

Reinhard G. Kratz

Biblical Interpretation and Redaction History

Abstract: The following article categorizes and describes certain phenomena of “editing” and paves the way from empirical data toward hypothetically reconstructing the literary- and redaction-history of biblical compositions. Following some general remarks on coherence and incoherence in “emic” and “etic” perspectives, the article deals with the genre of ancient commentaries from Qumran (*pesharim*) and their techniques of interpretation, citation and rewriting, transmission and translation, and finally redaction of biblical texts. Largely the same hermeneutics underlie the different kinds of formation, transmission, and re-use of biblical and parabiblical texts.

Keywords: Biblical interpretation, *pesharim*, rewritten bible, redaction history, biblical hermeneutics

The following article is the revised version and English translation of a German paper presented together with a paper by Michael Fishbane on biblical interpretation at the 2001 symposium in Heidelberg celebrating the hundredth birthday of Gerhard von Rad.¹ In view of the recent debate on empirical evidence for literary and redaction criticism² it might be

- 1 Originally published in M. Oeming *et al.* (ed.), *Das Alte Testament und die Kultur der Moderne: Beiträge des Symposiums “Das Alte Testament und die Kultur der Moderne” anlässlich des 100. Geburtstags Gerhard von Rads (1901–1971), Heidelberg 18.–21. Oktober 2001* (Altes Testament und Moderne 8; Münster: LIT Verlag, 2004), 37–69; repr. in R. G. Kratz in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels: Kleine Schriften I* (2nd. ed.; FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 126–156.
- 2 D. M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005); idem, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); K. van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007); J. Pakkala, *God’s Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible* (FRLANT 251; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013); R. Müller, J. Pakkala, and B. ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible* (Resources for Biblical Study 75; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014); R. Müller and J. Pakkala (ed.), *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* (Leuven: Peeters, 2017). See also the discussion in Part 1 of J. C. Gertz *et al.*

welcomed that this translation gives access to an earlier contribution that tried to categorize and describe certain phenomena of “editing” and pave the way from the empirical data to the hypothetical reconstruction of the literary and redaction history of biblical compositions. The volume on “Coherence and Incoherence” is an excellent setting to re-publish this article, in which the various modes of “editing,” i. e. of textual and literary history, are interpreted as processes of biblical interpretation.

1. Coherence and Incoherence in “Emic” and “Etic” Perspectives

What constitutes “coherence” and “incoherence” is a matter of standpoint and definition. What is coherent to one (writer or reader) is incoherent to the other. In scholarship, many discussions on the explanation of biblical and para-biblical texts could be avoided, or at least be more factual, if we were aware that the question of coherence and incoherence is a matter of definition, and if we differentiate and declare clearly whether or not we are speaking from the understanding of ancient scribes or readers, or from our own expectations and criteria.

The ideas of ancient scribes and readers on coherence and incoherence were certainly not the same as ours. Therefore, we should not simply express our ideas as being those of ancient scribes and readers, whether that involves asserting the unity of a highly complex text or dividing a text into several literary strata. On the other hand, our ideas of coherence and incoherence can be a heuristic aid in recognizing and understanding the ideas of the ancient scribes and readers, even if they did not share our ideas.

In short, I would like to plead the case of not treating the question of coherence and incoherence according to absolute criteria, but in an interplay of “emic” perspective (the ancient scribe and reader) and “etic” perspective (the modern exegete), where it is clear that the “emic” perspective of the ancient scribe and reader can only be a hypothetical assumption or a construct of the modern exegete. But it is the task of the modern exegete to reconstruct the thinking of the ancient scribes and readers on the basis of available sources and the understanding of his or her own time.

(ed.), *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America* (FAT III; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 9–195; and in the same volume, see M. Zahn’s essay “Scribal Revision and the Composition of the Pentateuch: Methodological Issues” (pages 491–500) and R. G. Kratz, “Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory,” (pages 501–524).

A suitable starting point to reconstruct the thinking of ancient scribes and readers seems to me to be a phenomenon we have known for a long time from parallels in the Hebrew Bible and from different text versions, and to which the Dead Sea Scrolls have provided abundant new material. It is the phenomenon of biblical interpretation, also known as inner-biblical exegesis, which encounters intertextual relationships and variants of the same material or writing in different recensions (or rewritings) of the text.³ Since the seminal work of Michael Fishbane an almost unmanageable wealth of literature on the phenomenon of biblical interpretation and the rewritten bible (or rewritten scripture) has been published.⁴ However, receiving little attention in the discussion is the meaning that the relevant material has for how the ancient scribes and readers understood themselves, i. e. the “emic” perspective, and also for the scholarly explanation of how biblical and para-biblical texts evolved, i. e. the “etic” perspective.⁵

In this respect, two points seem to be decisive. On the one hand, the material reveals a special kind of tradition culture, which not only shows many similarities to the common conventions of ancient Near Eastern scribal culture, but also significant differences. The main difference appears to me to be the high degree of self-referentiality in the biblical and para-biblical literature, which cannot be substantiated anywhere else. Whether we are always dealing with direct literary dependencies in the many linguistic and conceptual points of contact, allusions, and references within biblical and para-biblical literature, is frequently a matter of controversy in scholarship, but it cannot be completely ignored. In particular, the para-biblical (explicit and implicit) citations and rewritings clearly bear witness to it, which is also significant in retrospect for biblical writings themselves.

-
- 3 The problematic nature of the terms “Bible, biblical,” “scripture, scriptural,” “canon, canonical,” etc. is well known. In the absence of a convincing alternative, however, I will adhere to these terms and use them purely pragmatically to designate those writings which later entered into the canon of the Hebrew Bible as well as the para-biblical writings inspired by them. See R. G. Kratz, *Historisches und biblisches Israel: Drei Überblicke zum Alten Testament* (2nd. ed.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), XXIX–XXXVII.
- 4 See M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985). For the discussion, see K. Schmid, “Innerbiblische Schriftauslegung: Aspekte der Forschungsgeschichte,” in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift* (ed. R. G. Kratz et al.; BZAW 300; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 1–22; further literature in R. G. Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel: The History, Tradition, and Archives of Israel and Judah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 155 n. 37.
- 5 See, e. g., Reinhard G. Kratz, “Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory,” in *The Formation of the Pentateuch* (ed. J. C. Gertz et al.; FAT III; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 501–524. See also R. G. Kratz, “Das Alte Testament und die Texte vom Toten Meer,” *ZAW* 125 (2013): 198–213; R. G. Kratz and M. Popovic (ed.), “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Bible,” *DSD* 20 (2013): 347–507.

On the other hand, the material, especially the different versions of a text and the Dead Sea Scrolls, gives an insight into the special production methods and processes of textual and literary growth in biblical and para-biblical literature. By comparing different versions of a text or an entire scripture from our historically critical perspective (i.e. "etic"), we can observe coherences as well as incoherencies, due to the self-referentiality of tradition and given the phenomenon of biblical interpretation. At the same time, perceptions of what is coherent or incoherent vary naturally with individual exegetes. In turn, parallel versions and para-biblical rewritings provide abundant material here, which gives an intuition of what is to be expected in biblical writings. Another question is to what extent did the ancient scribes and readers themselves perceive a difference between coherence and incoherence.

From an "etic" perspective, coherences and incoherences thus show a dynamic process or discourse of interpretation in the interplay of *traditum* and *traditio*, which took place in the growth of a text in biblical and para-biblical writings. In the language of exegetical methodology, this process is called "textual and literary history" or, in a broader meaning of the term, "redaction history."⁶ This means that biblical interpretation and redaction history (in the broader sense) are the same. In both cases, we are dealing with relations: the relation of text and interpretation, *Vorlage* and recension, writing and rewriting, or, in methodological terms, tradition and redaction in the process of text formation and transmission. Biblical and para-biblical writings are themselves tradition, in a double sense of the word, in that a tradition (*traditum*) is being transmitted, and the transmission (*traditio*) has become tradition. Both took place first within the biblical and para-biblical writings themselves in the process of their formation and composition and then, after conclusion of the Hebrew canon, in the interplay between scripture and tradition.⁷

6 For my understanding of "redaction history," see R.G. Kratz, "Redaktionsgeschichte/Redaktionskritik I. Altes Testament," *TRE* 28 (1997): 367–378. In the following, I presuppose this broader meaning of the term, which covers the activities of scribes in general including writing (authorship), copying, and editing.

