

RBL 09/2014

George J. Brooke, Daniel K. Falk, Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, and Molly M. Zahn, eds.

The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions: Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 103

Leiden: Brill, 2012. Pp. viii + 275. Hardcover. \$156.00.
ISBN 9789004231047.

Andrea Ravasco
Facoltà Teologica dell'Italia Settentrionale
Milan, Italy

As the subtitle indicates, the book collects (twelve of the fifty-six) papers presented at the IOQS meeting held in Helsinki in August 2010. The topic of the meeting was to discuss “any aspect of the transmission, use, or interpretation of biblical traditions in the Scrolls from the Judean Desert” (E. Tigchelaar, vii), investigating canon and textual criticism, texts, topics and traditions.

George J. Brooke, in the opening lecture and paper, “Scripture and Scriptural Tradition in Transmission: Light from the Dead Sea Scrolls,” deals with some of the key issues around the theme of the meeting and of the volume itself. First he surveys the theories on the relationship between the Scrolls and the biblical text—the theory of W. F. Albright and F. M. Cross, that of S. Talmon, and those of E. Tov and E. Ulrich—and the schools that consequently emerged on the basis of the varying evidence. Second, Brooke deals with the transmission of scriptural texts, taking into account the manuscripts as artifacts, the nature of textual criticism, and the wider significance of the versions. Third, about the move from authority to canon, he suggests that “the rewriting processes provide a window into how textual authority was constructed, construed and conveyed” (11). Fourth, he presents six brief points about interpretation. In conclusion, Brooke notes that

biblical scholars need to take the material from the caves more into account, in particular the evidence of the transmission of scriptural traditions in the late Second Temple period.

In “Josephus’ Twenty-Two Book Canon and the Qumran Scrolls,” Jonathan G. Campbell discusses the Jewish canon’s formation in light of the evidence from Josephus. The leitmotiv of the article is a long and profound discussion of Steve Mason’s challenge, according to which *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 witnesses to a twenty-book canon. This critique as well as an alternative possible reading of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 as more rhetorical than factual suggest that Mason underestimates “the significance of the different ways in which the various elements of Scripture’s portrayal in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 relate to what is found in other sources” (45). Thus *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 seems to witness “two anomalous claims” under the influence of Alexandrian scholarship. All in all, according to Campbell, “*Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 should not be allowed single-handedly to outweigh the critical mass of evidence for Scripture rather than canon among Jews” (45).

Corrado Martone, in “All the Bibles We Need: The Impact of the Qumran Evidence on Biblical Lower Criticism,” investigates “how the Dead Sea manuscripts call our attention to a reappraisal of philology as an inescapable means of determining the text of the Bible” (49). When MT and Qumran evidence present different readings, modern versions of the Bible give translations with different textual bases. Through the analysis of examples, and after some observations on the “Codex Optimus” and the concept of a “biblical” manuscript, Martone concludes that “each translation of the Bible should be able to mention which text has *really* been translated” (63–64).

In “The Hodayot’s Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 4: Pss 90–106),” John Elwolde presents the fourth in a series of studies dedicated to the subject. He analyzes sixteen cases listed by J. Carmignac and P. Wernberg-Møller that shed light on the textual development of the Psalter. Summarizing, Elwolde finds a “relatively small number of sequences that can in any case convincingly be argued to reflect the biblical text in a verbatim way” (84). Thus, the author(s) of the Hodayot tended to *recast* biblical language, because the author(s) “did not so much ‘know’ the Bible as ‘live’ it” (85), feeling themselves “somehow *within* scripture.” According to Elwolde, the Qumran community studied the Bible more for its content than for its wording, which explains the absence of verbatim reproduction of biblical texts in the Hodayot.

Hans Debel, in “Editions, Reworkings and the Continuity of Tradition: Some Experimental Considerations on the *Genesis Apocryphon*,” deals with the concept of a “rewritten” Bible intended as “variant literary edition” of a scriptural book, in this case Genesis. After an analysis of the textual strategies and the added layers in 1QapGen, Debel concludes that the composition is coherent with the designation of “variant literary

editions” of scriptural texts contemporizing the tradition and making it relevant for its audience. He argues that 1QapGen favors dissolving the distinction between “variant literary edition” and “rewritten Bible/Scripture” for the period prior to the fixation of the text.

The article of Michael J. Lesley, “Exegetical *Wiles*: 4Q184 as Scriptural Interpretation,” deals with the scriptural parallels of the character of the dark female described in 4Q184, demonstrating that the scroll is a work of scriptural interpretation. The most obvious parallel is Prov 1–9, but the author of 4Q184 “must simply have taken the scriptural text and reused it to fit his own ideological purposes” (108). Lesley finds another parallel in Isa 59. After a thorough analysis of the scroll and its parallels (body and speech, clothing and dwelling), according to Lesley Isa 59 is the scriptural key to the transformation of the characters from Proverbs. Furthermore, he considers the eschatological implications and suggests that “this character is to be understood as a Lilith” (131) named in Isa 34:14. According to Lesley, 4Q184 is about the existence of sin in the world, not about a female character; furthermore, the nature of the sin is “in a form that accorded with eschatological thought in the scroll” (133). The paper ends with an appendix in which Lesley reexamines a little fragment (frg. 3) published in DJD 5. The final “very speculative and imaginative” interpretation, according to which 4Q184 3 might have described membership in the community and its ability to protect from evil (142), must be taken with caution because of the fragmentary state of the scroll.

