd Hanneken has recently advanced a thesis which argues that Jubilees is a *subversion* of Apocalypse. See Todd R. Hanneken, *The Subversion of the Apoclypses in the Book of Jubilees,* EJL 34 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). Regarding the formal characteristics of Apocalypse, see John Collins's work on the topic, esp. John J. Collins, "The Genre of the Book of Jubilees," in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam, A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam,* ed. Eric F. Mason et al., 2 vols., STDJ 153 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 737–55 and idem, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre" 14 (1979): 1–20.

"authority" or "authenticity" of the account. In this chapter I will focus on the ways that Jubilees portrayed itself as an authoritative revelation and how that affected concrete *practice*. I will argue that the book of Jubilees engages with cultural memory in a distinct fashion from other texts, such as the Genesis Apocryphon, in part through rhetorical means (so-called "authority conferring strategies"). I will further argue that this distinction is significant because it illustrates the way that memory not only affects the intellectual conceptions of the past, but also carries with it *concrete practical effects which can be concretely observed.* To accomplish this, I will draw on Hindy Najman's work on Mosaic Discourse and will discuss the ways that Jubilees portrays itself as authoritative literature, how this portrayal may have been understood in antiquity and how it could, in some sense, both authorize and rewrite the Torah with halakhic implications. Then, to illustrate the point, I will discuss the calendrical and chronological system of the book of Jubilees as an example of the concrete ways that constructing memory can impact one's understanding of the past and present with concrete practical implications.

5.1 CONSTRUCTING AUTHORITY IN JUBILEES

The book of Jubilees engages directly in prescriptive discourses—Jubilees has a view of the world which it presents as an official, correct, understanding which is divinely ordained . Jubilees deals with legal and halakhic matters directly—it gives instructions about how and when to celebrate festivals and directly critiques the sinful behavior of Israel. It stands to reason, therefore, that the purpose of Jubilees was not simply religious entertainment or

vaguely edifying storytelling; Jubilees does not mince words about what is right or wrong. While, the Genesis Apocryphon may have *implicitly* endorsed particular ideologies and halakhic practices through linking them with the foundational figures of Genesis (Lamech, Noah, and Abram), the book of Jubilees at times engages in direct imperative and presents itself as an authoritative text whose content comes directly from God, incised in the Heavenly Tablets, mediated by God's chief angelic being (the Angel of the Presence), and ultimately recorded by Israel's most authoritative legal figure, Moses. Yet, the book of Jubilees makes clear that the Torah, too, is from God. For example, God tells Moses in Jubilees 1:9–10 that the people will stray from the covenant in part by "forgetting" God's commandments and neglecting proper cultic activities. Furthermore, the persecution of those who study the law is included in a catena of evil deeds that Israel will perpetrate:

> (Jubilees 1:9) VanderKam: For they will forget all my commandments—everything that I command them—and will follow the nations, their impurities, and their shame. They will serve their gods and (this) will prove an obstacle for them—an affliction, a pain, and a trap. (10) Many will be destroyed. They will be captured and will fall into the enemy's control because they abandoned my statutes, my commandments, my covenantal festivals, my sabbaths, my holy things which I have hallowed for myself among them, my tabernacle, and my temple which I sanctified for myself in the middle of the land so that I could set my name on it and that it could live (there) (11) They made for themselves high places, (sacred) groves, and carved images; each of them prostrated himself before his own in order to go astray. They will sacrifice children to demons and to every product (conceived by) their erring minds. (12) I will send witnesses to them so that I may testify to them, but they will not listen and will kill the witnesses. they will persecute those too who study the law diligently. They will abrogate everything and will begin to do evil in my presence.

***VanderKam's translation (in the interest of time). I will provide my own text and translation in subsequent drafts*

Thus, Jubilees at once affirms the centrality of the Torah, while, in some sense, circumventing it by providing its own idiosyncratic account of Gen 1–Exod 12. The juxtaposition of deference toward Torah while simultaneously circumventing its claim to primacy yields a sort of "pseudepigraphical paradox." It is not immediately clear how a pseudepigraphical author, knowingly writing under a false name, can simultaneously endorse one text, while offering novel embellishments and changes to its interpretation. At least to the modern reader, this practice seems foreign and disingenuous by the pseudepigraphical author. The question should be raised, therefore, whether Jubilees *was in fact* intending to supersede or circumvent the authority of the Torah (as some scholars suggest) or whether some other relationship existed between the texts.[19]

Although there is some question whether the book of Jubilees attained the status of "scripture" in antiquity, it is generally agreed that pseudepigraphical texts such as Jubilees were not intended as replacements for the more well-known scriptures (especially the Torah).[20] Of course, the reality is that we do not know for certain what kinds of categories ancient readers

19. wacholder, for example, understands Jubilees and the Temple Scroll to be a single unit and a work which was meant to supersede the Pentateuch. See Ben Zion Wacholder, "Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commanment," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten,* ed. John Kampen, Moshe Bernstein, and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 195–211. His theory has not been widely accepted.

20. This position undoubtedly represents the majority opinion, though it is not unanimous. For the opposing opinion, see especially ibid., 195–211.

used to classify their literature; most likely, however, they were not static nor consistent across time and differed by social group. All the same, the special place that the Torah had for a number of Jewish sects—even in antiquity—seems to me to preclude the idea that pseudepigraphical texts such as Jubilees would be placed on-par with the Pentateuch, even if a work carried a potent practical authority (see below). What *can* be said about the book of Jubilees, however, is that *it presents itself* as a unique revelation that claims for itself the same kind of divine source as the Torah.[21]

VanderKam has offered a concise summary and analysis of this "pseudepigraphical paradox" and comes to the conclusion that the book of Jubilees functions as a vehicle for its author to proffer his own interpretation of Gen 1–Exod 12. VanderKam addresses the problem of Jubilees's author both acknowledging the existence and authority of the Torah while simultaneously offering his own original material, writing:

> [W]e could say differences in interpreting the Pentateuch had arisen by his time and that the author wanted to defend his own reading as the correct one. But he wished to find a way to package his case more forcefully than that, presumably within the limits of what was acceptable in his society.[22]

According to VanderKam, therefore, the project of the author of Jubilees was primarily one of *exegesis*. The book of Jubilees is an expression of the author's understanding of Gen 1–Exod 12; it offers explicit teachings about specific ambiguities and difficulties in the text of Genesis and

21. As a matter of clarification, I am assuming a distinction between 1) the author's intent, 2) the way the work presents itself, and 3) the way the work was understood by its readers. Thus the text may present itself as "on-par" with the Torah without either the author or audience treating it as such.

22. VanderKam, "Moses Trumping Moses," 28.

Exodus. He had a particular understanding of how the Pentateuch should be understood, and he used the common rhetorical technique of pseudepigraphy to "more forcefully" get his point across.[23]

VanderKam argues that the author of Jubilees intentionally located the setting of his work in the Exod 24:12 ascent for a rhetorical advantage. He argues for three such advantages: first, by locating the story during Moses's ascent, he is able to draw on the *character* of Moses. The author, therefore was able to imbue his work with the gravitas of Israel's most famous lawgiver. Second, setting the work as a part of the first forty-day period that Moses was on Mt. Sinai grounds the author's interpretation of Torah in the original revelation of the Law (prior to even Deuteronomy). These events putatively took place at the same time that Moses received the first set of stone tablets from God. While the stone tablets were broken and had to be rewritten, the account provided in Jubilees is prior even to those "copies" of the decalogue. Any subsequent interpretation of the Torah is secondary by virtue of its relative lateness. Finally, because Moses himself is presented as the author of Jubilees, there is no question of the chain of transmission. God revealed the contents of Jubilees to Moses by having the Angel of the Presence dictate to him the contents of the Heavenly Tablets. God is supreme, the tablets are eternal, and Moses is reliable.

Moses, therefore, received more from God on Mt. Sinai than is recorded in the Torah. The claim made by Jubilees is that it contains the additional information given to Moses, and that the subject of this additional revelation is the sacred history of Israel schematized

23. VanderKam, "Moses Trumping Moses," 28.

according to the absolute heavenly reckoning of time (364-day years, weeks of years, and jubilees).

The tradition that God told Moses more on Mt. Sinai than he recorded in the Torah is not unique to the book of Jubilees. VanderKam points toward the later rabbinic tradition that Moses received the Oral Torah during his time atop Mt. Sinai.[24] For example, VanderKam cites b. Berakot 5a, which references the specific time during which Jubilees is set (Exod 24:12):[25]

> מאי דכתיב ואתנה לך את לחת האבן והתורה והמצוה אשר כתבתי להורתם לחת אלו עשרת הדברות תורה זה מקרא והמצוה זו משנה אשר כתבתי אלו נביאים וכתובים להרתם זה תלמוד מלמד שכולם נתנו למשה מסיני:
>
> What is [the meaning where] it is written, *I will give you the tablets of stone and the Torah and the commandments which I have written so that you might teach them* (Exod 24:12)?
>
> ‘the tablets’ — these are the ten commandments
> ‘the Torah’ — this is scripture
> ‘the commandments’ — this is Mishnah
> ‘that which I have written’ — these are the Prophets and the Writings
> ‘that you might teach them’ — this is Talmud
>
> [This] teaches that all of them were given to Moses on at Sinai.

The tradition here, therefore, asserts that the decalogue, the full Torah, its interpretation, the rest of the Tanakh, and the Talmud were all revealed to Moses on Sinai. Similarly, Sifra Beḥuqqotay 8, citing Lev 26:46:

> אלה החקים והמשפטים והתורֹת: החוקים אלו המדרשות והמשפטים אלו הדינים והתורות מלמד ששתי תורות ניתנו להם לישראל אחד בכתב ואחד בעל פה

24. VanderKam, “Moses Trumping Moses,” 28–31.

25. Translations of all rabbinic texts are my own.

These are the statutes and ordinances and Torahs (Lev 26:46):

'the statutes' — this is midrash.

'and the judgments' — this is the legal rulings.

'and the Torahs' — [this] teaches that two Torahs were given to Israel:

one in writing, the other by mouth.