7 See M. Fishbane, "The Hebrew Bible and Exegetical Tradition," in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (ed. J.C. de Moor; OTS 40; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 15–30, 18: "That conviction has only increased over the years, and I would now stress that the Bible is only tradition, in form and content, and that a proper analysis of its materials must take note of its composite character. ... As we now have them, we have tradition producing tradition through the mediation of a silent redaction. This silent hand of culture-formation and its anthological product is of the essence of biblical and postbiblical tradition." For the prophetic literature, see O.H. Steck, *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis: Wege der Nachfrage und Fährten zur Antwort* (Tübingen:

In the following, I would like to give an overview of the different types of biblical interpretation, paying particular attention to two aspects: firstly, to the techniques and forms of interpretation, which are also indicators of text genesis and growth, i. e., the literary and the redaction history of the biblical and para-biblical writings; secondly, to the underlying hermeneutics, which provide information on what the ancient scribes and readers might have regarded as coherence or incoherence. In this overview, I will be moving from the certain to the less certain as I take as a starting point the external or empirical evidence of manuscripts, progressing towards cases which can be ascertained by critical analysis only on the basis of an analogy to external evidence, with the aid of internal criteria.⁸

The extensive material involves examples from the Jewish and Christian interpretative traditions.⁹ It will not be discussed *in toto*, but consulted specifically according to how it deals with the relationship of biblical interpretation and redaction history. The most productive source proves to be the Dead Sea Scrolls. They do not presuppose the finished canon of the Hebrew Bible, but the completion of the writings, which entered into the later canon. The distinction between internal and external biblical interpretation, or more precisely between internal and external evidence, therefore, does not refer to the written corpus of the bible as a whole, but primarily to the internal and external interpretation of individual books.

In Fishbane's classic study *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, the manifold phenomena of internal exegesis are classified partly by external and partly by internal criteria. The first part is "Scribal Comments and Corrections," which deals with the entries that ensure an understanding of the text as part of the textual tradition; the following parts go through examples in the statutory ("Legal Exegesis"), narrative ("Aggadic Exegesis"), and most broadly the prophetic literature ("Mantological Exegesis"). I will keep to external criteria, texts and types of textual transmission, and only

Mohr Siebeck, 1996); idem, *Gott in der Zeit entdecken: Die Prophetenbücher des Alten Testaments als Vorbild für Theologie und Kirche* (BThSt 42; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001); R. G. Kratz, *The Prophets of Israel* (CSHB 2; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 2015).

- 8 For this approach, see also Carr, *Formation*, who, however, is a bit anxious to apply the insights from external evidence to the critical analysis of the biblical text.
- 9 See Martin J. Mulder, ed., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRI II,1; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); D. I. Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992); M. Hengel and H. Löhr (ed.), *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum* (WUNT 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994); M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, vol. 1/1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996).

consider those phenomena that are also empirically evidenced. I will deal in turn with the following: commentary; citation and rewriting; transmission and translation; and finally, redaction.

2. The Commentary

In addition to homilies, commentaries on the biblical books even today remain the most common form of scriptural interpretation, and show the hermeneutical principles most clearly. As far as we can see, the genre was first developed systematically in Qumran, although not devised there. Commentary has ancient Near Eastern models, perhaps alongside the model of Hellenistic commentary.¹⁰ In the context of the diverse exegetical literature of Qumran, commentaries on the prophetic books (including the Psalms), known as *pesharim*, occupied a prominent position.¹¹ Practised sporadically in other works, the prevailing principle here is an annotated interpretation of scriptural quotations using specific formulas of citation and interpretation. Characteristic is the strict separation of text (*lemma*) and interpretation using the formula *pšrw*, “its interpretation [is],” or similar, which was borrowed from Mesopotamian divination.¹² The formula gives the genre its name. Differences in the use of formulas and texts permit an element of classification and relative dating, while historical allusions and palaeography

10 See RA 6 (1983): 188–191; R. G. Kratz, “Text and Commentary: the *Pesharim* of Qumran in the Context of Hellenistic Scholarship,” in: *The Bible and Hellenism. Greek Influence on Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (ed. T. L. Thompson and P. Wajdenbaum; Durham: Acumen Publishing, 2014), 212–229; see also the discussion in DSD 19 (2012): 249–484.

11 See M. Fishbane, “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. Mulder; CRI II,1; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 339–377; J. Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature,” in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 1:108–129; furthermore M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQ,MS 8; Washington DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979); G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOT.S 29; Sheffield 1985); H. Feltes, *Die Gattung des Habakukkommentars von Qumran (1QpHab): Eine Studie zum frühen jüdischen Midrasch* (fzb 58; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1986); A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 („Florilegium“) und 4Q177 („Catena A“) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 170–192.

12 See AHw, 842f s. v. *pašāru(m)* and cf. *ptr* in Gen 40–41, *pšr* in Daniel 2–7.

allow the absolute dating of the *pesharim* which, insofar as they have been preserved, were all produced in the 1st century B.C.E.¹³

The object of scriptural interpretation in the *pesharim* is selected quotations from individual prophetic books, which are often combined with other writings and interpreted. Over time, the *pesharim* become devoted to whole books, which are commented verse by verse. To what extent the whole book or only details of an individual passage were considered is difficult to judge due to the poor state of preservation. A certain tendency towards atomising the text cannot be denied, but the tendency to *lectio continua* indicates that the interpreters were not indifferent to the meaning of a larger text corpus.

The exegetical techniques are diverse and not dissimilar to later rabbinical exegesis, but are already found much earlier in the ancient Near East and the Hebrew Bible.¹⁴ The complexity of the combinations that lead from text to interpretation either directly or indirectly, stretches our imaginative power to the limit. The reason why this effort was necessary lies in the fundamental hermeneutical problem, which confronts anyone who applies a transmitted text to their own present day. Where prophecies are concerned, the question is to whom do they refer and when they will be fulfilled. This became an increasingly urgent question for the Qumran community, because it was conscious of living close to the end times proclaimed by these prophets.

Calculations of the end are also based on prophetic prophecies. Thus, the 390 years of anger from Ezek 4:5 were interpreted as being the time from the destruction of the temple in 587 to the beginnings of the community and the appearance of the master, the "Teacher of Righteousness," after another 20 years (CD I 5–11). In scholarship, these and other numbers such as the 40 years in CD XX 13–15 (see also XIX 33–XX 1) were combined, and attempts were made to correlate them with the hypothetically reconstructed history, i. e., the foundation of the Qumran community, the appearance of the "Teacher of Righteousness" and his death.¹⁵ These historical combinations are rather doubtful. What the numbers say in detail frequently remains a riddle to us, but they show that the community of Qumran not only had the anxious question of whether and when the expected end would finally come,

13 Steudel, *Midrasch*, 188f, 197f.

14 See M. Fishbane, "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: Jerusalem Academic Press, 1977) 1:97–114.

15 See Steudel, *Midrasch*, 203–207; on the historical reconstruction, see A.S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988) IV. Ursprung und Geschichte der Qumrangemeinde," *ThR* 57 (1992): 225–253.

but also faced the exegetical problem that the course of events did not always correspond to the calculations and expectations derived from the scriptures.

The problem and the hermeneutical approach to solving this problem are stated specifically in Peshar Habakkuk, 1QpHab, the most frequently discussed specimen of this genre.¹⁶ In the interpretation of Hab 2:1–3, at the transition from Col. VI to Col. VII, the relationship between text and interpretation is considered first. Both the text and interpretation refer to the final generation (VII 2), the end (VII 7, 12). This is the time when the Qumran community lives as the final generation of the end time, guided by the “Teacher of Righteousness” and surrounded by hostile groups in their own people, in the people and land of God, to which the words of the prophets refer (I 16–II 9). But the prophetic text contains a mystery which God has not made known to Habakkuk and which requires interpretation: the “completion of time” (VII 2). Not that the text did not contain this knowledge. Indeed, it is only through the text that scribal interpretation brings this knowledge to light. But in order to extract knowledge from the wording of the text according to all the rules of interpretation, additional revelation is necessary. This was given to the “Teacher of Righteousness,” to whom God had revealed the secrets of the words of his servants, the prophets (VII 4f; in I 8f to the “priest”; in Sir 39:1–3, 6 to the learned sage).

What is the meaning of this revelation of God’s mysteries? It is not simply identical to the interpretation of the prophetic words in the *pesharim*. The “Teacher of Righteousness” is not the author of the *pesharim*, and so there is no contradiction between the special revelation and the methods of text interpretation. We are in fact dealing with a hermeneutical principle, which reveals the deeper meaning of prophetic sayings and enables interpreters to elicit this hidden knowledge, the “completion of time,” through their interpretative methods. The hermeneutical principle is simple, but successful: the end of time stretches out far beyond what the prophets have said (1QpHab VII 7f). This means that all calculations subject to the regulation of divine times (1QpHab VII 12–14) have to be repeatedly recalculated and temporally stretched, and that all the words of the prophets have to be re-written time and again to suit contemporary events and persons. And this is exactly what happens in the *pesharim*.