Mika S. Pajunen’s “The Prayer of Manasseh in 4Q381 and the Account of Manasseh in 2 Chronicles 33” studies the connections between 4Q381 and 2 Chr 33. After an overview of the origin of the tradition of the Prayer, Pajunen carefully analyzes the text of the scroll and its connections with the biblical account. According to him, the use of the verb *knʿ* in line 2, the rare *hithpael* form of *yʿš* in line 5, and the employment of source texts in general suggest that “the 4Q381 prayer is using the Chronicles as a source, and there do not appear to be any strong arguments for seeing the influence going the other way” (157). In conclusion, he proposes the relative chronology as 2 Kgs—2 Chr—4Q381, although the author of the scroll does not use the specific vocabulary of Chronicles/Kings but “creates a unique idea of Manasseh teaching people about his sins and repentance, thus emphasizing Manasseh’s exemplary role as a repentant sinner forgiven by God” (161). Pajunen could have mentioned an important article of É. Nodet in *Revue Biblique* (117 [2010]: 345–60), according to which Flavius Josephus did know the Prayer of Manasseh. Neither does he mention the Syriac version of the prayer, preferred by J. H. Charlesworth in *OTP*.

In “4Q470 in Light of the Tradition of the Renewal of the Covenant between God and Israel,” Bilhah Nitzan examines the possibility that 4Q470, which seems nonsectarian and

mentions Zedekiah in an eschatological context of making a covenant, integrates into the historical and literary development of the tradition of the covenantal relationship between God and Israel. I point out Nitzan's remark on the change during Second Temple period toward the renewal of the covenant, that is, the aspiration for the eschatological renewal of the covenant witnessed by 4Q504 as well. The text of 4Q470 "seems to encourage the people of Israel ... that the eschatological day when God will make a new covenant with them is on its way to being realized by the angel Michael with the eschatological King Zedekiah" (175). Nitzan concludes that the eschatological covenant of 4Q470 "will ensure Jeremiah's prophecy." As for the angel Michael in note 20, the bibliography can be enriched with the recent work of A. R. Michalak, *Angels as Warriors in Late Second Temple Jewish Literature* (2012), in particular pages 99–124.

Hannah Harrington's "How Does Intermarriage Defile the Sanctuary?" examines the sexual defilement and the defilement of the sanctuary in the Aramaic Levi Document, Jubilees, MMT, the Damascus Document, and other Cave 4 texts such as 4QOrdinances^b, Halakha A (4Q251), 4QInstructions^d, 4Q435, 4Q174. The flexibility on sexuality shown in preexilic texts for the *ger* disappears in the Second Temple period. In Qumran texts intermarriage defiles the sanctuary. In particular, the Aramaic Levi Document makes a connection between the concept of sanctuary and the physical body of the Jews, Jubilees shows concern for both the defilement of the temple and the defilement of the people, and MMT protests against marriage with ineligible persons. After a careful analysis of other texts, such as the Damascus Document and other texts mentioned above, Harrington points out that "intermarriage is in direct conflict with holiness, be it at the temple or in the bodies of Israel. In priestly and conservative applications of the law, following late biblical authors (Ezra-Nehemiah and Malachi), a forbidden sexual partner can destroy one's holiness altogether" (193). Furthermore, the notion of human sanctuary also developed, emphasizing that the bodies of all Israel were physical sancta. About the Day of Atonement the bibliography can be enriched with the monograph edited by T. Hieke and T. Nicklas, *The Day of Atonement: Its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions* (2012).

Gudrun Holtz, in "Temple and Purification Rituals: From Torah to the Dead Sea Scrolls," compares some scrolls regarding purification rites for scale disease, genital discharge, and corpse defilement (in particular the Temple Scroll, MMT, and CD) that homogenize the diverging rites required by the Torah. Holtz presents the evidence "of a two-partite purification ritual in the DSS, one for the temple city ... and another for the cities" (197). Holtz points out aspects such as the aerial defilement of the temple, the defilement of buildings and temple caused by intermarriage and alienage, and the transmission of impurity to the temple from afar.

Albert L.A. Hogeterp's "Relations to Gentiles in the *Damascus Document* and Biblical Tradition" deals with the question of how CD connects to the biblical tradition about gentiles and whether it develops in new directions. Hogeterp focuses on several passages of CD, concluding that it "echoes, paraphrases, cites, and elaborates on biblical tradition" (229), appearing more stringent and responding to broader social settings, thus picking up features of biblical tradition that in several sections are also concerned with broader social settings in order to uphold a position of moral integrity in the surrounding world.

John Kampen's "'Torah' and Authority in the Major Sectarian Rules Texts from Qumran" investigates the nature of authority for the community in which the sectarian texts were utilized. Using as a starting point the works of C. Newsom, M. Grossman, H. Najman, and other scholars, Kampen considers the use of the figure and the authority of Moses and the term *Torat Moshe* or the language of Deuteronomy. These aspects are key indicators of authority for texts such as Jubilees, the Temple Scroll, CD, and 1QS. The figure of Moses is of particular significance, because the Sinai event is then foundational rather than ideal, orienting the lifestyle and the legislation of the sect "to that period between the transgression of Israel and God's future redemption" (254).

The volume is a profound contribution to Qumran literature related to biblical tradition and may be used with profit by scholars of the Bible and Second Temple Judaism.