

### *Chapter 3: 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 antediluvian 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

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

Genesis stories including Noah and Abram. Thus, the more descriptive title, *Genesis Apocryphon*, was given to the scroll by Avigad and Yadin for the publication of its *editio princeps* in 1956.<sup>2</sup> While the name Genesis Apocryphon remains in wide use, it is notable that the name has been criticized and a number of alternative titles have been suggested; most notably: “Book of the Patriarchs”,<sup>3</sup> “Memoirs of the Patriarchs”,<sup>4</sup> and כתב אברהם<sup>5</sup> In this chapter, I will retain the traditional title, Genesis Apocryphon.

Although much of the scroll was very badly damaged, illegible, or missing, enough survived for Avigad and Yadin to make the generalized observations that Genesis Apocryphon followed the basic order and events of Genesis from the Flood (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”<sup>6</sup>—by Lamech, Noah, and Abram,

---

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

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

4. 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 אברהם 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 dis-

respectively and show a clear affinity with the roughly contemporaneous works of 1 Enoch and Jubilees.<sup>7</sup> The literary relationship of Genesis Apocryphon to both 1 Enoch and (especially) Jubilees remains a matter of debate, with Avigad and Yadin suggesting that Genesis Apocryphon more probably preceded Jubilees, while the recent prevailing opinion seems to prefer the opposite.<sup>8</sup>

The name given to the Genesis Apocryphon in the *editio princeps* set the agenda for scholarly inquiry on the work into the modern era by connecting it to the biblical book of Genesis while simultaneously categorizing it as apocryphal. Much of the attention given to the Genesis Apocryphon, therefore, has focused on its literary genre and its relationship to the tinct (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”).

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.

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.”<sup>9</sup> The result of this framing (whether one considers it appropriate or not) has been that much of the scholarly attention paid to Genesis Apocryphon has focused on its relationship to Genesis and especially how its author(s) may have been addressing exegetical issues found within the (later) biblical work. Yet, as Fitzmyer observes, the roots of biblical midrash are now generally accepted to be found within the Hebrew Bible itself.<sup>10</sup> 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

---

9. Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*, StPB 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1961), 124.

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

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*.<sup>11</sup>

From the perspective of cultural memory, therefore, Genesis Apocryphon operates

---

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. (Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 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 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.

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 progeniture 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.

### 3.1 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.<sup>12</sup> 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 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

---

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.

discussion of its relationship to both the biblical text and other Second Temple texts such as Jubilees and 1 Enoch.

### 3.1.1 What was the Genesis Apocryphon Rewriting?

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

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.<sup>14</sup> In this section, Lamech, recounts the birth of

---

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 [4QBN<sup>a-d</sup>], 1QNoah<sup>a</sup> as well as James C. VanderKam, “The Birth of Noah,” in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik*, ed. Zdzisław Jan Kapera, QM 6 (Kraków: Enigma, 1992), 213–31. Note also Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “The Lamech Narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) and *Birth of Noah* (4QEnoch<sup>a</sup> ar): A Tradition–Historical Study,” in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008*, ed. Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, STDJ 94



Noah and Lamech's fear that his wife, Bitenosh, had conceived Noah by means of the עִירִין "Watchers." Despite Bitenosh's assurances, Lamech petitions his father, Methuselah, to ask *his* father, Enoch, for further assurance, which he ultimately gives. Although this section is fragmentary, its close resemblance to 1 Enoch 106–107 makes the scholarly reconstruction of the missing sections quite plausible. While it may be tempting to suggest that this section of Genesis Apocryphon represents a variant edition of 1 Enoch 106–107, rather than a rewriting, the fact that the version of the story preserved in Genesis Apocryphon is told in the first-person from the point of view of Lamech, while 1 Enoch 106–107 is told in the third-person, makes this suggestion highly unlikely. Moreover, because both 1 Enoch and Genesis Apocryphon were composed in Aramaic, the differences between the two tellings cannot be attributed to translational issues. In other words, although cols. 0–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.<sup>15</sup>

---

(Leiden: Brill, 2010), 253–71.

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,

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).<sup>16</sup>

Although this section accounts for the bulk of the scroll, significant portions are missing or unreadable. This “Noah Memoir” begins with a description of Noah’s righteousness<sup>17</sup>

---

*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 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:

(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 publication.<sup>18</sup> Although the flood account in Gen 6:9–9:17 is a longer and more developed story in its own right than is the account of Noah's birth (which the Lamech Memoir takes as its point of departure), characterizing 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: עִירִיָּן) and the Nephilim in cols. VI–VII evinces a clear thematic affinity

---

Scholars Press, 1980), 13–32.