Thus, we see an inspired and also scribal culture of interpretation in the *pesharim* of Qumran. The interpretation regards the text of prophetic books as authoritative. Hence, the interpreter confronts this text with the experi-

¹⁶ See Steck, *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis*, 133–135; for the discussion, see Adam S. van der Woude, “Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988) III. Studien zu früher veröffentlichten Handschriften,” *ThR* 57 (1992): 1–57, 23–30.

ences of his own time and extracts newly formulated answers for questions of the present. Quoting accurately and fully, the interpretation retains the wording of the transmitted text, apart from a few variations which in some cases are very meaningful and adapted to suit the interpretation. On the basis of this authoritative text, whose essence has been transmitted unchanged and according those divine hermeneutics mediated by the “Teacher of Righteousness,” the interpretation at the same time goes beyond the text in that it updates time and addressees. Thus, unconditional textual fidelity and the greatest freedom with respect to the text’s literal sense go hand in hand. For as the *peshet* puts it, the texts of the prophets inspired by God are inexhaustible and his mysteries are astounding (1QpHab VII 8).

The *peshet* was not canonised. It already presupposes a more or less fixed stock of writings and, even though the interpretation is inspired and explicates the prophetic words’ deeper meaning, it does not itself count as scripture. The genre is defined by a strict distinction between the transmitted text as *lemma* and its interpretation, while at the same time this distinction is reinforced by the genre, which in this way is contributing to the canonisation of the prophetic books. Nevertheless, *peshet* interpretation can be found also in the biblical writings themselves.

The name and the method of *peshet* interpretation are encountered in the interpretation of dreams and riddles in Genesis 40–41 and Daniel 2; 4–5; and 7. However, as the forerunner of the technique of interpretation and with precedent in the ancient Near East, this method is not a real parallel to the *pesharim* of Qumran. The interpretation known as *peshet* (*ptr*, *pšr*) does not deal with written documents but with dreams or other divine signs. One of the striking differences to the ancient Near Eastern divination and omen science is the fact that, in the Qumran *pesharim*, the specialists for dream and omen interpretation – i.e. the prophets, including dream interpreter and visionary Daniel¹⁷ – are not the interpreters, but are themselves the subject of the interpretation. Only Daniel 7 marks a transition; unlike Dan 2:19–23, Daniel himself does not understand the night vision sent by God, but receives an explanation from a third party, God himself in the form of the *angelus interpres*.

However, in another chapter of the book of Daniel, namely Dan 9, we are much closer to the hermeneutic principles of *peshet* interpretation.¹⁸

17 In Qumran, he was regarded as being one of the prophets. See 4Q174 (4QFlor) II 3; 11Q13 (11QMelch) II 18.

18 See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 482–489; Steck, *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis*, 131–133; R. G. Kratz, *Translatio imperii: Untersuchungen zu den aramäischen Danielerzählungen und ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Umfeld* (WMANT

Although the word “peshar” is not used here, the nature of scripture use and interpretation are the same.

The “scriptural” starting point is the 70-year prophecy of Jeremiah (Jer 25:11f; 29:10), which Daniel is thinking about (Dan 9:2). It is the only case in the Hebrew Bible, where, as in the *pesharim*, a particular passage is quoted and explicitly exposed as being an exegetical problem. Daniel turns to God in prayer (9:3, 4–19), to confess the sins of his people, and thereupon receives clarification on the meaning of the previously mentioned passage: the announcement of the interpretation is 9:20, 21–23, the interpretation itself is 9:24–27.

The problem is also laid out in a similar manner as in the *pesharim*. It is the number of the seventy years “for Babel” which is taken to be the deadline for the coming of the end. The problem of this number is that – according to the (fictional) chronological framework of the book of Daniel, the time between the Babylonian kings and the Persian king Cyrus (1:21; 6:29; 10:1, cf. 2 Chr 36:20f) – the seventy years have almost or already expired both in the first year of the ominous Median king Darius in which Dan 9 is dated and in the author’s own lifetime in the 2nd century B.C.E. Thus, the end should already have taken place but did not come yet, and this is what provokes the question of when the end will come and who is concerned.

The solution of this exegetical problem is based on two sources of revelation. On the one hand, the text itself is regarded as authoritative and is quoted and comprehensively interpreted; on the other hand, an angel mediates additional divine revelation, which determines the interpretation. How closely the interpretation is related to scripture is shown by the other passages in the Hebrew Bible referring to the issue of 70 years, which, alongside Jer 25:11f and 29:10, are quoted or alluded to: Zech 1:12 and 7:5 for the “ruins of Jerusalem” instead of the time “for Babel” in Jeremiah 25 and 29; also 2 Chr 36:20f., 22f. and Ezra 1, which refers to Leviticus 26, for the “completion” (cf. Jer 29:10) of the Sabbath years up to the first year of the reign of Cyrus (II) and the rebuilding of the temple. Both the dating in Dan 9:1 and the interpretation of the seventy years in Dan 9:24–27 refer to these events. However, even on the basis of these (inner-biblical) scriptural references, the passage in Jeremiah is evidently not yet – or rather, no longer – sufficiently understood. A special revelation is required, which reveals the deeper understanding of this mysterious prophecy.

63; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1991), 265–267; idem, “The Visions of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTS 83,1; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 91–113, 109–111.

Finally, we have the exegetical solution to the problem itself, which already follows the same path as the Qumran *pescharim* later. Time is stretched and the deadline is prolonged: the seventy years are understood as seventy “year weeks,” that is, $7 \times 70 = 490$ years (or 10 jubilees as in 11QMelch), and they extend far beyond the time of the prophets Jeremiah and Daniel into the lifetime of the author and readers of the book of Daniel around the middle of the 2nd century B.C.E. Also the point of reference of the prophecy is extended: the 70 years or 70 “year weeks” are not only a time limit “for Babel” and the Babylonian Gola nor for the “ruins of Jerusalem” and the temple alone (thus Zech 1:12 and 2 Chronicles 36). Rather, they have also to do with the people as a whole who are burdened by sin and face judgment (Dan 9:24, cf. 8:19, 23 and the prayer of repentance 9:4–19). Also, the chronological order is made more concrete with events and persons in contemporary time, here the desecration of the temple under Antioch IV, which also relates past and future.

Daniel 9 is an astounding parallel that makes the book of Daniel appear as a “canonised pesher.”¹⁹ But the *pescharim* strictly separate text and interpretation from one another, whereas the interpretation in Daniel 9 is in a book that is not a commentary on the book of Jeremiah, though even here the textual basis and interpretation are explicitly distinguished. For its part, Daniel ranks in Qumran as scripture, specifically as a prophetic book. Whether the author of the book of Daniel understood himself as being an inspired interpreter of the authoritative “canonical” books from which he quotes, or as the author of such a book, is hard to say and probably not an appropriate question. He does not yet make the distinction between text and interpretation, as do the Qumran *pescharim*. He is at once an interpreter and author. This teaches us that it is not important whether or when a book became classified and was understood as “canonical,” but whether or not it involves the principle of interpreting other texts. This is clearly the case in Daniel 9, as well as in other books, which were later not classified as canonical. The literary development of a (biblical) writing to which a (non-biblical) interpretation refers already flows in the stream of the same tradition.

Incidentally, this stream of tradition can be seen not only in the relationship of Daniel to Jeremiah and other passages in Daniel 9, but also in the relationship of Daniel 9 to its own literary context, to which the chapter displays numerous literary and conceptual connections. As a closer analysis

19 A. Szörényi, “Das Buch Daniel, ein kanonisiertes Pescher?,” in *Volume du Congrès International pour l'étude de l'Ancien Testament, Genève 1966* (VT.S 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 278–294.

shows,²⁰ Daniel 9 is a literary supplement in the book of Daniel. Following the example of all the visions in Dan 7–12, which already reinterpret the collection of narratives in Daniel 1–6 and its chronological framework, especially the timeframe of seventy years in 1:1, 21; 6:29, Dan 9, in addition, reinterprets also the eschatological perspective of the visions in Daniel 7–8 and 10–12 in the spirit of a Deuteronomistic view of history. The chapter is not a sporadic, separate addition, but fits in a carefully considered manner into the whole composition of the book of Daniel. Both the interpretation of the “scriptures” and the productive self-interpretation of the book of Daniel in Daniel 9 demonstrate inner-biblical exegesis in the composition and literary growth of biblical books, the prophetic books in particular.