The rhetorical function of asserting that later interpretive material was revealed to Moses is essentially the same as it is for Jubilees.

Thus, for VanderKam, the book of Jubilees upholds the authority of the Torah by offering its own interpretation of its contents in a similar fashion to the way that the oral Torah, too, rooted its authenticity in the Sinai revelation. Jubilees, therefore asserts itself as a correct and authoritative interpretation of the Torah by claiming that it is the interpretation that Moses himself received from God; as VanderKam puts it, according to the book of Jubilees, "[t]he message of Jubilees is verbally inerrant."[26]

While VanderKam makes a number of useful observations, his characterization of Jubilees as exegesis, I think, ignores the question of how readers would have understood the work. This is where the analogy to the Oral Torah breaks down. While rabbinic claims that the Oral Torah was revealed to Moses, rabbinic discourse self-consciously acknowledges its work as exegetical—the rabbis offer explanations and instruction on how to understand the texts that they are commenting on. Although the rabbis may claim that an interpretation goes back to

26. VanderKam, "Moses Trumping Moses," 33. Although the book of Jubilees is not generally thought to be the product of the Qumran community (it likely predates the settlement), it is worth noting that within the community, it was accepted that the community not only possessed the correct interpretation of its scriptures, but also that the community received a special revelation which the rest of Israel did not receive. As Fraade notes, this idea is quite different than supposing that additional material had been revealed *to Moses*. See Steven Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69.

Moses, it is not the same as claiming to speak *for* Moses or *as* Moses. Thus VanderKam's assertion that the purpose of writing pseudonymously and claiming that a work is the result of direct divine revelation goes beyond simply advocating for one's own interpretation "more forcefully." The fact that VanderKam leaves the particulars of this phrase ambiguous, I think, indicates ambiguity in his own thinking about *how specifically* ancient readers may have understood Jubilees vis-à-vis other so-called authoritative works, in particular, the Torah.

A more nuanced approach to this topic has been offered by Hindy Najman who, similarly has argued that the author of Jubilees utilized several "modes of self-authorization" in order to bolster its audience's perception of the work's authority.[27] Building on the work of Florentino García Martínez,[28] Najman argues that the book of Jubilees utilized (at least) four such "authority conferring strategies," which I have reproduced in full:

> 1. Jubilees repeatedly claims that it reproduces material that had been written long before the "heavenly tablets," a great corpus of divine teachings kept in heaven.
>
> 2. The entire content of the book of Jubilees was dictated by the angel of the presence at God's own command. Hence, it is itself the product of divine revelation.
>
> 3. Jubilees was dictated to Moses, the same Moses to whom the Torah had been given on Mount Sinai. Thus the book of Jubilees is the co-equal accompaniment of the Torah; both were transmitted by the same true prophet.
>
> 4. Jubilees claims that its teachings are the true interpretation of the Torah. thus, its teachings also derive their authority from that of the Torah; that its interpretations match the Torah's words resolve all interpretive problems

27. Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing," 380.

28. Garcia Martinez, "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees," 51–69.

further substantiates its veracity.[29]

Her ultimate conclusion is that texts such as Jubilees which interpret and rewrite portions of the Bible do so to "[respond] to both the demand for interpretation and the demand for demonstration of authority."[30] Thus the purpose of the book of Jubilees, according to Najman, is to provide an "interpretive context" for reading the Torah—to make explicit a particular tradition of interpretation that guides the Torah-reader away from spurious or otherwise heterodox readings.

This idea is similar to, but importantly distinct from VanderKam's understanding of Jubilees. Whereas VanderKam envisioned Jubilees as an exegetical *product* of Gen 1–Exod 12, Najman understands Jubilees as a kind of "background" text which is meant as an aid *for reading* Torah. The difference is subtle, but significant, especially for our understanding of Jubilees within the framework of cultural memory. VanderKam's characterization of Jubilees as a sort of "official" interpretation of the Torah is problematic because it does not leave room for Torah going forward. If Jubilees portrays itself as *the* meaning of Gen 1–Exod 12—the inerrant interpretation of this portion of Torah—what need is there for the Torah? Najman's model, on the other hand, assumes that readers are cued into the genre. Rather than characterizing Jubilees as an authoritative, but idiosyncratic, interpretation of Torah, Najman's approach understands Jubilees as something that could be read *before* the Torah in order to quash potentially errant readings of Torah when the reader finally reaches them.[31]

29. Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing," 380.

30. Ibid., 408.

31. Ibid., 408.

In her subsequent book, Najman builds on this thesis by introducing the idea of "Mosaic Discourse" into the discussion of Early Jewish and Christian literary production. She traces the practice of pseudonymous engagement with the Mosaic legal tradition through literary production back to the book of Deuteronomy.[32] She identifies four features of Mosaic discourse, which she extrapolates from the way that Deuteronomy draws from, augments, and affirms earlier legal traditions (such as the Covenant Code). The way that the author of Deuteronomy was able to both modify/reinterpret the legal tradition of the Covenant Code while retaining the traditions of the Covenant Code served as a model for later tradants (such as the author of Jubilees, but also the Temple Scroll and others) to repeat the process by engaging with and developing both the message of Moses and the idea of Moses as an author. This is what she refers to as "Mosaic Discourse." With this term, Najman builds on a Foucauldian understanding of the Author which is neither static, nor bound by any historical or literary factors. She writes:

> As Foucault reminds us, it is not only *texts* that develop over time. The connected *concepts* of the authority and authorship of texts *also* have long and complex histories. Both models of anonymity and of pseudonymity can be found in the Hebrew Bible and in the extra-biblical texts of the Second Temple period. But even when an author is identified in a biblical text, it is unclear if that identification is to be considered *the same* as what moderns would characterize as *the author function.*[33]

Najman suggests that when ancient writers participated in pseudonymous writing, the purpose was not to deceive their readers so much as to honor the tradition of the Author under whose

32. Najman, *Seconding Sinai,* 48.

33. ibid., 9–10. Here she is referencing Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?" In *Michel Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology,* ed. James D. Faubion, vol. 2 of *Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984,* 3 vols. (New York: The New Press, 1999), 205–22.

name they wrote.[34] Historically speaking, of course, unless one posits that a real figure named Moses established the legal tradition of Israel, *all* Mosaic attribution is, in effect, pseudepigraphical and an expansion of Moses the Author. The tradition of Moses the Author grew in step with the "writings" of Moses.

The book of Jubilees, therefore, can be understood as participating within this tradition of Mosaic attribution which serves to faithfully augment the body of Mosaic teaching through the use of pseudepigraphy. The interpretation of the Torah by the writer of Jubilees is not meant to be understood as the "actual words" of Moses, but as a representation of "authentic teaching" which aligns with the function of Moses as an Author as an aide to reading the Torah.[35]

Unsurprisingly, Najman's approach to Jubilees and Mosaic Discourse dovetails quite well with the idea of social and cultural memory theory. The way that Najman describes the growth and development of the Author extending beyond the historical and literary bounds of the "real" author is evocative of the process of memory construction. In fact, from my perspective, what Najman describes as Mosaic Discourse *is* a process of memory construction, though she does not use the terminology. What she describes as Mosaic Discourse is the same

34. Najman notes a number of classical authors who seem to have practiced a form of pseudonymity where a student writes in the name of their master. In particular, she cites Iamblichus the Pythagorean who claims that it was "more honorable and praiseworthy" to use Pythagorus' name, rather than one's own name when publishing (De Vita Pythagorica 98). She also quotes Tertullian who suggests that certain New Testament work sought to be ascribed to Paul and Peter because the works in question were written by their disciples (Marc. 6.5). Likewise, she notes that Plato wrote under the name of his master, Socrates. See Najman, *Seconding Sinai,* 13.

35. Ibid., 13.

set of processes which enabled the author(s) of the Enochic works to expand on and speculate about the Watchers and the Flood, and which enabled the Genesis Apocryphon to draw from those traditions in its rewriting.[36] Given the fascination with the figure of Enoch in the Second Temple period (as evidenced by the plethora of texts which evoke the character), we could just as easily talk about "Enochic Discourse" when we discuss the various and sundry texts which draw from, expand, and reframe the enigmatic antedeluvian figure. Furthermore, we can easily identify additional Discourses about the figures of Abram, Daniel, and David, all of whom are the subjects of expanding bodies of literary production in the Second Temple period, albeit not all as pseudepigrapha, and not all with the same foundational significance as that of Moses.

The ability to also talk about these other discourses, I think, signals to the broader applicability of Najman's ideas. From my perspective, the discussion can be further augmented by including language of cultural and social memory which brings with it a taxonomy for discussing the processes in sociological terms. Najman's terminology is able to describe *that* these various texts are participating in a particular discourse, but it does not *describe* the discourse nor the *social influences* or *social effects* of the discourses.

Although the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees generally participate in different sets of discourses (with notable exceptions, such as the division of the world sections), they engage with them in qualitatively different ways, despite the fact that both can be characterized as pseudepigrapha. The Genesis Apocryphon, although written largely in the first-person, takes a broadly *de*scriptive approach to its memory construction through rewriting. Although there are

36. The Genesis Apocryphon, of course, may have also drawn from the book of Jubilees, which only goes to further this point.

parts of the text which portray its characters in ways that betray the author's own social frameworks (See chapter 3), the Genesis Apocryphon resists readings which could be characterized as didactic or halakhic. Jubilees, on the other hand, includes a framing narrative which encourages the reader to not only reshape the way that they think about the characters within their rewriting, but also encourage particular kinds of *practices*. In this sense Jubilees can be thought of as engaging with memory in more *pre*scriptive discourses.

This shift from more *descriptive* rewriting (like the Genesis Apocryphon) to rewritings which incorporate *prescriptive* discourses (like Jubilees) illustrates the social dimensions of talking about these texts as *memory*. Even if the procedural, technical processes of interpretation and rewriting are identical, the social outcomes and concrete purposes of texts effect memory differently. For example, although the Genesis Apocryphon utilizes the literary form of a *waṣf*, this does not bear meaningfully on the concrete social effects of the Genesis Apocryphon on memory. Even supposing the readers of Genesis Apocryphon believed Genesis Apocryphon to be the authentic "historical"[37] accounts of Lamech, Noah, and Abram, the Genesis Apocryphon simply *does not ask* the reader to accept its account over and against any others. Its authenticity may be implied by its first-person rhetoric, but Genesis Apocryphon does not exhibit the same kinds of authority conferring strategies that we see in Jubilees.