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

to the Book of Watchers in 1 Enoch 6–11.<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup> In fact, it was the explicit identification of Lamech’s wife Bitenosh which first prompted Trevor’s initial identification of the (unopened) scroll with the so-called Book of Lamech.<sup>22</sup> Although an exhaustive treatment of the parallels between Jubilees and Genesis 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:<sup>23</sup>

---

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 ‘Ain Feshkha,” 8–10.

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 Ciotatǎ, and Char-

1. Several personal and geographic<sup>24</sup> 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.
  4. The “division of the earth,” while different in several specifics are strikingly similar and
- 
- lotte 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* 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).

offer, perhaps, the most compelling case for a direct, genetic relationship between the two texts.<sup>25</sup>

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.<sup>26</sup>

---

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. 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 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.<sup>27</sup> This inconsistency, perhaps more than any other feature of Genesis Apocryphon, has complicated its generic classification.

---

27. 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 seam 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.”<sup>28</sup> 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 Pharaoh's princes, how long Sarai was with Pharaoh, numerous geographical and personal names, etc. A number of these details, as with earlier sections of Genesis Apocryphon, are also found in Jubilees, though, again, the direction of dependence is not clear (if present).

---

28. 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 Bakhtos, JSJSup 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 9–34.



More noticeable are the larger expansions present in the Genesis Apocryphon such as Abram's portentous dream (col. XIX, 14–17), the *wasf* put on the lips of Pharaoh's princes about Sarai (col. XX, 2–8), Abram's prayer following Sarai's abduction (col. XX, 12–16), the details of Pharaoh's afflictions (col. XX, 16–21), Harkenosh's discussion with Lot (col. XX, 21–XX, 24), and Abram's intervention on Pharaoh's behalf (col. XX, 24–32).<sup>29</sup>

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.<sup>30</sup>

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.<sup>31</sup>

---

29. 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.

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

31. *Ibid.*, 125.

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.<sup>32</sup> Although the change from first-person to third-person is, perhaps, the most significant literary shift that occurs in the Genesis 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.<sup>33</sup> It is not clear, however, why there seems to be such a dramatic difference in narrative voice beginning at col. XXI, 23.

---

32. 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.

33. 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 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), 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

### 3.1.2 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.<sup>34</sup>

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 1 Enoch and Jubilees. Thus, characterizing the work as a whole as focused primarily on the Apocryphon a Unity? What Sort of Unity Were You Looking For?” 107–34.

34. Craig A. Evans, “The Gensis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible,” in “Mémorial Jean Carmignac” 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. 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; Bernstein, “Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” 317–43 (327 n. 33, 328–29).

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, which, I think is a methodological dead-end for thinking about Genesis Apocryphon.<sup>35</sup>

To illustrate this difficulty, I would like to focus on Moshe Bernstein's treatment of the "Genre(s)" of the Genesis Apocryphon.<sup>36</sup> 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."<sup>37</sup>

---

35. 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.

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

37. *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 George W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Pe-*

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 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).<sup>38</sup> 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<sup>39</sup> 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 is the assumed qualitative distinction between its sources that should be interrogated. After all, formally speaking, Genesis

---

*riod: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. Michael E. Stone (Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 89–156.

38. Bernstein, “Genre(s) of the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” 337.

39. 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.

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 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.<sup>40</sup> 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,<sup>41</sup> 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,<sup>42</sup> it is now widely acknowledged that no definitive evidence has yet been

---

40. SOMETHING, SOMETHING Eva Mrozeck.

41. Avigad and Yadin, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 38; Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 20–22; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 110–16; Machiela, *Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 8–19.

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

assembled to argue one way or another.<sup>43</sup> Thinking about Genesis Apocryphon in terms of cultural memory means thinking about 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. In some sense, then, it does not matter which *text* came first. What is clear is that the cultural memory that surrounded the book of Genesis—the biblical memory of Genesis—was more broad than the text of Genesis and included traditions that we know from

---

43. 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.

Jubilees and 1 Enoch whether or not they were directly informed by the *texts* of Jubilees and 1 Enoch.

### 3.2 ABRAM IN THE DIASPORA: THE LITERARY FRAMEWORKS OF GENESIS

#### APOCRYPHON

Having dealt with the Genesis Apocryphon as the product of cultural memory in terms of its relationship to its inherited biblical memory (including the traditions which were ancillary to Genesis proper), we may now turn our attention to the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon addressed its audience at the level of *social* memory. In this section I will address the way that the Genesis Apocryphon *speaks to* its audience and the ways that the Genesis Apocryphon changes and adapts its cultural memory into a meaningful piece of literature for 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. 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 in cols. XIX–XXII, 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.<sup>44</sup>

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.<sup>45</sup> 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 narrational ambiguities of Gen 12:10–20 through

---

44. 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).