One might object against this far reaching conclusions of the comparison between the formation of biblical books and the *pescharim* from Qumran that, with the book of Daniel, we already find ourselves in the time of the formation of canon and the beginning of interpretive literature, not long before Qumran, and these findings thus have little significance for older biblical literature. But like the Qumran *pescharim*, the example of the book of Daniel only makes explicit the hermeneutical principles that must have been a governing factor in the books of the prophets from the beginning, provided that the written tradition was of any importance to the scribes who transmitted the biblical books. Shortly after the death of a prophet, at the latest from the 7th century B.C.E. onwards, questions must have arisen about to what time period and to whom the oracles of Amos, Hosea, or Isaiah from the eighth century refer. The constant appeal to the seventy years in Jeremiah, Zechariah, 2 Chronicles 36 / Ezra 1 as well as Daniel 1 and 9 speaks for itself, and this detail reveals the basic conviction that triggered the entire tradition of the prophets and kept the ball rolling from the first collections up to the final shape of the books and the beginning of their external interpretation.²¹

The fundamental conviction was the long-term effect of God’s word in the words of his prophets. Without this conviction, we would not have a single biblical prophetic book, not even a prophetic word as offered in the biblical books, and the chance discoveries of archaeology have so far not brought such a book to light. Only this conviction allowed an application to other times and other circumstances. It permeates both the transmission and the

²⁰ See Kratz, “Visions.”

²¹ See R. G. Kratz, *Kyros im Deuterocesaja-Buch: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–45* (FAT 1; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 218–229; idem, *Prophetenstudien: Kleine Schriften II* (FAT 74; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 32–48 and 49–70; Steck, *Die Prophetenbücher und ihr theologisches Zeugnis*; idem, *Gott in der Zeit entdecken*.

supplementation (*Fortschreibung*) of the books of the prophets. Interpretation begins with the first writing of an oracle, which has or has not come to fulfilment, presumably in the literary context of a small collection. The process of inner-biblical exegesis begins as soon as the first written fixation of a prophetic saying becomes the matrix for further supplementations up to the present book. Besides the genre and the various interests involved, this applies more or less to the other traditions, such as law, wisdom, psalms and narrative literature.²²

It goes without saying that both the differences in the transmitted text, as well as the relationship between biblical text and interpretation in the *pescharim* were regarded as “coherent” by ancient scribes and recipients. What they perceived as “incoherence” refers to the relationship of the text to historical reality. This “incoherence” is balanced by a divine revelation as the hermeneutical key and by the interpretation in the *pescharim*, and is declared “coherent.” The modern scholar, however, notices both the incoherences between text and reality, and between text and interpretation. This allows us to question critically and deconstruct the relationship between text and interpretation, and by so doing, explain it historically.

3. Citation and Rewriting

The biblical books are cited and commented upon not only in commentaries, but also in other works. Allusions, quotations, and excerpts up to reformulations of entire books are what dominate Jewish literature between Mikra and Talmud. They are found in non-biblical (or para-biblical) writings from Qumran, in the so-called Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, which are in part also attested within the Dead Sea Scrolls, alongside Hellenistic poets and historians such as Philo and Josephus, in the New Testament, as well as in rabbinic and early Christian literature. In contrast to the *pescharim*, the text usually is not cited specifically so that it can then be interpreted, but inserted into the new text. Today, this type of text use is increasingly discussed in terms of interpretation and reception history and summarised under the title of rewritten bible or rewritten scripture.²³

²² On this question, see R.G. Kratz, “Die Suche nach Identität in der nachexilischen Theologiegeschichte: Zur Hermeneutik des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes und ihrer Bedeutung für das Verständnis des Alten Testaments,” in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels: Kleine Schriften I* (2nd. ed.; FAT 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 157–180; idem, *Historical and Biblical Israel*, 61–130.

²³ See M. E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRI 2/2; Philadel-

In order to forge a pathway through the thicket of this literary mass, it is advisable to reduce the phenomena to the main categories and to limit ourselves to a few examples. Referring mainly to the non-biblical texts of Qumran²⁴ and the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,²⁵ I will focus, on the one hand, on explicit or implicit citations and allusions to biblical texts and content and, on the other hand, on excerpts or paraphrases of biblical books. The transitions between various types of text use are fluid, but the different categories can be distinguished from one another.

The explicit text citation (quotation) is closest to the *pesher* method, but it performs a different function. In Qumran, apart from the *pesharim*, we encounter explicit citations with and without interpretation,²⁶ but in the Apocrypha they are without explicit interpretation.²⁷ As far as thematic *midrashim* (e. g. 4Q MidrEschat = 4Q174 + 4Q177) or excerpts (e. g. 4QTest = 4Q175) are concerned, citations are similar to those in the *pesharim*. They

phia: Fortress Press, 1984); on the use and interpretation of scripture, see the literature above n. 2 and 7.

- 24 See the literature above n. 9, and also M. J. Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill 1998), 1:128–159; G. J. Brooke, "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives," *ibid.* 271–301; D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz (ed.), *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009); *idem* (ed.), *Rewriting and Interpreting the Hebrew Bible: The Biblical Patriarchs in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BZAW 439; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013). On the relationship between inner- and extra-biblical interpretation, see R. G. Kratz, "Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac: Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. D. Dimant and R. G. Kratz, FAT II/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 79–105 with an example from the narrative literature; *idem*, "Der 'Penal Code' und das Verhältnis von *Serekh ha-Yachad* (S) und Damaskusschrift (D)," *RdQ* 25 (2011): 199–227; *idem*, "Law and Narrative in Deuteronomy and the Temple Scroll," in *The Reception of Biblical War Legislation in Narrative Contexts: Studies in Law and Narrative* (ed. C. Berner and H. Samuel; BZAW 460; Berlin: de Gruyter 2015), 109–122; *idem*, "Rewriting Torah in the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period* (ed. B. U. Schipper and D. A. Teeter; JSJSup 163; Leiden: Brill 2013), 273–292, with examples from the legislative literature; *idem*, "Der Pescher Nahum und seine biblische Vorlage," in *Prophetenstudien*, 99–145 with an example from the prophetic literature; furthermore, see the overview *idem*, "Das Alte Testament und die Texte vom Toten Meer."
- 25 See D. Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. Mulder; CRI II,1; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 379–419; R. A. Kraft, "Scripture and Canon in Jewish Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 1:199–216.
- 26 Steudel, *Midrasch*, 170–187.
- 27 Dimant, "Use and Interpretation of Mikra."

are cited in order to be interpreted, although here it is the theme, not the biblical book, that directs the selection of citation and the character of the work.

Otherwise, citations are explained entirely in the context of the work in which they are written (IQS V 15, 17; VII 13f; IQM X 6–8; XI 5–7, 11f; CD I 13f, etc.; Tob 2:6, 8:6, etc.). The text is not cited in order to be interpreted, but to interpret a new context, to reaffirm or explain the statement with a biblical (divine) word. This is also the case where an explicit interpretation with corresponding interpretation formula follows (CD IV 14, see also VII 13–VIII 1 in manuscript A1). The interpretation here has the function of explaining the contribution of the citation to the context. On the other hand, it is clear that the commentary on the context using text citation without interpretation also assumes a corresponding understanding of the quoted passage and its interpretation. Citation and context are mutually interpretive.

Regarding the text form of explicit citation, we find, as in the pesharim, slight, sometimes more serious, deviations from the Masoretic text, possibly caused by textual, mnemotechnical, or content issues. Particularly interesting are cases where deviations occur in manuscripts of the same work.²⁸ Even formulations that are not given in the biblical text in that particular form, can be set forth as being citations without further ado.²⁹ Incidentally, the category of explicit citation also includes reminiscences of biblical characters and stories.³⁰

Even more than explicit allusions, implicit allusions to biblical texts or motives are embedded in the context of a new composition, and it is not always easy to identify them. This is owing to the fact that, apart from citations that are (almost) literal but not declared as such,³¹ the possibilities include quotation from memory, allusions, and free formulation of a particular text passage, of an entire text, or of a genre after a biblical model. We can frequently observe it in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and Ben Sira.

It is primarily the implicit quotations, coupled with a propensity for the biblical language, which give the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and the

28 CD A1 VIII 3 // B XIX 15f; several quotations A1 VII 10–12 // B XIX 7–9. See R. G. Kratz, *Prophetenstudien*, 249–264.