On the other hand, the claim made by the book of Jubilees—that Moses received more information atop Mt. Sinai than is recorded in the books of the Pentateuch—is characterized as a kind of authoritative,revelatory literature which invites the reader to incorporate this new

37. Here again, I am referring to the fact that, for the ancient readers of Jubilees, the character of Lamech/Noah/Abram was likely perceived as a real person from the distant past.

knowledge into their conception of the past in an act of cultural memory construction. The effect of this change on the remembered past does not remain in the abstract, however, but rather alters the way that the reader perceives the past with real-life, concrete, practical outcomes.

5.2 RESTRUCTURING THE PAST

The practical effect of memory and memory construction can be seen most clearly within the book of Jubilees through the somewhat idiosyncratic system by which it orders time. The restructuring of the past based on a particular contemporary system of reckoning is a classic means by which contemporary social frameworks shape one's understanding of the past. Although the system of weeks of years and jubilees as found in the Hebrew Bible (esp. Lev 25), obviously, predates the book of Jubilees, the application of this system of chronology to the whole of Israelite remembered past is most certainly an anachronism of Jubilees's author. Likewise, although it is not clear what yearly calendar system was used by the most ancient Israelites, it was most probably not the 364-day calendar of Jubilees.[38]

The question may be asked, therefore, how did the calendar and chronological system of the book of Jubilees affect its readers through the construction of memory? In particular, how might the effects of this construction of of the past affect the *practice* of early Judaism? In this section I will discuss the calendrical and chronological systems presented in the book of

38. When or whether a 364-day calendar was in use prior to the Persian or Second Temple period remains a point of contention among scholars (more on this below). However, the portrayal of the 364-day calendar as the immutable system of the Heavenly Tablets is certainly an innovation of the Second Temple period.

Jubilees and argue that they function as more than idiosyncratic modes of accounting but had real, practical socio-political effects during the late Second Temple period.

5.2.1 The Structure of Time in Jubilees

One of the most notable features of the Book of Jubilees is its preoccupation with the correct division of time—both with respect to a 364 day year as well as longer units encompassing multiple years. Although neither the 364-day year nor the larger 7 and 49 year units ("weeks" of years and "jubilees," respectively) are unique to the book of Jubilees, the proper division of time is into these units provides the central organizing principle for the book's rewriting of Gen 1–Exod 12.

The author of Jubilees makes it very clear that the proper division of time through a 364 day year is an essential practice for the correct observation of religious feasts and other holidays throughout the year. The pattern and significance of this 364 day cycle is explained to Moses after the Angel of the Presence retells the events of the Flood. The Angel of the Presence explains the division of the year into four seasons, each beginning with a memorial day (Jubilees 6:23) and consisting of thirteen-weeks. The system as a whole yields a fifty-two week year (Jubilees. 6:29) and is presented as "inscribed and ordained on the tablets of heaven" (6:31; Eth. **ተቁርፀ ፡ ወተሠርዐ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ጽላተ ፡ ሰማይ** [*taqʷarḍa wa-tašarʕa wəsta ṣəllāta samāy*].

The 364 day year is considered "complete" (Eth. **ፍጹመ** [*fəṣṣuma*]) by the Angel of the Presence such that proper observance maintains synchrony year-over-year. In other words, adding or subtracting days from this calendar renders a "revolving" calendar vis-à-vis the

absolute reference of the heavenly tablets.[39] By comparison, the Angel of the Presence warns against the use of a lunar calendar because the lunar year is too short. Jubilees 6:36–37 reads:

> (6:36) **ወይከውኑ ፡ እለ ፡ ያስተሐይጹ ፡ ወርኀ ፡ በሐይጼ ፡ ወርን ። ዕስመ ፡ ትማስን ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ጊዜያተ ፡ ወትቀድም ፡ እምዓመታት ፡ ለዓመት ፡ ዐሡረ ፡ ዕለተ ። (37) በእንተዝ ፡ ይመጽእ ፡ ዓመታተ ፡ ሎሙ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ያማስኑ ፡ ወይገብሩ ፡ ዕለተ ፡ ስምዕ ፡ ምንንተ ። ወዕለተ ፡ ርኵስተ ፡ በዓለ ፡ ወኵሉ ፡ ይደምር ፡ ወማዋዕላ ፡ ቅዱሳተ ፡ ርኩሰ ፡ ወዕለተ ፡ ርኵስተ ፡ ለዕለት ፡ ቅድስት ። ዕስመ ፡ ይስሕቱ ፡ አውራኀ ፡ ወሰንበታተ ወብዓላተ ፡ ወኢዩቤለ ።**
>
> (6:36) *wa-yekawwenu ʔella yāstaḥayyeṣu warḥa ba-ḥuyāṣē warḫ ʕesma temās(s)en yeʔeti gizēyāta wa-teqaddem ʔem-ʕāmatāt la-ʕāmat ʕašur ʕelata* (37) *ba-ʔenta-ze yemaṣeʔ ʕāmatāta lomu ʔenza yāmāsenu wa-yegabru ʕelata semʕ menent wa-ʕelata rekʷesta ba-ʕāla wa-kʷellu yedēmer wa-māwāʕelā qedusāta rekusā wa-ʕelata rekʷesta laʕlat qedust ʕesma yeseḥetu ʔawrāḫa wa-sanbatāta wa-beʕālāta wa-ʔiyobēla*
>
> (6:36) [36] VanderKam: There will be people who carefully observe the moon with lunar observations because it is corrupt (with respect to) the seasons and is early from year to year by ten days. (37) [37] Therefore years will come about for them when they will disturb (the year) and make a day of testimony something worthless and a profane day a festival. Everyone will join together the holy days with the profane and the profane day with the holy day, for they will err regarding the months, the sabbaths; the festivals, and the jubilee.
>
> ***VanderKam's translation (in the interest of time). I will provide my own translation in subsequent drafts*

The contrast drawn to the lunar calendar combined with the fact that a 364 day calendar more

39. For an overview of calendar systems in the ancient world, including a discussion of "revolving calendars," see Uwe Glessmer, "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assesment,* ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 213–78.

closely approximates the actual period of Earth's orbit around the sun (approx. 365.24 days) led most early interpreters of Jubilees to call the 364 day calendar a "solar" calendar.[40] Because some of the early Israelite festivals were tied to the agricultural year (for example, *Shavuot* was celebrated after the wheat harvest, see Exod 34:22), a solar calendar would indeed keep the calendar from drifting backward every year. Because the lunar (synodic) month[41] averages approximately 29.5 days, a lunar year (twelve synodic months) lasts approximately 354 days. Without any intercalation the calendar would drift back 11.24 days per year (a so-called "revolving year"). Within a matter of only two-or-three years, the correlation between agricultural activity and cultic practice would break down.[42]

Recent treatments of the 364-day calendar, however, have eschewed the "solar" label in most cases.[43] The rationale for doing so is two-fold: first, although a 364-day year is *close* to the

40. Some recent contributions retain this designation such as Sacha Stern, *Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd Century BCE to 10th Century CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 10.

41. The synodic month is derived from the length of time it takes the moon to process through its full cycle and is distinct from the period of the moon's *orbit*.

42. The major advantage of the lunar system is the ability for anybody to make reasonably accurate observations about when months begin and end. By contrast, the solar year requires a more subtle and long-term set of measurements. Most cultures which utilize a lunar calendar account for the discrepancy through the intercalation of an additional month every few years to bring the solar and lunar calendars into alignment. Most "lunar" calendars, therefore, are really lunisolar calendars, though exceptions (such as the Islamic calendar) do exist. See Glessmer, "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," 214, 238; Wayne Horowitz, "The 360 and 364 Day Year in Ancient Mesopotamia," *JANES* 24 (1996): 35–44.

43. Glessmer, "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," 231; Jonathan Ben-Dov, "The 364-day Year at Qumran and in the Pseudepigrapha," in *Calendars and Years II: Astronomy and Time in the Ancient and Medieval World,* ed. John Steele (Oxford: Oxbow, 2011), 69–105; Helen R. Jacobus, "Calendars," in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls,* ed. Greorge J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel (London: T & T Clark, 2018), 435–48.

actual period of Earth's orbit around the sun, the 1.24 day discrepancy is large enough that after fifty years, the calendar would have floated backward a full two-months.[44] In other words, although a 1.24 day drift may not be noticeable from one year to the next, the difference is significant *enough* to be noticeable within the average lifespan of an individual and would certainly conflict with agriculturally contingent festivals.[45] Second, while the Angel of the Presence expresses concern with the "corruption" of the yearly cycle, the rationale for the 364-day year is not explicitly connected to the solar year. In other words, when the Angel of the Presence decries the deficiencies of the lunar year, it does so with respect to the 364-day year and *not* with respect to the solar year. Instead, the problem with a 354-day (lunar) year, according to the Angel of the Presence is that the holidays, months, sabbaths, festivals, and jubilees will fall on the wrong days *according to the 364-day calendar*. This rationale is, essentially, circular. The 364-day year is an absolute measure of a "year" according to the book of Jubilees—it is inscribed on the "heavenly tablets" as such—and is not contingent or defined with reference to the sun or the moon. Instead, the author of Jubilees seems more concerned with the proper and even division of *seasons* (defined as three months) and *weeks* (a so-called heptadic structure) without the need for intercalation.[46]

44. Specifically, 62 days. This would be the equivalent of celebrating the new year near Halloween.

45. Ben Zion Wacholder and Sholom Wacholder, "Patterns of Biblical Dates and Qumran 's Calendar: The Fallacy of Jaubert's Hypothesis," *HUCA* 66 (1995): 1–40. This assumes, of course, that the various festivals continued to be connected to the agricultural cycle and not a purely utopian construct as Wacholder and Wacholder suggest.