45. 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,” *JSS* 49 (3 2018): 1–34.

interpretive expansion upon the latent exegetical links of the text while concurrently modifying the narrative to appeal to contemporary literary expectations.<sup>46</sup>

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 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.

### 3.2.1 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

---

46. Jurgens, “A Wandering Aramean in Pharaoh’s Court,” 27.

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.<sup>47</sup> These details, according to Jurgens, are 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.

### 3.2.2 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.<sup>48</sup> Such narratives, as observed by Collins and others, follow particular narrative progressions with

---

47. 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.

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

common features.<sup>49</sup> Jurgens has convincingly shown that the Genesis Apocryphon's retelling of Abram's sojourn in Egypt fits such a progression by comparing this pericope to Dan 2, 4, and 5 as well as Gen 41. Although based on the earlier work of Collins and Humphreys, Jurgens offers his own outline, which can be summarized as follows:<sup>50</sup>

- 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

It is easy to imagine how the author of Genesis Apocryphon would conceive of Abram's interaction with Pharaoh in Gen 12 as analogous to other well-known court contests from Israel's biblical memory. The biblical account, however, offers a rather anemic description of the events, but leaves open the specifics of how Pharaoh came to know about Abram and how the monarch was relieved from the plagues.

---

49. 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).

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

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. While the Gen 12 account is very terse, the Gen 20 account includes a dream-revelation, 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 Pharaoh and his household for healing.

However, while these similarities may indeed represent some kind of literary conflation between the two accounts,<sup>51</sup> at the level of genre and structure, conflation with Gen 20 cannot 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 Pharaoh, 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 Pharaoh and his household functions as the

---

51. 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.

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.

### **3.2.3 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.<sup>52</sup>

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.<sup>53</sup> While Noah is not described as a dreamer within the biblical text, within the Genesis Apocryphon, he seems to

---

52. 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

53. 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 Eschel, “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.

have been the recipient of as many as five dream-visions.<sup>54</sup> 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."<sup>55</sup>

Fitzmyer notes that the component parts of this dream—"cedar" (Aramaic: אֲרִי) and "date-palm" (Aramaic: תְּמָרָא)—are derived from Ps 92, which declares "the righteous will flourish like the date palm (Hebrew: כִּתְמָר); like a cedar (Hebrew: כִּפְאָרִי) 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 אֲרִי (masc.) and תְּמָרָא (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).

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 וְהָא אֲזֹר חֵד וְתִמְרָא כְּחֵדָּא חֲמֵחוּ מִן שְׂרֵשׁ חֵד "a

---

54. 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.).

55. Ibid., 55.



cedar and a date-palm *growing from a single root*” (so DJD), or *והא אזור 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 Pharaoh, 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.<sup>56</sup> The second digression focuses on the ability of date-palms to produce fruit (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:

---

56. Although the Psalm uses the typical term for “righteousness” (Hebrew: צִדִּיק), 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.

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.<sup>57</sup> 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

---

57.

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.

### 3.2.4 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.

### 3.3 GENESIS APOCRYPHON AS PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA

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.<sup>58</sup>

#### 3.3.1 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

---

58. 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.

inserts phrases like “this is why...” or “...until this day”), for all intents and purposes, the author 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.”<sup>59</sup> 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.”<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> Individuals within the community—teachers and religious leaders and even

---

59. 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.

60. Ibid., 33.

61. Ibid., 33.

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:

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.<sup>62</sup>

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.

### 3.3.2 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

---

62. Blum, “Historiography or Poetry?” 33.

terms.<sup>63</sup> In the simplest terms, pseudepigrapha are texts which are fictively purported to be 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.<sup>64</sup> Thus, the term has

---

63. The topic of pseudepigraphy has received a large amount of very sophisticated attention in recent years. See especially Eva Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016); Eibert Tigchelaar, “Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*, ed. Eibert Tigchelaar, BETL 270 (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 DiTommaso 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* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

64. See esp. Eusebius’s *Hist. eccl.* 6.12.2 where the Bishop of Antioch, Serapion, refers to the

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.<sup>65</sup> 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 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 *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.”

65. Mroczek, *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*, 53–58; See also Reed, “The Modern Invention of ‘Old Testament Pseudepigrapha,’” 403–36.



includes many which do not meet the formal definition of pseudepigrapha.<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup> 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. 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 been written by David. Rather, the Psalm was simply *attributed* to

---

66. 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)

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

David, along with many others, in part due to the tradition of David being a musician.<sup>68</sup> 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 *הדברים אשר דבר משה אל-כל-ישראל* “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 certainty and the matter is further complicated by the editorial processes that the book likely underwent through the centuries.<sup>69</sup> What we *can* say is that there are concrete literary cues within Deuteronomy which make the attribution to Moses easier.