29 See 4QMMT and CD IV 15.

30 See Sir 16:6–10; 44–49; 1 Macc 2:49–69 or individual cases as in Isaiah 36–37 // 2 Kings 18 f. in 1 Macc 7:41; Genesis 34 in Judith 9:2–4; Jubilees 30 and TestLevi 2:1f.; 5–7; furthermore, the historical reminiscences in Tobit, Judith, the explicit reference to biblical books in Bar, Epler, Add Dan and Add Esth, PrMan, 1 Enoch; 4 Ezra and the parabiblical material from Qumran (see Brooke, “Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives”).

31 See e.g. Isa 11:2, 4f in IQSb V 21, 24–26; Prov 10:2 or 11:4 in Tob 4:10; Num 23:19 in Judith 8:16; Psa 146:4 in 1 Macc 2:63.

Dead Sea Scrolls their biblical veneer. This is undoubtedly deliberate. The cited books (which later became “biblical”) are already so highly regarded that they give authority to the new literary productions, and *vice versa* literary references to the biblical books increases their prestige and promotes the process of authorisation and canonisation. Moreover, like the explicit citations yet even more so, implicit citations control the understanding of the new text formulated with them. At the same time, they reveal how the underlying biblical text should be read, and this reading is literarily productive in the citations. Usually, reception, reworking, and supplementation of the biblical material is done outside their biblical *Vorlage* (with and without explicit reference to them), but it sometimes occurs within it (Additions to Daniel and Esther); it may also occur as a kind of external *Fortschreibung*, being a separate composition which places itself within the narrative framework of its biblical *Vorlage* (Baruch, Epistula Ieremiae).

The literary horizon of explicit and implicit citations is usually not very broad. The selection of the citation is mostly motivated by the immediate context of the receiver text, regardless of the context of the donor text. It is different with allusions to wider biblical contexts, imitations of biblical role models, or updates of biblical tradition. Here too, the wider contexts of receiver and donor text are taken into account, such as the story of Genesis 24 in Tobit;³² the literary framework of Jeremiah in Baruch and Epistula Ieremiae;³³ the book of Daniel and the book of Esther in the Greek supplements; and the sequence of books forming the biblical canon in Ben Sira 44–49. The more the new compositions move closer to the biblical sources, the closer they approach the next category, that of rewriting whole books.

Although rewriting is related to citation, it is another category. Citations, allusions, imitations and supplementation (*Fortschreibung*) are related to one or more *Vorlagen*, to which they make either explicit or implicit reference, but they create a new work. In contrast, rewriting usually has only one main *Vorlage*. It refers back to this *Vorlage*, reproduces it, sometimes cites other texts, and interprets the *Vorlage*. The rewritten text moves between text transmission (including translation) and literary supplementation (*Fortschreibung*) and revision directed by interpretation. The

32 See P. Deselaers, *Das Buch Tobit: Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (OBO 43; Fribourg: Universitätsverlag, 1982), 293–304.

33 See O. Hannes Steck, *Das apokryphe Baruchbuch: Studien zu Rezeption und Konzentration »kanonischer« Überlieferung* (FRLANT 160; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); R. G. Kratz, “Die Rezeption von Jer 10 und 29 im pseudepigraphen Brief des Jeremia,” *JSJ* 26 (1995): 2–31; O. H. Steck, R. G. Kratz, and I. Kottsieper, *Das Buch Baruch – Der Brief des Jeremia – Zusätze zu Ester und Daniel* (ATD.A 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

examples, such as the *Reworked Pentateuch* 4Q364–367 (with a flowing transition from biblical manuscript to rewriting), the Book of Jubilees, Genesis-Apocryphon 1QapGen (aram.), 1 Enoch 6–11, Temple Scroll 11Q 19–20, various versions of the Psalter, in particular 11QPs^a, 3 Ezra (1 Ezra), as well as Josephus, *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, and other Jewish historians and tragedians,³⁴ therefore range from excerpts to complete reformulations and revisions of a *Vorlage*.

Unlike the *pesher* and the citations, in rewritings the use of scriptures is neither eclectic nor atomistic. The rewriting of whole books has the entire composition in mind, which it takes over or rearranges by deleting, changing, or adding text. Rewriting occurs *per se* outside the *Vorlage*. But by reproducing it, no matter how close to the original text, the interpretation is simultaneously operating within the *Vorlage*. Is the rewriting therefore a new edition of the biblical book, equal to or even superior in canonical status? Is it supposed to replace the biblical *Vorlage* or be transmitted alongside and in conjunction with it? Is it indeed a different work, or simply a different version of the biblical book, that is, a “biblical” manuscript (as for example in the case of *Reworked Pentateuch*)?³⁵

These questions are not easy to answer because the rewritings remain silent about it. Only in one place, in *Jubilees* 1, do we find a reflection on how a rewriting conceives of itself. According to this passage Moses is on Mount Sinai (Exod 19–24) and receives from God himself (Jub 1:5, 7, 26), or from the angel of the presence, who represents God’s word (1:27; 2:1) the written divisions of the times, the earlier and coming things, dictated for Moses by either God (1:1 and in some manuscripts 1:26) or the angel (1:27), combined with the task of writing these things in a book (1:5, 7, 26; 2:1). It is ostensibly the story of how the *Book of Jubilees* came into being, which recapitulates the story of Genesis 1–Exodus 14, taking into account the ensuing giving of the law on Mount Sinai in the Pentateuch. What Moses writes down, then, is

34 Examples are also to be found among the parabiblical texts from Qumran, provided that the excerpts and paraphrases of biblical texts and scenes are not in a completely different context.

35 See also 4QSam^a, and on this R. G. Kratz, “Bibelhandschrift oder Midrasch? Zum Verhältnis von Text- und Literargeschichte in den Samuelbüchern im Licht der Handschrift 4Q51 (4QSam^a),” in *The Books of Samuel: Stories – History – Reception History* (ed. W. Dietrich in cooperation with C. Edenburg and P. Hugo; BETL 274; Leuven: Peeters, 2016), 153–180; idem, “Nahash, King of the Ammonites, in the Deuteronomistic History,” in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?* (ed. R. Müller and J. Pakkala; Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 163–188; idem, “Textual Supplementation in Poetry: The Song of Hannah as a Test Case,” (forthcoming), all articles with further literature on the manuscript 4QSam^a.

nothing more than the sum of the Pentateuch in the sense of the “earlier and the later history of the division of all the days of the law and of the testimony” (*Jub* 1:4; for the time afterwards see the historical preview in 1:5, 6ff).

The *Book of Jubilees* tells about how this very composition came into being, and is thus at the same time a story of how the Pentateuch came into being. *Jubilees* wants to provide evidence for “the heavenly prototype of the qualified chronology of the ‘law’ and the qualified course of time of ‘testimony,’”³⁶ i. e., as the “heavenly prototype” for history and law in the Pentateuch, which is valid for all ages. It is also a Sinaitic model for the transcript made by Moses in the land of Moab (*Deut* 31:9). The fact that the story of Genesis 1–Exodus 14 is not simply reproduced, but embedded in the scene of Exodus 19–24 which acts as a hermeneutical framework, contradicts the assumption that the “heavenly prototype” is meant to replace the biblical model. Rather, the *Book of Jubilees* directs the reader to read the transmitted Pentateuch through the hermeneutic framework of Sinai in such a way as the “prototype” intends, showing how, when guided by the *Book of Jubilees*, the prototype is to be found also in the Pentateuch. In short: according to *Jubilees* 1, the rewriting is not supposed to suppress the original, but owing to the rewriting presented as being a “heavenly prototype,” the original is put into the proper perspective.

We cannot simply apply the hermeneutical construction from the *Book of Jubilees* to all rewritings of biblical texts. Nevertheless, it makes clear that rewriting does not diminish the authority of a biblical source, but on the contrary, reinforces it, even or especially when it claims for itself the divine copyright. Other evidence points in the same direction, such as the interpretation of the law in 4QMMT and the Damascus Document (CD), which use scripture to justify laws which are not found in scripture as such;³⁷ the thematic foci in the interpretation of the Pentateuch, as pointed out by Moshe Bernstein,³⁸ which suggest that the biblical texts should not be revised or replaced, but only worked out in more detail and updated at certain points, especially with Noah and Abraham. To some extent, rewritings are inner-biblical exegesis outside the Bible. Since the literary processing associated with rewriting takes place outside at the same time as within the biblical *Vorlage*, rewritings lend themselves in particular to com-

36 See O. H. Steck, “Die getöteten »Zeugen« und die verfolgten »Tora-Sucher« in *Jub* 1,12: Ein Beitrag zur Zeugnis-Terminologie des Jubiläenbuches,” *ZAW* 107 (1995): 445–465; *ZAW* 108 (1996): 70–86, 81.