46. Jonathan Ben-Dov and Stéphane Saulnier, "Qumran Calendars: A Survey of Scholarship 1980–2007," *CurBR* 7.1 (2008): 124–68.

According to most reconstructions of Jubilees's 364-day calendar, the year was divided into four seasons consisting of exactly thirteen weeks (91 days). Each season was also divided into three months, though, because 91 does not divide evenly by 30, the third month in each season was counted as 31 days. Thus, each season was composed of two months of 30 days and one month of 31 days. Because these seasons' lengths divide evenly by seven, every season began on the same day of the week and followed an identical structure.[47] The advantage of such a system is its consistency year-over-year. Because the whole year divides evenly by seven, every day of the year (in every year) implicitly referred to a particular day of the week. Thus any scheduled event would fall on the same day of the week the following year, preventing the undesirable situation where a holiday would accidentally fall on a Sabbath (such as the memorial feasts prescribed in Jubilees 6:23).[48]

Although the mechanics of this calendar are reasonably well understood, its purpose and antiquity remain matters of debate. The seminal work of Annie Jaubert (building on Barthélemy) during the mid-20th century, despite numerous criticisms, remains the *Ausganspunkt* for most discussions of the topic.[49] Her thesis took as its point of departure

47. In other words, every season began on the same day of the week, and the "nth" day of any given season was the same day of the week as the nth day of any other season.

48. John Sietze Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation,* VTSup 115 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 233. So, if a person were born on a Tuesday, every subsequent birthday would also fall on a Tuesday. Likewise, there would be no need to buy a new calendar every year, since every year is the same "shape." See esp. Annie Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân: Ses origines bibliques," *VT* 3.3 (1953): 250–64.

49. See especially ibid., 250–64; idem, "Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jour liturgiques de la semaine," *VT* 7.1 (1957): 35–61; idem, *La date de la Cène: Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* (Paris: Gabalda, 1957). The final work was translated into English as *The Date of the Last Supper,* trans. Isaac Rafferty (Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965); trans. of *La date de la Cène:*

Barthélemy's theory that the Jewish 364-day year began on Wednesday, the day that the sun and moon were created, according to the Priestly creation account in Genesis 1:14–19.[50] To prove this idea, she began by noting that the book of Jubilees specifically prohibits beginning a journey on the sabbath (50:8, 12) and infers that, therefore, the various travel narratives in Jubilees ought to obey this rule, e.g, when Abram travelled, he would not have done so on the Sabbath according to Jubilees. She worked backwards through the descriptions of such journeys in Jubilees to confirm that, indeed, the only possible situation where the patriarchs would not have traveled on the sabbath, as described in Jubilees demands that the first day of the year be a Wednesday.[51] Jaubert further hypothesized that the 364-day calendar utilized by the author of Jubilees was, in fact, quite ancient and reflected the same views of the latest Priestly strata of the Hexateuch by applying the same method to the Hexateuch and yielding an identical result.[52] Thus, according to Jaubert, the 364-day calendar was the calendar of Second Temple Judaism and it was not until later—at the time of Ben Sira—that the lunar modifications known from the Rabbinic period were instituted.[53]

Jaubert's thesis has been challenged and modified over the past several decades, but the publication of a number of important calendrical texts from Qumran have—at least

---

Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne (Paris: Gabalda, 1957).

50. Dominique Barthélemy, "Notes en marge de publications récentes sur les manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 59.2 (1952): 187–218; Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés," 250; idem, *Date of the Last Supper,* 24–25.

51. idem, "Le calendrier des Jubilés," 252–54; idem, *Date of the Last Supper,* 25–27.

52. idem, "Le calendrier des Jubilés," 258; idem, *Date of the Last Supper,* 33.

53. idem, "Le calendrier des Jubilés," 254–58, 262–64; idem, *Date of the Last Supper,* 47–51.

partially—served to support the broad strokes of her thesis that the 364 day calendar was in broad use during the late Second Temple period (though the more specific claims remain controversial).[54] What seems apparent from the more recently discovered evidence from Qumran is that the system of keeping time during the Second Temple period was not a monolith. As VanderKam notes, among the Qumran texts the festivals were generally dated based on the 364-day calendar but there still remain cases where 354-day "lunar" year was used for more general purposes.[55] And while the book of Jubilees clearly participates in a tradition which privileged the 364-day year, the particulars of the Jubilees calendar and its theological and ideological underpinnings do not necessarily align with other advocates for the 364-day year (such as the Astronomical Book and the other calendrical texts from Qumran).[56] In other words, one of the major observations from the most recent scholarship on the 364-day calendar

54. Early reactions to her thesis were mixed. In particular, she was critiqued by Baumgarten ("The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees and the Bible," in *Studies In Qumran Law,* ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, vol. 24, SJLA [Leiden: Brill, 1977], 101–14; trans. of "Hlwḥ šl spr hywblym wh-mqr?," *Tarbiz* 32 [1962]: 317–28) and more recently by Wacholder & Wacholder ("Patterns of Biblical Dates," 1–40) and Ravid ("The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar: A Reexamination," *DSD* 10.3 [2003]: 371–94). Her thesis was adopted and slightly modified by Morgenstern who suggested that the first month of the quarter was 31 days, rather than the last month; ("The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, Its Origin and Its Character," *VT* 5.1 [1955]: 34–76), at least partially supported by VanderKam ("The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassesment of Jaubert's Hypothesis," *CBQ* 41 [1979]: 390–411) and still retains broad support generally, if at times (seemingly) by virtue of its ubiquity. See Ben-Dov and Saulnier, "Qumran Calendars," 142.

55. VanderKam, *Jubilees,* 1:45.

56. See Ben-Dov and Saulnier, "Qumran Calendars," 159. Although the calendar of Jubilees is distinct from other 364 day calendars inferred from the Qumran texts, many of the more general observations about their function apply to all such calendars and are frequently discussed together. The early discussions of Barthélemy and Jaubert mostly focused on Jubilees, as most of the Qumran scrolls had either not been discovered or not published at the time of writing. See Barthélemy, "Notes en marge," 187–218 and Jaubert, "Le calendrier des Jubilés," 35–61.

tradition is that their commonalities are complimented by significant variation. So, although the Astronomical Book (1 Enoch 72–82), the Aramaic Levi Document, the Temple Scroll, MMT, 4Q252 and other astronomical (e.g., 4Q317; 4Q318), liturgical (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice; 11QPsalms[a]; 4Q503; 4Q334) and many formally calendrical texts[57] from Qumran tend to prefer a 364-day calendar, they do not all seem to agree on *why* they follow it.[58] This diversity leaves open the question of what the purpose and significance of the 364-day calendar was for the author of the book of Jubilees and raises new questions about its polemical underpinnings.

The larger super-annual chronological cycles which concern the author of Jubilees also follow a heptadic structure. Throughout the work, the author refers to "weeks" of years (a seven-year interval) and the length of time known as a "Jubilee" (seven "weeks" of years, or 49 years) both of which are heptadic units which reflect the same concern with sabbath cycles as the intra-annual divisions.[59] In fact, as VanderKam has observed, while the calendar (364-day year) is only mentioned in Jubilees 6, the chronological system (7-year "weeks" and jubilees) is a pervasive and first-order literary device for the author's adaptation of Israel's past.[60]

57. Ben Dov and Saulnier lists several dozen texts and fragments of these calendrical texts in their recent summary. See Ben-Dov and Saulnier, "Qumran Calendars," 132–33.

58. For a concise summary of the calendrical issues in these texts, see James C. VanderKam, *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time,* LDSS (London: Routledge, 1998); Glessmer, "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls," 233–68; Ben-Dov and Saulnier, "Qumran Calendars," 127–35; and Jacobus, "Calendars," 435–48.

59. Indeed, as cited above in the prologue, the work is concerned with the "the testimony for the event[s] of the years; for their weeks, for their jubilees in all the years of the world."

60. James C. VanderKam, "Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees," in *Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees,* JSJSup 62 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 522–44. He credits Wiesenberg with this observation as well who writes, "His chronology, not his calendar, is the object of primary interest to the writer of the Book of Jubilees." See Ernest Wiesenberg, "The Jubilee of Jubilees," *RdQ* 3.1 (1961): 3–40.

The heptadic quality of the entire system of Jubilees's calendar and chronological systems is rooted in the traditions surrounding the sabbath and slave laws, which themselves show considerable development within the Hebrew Bible itself. The Sabbath and Jubilee legislation of Leviticus 25 likely draws from and adapts the earlier slave and fallow laws from the Covenant Code (Exod 21:1–11 and 23:10–11, respectively) and bears similarities with other ancient Near Eastern practices such as the *mīšarum* and *andurārum* known from Mesopotamia.[61] At the core of the Jubilee tradition in Leviticus 25 is an abstraction of the idea of sabbath "rest" on the seventh day of the week to longer seven-year units of time: the manumission of slaves, the forgiveness of debts, reallocation of ancestral lands, and letting the land lie fallow all occur in the seventh year, just as people were to rest on the sabbath day. Seven sets of these "weeks" completed a full cycle, which was then followed by a Jubilee year (year 50).[62]

Within the book of Jubilees, however, the term Jubilee is used to delineate a period of 49 years, rather than to specify the 50th year.[63] Thus, when the author of Jubilees describes an event occurring in the *nth* jubilee, he is referring to the the event occurring within a particular 49-year span and not in the *nth* "jubilee year." The term "week" or "week of years," on the other hand, retains its traditional denotation.

61. For the ostensible antecedents of the biblical Jubilee see Bergsma, *Jubilee,* 1–51. Other major publications on the idea of the biblical Jubilee include Robert G. North, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee,* AnBib 4 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1954); Jeffrey A. Fager, *Land Tenure and the Biblical Jubilee: Uncovering Hebrew Ethics through the Sociology of Knowledge,* JSOTSup 155 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) and Jean-François Lefebvre, *Le jubilé biblique: Lv 25—exégèse et théologie,* OBO 194 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

62. Bergsma, *Jubilee,* 85–92.

63. VanderKam, "Chronology," 524–25; Bergsma, *Jubilee,* 234.

5.2.2 Time and the Social Frameworks of Memory

As I have alluded to, frameworks for ordering the past are not neutral and the use of particular systems bears on one's interpretation of the past and understanding of the present. In other words, chronological systems can have a profound impact on processes of memory. Thus, the ordering of time with respect to the 364-day year, sabbath and jubilee traditions should be understood as not simply as the alignment of the past with an idiosyncratic numbering system, but as a reinterpretation and commemoration of Israel's past within a discrete social and ideological framework.