---

68. 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

69. Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, MA:

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.

### 3.3.3 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.<sup>70</sup> This explicitness changes the way that the reader understands how the text

---

Harvard University Press, 2007), 143–72.

70. 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.

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 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.<sup>71</sup>

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.<sup>72</sup> My point here is not to

---

71. 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.

72. For example, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church includes 1 Enoch among its scriptures. 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 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.

### 3.4 CONCLUSIONS

Although the preceding discussion has dealt with the idea of memory at three distinct levels of discourse and engaged with several discrete modes of analysis, my ultimate goal is to bring those discrete parts into conversation to advance a more comprehensive portrait of Genesis bit, too may, under certain rubrics, be considered pseudepigrapha, which is included within the Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox deuterocanon. Insofar as deuterio- 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.

Apocryphon through the lens of memory studies.

First, in discussing the way Genesis Apocryphon “looks backward” toward its sources and toward what I have called “biblical memory,” I argued that Genesis Apocryphon drew from much more than just the biblical text. Although the relative chronology of 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Genesis Apocryphon is not secure, 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 Pharaoh 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, by participating in pseudepigraphy, the author of the Genesis Apocryphon reentered the discursive space 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 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).

These three levels of discourse map onto the basic premise of memory studies that memory is 1) inherited, 2) reshaped by extant social frameworks, and 3) constructive. As a product of memory, the Genesis Apocryphon fits this 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 is able to engage with, draw from, and adapt the received traditions about Genesis and account for the reception of the resulting text and how it could further shape the memory of the society that produced it.

## 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.
- Avigad, Nahman, and Yigael Yadin. *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea*. 1956.
- Barthélemy, Dominique, and Józef T. Milik, eds. *Qumran Cave 1. DJD I*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
- Bernstein, Moshe 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.
- 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.
- 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.



- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1983.
- Collins, John J. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1993.
- . “The Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic.” *JBL* 94 218–34.
- Crawford, Sidnie White. *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 Winnige, and Martin Ehrensverd. 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 Genesis Apocryphon and the Rewritten Bible.” In “Mémorial Jean Carmignac” 13 (1988): 153–65.
- 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.
- Gaster, T. H. *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*. 3rd ed. Garden City, NY: Anchor, 1976.
- Gevirtz, Marianne Luijken. “Abram’s Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon: Its Motifs and Their Function.” *MAARAV* 8 (1992): 229–43.
- 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.
- Humphreys, W. L. “A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel.” *JBL* 92 (1973): 211–23.
- 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.
- Kugel, James L. *A Walk Through Jubilees: Studies in the Book of Jubilees and the World of Its Creation* 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.
- 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.
- . “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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Mroczek, Eva. *The Literary Imagination in Jewish Antiquity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- 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.
- . *Seconding Sinai : The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

- 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).
- Perrin, Andrew B. *The Dynamics of Dream-Vision Revelation in the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*. JAJSup 19. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- 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.
- . "The Modern Invention of 'Old Testament Pseudepigrapha'." *JTS* 60 (2009): 403–36.
- 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.
- Segal, Michael. "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.
- 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." *JSTJ* 2 (1995): 66–71.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Lamech Narrative in the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen) and *Birth of Noah* (4QEnoch<sup>a</sup> ar): A Tradition–Historical Study." Pages 253–71 in *Aramaica Qumranica: Proceedings of the Conference on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran in Aix-En-Provence 30 June – 2 July 2008*. Edited by Katell Berthelot and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra. STDJ 94. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Tigheelaar, Eibert. "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures." Pages 1–18 in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the Scriptures*. Edited by Eibert Tigheelaar. BETL 270. 2014.
- Toorn, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2007.

- Treuer, John C. "Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll from 'Ain Feshkha." *BASOR* 115, 1949, 8–10.
- VanderKam, James C. "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 Ciotatǎ, and Charlotte Hempel. STDJ 119. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- . "The Birth of Noah." Pages 213–31 in *Intertestamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik*. Edited by Zdzisław Jan Kapera. QM 6. Kraków: Enigma, 1992.
- . "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.
- Vermes, Geza. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. StPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Werman, Cana. "Qumran and the Book of Noah." Pages 171–82 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by Estelle Glickler Chazon, Michael Edward Stone, Avital Pinnick, et al. STDJ 31. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- 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.