37 See Bernstein, “Pentateuchal Interpretation,” 142–145, 154–158.

38 *Ibid.* 137.

parison with literary and redactional historical reconstructions within the biblical books.³⁹

The closest parallel for citation and paraphrase within the Hebrew Bible is the book of Chronicles, in which interpretation and literary reworking of the original (Genesis–Judges, Samuel–Kings) also go hand in hand.⁴⁰ Since the *Vorlage* is preserved, it can be regarded as a test case for literary and redactional critical reconstruction.⁴¹ But having said this, we cannot expect too much. The fact that the two versions are transmitted here within the Hebrew canon, and in other cases either within the Greek canon or distributed over canonical and non-canonical writings, makes no difference. The book of Chronicles is a further instance of external evidence, but no more than that. The same applies to the doublets within the biblical canon,⁴² which we shall discuss below.

As with the extra-biblical evidence, Chronicles also shows all possible ways of using scripture. On the one hand, it is an almost literal excerpt with unintended and intended variants and with explicit or implicit citations from sources other than the main *Vorlage*. On the other hand, it is a free arrangement of the material streamlining or further working out of the original. Furthermore, it shows omission of text or addition of special material. All of this happened presumably not in one but in several consecutive phases, though we lack empirical evidence for this claim.⁴³

The hermeneutics in the relationship between the original and the rewriting, which directs the literary adaptation, confirms the considerations set out above concerning *Jubilees 1*.⁴⁴ Chronicles itself is also based on a certain theory of sources, which is modelled on the references to certain sources in Samuel–Kings, but which develops these further. In its references, Chronicles refers back to a “book of the kings of Judah and Israel,” in which the records of prophets are collected together, where it is believed that each time period had its own prophets who were writing down the events. This theory has the purpose of ascribing the *Vorlage* of Genesis–Kings, the occa-

39 See S.A. Kaufmann, “The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism,” *HUCA* 53 (1982): 29–43.

40 T. Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

41 W. Johnstone, “Reactivating the Chronicles Analogy in Pentateuchal Studies, with Special Reference to the Sinai Pericope in Exodus,” *ZAW* 99 (1987): 16–37.

42 See below n. 60.

43 See R. G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (London: T&T Clark International, 2005), 9–48.

44 See Kratz, “Die Suche nach Identität.”

sionally cited prophetic books and psalms, and their “reproduction” in the book of Chronicles itself to an underlying prophetically inspired common source. This gives both the *Vorlage* and the book of Chronicles authority, neither replacing nor supplementing the *Vorlage* nor simply interpreting or commenting it, but wanting to “re-present” it in a proper way.

This theory of sources in Chronicles wants to suggest that in its “re-presentation,” which is in fact a literary reworking and *Fortschreibung*, the spirit of the beginning prevails, and in it the text of the *Vorlage* is “re-presented” in the formulation that Chronicles offers – a formulation that correlates the time of the First Temple with that of the Second Temple. The “re-presentation” directs the reader to the original, and the updating controls understanding. The book of Chronicles, like all rewritings of biblical books, is also a guide for reading precisely these books of the nascent canon. The fact that in the case of Chronicles the reading guide has itself entered into the canon is probably due to the fact that it overviews the entire tradition, Torah and (Former and Latter) Prophets, including the book of Psalms.

Again, one could raise objections that the book of Chronicles is a rather recent work, which, like the para-biblical analogies, already presupposes a virtually completed canon or at least the completed composition of the biblical books used, and that the example therefore adds little to the discussion. But the phenomenon of rewritten bible has already been documented earlier in the writings of the Hebrew Bible. For this reason, we will now turn to the cases in which the empirically demonstrable phenomena of citation and reformulation are encountered in the same literary context as in the biblical books. The examples are legion, so just a few will be mentioned.

The best example of the category of citation are the literal restatements, i. e. quotations, literary allusions, imitations, and variations of formulations which are found not only in the relationship between Trito- and Deutero-Isaiah, but also within the two literary blocks of Isaiah 40–55 and 56–66. And if we draw Isaiah 12 or 35 (// 40 // 49 // 60–62) into the calculation, such citations are found throughout the entire book.⁴⁵ In addition to the citation of passages within the same literary context we also find citations from other sources, especially those from the book of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah (from Isaiah 40 onwards).⁴⁶ The book of Isaiah, on the other hand, is

45 See O. H. Steck, *Bereitete Heimkehr: Jesaja 35 als redaktionelle Brücke zwischen dem Ersten und dem Zweiten Jesaja* (SBS 121; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985); idem, *Studien zu Tritojesaja* (BZAW 203; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1991); W. Lau, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie in Jes 56–66: Eine Untersuchung zu den literarischen Bezügen in den letzten elf Kapiteln des Jesajabuches* (BZAW 225; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994); Kratz, *Kyros im Deuterokapitel des Jesajabuches*; idem, *Prophetenstudien*, 233–242.

46 Kratz, *Prophetenstudien*, 198–232; B. D. Sommer, “Allusions and Illusions: The Unity

cited in other biblical books, such as in 2 Chr 20:20 (Isa 7:9), or in Daniel (9:27; 10:10, 22, 26, 40 / Isa 8: 8; 28: 2; Dan 11:36 / Isa 10: 22–27).

The phenomenon is not confined to Isaiah. Apart from the peculiarities of individual books, it can be observed in the entire *corpus propheticum*. We need think only of the doublets and the “Deuteronomistic” formulations in the book of Jeremiah, the redundancies and the many allusions to the symbolic acts of other prophets in the book of Ezekiel, or the literary interconnections of the books comprising the book of the Twelve. The historical books and the writings, especially Psalms and Proverbs, are also full of self-citations and citations of other sources. Examples in Genesis include the promises; the many variants of the wife-sister-narrative (Genesis 12; 20; and 26); in the book of Deuteronomy, examples are the Decalogue (Exodus 20; 34; and Deuteronomy 5); the summarised recapitulations of the revelations on Mount Sinai (Exodus 19–Numbers 10) and the wandering in the wilderness (Numbers 10–36); in Joshua–Kings, examples are the speeches and other Deuteronomistic pledges; and in the Psalms, examples are the combinations of citations (e.g., Psalm 1; 100; 105–106; cf. Nehemiah 9; Psalm 135; 145–150). These cases are only the tip of the iceberg.

However, because the identification and demarcation of citations is not always clear-cut, it remains a matter of controversy in scholarship. Explicit citation is rare in the Hebrew Bible, and in prophetic literature it is almost non-existent.⁴⁷ As a rule we find implicit citation and more or less verbatim allusions to formulations, persons, and content. This certainly has something to do with the fact that the biblical writings were not yet completed and canonical. Explicit citation begins, not without reason, with the collection of books that first acquired canonical validity, i.e., the Torah of Moses. This does not mean, however, that the early books, during the

of the Book of Isaiah in Light of Deutero-Isaiah’s Use of Prophetic Tradition,” in *New Visions of Isaiah* (ed. R.F. Melugin and M.A. Sweeney; JSOT.S 214; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1996), 156–186.

47 The quote of Micah of Moresheth in Jer 26:18 (Mic 3:12) is an exception; the book of Jeremiah quotes itself in Jer 25:13 and also 30:2; 36; 45:1; 51:60; cf. Isa 8:16; 30:8; Ezek 2:8ff; 24:2; 43:11; Hab 2:2. In the remaining literature reference is often made to books which are unknown to us, lost or invented, and quoted (Josh 10:12f); the formula “as is written in,” however, refers to the Torah only (cf. the evidence in ThWAT 4:390 f., 393f). If we include the allusions to biblical persons and stories, it is a quite different situation. The following prophets are mentioned by name: Isaiah (in 2 Kings 18–19 // Isaiah 36–39 and also 2 Chr 26:22; 32:20, 32), Jeremiah (in 2 Chr 36:12 and v. 21–22 // Ezra 1:1 and also Daniel 9), Haggai and Zechariah (in Ezra 5:1; 6:14), other prophets are mentioned in the prophetic narratives of the historical books, as well as in the sources of the book of Chronicles. Conversely, in the prophetic literature the sacred history is recalled every so often, to a great extent in e.g. Hosea 9–13.

process of their formation and growth, were not really worth citing. There was no difference between citations (explicit and implicit) and verbal sayings of God, the prophets or other persons in the biblical texts, or explicit references to any other books (actually existing or fictitious). Rather, it seems to be the speeches and deeds of the sacred history, and the reference to ancient sources, which gave the texts a special status from the very outset and made them citable.