The insistence of the author of Jubilees that the 364-day year be maintained and his sharp rebuke of those who "closely observe the moon" (Jubilees 6:36) point toward the likelihood that calendar conflicts were a point of contention between the author of Jubilees and some of his contemporaries. This apparently polemical tone used by the author has prompted speculation about the possible causes of such polemic. VanderKam, for example has suggested that the impetus for the calendar dispute was Antiochus IV Epiphanes' imposition of a Hellenistic luni-solar calendar in-or-around 167 BCE. According to VanderKam's theory the 364-day calendar was the calendar in use by the Jerusalem temple in the late Persian and early Second Temple periods (generally following the argument of Jaubert). As evidence for Antiochus IV's calendrical changes, VanderKam cites the numerous and infamous decrees made by Antiochus IV recounted in the books of Daniel and 1 & 2 Maccabees. Although he concedes that none of these texts demand a calendrical change (only that the decrees prohibited certain festivals) VanderKam reads Dan 7:25 to mean that the Seleucids did not only proscribe certain

Jewish practices, but may have imposed a different calendar system.[64] Daniel 7:23–25 reads:

(7:23) כֵּן אֲמַר חֵיוְתָא רְבִיעָיְתָא מַלְכוּ רְבִיעָיָא תֶּהֱוֵא בְאַרְעָא דִּי תִשְׁנֵא מִן־כָּל־מַלְכָוָתָא
וְתֵאכֵל כָּל־אַרְעָא וּתְדוּשִׁנַּהּ וְתַדְקִנַּהּ׃ (24) וְקַרְנַיָּא עֲשַׂר מִנַּהּ מַלְכוּתָה עַשְׂרָה
מַלְכִין יְקֻמוּן וְאָחֳרָן יְקוּם אַחֲרֵיהוֹן וְהוּא יִשְׁנֵא מִן־קַדְמָיֵא וּתְלָתָה מַלְכִין יְהַשְׁפֵּל׃
(25) וּמִלִּין לְצַד עִלָּיָא יְמַלֵּל וּלְקַדִּישֵׁי עֶלְיוֹנִין יְבַלֵּא וְיִסְבַּר לְהַשְׁנָיָה זִמְנִין וְדָת
וְיִתְיַהֲבוּן בִּידֵהּ עַד־עִדָּן וְעִדָּנִין וּפְלַג עִדָּן׃

(Dan 7:23) Thus he said, "As for the fourth beast, there will be a fourth kingdom on the earth which will be different from all the other kingdoms and it will consume the whole earth and trample it and crush it. (24) As for the ten horns—from it [the kingdom] ten kings will rise up and another will rise up after them and that one will be different from the previous ones and will bring down three kings. (25) And he will speak words against the Most High and he will wear-out the Holy Ones of the Most High and he will try to change the times and the Law and they will be given into his hand for a time, two times, and half a time."

VanderKam suggests that the Aramaic term זִמְנִין in v. 25 may be equivalent to Hebrew מוֹעֲדִים or עִתִּים and thus may be referring to particular appointed times and festivals.[65] VanderKam further argues that 1 Macc 1:59 and 2 Macc 6:7a allude to the practice of celebrating the king's birthday with a sacrifice on a monthly basis (every *nth* day of the month) which would have demanded that the Jerusalem temple to adopt the Seleucid calendar. Thus, he reasons, this may be the time when the traditional 364-day calendar was replaced by the Hellenistic lunisolar calendar in the Jerusalem temple. When the Maccabees took power, however, they did not, apparently, revert back to the older calendar. The conservative "Essene" group which later formed the Qumran community opposed this innovation and separated themselves from the

64. C. VanderKam James, "2 Maccabees 6, 7a and Calendrical Change in Jerusalem," *JSJ* 12 (1981): 52–74

65. ibid., 59–60.

Jerusalem priesthood. Thus, VanderKam suggests that the calendar change/crisis may have been one of the major precipitating factors for the schism between the Qumran community and the Jerusalem temple authorities.[66] VanderKam's theory, however, has been met with some resistance, particularly from scholars such as Philip Davies, among others.[67]

For our purposes, the putative calendrical conflict to which Jubilees alludes points toward the *significance* of such traditions for everyday practice. For the author of Jubilees (and, perhaps for the Qumran community) the calendar was not simply a mundane system for bookkeeping, but was intimately tied to liturgical and cosmological order. Such a system aligns with God's created order which takes the seven-day week as its fundamental unit (as described in Gen 1). Such a system, one presumes, ought to respect the sanctity of the sabbath and prevent the overlap of holidays with the sabbath. The book of Jubilees does not appeal to observation or "science" but instead asserts the absolute fact of the 364-day year, as established by God and recorded on the Heavenly Tablets.

Although the book of Jubilees portrays the 364-day year as a principle *predicated on* a

66. VanderKam, "2 Maccabees," 52.

67. Philip R. Davies, "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory," *CBQ* 45.1 (1983): 80–89; Wacholder and Wacholder, "Patterns of Biblical Dates," 1–40; Sacha Stern, "Qumran Calendars: Theory and Practice," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context,* ed. Timothy Lim, with A. Graeme Auld, Larry W. Hurtado, and Alison Jack (London: T & T Clark, 2000), 179–86; idem, "The Babylonian Calendar at Elephantine," *ZPE* 130 (2000): 159–71; idem, *Calendar and Community,* 29 n. 136. The core of these criticisms boil down to the fact that VanderKam's theory is quite speculative and lacking in concrete *positive* evidence of his historical reconstruction. The theory provides a clean explanation for a pressing historical question, but is perhaps a bit over-simplified. Ben Dov and Saulnier observe that VanderKam's theory tends to be more popular among scholars who specifically study Essenes, while it is generally rejected by historians of the Second Temple period more generally. See Ben-Dov and Saulnier, "Qumran Calendars," 142.

seven-day week and related numerical properties, in fact, from the perspective of memory construction and reinforcement, the opposite is the case. By insisting on the utilization of a calendar whose distinguishing characteristic is its protection of sabbath laws (i.e., that no holidays will ever conflict with the sabbath), and the consistently of memorial days vis-à-vis the day of the week, the calendar reinforces the practices of observing the sabbath and the other holidays. It is a system which (though not, perhaps, designed for the purpose) reinforces some of the fundamental practices of early Judaism. Whether or not the 364-day calendar was the more traditional calendar or whether it was an innovation is, to some degree beside the point. The author of the book of Jubilees made explicit what *he* thought was the right calendar and leveraged his text—with all of its authority conferring strategies—to participate in the contemporary cultural conflict over what calendar to use.

The significance of the 364-day calendar as one centered around the idea of the sabbath cycle gives cultural meaning to a calendar that likely found its origins elsewhere. This significance, which was imputed upon the 364-day year, then became one rationale by which the sabbath ritual practice was bolstered. The circular and iterative process of memory construction is clearly on display.

The larger cycles of weeks and jubilees likewise carry significance beyond their simple numerical values. The seven and 49-year cycles are drawn from Lev 25. Of course, the author of Jubilees is *drawing from* Lev 25, though the rhetorical force of Jubilees suggests that the heptadic system of Lev 25 derives from the Heavenly Tablets.

More so than the seven-year week, the jubilee carried special significance for the

Israelite chronological tradition. It is unimportant whether or not the biblical Jubilee as described in Lev 25 was every actually carried out or whether it was a utopian fiction; what matters is that the during the Second Temple period, the year of Jubilee was a potent idea with broader social and political implications.[68] Using the system of jubilees allowed the author of the book of Jubilees to align his chronological system with significant events in the history of Israel. For instance, as Bergsma notes, within the framework of the book of Jubilees, the history of Israel from creation to the entrance to the land amounts to precisely 50 cycles of jubilees.[69] According to the book of Jubilees, the Sinai revelation—where the book of Jubilees is set—occurs precisely 9 years (or, more accurately, one week and two years) into the 50th jubilee cycle since creation. Jubilees 50:4 reads:

> (50:2) VanderKam: On Mt. Sinai I told you about the sabbaths of the land and the years of jubilees in the sabbaths of the years, but its year we have not told you until the time when you enter the land which you will possess. (3) the land will observe its sabbaths when they live on it, and they are to know the year of the jubilee. (4) For this reason I have arranged for you the weeks of years and the jubilees—49 jubilees from the time of Adam until today, and one week and two years. I is still 40 years off (for learning the Lord's commandments) until the time when he leads (them) across to the land of Canaan, after they have crossed the Jordan to the west of it.
>
> ***VanderKam's translation (in the interest of time). I will provide my own text and translation in subsequent drafts*

68. The imagery of the biblical Jubilee is even evoked in the Christian New Testament in the gospel of Luke when Jesus quotes from Isa 61:1; 58:6; and 61:2. Although the term יוֹבֵל "jubilee" is not explicitly used in the MT of Isa, the related term דְּרוֹר "liberty" (the term used for what one "declares" in the Jubilee year, according to Lev 25:10) is used.