This conclusion is confirmed by external evidence. Explicit citation is also the exception in Chronicles, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and in the Qumran writings apart from the *pesharim* and similar works. As is clearly documented by the *pesharim*, the other uses of scripture, the manuscripts, and the evidence of the two- or perhaps three-part canon in 4QMMT,⁴⁸ a pre-canonical collection of biblical books, especially Torah, Prophets, and Psalms (David), had long been established. Yet other writings still preferred implicit citations and continued to refer to ancient books that no longer or never existed. Thus, it is not the canonical status of a book that makes the citations, but the citations which make the canon. And this applies not only to the writings of the late period, but to the biblical books in general, which, like Chronicles and the other rewritings, in substance consists of literary citations of themselves and other biblical sources.

Rewriting a biblical book within the same book is rare, but it does occur. It is immediately recognisable in at least two cases: first, the repetition in Exodus 32–34 of the Sinaitic law from Exodus 19–24; and second, the recapitulation of the Sinai-pericope and the wandering in the wilderness (Exodus + Numbers) in the farewell speech of Moses in the land of Moab (Deut). In Deuteronomy, we can distinguish between two further strata: one is the corpus of law (Exodus 20–23 // Deuteronomy 12–30; cf. also Leviticus 17–27) and another is the historical scene at Mount Sinai (Exodus 19–24 + 32–34 // Deuteronomy 4–11 including the Decalogue in Exodus 20; 34; and Deuteronomy 5) and in the desert (Num 10ff // Deut 1–3; 31–34). In both cases, the scenic fiction provides the motive for the repetition in the same literary narrative context: the fall of man and the broken tablets in Exodus 19–24 and 32–34, the imminent death of Moses (Numbers 27 and

⁴⁸ 4Q394–399, the canonical books (Moses, Prophets and, if the reading is correct, David) in 4Q397 Fr. 14–21 l. 10 = 4Q398 Fr. 14–17 l. 5; see R. G. Kratz, “Mose und die Propheten: Zur Interpretation von 4QMMT C,” in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez et al.; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 151–176. The designation corresponds roughly to the inventory assumed by the “Hymn in Honour of Our Ancestors” in Sirach 44–49 and mentioned by the grandson in his Greek foreword.

Deuteronomy 31–34), and the promulgation and literary fixation of the law of Sinai in Deuteronomy.

Other examples are less evident, or require a literary critical analysis, which not everyone recognises as being possible or necessary. However, I would mention the relationship between the texts of Priestly and non-Priestly writings in the books of Genesis–Numbers, whose differentiation on literary-critical grounds is generally acknowledged even by critics of literary criticism. If we accept that the Priestly writing was originally independent, then we have to deal with the interesting case that the (non-priestly) *Vorlage* and the (priestly) rewriting evolved separately from each other and were secondarily combined.⁴⁹

As in the case of the non-biblical examples and in Chronicles, the literary relationship of the various rewritings in the Pentateuch is likewise characterized by fidelity to the *Vorlage* and far-reaching changes. From literal citation to free formulation, from the adoption of the structure to confident (re-)arrangement of the material, all possibilities are represented. The literary reformulation of the *Vorlage* in a new context of the same work, such as the Pentateuch, has the entire *Vorlage* in view. When looking at the hermeneutics in relation to *Vorlage* and rewriting, however, the question arises whether it makes a difference that a rewriting took place as a *Fortschreibung* within the same literary context, or as a separate writing outside the *Vorlage*. One difference is undoubtedly that, in rewriting within the same work, the motive for the rewriting follows from the course of the action, whereas in the external rewritings it is either not mentioned, or has to be artificially manufactured by an elaborate theory of sources (Chronicles, Jubilees). In addition, the reworking in the work itself offers the possibility of completely preserving the original. As a result, and decisively for literary- and redaction-critical analysis, old and new texts exist alongside each other, and the new text cannot really be understood without the old text. With external rewriting, we only have the result of the reformulation, the new text, which can be read in its own right, but that requires the knowledge of the original for complete understanding.

Finally, the external difference in effect marks an authority gradient: book-internal rewriting became canonical together with its *Vorlage*, which was not usually the case with external rewriting. However, we should be clear that this does not really signify much because the book of Chronicles still found its way into the Hebrew canon, the Apocrypha into the Greek and Latin canons, and the *Book of Jubilees* (which among others was highly

49 See Kratz, *Composition*, 97–152 and 223–308.

valued at Qumran) into the Ethiopian canon. In terms of hermeneutic principles, or in other words, in the “emic” perspective, book-internal reworking and external rewriting are in any case in agreement. Whether or not it became canonical, the rewriting is supposed to interpret the original, but not replace it. It is precisely the rewritings within the Pentateuch, which preserve both versions in the same literary context, that make us realise that *Vorlage* and rewriting were regarded as complementary and mutually interpretive items.

This is the evidence. A separate question is how to explain this evidence genetically. Since citations and allusions are neither immediately nor with certitude identifiable, we often refer to the scribe’s special style, characteristic expressions or a distinctive tradition behind the texts rather than to literary dependency. The rewritings in the Pentateuch, the various sources, and Deuteronomy, among other similar phenomena are usually explained from the (oral or written) prehistory rather than from a history of continuous interpretation. Nevertheless, a very different picture is revealed by the evidence in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also in the writings from Qumran. The latter, although demonstrably dependent on biblical sources, could and did deal quite freely with them, irrespective of the attributed authority. Aspects such as the authority of the text and freedom in dealing with it, literary dependence and the integration of foreign material, preservation and updating of the text are not contradictions in the “emic” perspective, but are mutually dependent in how the books come into being.

Therefore, we have to explain explicit and implicit citations in and between the biblical books, as well as the phenomenon of rewriting, in the same way as with the extra- and post-biblical examples. They are the scribal interpretation and literary reformulation of a literary *Vorlage*, but here in the context of the *Vorlage* itself, i. e. as inner-biblical exegesis in the true sense of the term. Other questions are, What is the *Vorlage* and what is the interpretation? Did they come to be in one or multiple steps? This is where the methods of literary and redactional criticism come into play.

4. Transmission and Translation

Before we come to literary and redaction history, there is still another example of inner-biblical exegesis for which there is empirical evidence. It is a well-known phenomenon of textual criticism. Both the manuscripts of the Masoretes and the different versions of the biblical text, notably the Septuagint and the Targumim, show very clearly that the transmission of

the text in its original language as well as in translation means not only maintenance of the text (*Textpflege*) but also of the meaning (*Sinnpflege*).⁵⁰ The copying and translating of the biblical books always goes hand in hand with interpretation. This phenomenon is illustrated beautifully by the Dead Sea Scrolls, both the bible manuscripts and the manuscripts of non-biblical works.⁵¹ Here we can study quasi *in statu nascendi* the various scribal practices and multiple variants in an early period, sometimes immediately after and sometimes during the completion of biblical writings.

The first thing we notice is the diversity of the text traditions in the period from the 3rd century B.C.E. to the 1st century C.E. Emanuel Tov has divided it into four different and partially overlapping categories:

1. M-like text;
2. pre-Samaritan texts;
3. texts close to the presumed Hebrew source of the Septuagint (G);
4. a cluster of non-aligned texts.

In addition, there are the text versions of citations in non-biblical writings and excerpts.⁵²

Eugene Ulrich believes that this classification is still too narrow, and he reckons with a wealth of “successive literary editions.” The diversity proves that at this time there was no standardised text and that the biblical text was still in the making, so that conceptions of its “correct” wording differ

50 The terminology from J. Assmann, *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (München: Beck, 1992), 88; this is taken up by K. Schmid, *Buchgestalten des Jeremiabuches: Untersuchungen zur Redaktions- und Rezeptionsgeschichte von Jer 30–33 im Kontext des Buches* (WMANT 72; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), 42, 327–328.

51 See Mulder (ed.), *Mikra*, 87 ff., 161 ff., 189 ff., 217 ff., 255 ff., 299 ff.; Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament 1/1*, 49ff, 84ff, 323ff, 587ff, 642ff.; furthermore, E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Third Edition Revised & Expanded* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012); U. Dahmen et al. (ed.), *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000); L. J. Green-spoon, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill 1998), 1:101–127. Examples from the prophets in Kratz, *Prophetenstudien*, 101f., 125 ff., 243 ff., 358 ff.; on 4QSam^a; see idem, “Bibelhandschrift oder Midrasch?”; idem, “Nahash; King of the Ammonites”; idem, “Supplementation.” For further examples, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny, *Evidence*; Müller and Pakkala (ed.), *Insights*; also Pakkala, *God’s Word*.