69. Bergsma, *Jubilee,* 234–35.

Thus, after a 40-year wandering, the Israelites enter the land in the Jubilee year of the 50th jubilee cycle. The significance of this juxtaposition should not be missed—the Jubilee legislation of Lev 25 instructed that all ancestral lands be returned and redistributed among the tribes of Israel. The author of the book of Jubilees has, therefore, connected the entrance of the land to the rightful repossession of inalienable ancestral landholdings. Jubilees's restructuring the remembered past, therefore, reinforced the socio-political ideology of Israel's right to the land.[70]

Such an ideology, however, is not confined only to the abstract *idea* of the past, but carries with it concrete political implications. It is significant, I think, that the book of Jubilees was likely composed near the time of the Maccabees when discourses about national sovereignty and messianic renewal were widespread. Of course, I am not suggesting that Jubilees is specifically referencing the Maccabean revolt, only that discourses of national sovereignty and idealized social renewal were potent at this time. Carrying this idea forward a bit more, because the jubilee cycle was a predictable one, it stands to reason that one of the underlying subtexts of the book of Jubilees is that another Jubilee year is coming. Because the narrative setting of the book is in the distant past, the author does not plainly tell the reader when the next Jubilee would arrive and instead links the ultimate restoration of the land to Israel to the successful purgation of sinful behavior from the people. Jubilees 50:5 reads:

> (50:5) VanderKam: The jubilees will pass by until Israel is pure of every sexual evil, impurity, contamination, sin, and error. Then they will live confidently in the entire land. they will no longer have any satan or any evil person.

70. Bergsma, *Jubilee,* 234–35.

The land will be pure from that time until eternity.

***VanderKam's translation (in the interest of time). I will provide my own text and translation in subsequent drafts*

Evoking the memory of the biblical Jubilee year not only ties the shifting independent political landscape to divinely ordained cycles of renewal, but ties the restoration of ancestral lands to this cycle predicated on proper living and the purgation of evil from the people.

Thus the calendrical (364-day) system and the larger chronological ordering (weeks and jubilees) of the book of Jubilees functioned as a means by which the story of Israel's remembered past could be restructured and recontextualized to for its Second Temple period audience. The systems of time both reinforced the significance of sabbath laws and keeping the festivals and the super-yearly cycles of weeks and jubilees carried with them ideologies of liberty and renewal of the land. Rewriting Israel's past within this system brought new interpretations of Israel's entrance into the land as and expression of the Jubilees year, and invites the reader expect the *next* Jubilee. This expectation carries with it concrete social and political expectations.

5.3 BAD CONCLUSION

In this chapter I have attempted to differentiate the *manner* that Rewritten Bible texts may have engaged with the cultural memory. I will focused on the ways that Jubilees portrayed itself as an authoritative revelation and how that posture affected concrete *practice*. The book of Jubilees engages with cultural memory in a distinct fashion vis-à-vis Genesis Apocryphon by utilizing so-called "authority conferring strategies" which more directly engages the received

tradition and calls on the reader to integrate her understanding of the past with the new information presented in the book. I have further argued that this distinction is significant because it illustrates the way that memory not only affects the intellectual conceptions of the past, but also carries with it *concrete practical effects which can be concretely observed.* Drawing on Hindy Najman's work on Mosaic Discourse I discussed the ways that Jubilees portrays itself as authoritative literature, how this portrayal may have been understood in antiquity and how it could, in some sense, both authorize and rewrite the Torah with halakhic implications. Finally, to illustrate the point, I discussed the calendrical and chronological system of the book of Jubilees as an example of the concrete ways that constructing memory can impact one's understanding of the past and present and ultimately affect the praxis of the reader.

Conclusion

Bibliography

Abbott, H. Porter. *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Alexander, Philip. "Notes on the 'Imago Mundi' of the Book of Jubilees." *JJS* 38 (1982): 197–213.

Alexander, Philip S. "Retelling the Old Testament." Pages 99–121 in *It is Written—Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF.* Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Allen, Garrick V. "Rewriting and the Gospels." *JSNT* 41 (2018): 58–69.

Ansell-Pearson, Keith. "Bergson on Memory." Pages 61–76 in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates.* Edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.

Asale, Bruk A. "Mapping the Reception, Transmission, and Translation of Scriptural Writings in the EOTC: How and Why Some "Pseudepigraphical" Works Receive 'Canonical' Status in the Ethiopian Bible." *JS* 22.2 (2013): 358–75.

———. "The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church Canon of the Scriptures: Neither Open nor Closed." *BT* 67.2 (2016): 202–22.

Assmann, Aleida. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

———. "Memory and Culture." Pages 325–49 in *Memory: A History.* Edited by Dmitri Nikulin. OPC. New York: Oxford University Press.

Avigad, Nahman, and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea.* Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1956.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "Notes en marge de publications récentes sur les manuscrits de Qumrân." *RB* 59.2 (1952): 187–218.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees and the Bible." Pages 101–14 in *Studies In Qumran Law.* Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten. Vol. 24. SJLA. Leiden: Brill, 1977. Translation of "Hlwḥ šl spr hywblym whmqr?." *Tarbiz* 32 (1962): 317–28.

Baynes, Leslie. "Enoch and Jubilees in the Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church." Pages 799–818 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam.* Vol. 2 of *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam.* Edited by Eric F. Mason, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, Angela Kim Harkins, and Daniel K. Machiela. 2 vols. STDJ 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Ben Zvi, Ehud. "Chronicles and Social Memory." *ST* 71.1 69–90.

———. "Reading Chronicles and Reshaping the Memory of Manasseh." Pages 121–40 in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography.* Edited by Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

———. "Toward a Sense of Balance: Remembering the Catastrophe of Monarchic Judah / (Ideological) Israel and Exile through Reading Chronicles in Late Yehud." Pages 247–65 in *Chronicling the Chronicler: The Book of Chronicles and Early Second Temple Historiography.* Edited by Paul S. Evans and Tyler F. Williams. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2013.

Ben-Dov, Jonathan. "The 364-day Year at Qumran and in the Pseudepigrapha." Pages 69–105 in *Calendars and Years II: Astronomy and Time in the Ancient and Medieval World.* Edited by John Steele. Oxford: Oxbow, 2011.

Ben-Dov, Jonathan, and Stéphane Saulnier. "Qumran Calendars: A Survey of Scholarship 1980–2007." *CurBR* 7.1 (2008): 124–68.

Bergsma, John Sietze. *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation.* VTSup 115. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Berliner, David. "The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology." *AQ* 78.1 (2005): 197–211.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "Divine Titles and Epithets and the Sources in the Genesis Apocryphon." *JBL* 128 (2009): 291–310.

———. "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. STDJ 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

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

———. "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions." Pages 1–26 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.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "Rewritten Bible: A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Text* 22 (2005): 169–96.

Black, Matthew. "Aramaic Studies and the Language of Jesus." Pages 17–28 in *In Memoriam Paul Kahle.* Edited by Matthew Black and Georg Fohrer. BZAW 103. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1968.

———. *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.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *David Remembered: Kingship and National Identity in Ancient Israel.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.

Bloch, Renée. "Écriture et tradition dans le Judaïsme: Aperçus sur l'origine du Midrash." *CaS,* 1954, 9–34.

———. "Methodological Note for the Study of Rabbinic Literature." Pages 51–75 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice.* Edited by William Scott Green. Translated by William Scott Green, with William J. Sullivan. BJS 1. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978. Translation of "Note méthodologique pour l'etude de la littérature rabbinique." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 43.2 (1955): 194–225.

Blum, Erhard. "Historiography or Poetry? The Nature of the Hebrew Bible Prose Tradition." Pages 25–45 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004), September 2004).* Edited by Stephen C. Barton, Loren T. Stuckenbruck, and Benjamin G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Braun, Roddy. *1 Chronicles.* WBC 14. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986.

Brooke, George. "Genre Theory, Rewritten Bible and Pesher." In "Rethinking Genre: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins." *DSD* 17.3 (2010): 332–57.

———. "Rewritten Bible." Pages 777–81 in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Vol. 2 of *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "The Rewritten Law, Prophets, and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible." Pages 31–40 in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries.* Edited by Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov. London: British Library; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002.

Brooke, George J. "Memory, Cultural Memory and Rewriting Scripture." Pages 119–36 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes.* Edited by József Zsengellér. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Burns, Joshua Ezra. *The Christian Schism in Jewish History and Jewish Memory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Campbell, Jonathan G. "Rewritten Bible: A Terminological Reassessment." Pages 49–81 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes.* Edited by József Zsengellér. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Carruthers, Mary. "How to Make a Composition: Memory-Craft in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages." Pages 15–29 in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates.* Edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.

Ceriani, A. M. *Monumenta Sacra et Profana.* 2 vols. Milan: Bibliotheca Ambrosiana, 1861–1863.

Charles, Robert Henry. *Maṣḥafa Kufālē or the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1895.

———. *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis.* London: Adam & Charles Black, 1902.

Childs, Brevard S. *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

———. *Memory and Tradition in Israel.* SBT 37. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Coggins, R. J. *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles.* CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993.

———. "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre" 14 (1979): 1–20.

———. "The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic." *JBL* 94 218–34.

———. "The Genre of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 737–55 in *A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam. A Teacher for All Generations: Essays in Honor of James C. VanderKam.* Edited by Eric F. Mason, Kelley Coblentz Bautch, Angela Kim Harkins, and Daniel K. Machiela. 2 vols. STDJ 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Coman, Alin, Andreas Kolling, Michael Lewis, and William Hirst. "Mnemonic Convergence: From Empirical Data to Large-Scale Dynamics." Pages 256–65 in *Social Computing, Behavioral–Cultural Modeling and Prediction.* Edited by Shanchieh Jay Yang, Ariel M. Greenberg, and Mica Endsley. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 2012.

Coman, Alin, Ida Momennejad, Rae D. Drach, and Andra Geana. "Mnemonic Convergence in Social Networks: The Emergent Properties of Cognition at a Collective Level." *PNAS* 113.29 (2016): 8171–76.

Confino, Alon. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *AHR* 102.5 (1997): 1386–403.

Coser, Lewis A. Introduction to *On Collective Memory,* by Maurice Halbwachs. Translated by Lewis A. Coser. Pages 1–34. HS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Cowley, Roger W. "The Biblical Canon of the Ethiopian Orthodox Church Today." *OS* 23.4 (1974): 318–23.

Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. "The Rewritten Bible at Qumran." Pages 173–95 in *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Vol. 1 of *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 3 vols. North Richland Hills, TX: BIBAL, 2000.

Dacy, Marianne. "Plant Symbolism and the Dreams of Noah and Abram in the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 217–32 in *Keter Shem Tov: Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Alan Crown.* Edited by Shani Tzoref. PHSC. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2013.

Davies, Philip R. "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory." *CBQ* 45.1 (1983): 80–89.

———. *Memories of Ancient Israel: An Introduction to Biblical History–Ancient and Modern.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008.

Dillmann, August. "Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuch-Textes." *SPAW* 15 (1883): 323–40.

———. "Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis." *JBW* 2 (1849): 230–56, 3 (1850–51): 1–96.

———. *Maṣḥafa Kufālē sive Liber Jubilaeorum.* Keil: C.G.L. van Maak; London: Williiams & Norgate, 1859.

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.

Driver, Samuel R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.* ML 3. New York: Meridian, 1956.

Erho, Ted. "New Ethiopic Witnesses to Some Old Testament Pseudepigrapha." *BSOAS* 76 (2013): 75–97.

Eshel, Esther. "The Dream Visions in the Noah Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts." Pages 41–61 in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006.* Edited by Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge, and Martin Ehrensvärd. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

———. "The Genesis Apocryphon: A Chain of Traditions." Pages 182–93 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008).* Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Evans, Craig A. "The Gensis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible." In "Mémorial Jean Carmignac." *RdQ* 13 (1988): 153–65.

Ewald, Heinrich. "Ueber die Aethiopischen Handschriften zu Tübingen." *ZKM* 5 (1844): 164–201.

Fager, Jeffrey A. *Land Tenure and the Biblical Jubilee: Uncovering Hebrew Ethics through the Sociology of Knowledge.* JSOTSup 155. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Falk, Daniel K. *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls.* CQS 8; LSTS 63. London: T & T Clark, 2007.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1.* 3rd 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.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" Pages 205–22 in *Michel Foucault: Aesthetics, Method, and Epistemology.* Edited by James D. Faubion. Vol. 2 of *Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984.* 3 vols. New York: The New Press, 1999.

Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Mode.* Revised. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Fraade, Steven. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *JJS* 44 (1993): 46–69.

Fraade, Steven D. "Between Rewritten Bible and Allegorical Commentary: Philo's Interpretation of the Burning Bush." Pages 221–32 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes.* Edited by József Zsengellér. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

———. "Rewritten Bible and Rabbinic Midrash as Commentary." Pages 59–78 in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash.* Edited by Carol Bakhos. JSJSup 106. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Galinsky, Karl. "Introduction: Memory and Memory Studies." Pages 1–39 in *Memory in Ancient Rome and Early Christianity.* Edited by Karl Galinsky. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Garcia Martinez, Florentino. "The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees." Pages 51–69 in *Between Philology and Theology: Contributions to the Study of Ancient Jewish Interpretation,* by Florentino Garcia Martinez. Edited by Hinidy Najman and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 162. Leiden: Brill, 2012. Translation of Florentino García Martínez. "Las Tablas Celestes en el Libro de los Jubileos." Pages 333–49 in *Palabra y Vida: Homenaje a José Alonzo Díaz en su 70 Cumpleaños.* Edited by A. Vargas–Machuca and Gregorio Ruiz. PUPCM 58. Madrid: Ediciones Universidad de Comillas, 1984.

Gaster, T. H. *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation.* 3rd ed. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic, 1973.

Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree.* Translated by Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Gevirtz, Marianne Luijken. "Abram's Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon: Its Motifs and Their Function." *MAARAV* 8 (1992): 229–43.

Glessmer, Uwe. "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 213–78 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assesment.* Edited by Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Halbwachs, Maurice. *La Topographie légendaire des évangiles en terre sainte: étude de mémoire collective.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1941.

———. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire.* F. Alcan, 1925.

———. *On Collective Memory.* Translated by Lewis A. Coser. HS. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

———. *The Collective Memory.* Translated by Francis J. Ditter Jr. and Vida Yazdi Ditter, with an introduction by Mary Douglass. New York: Harper & Row, 1980. Translation of *La mémoire collective.* Bibliothèque de sociologie contemporaine. Paris: University of Paris Press, 1950.

Hanneken, Todd R. *The Subversion of the Apoclypses in the Book of Jubilees.* EJL 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.

Harrington, Daniel J. "Palestinian Adaptations of Biblical Narratives and Prophecies I: The Bible Rewritten (Narratives)." Pages 239–47 in *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters.* Edited by Robert A. Kraft and George W. E. Nickelsburg. BMI 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Hartman, Louis F. Review of *Qumran Cave 1, The Genesis Apocryphon,* by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. *CBQ* 28 (1966): 495–98.

Hendel, Ronald S. *Remembering Abraham: Culture, Memory, and History in the Hebrew Bible.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Heschel, Susannah. *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.

Horowitz, Wayne. "The 360 and 364 Day Year in Ancient Mesopotamia." *JANES* 24 (1996): 35–44.

Hübenthal, Sandra. "Social and Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis: The Quest for an Adequate Application." Pages 175–99 in *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis.* Edited by Pernille Carstens, Trine Hasselbalch, and Niels Peter Lemche. PHSC 17. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012.

Humphreys, W. L. "A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel." *JBL* 92 (1973): 211–23.

Jacobus, Helen R. "Calendars." Pages 435–48 in *T & T Clark Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Greorge J. Brooke and Charlotte Hempel. London: T & T Clark, 2018.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary.* OTL. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

———. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought.* Translated by Anna Barber. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009. Repr., Japhet, Sara. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought.* 2nd revised ed. BEATAJ 9. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997.

Jaubert, Annie. “Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumrân: Ses origines bibliques.” *VT* 3.3 (1953): 250–64.

———. “Le calendrier des Jubilés et les jour liturgiques de la semaine.” *VT* 7.1 (1957): 35–61.

———. *The Date of the Last Supper.* Translated by Isaac Rafferty. Staten Island, NY: Alba House, 1965. Translation of *La date de la Cène: Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne.* Paris: Gabalda, 1957.

Jurgens, Blake A. “A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh’s Court: The Literary Relationship Between Abram’s Sojourn in Egypt in 1QapGen 19-20 and Jewish Fictional Literature.” *JSJ* 49.3 (2018): 1–34.

Kahle, Paul. *The Cairo Geniza.* The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1941. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Keith, Chris. “Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One).” *EC* 6.3 (2015): 354–76.

———. “Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part Two).” *EC* 6.4 (2015): 517–42.

Kisch, Guido. *Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.* PMS 10. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame, 1949.

Klein, Kerwin Lee. “On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse.” Pages 112–37 in *From History to Theory.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2011. Reprint of “On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse.” *Representations* 69 (2000): 127–50.

Knoppers, Gary N. *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* AB 12. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

Koskenniemi, Erkki, and Pekka Lindqvist. “Rewritten Bible, Rewritten Stories: Methodological Aspects.” Pages 11–39 in *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24–26 2006.* Edited by Antti Laato and J. van Ruiten. SRB. Turku, Finland: Åbo Akademi University; Winona Lake, IN.: Eisenbrauns, 2008.

Kreps, Anne. “From Jewish Apocrypha to Christian Tradition: Citations of Jubilees in Epiphanius’s Panarion.” *CH* 87.2 (2018): 345–70.

Kugel, James L. *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation.* JSJSup 156. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

———. “Which Is Older, Jubilees or the Genesis Apocryphon? An Exegetical Approach.” Pages 257–94 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference Held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008).* Edited by Adolfo D. Roitman, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Shani Tzoref. STDJ 93. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Le Donne, Anthony. *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David.* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.

Lefebvre, Jean-François. *Le jubilé biblique: Lv 25—exégèse et théologie.* OBO 194. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.

Machiela, Daniel A. "Genesis Revealed: The Apocalyptic Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1." Pages 205–21 in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana.* Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Sarianna Metso, Donald W. Parry, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. STDJ 91. Leiden: Brill.

———. "Once More, with Feeling: Rewritten Scripture in Ancient Judaism—A Review of Recent Developments." *JJS* 61.2 (2010): 308–20.

———. "Some Egyptian Elements in the Genesis Apocryphon: Evidence of a Ptolemaic Social Location?" *AS* 8 (2010): 47–69.

———. *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17.* STDJ 79. Leiden: Brill.

Malan, Gert J. "Is Rewritten Bible/Scripture the Solution to the Synoptic Problem?" *HTS* 70.1 (2014): 1–10.

Mandel, Paul D. "The Origins of Midrash in the Second Temple Period." Pages 9–34 in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash.* Edited by Carol Bakhos. JSJSup 106. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

———. *The Origins of* Midrash*: From Teaching to Text.* Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Mason, Steve. "Josephus and His Twenty-two Book Canon." Pages 110–27 in *The Canon Debate.* Edited by Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

Mays, James Luther. "The David of the Psalms." *Int* 40.2 (1986): 143–55.

Milik, Józef T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea.* Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM Press, 1959.

Morgenstern, Julian. "The Calendar of the Book of Jubilees, Its Origin and Its Character." *VT* 5.1 (1955): 34–76.

Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Müller, Mogens. "Luke — The Fourth Gospel? The 'Rewritten Bible' Concept as a Way to Understand the Nature of the Later Gospels." Pages 231–42 in *Voces Clamantium in Deserto: Essays in Honor of Kari Syreeni.* Edited by Sven-Olav Back and Matti Kankaanniemi. STÅA. Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 2012.

Najman, Hindy. "How Should We Contextualize Pseudepigrapha? Imitation and Emulation in 4 Ezra." Pages 529–36 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez.* Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority." *JSJ* 30.4 (1999): 379–410.

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

Newsom, Carol. "Rhetorical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 198–214 in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods.* Edited by Maxine L. Grossman. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010.

Nickelsburg, George. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah.* 2nd ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded." Pages 89–156 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus.* Edited by Michael E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Niditch, Susan, and R. Doran. "The Success Story of the Wise Courtier: A Formal Approach." *JBL* 96 (1977).

Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." In "Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory." *Representations* 26 (1989): 7–24.

———. *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past.* Edited by Lawrence D. Kritzman. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. 3 vols. European Perspectives. New York: Columbia University Press. Translation of Pierre Nora, ed. *Les Lieux de mémoire.* 7 vols. Paris: Gallimard.

North, Robert G. *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee.* AnBib 4. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1954.

Olick, Jeffrey K., and Joyce Robbins. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *ARS* 24 (1998): 105–40.

Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy. "Introduction." Pages 3–62 in *The Collective Memory Reader.* Edited by Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Perrin, Andrew B. *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls.* JAJSup 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

Petersen, Anders Klostergaard. "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon: Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" Pages 285–306 in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino Garcia Martinez.* Edited by Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Pioske, Daniel. "Retracing a Remembered Past: Methodological Remarks on Memory, History, and the Hebrew Bible." *BibInt* 23.3 (2015): 291–315.

Rappaport, Salomo. *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus.* Veröffentlichungen der Oberrabbiner Dr. H.P. Chajes-Preisstiftung an der Israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien 3. Vienna: Alexander Kohnt Memorial Foundation, 1930.

Ravid, Liora. "The Book of Jubilees and Its Calendar: A Reexamination." *DSD* 10.3 (2003): 371–94.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "Pseudepigraphy and/as Prophecy: Continuity and Transformation in the Formation and Reception of Early Enochic Writings." Pages 25–42 in *Revelation, Literature, and Community in Late Antiquity.* Edited by Philippa Townsend and Moulie Vidas. TSAJ 146. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

———. "Pseudepigraphy, Authorship and the Reception of 'the Bible' in Late Antiquity." Pages 467–90 in *The Reception and Interpretation of the Bible in Late Antiquity: Proceedings of the Montréal Colloquium in Honour of Charles Kannengiesser, 11–13 October 2006.* Edited by Lorenzo DiTommaso and Lucian Turcescu. BAC 6. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

———. "Retelling Biblical Retellings: Epiphanius, the Pseudo-Clementines, and the Reception-History of Jubilees." Pages 304–21 in *Tradition, Transmission, and Transformation from Second Temple Literature through Judaism and Christianity in Late Antiquity.* Edited by Menahem Kister, Hillel Newman, Michael Segal, and Ruth Clements. STDJ 113. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

———. "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha'." *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Memory, History, Forgetting.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Rodríguez, Rafael. *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance, and Text.* LNTS. London: T & T Clark, 2010.

Rogerson, John W. *A Theology of the Old Testament: Cultural Memory, Communication, and Being Human.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 2010.

Rosenfeld, Graviel D. "A Looming Crash or a Soft Landing? Forcasting the Future of the Memory 'Industry'." *JMH* 81.1 (2009): 122–58.

Sarna, Nahum M. "The Psalm Superscriptions and the Guilds." Pages 281–300 in *Studies in Jewish Religious and Intellectual History presented to Alexander Altmann on the occasion of his seventieth birthday.* Edited by Siegfried Stein and Raphael Loewe. University, AL: University of Alabama Press, 1979.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Cours de linguistique générale: Édition critique.* Edited by Rudolf Engler. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1989.

Schudson, Michael. "The Present in the Past versus the Past in the Present." *Communication* 11.2 (1989): 105–13.

Schürer, Emil. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ: 175 BC – AD 135.* Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Matthew Black. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986.

Schwartz, Barry. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

———. "Social Change and Collective Memory: The Democratization of George Washington." *ASR* 56.2 (1991): 221–36.

Schwartz, Barry. "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory." *SF* 61.2 (1982): 374–402.

Segal, Michael. "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible." Pages 10–28 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran.* Edited by Matthias Henze. SDSS. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. "The Literary Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees: The Chronology of Abram and Sarai's Descent to Egypt." *AS* 8.1 (2010): 71–88.

Smith, Mark S. "Remembering God: Collective Memory in Israelite Religion." *CBQ* 64.4 (2002): 631–51.

Smith, Philip, and Alexander Riley. *Cultural Theory: An Introduction.* 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 2009.

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." *JSJ* 2 (1995): 66–71.

Stern, Sacha. *Calendar and Community: A History of the Jewish Calendar, 2nd Century BCE to 10th Century CE.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

———. "Qumran Calendars: Theory and Practice." Pages 179–86 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context.* Edited by Timothy Lim, with A. Graeme Auld, Larry W. Hurtado, and Alison Jack. London: T & T Clark, 2000.

———. "The Babylonian Calendar at Elephantine." *ZPE* 130 (2000): 159–71.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Lamech Narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) and *Birth of Noah* (4QEnoch^{a} 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. STDJ 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Terdiman, Richard. "Memory in Freud." Pages 93–108 in *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates.* Edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.

Tigchelaar, Eibert. "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures." Pages 1–18 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures.* Edited by Eibert Tigchelaar. BETL 270. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

Tiňo, Jozef. "The Classification of Rewritten Scripture: A Plea for Retaining the Emic Perspective." *JSJ* 49.3 (2018): 330–49.

Tisserant, E. "Fragments syriaques du Livre des Jubilés." *RB* 30 (1921): 55–86, 206–32.

Toorn, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Tov, Emanuel. "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch." *DSD* 5.3 (1998): 334–54.

Tov, Emanuel. "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere." Pages 369–93 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006.* Edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Trever, John C. "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from ʿAin Feshkha." *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10.

Ulrich, Eugene. "Crossing the Borders from 'Pre-Scripture' to Scripture (Rewritten) to 'Rewritten Scripture'." Pages 83–104 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes.* Edited by József Zsengellér. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

———. "The Notion and Definition of Canon." Pages 21–35 in *The Canon Debate.* Edited by Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.

VanderKam, C., James. "2 Maccabees 6, 7a and Calendrical Change in Jerusalem." *JSJ* 12 (1981): 52–74.

VanderKam, James C. "Authoritative Literature in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 5.3 (1998): 382–402.

———. *Calendars in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Measuring Time.* LDSS. London: Routledge, 1998.

———. *Jubilees: A Commentary.* 2 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2018.

———. "Moses Trumping Moses: Making The Book Of Jubilees." Pages 25–44 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts.* Edited by Sarianna Metso, Hindy Najman, and Eileen Schuller. STDJ 92. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

———. "Some Thoughts on the Relationship between the Book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon." Pages 371–84 in *Is There a Text in This Cave? Studies in the Textuality of the Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of George J. Brooke.* Edited by Ariel Feldman, Maria Ciotată, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

———. "Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees." Pages 522–44 in *Studies in the Chronology of the Book of Jubilees.* JSJSup 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "Textual Affinities." *JBL* 97.1 (1978): 45–55.

———. *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees.* HSM 14. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. "The Birth of Noah." Pages 213–31 in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Jósef Tadeusz Milik.* Edited by Zdzisław Jan Kapera. QM 6. Kraków: Enigma, 1992.

———, ed. *The Book of Jubilees.* 2 vols. CSCO 510-11; SA 87–88. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

———. "The Origin, Character, and Early History of the 364-Day Calendar: A Reassesment of Jaubert's Hypothesis." *CBQ* 41 (1979): 390–411.

VanderKam, James C. "The Righteousness of Noah." Pages 13–32 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms.* Edited by John J. Collins and Nickelsburg George W. E. SCS 12. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980.

Vansina, Jan. *Oral Tradition as History.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Vermes, Geza. "Bible Interpretation at Qumran." In "Yigael Yadin Memorial Volume." *ErIsr* 20 (1989): 184–91.

———. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies.* StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.

———. "The Genesis of the Concept of 'Rewritten Bible'." Pages 3–9 in *Rewritten Bible after Fifty Years: Texts, Terms, or Techniques? A Last Dialogue with Geza Vermes.* Edited by József Zsengellér. JSJSup 166. Leiden: Brill, 2014.

Verovšek, Peter J. "Collective Memory, Politics, and the Influence of the Past: The Politics of Memory as a Research Paradigm." *PGI* 4.3 (2016): 529–43.

Veyne, Paul. *Did the Greeks Believe in Their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination.* Translated by Paula Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Wacholder, Ben Zion. "Jubilees as the Super Canon: Torah-Admonition versus Torah-Commanment." Pages 195–211 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995. Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten.* Edited by John Kampen, Moshe Bernstein, and Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 23. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Wacholder, Ben Zion, and Sholom Wacholder. "Patterns of Biblical Dates and Qumran 's Calendar: The Fallacy of Jaubert's Hypothesis." *HUCA* 66 (1995): 1–40.

Weber, Max. *Economy and Society.* Edited by Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Translated by Ephraim Fischoff. 1922. Repr., Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1978.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel.* Translated by J. Southerland Black and Allan Menzies. ML 6. New York: Meridian, 1957. Translation of *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels.* Berlin: Reimer, 1883.

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.

Wiesenberg, Ernest. "The Jubilee of Jubilees." *RdQ* 3.1 (1961): 3–40.

Wills, Lawrence. *Ancient Jewish Novels: An Anthology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

———. *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1990.

———. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Winter, Jay. *Remembering War: The Great War between Memory and History in the 20th Century.* New Haven: Yale Univerisity Press, 2006.

Wright, Jacob L. *David, King of Israel, and Caleb in Biblical Memory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Wright, John W. "From Center to Periphery: 1 Chronicles 23–27 and the Interpretation of Chronicles in the Nineteenth Century." Pages 20–42 in *Priests, Prophets and Scribes: Essays on the Formation and Heritage of Second Temple Judaism in Honour of Joseph Blenkinsopp.* Edited by Eugene Ulrich, John W. Wright, Robert P. Carroll, and Philip R. Davies. JSOTSup 149. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.

Yamashiro, Jeremy K., and William Hirst. "Mnemonic Convergence in a Social Network: Collective Memory and Extended Influence." *JARMC* 3.4 (2014): 272–79.

Yerushalmi, Yosef Hayim. *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory.* SASLJS. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1982. Repr., New York: Schocken, 1989.

Zahn, Molly M. "Genre and Rewritten Scripture: A Reassessment." *JBL* 131.2 (2012): 271–88.

———. *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts.* STDJ 95. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

———. "Rewritten Scripture." Pages 323–36 in *Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Vita

My life.