52 Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 107–110; this classification has slightly changed compared to the earlier editions of Tov’s monograph; see also idem, “Die biblischen Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda – Eine neue Synthese,” in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 1–34.

widely.⁵³ In this respect, the various text witnesses as such are witnesses to exegesis within the bible in the process of textual formation.

In individual cases, however, it is not always easy to decide what the scribe and translator intended or whether text variants were random or conscious changes. It seems unclear where maintenance of the text (*Textpflege*) ends and maintenance of the meaning (*Sinnpflege*) begins. But from the “emic” perspective, an either/or alternative is probably wrong. Even a slavish copy of a manuscript such as the proto-Masoretic (or proto-rabbinic) group of texts and Masoretic manuscripts, or a literal and concise translation, such as that of the Psalms, still intends to preserve the text strictly as found. Fidelity to the letter is the ruling principle of interpretation. Of course, scribal errors and other unintentional corruptions of the text do occur in the process. However, as the insertion of corrections in the manuscripts proves,⁵⁴ scribes were aware of this and respected the “correctness” of the text. This presupposes a keen interest in the meaning of what is being copied and transmitted.

The same applies to the more formal practices of the scribes and the Masoretes, such as the script, orthography, word and sentence breaks, text division, structuring signs, and annotations to the text. These are found both in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Masoretic manuscripts, and in some cases, were inserted secondarily.⁵⁵ They are not always easy to understand and allow – intentionally or not – different interpretations.⁵⁶ However, they also follow the exegetical principle of text preservation. They want to safe-

53 E. Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1 (ed. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill 1998), 79–100.

54 E. Tov, “Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 232–263; idem, *Textual Criticism*.

55 E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004); also, idem, “Scribal Practices Reflected in the Texts from the Judean Desert,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1 (ed. P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill 1998), 403–429; idem, *Textual Criticism*, 191–219.

56 See, e.g., O.H. Steck, *Die erste Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIs^a): Schreibweise als Leseanleitung für ein Prophetenbuch* (SBS 173; Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1998); idem, “Bemerkungen zur Abschnittgliederung der ersten Jesajarolle von Qumran (1QIs^a) im Vergleich mit redaktionsgeschichtlichen Beobachtungen im Jesajabuch,” in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann* (ed., Bernd Kollmann et al.; BZNW 97; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 12–28; idem, Bemerkungen zur Abschnittgliederung in den Jesaja-Handschriften aus der Wüste Juda: Ein Vergleich auf der Grundlage von 1QIsa^a, in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. Ulrich Dahmen et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 53–90.

guard the text by structuring its presentation, making the grammatical and syntactic structure recognisable, and pointing out specific features, possible errors, uncertain or incomprehensible readings or variants.

An even clearer language is spoken by the different interpretations that appear in scribes' marginal notes, or in the comparison of the manuscripts and versions: morphological and semantic variants, surpluses and minuses in the text, different textual arrangements.⁵⁷ It is true that the readings which are offered are primarily used to safeguard the text, but the variants differ from mere copy and scribal practices because they document a different text, and thus, in some places, an intervention into the textual substance. The reasons for intervening are often hidden, making it almost impossible to decide which is the primary reading.⁵⁸ Occasionally, for example in the Samaritan glosses, the direction of dependency and, with it, the interpretation process is obvious. The vast majority of cases lies between these two extremes.

Using the example of Hab 1:11–12, Arie van der Kooij has demonstrated the importance of variants in manuscripts and versions, including the evidence in non-biblical texts, for interpretation and reception history.⁵⁹ How the biblical text is cited in the *pesharim*, as well as the citations and reformulations within other books, show that interpretation is often inserted into text reproduction. Therefore, we must assume that this is also the case for the choice of readings in the biblical text. This does not mean that the text

57 See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 219–262, 283–326.

58 Recently, due to the findings from the Dead Sea, a frequently held view is that *the* original text never existed. This may be correct on the whole, but not for individual readings, nor for the synonyms. They cannot have been created at different places and in different versions independently of one another, but must have had their origin somewhere, in order that they be either adopted or altered. But then we have the unavoidable question of which reading is the more original (not necessarily *the* original) or older and in which direction do we have dependency? The same applies to deviations on a large scale, whether primarily in the arrangement (e.g. Psalter) or in the version of the text (Jeremiah, Daniel, etc.). On this problem, see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 161–169.

59 A. van der Kooij, "Textual Witnesses to the Hebrew Bible and the History of Reception. The Case of Habakkuk 1:11–12," in *Die Textfunde vom Toten Meer und der Text der Hebräischen Bibel* (ed. U. Dahmen *et al.*; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 91–108. See also I.L. Seeligmann, "Indications of Editorial Alteration and Adaptation in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint," VT 11 (1961): 201–221; G.J. Brooke, "The Biblical Texts in the Qumran Commentaries: Scribal Errors or Exegetical Variants?," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. C.A. Evans and W.F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 85–100; A. Rofé, "From Tradition to Criticism: Jewish Sources as an Aid to the Critical Study of the Hebrew Bible," in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (ed. J.A. Emerton; VTS 66; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 235–247.

was set forth and written down however one wished, but rather – from the “emic” perspective – the congruence of text and interpretation is an expression of the fact that the interpretation also wants nothing more than to safeguard and preserve the text. The interpretation – whether in the text itself, or separated from it – simply wants to make explicit what the interpreter has found in the text, occasionally owing to additional revelation. Seen through the history of interpretation and reception, the text-critical variants move between *Fortschreibung* and commentary.

This leads us to a further point which has long been recognized in textual criticism, but for which the manuscripts from the Dead Sea have provided the first pre-Christian evidence. The transitions from textual history to literary and redaction history are fluid, and the closer we look, the more blurred they become. In the different text types or “successive literary editions” of textual history continues what begins with the genesis and compositional history of the biblical books. This is true of many of the smaller variants with a narrow literary horizon,⁶⁰ and even more so with regard to complex variants up to different versions of the text, which are connected with the genesis and composition of whole books (Psalter, Jeremiah, Daniel, etc.).⁶¹

No matter how they are explained in detail, all these phenomena of textual history have their conceptual implications, such that the changes from one stage to another of the text can or must be viewed from the vantage point of the interpretation and reception of the biblical text. The processes of text formation that are evidenced by manuscripts and versions (those with a Hebrew or Aramaic original), are only one side of textual history. On the other side, text history comes to expression (here too with fluid transitions) in the transmission and translation of the text which produce further

60 See J. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871), XI ff; I. Willi-Plein, *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments: Untersuchungen zum literarischen Werden der auf Amos, Hosea und Micha zurückgehenden Bücher im hebräischen Zwölfprophetenbuch* (BZAW 123; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971); A. Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period* (FAT 92; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

61 See Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 283–326; furthermore J. H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985); Dahmen et al. (ed.), *Textfunde*; Carr, *Formation*; Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny, *Evidence*; Müller and Pakkala (ed.), *Insights*; Pakkala, *God’s Word*; also H.-J. Stipp, “Das Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik in neueren alttestamentlichen Veröffentlichungen,” *BZ* 34 (1990): 16–37; A. van der Kooij, “Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele,” in *Congress Volume Cambridge 1995* (ed. J. A. Emerton; V.T.S 66; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 185–202; and the articles listed above in n. 33.

variants on a larger or smaller scale, extending to Midrash-like explorations in the translations, especially the Targumim, and rewritings of whole biblical books. These processes also serve to preserve the biblical text, and, as an interpretive principle, permeate the entire textual history, not just to the letter, but also in spirit.

Text transmission and translation are not extra-biblical analogies in the strict sense, but rather examples of inner-biblical exegesis, albeit with external evidence. Irrespective of the manuscript tradition, there are examples within the Bible itself: the duplicate traditions in the Hebrew Bible.⁶² Here, too, we are dealing with two representatives (recensions) of the same text. The same text-critical regularities and hermeneutical principles apply as in the comparison of manuscripts and versions of the same text. Nevertheless, it is not only a text-critical phenomenon. That would be the case if the duplicate traditions represented independent recensions. But this is only possible with the duplicates Psalm 14 // 53 and Psa 57:8–12 + 60:7–14 // 108, that are preserved in various collections which had previously been independent of the Psalter, though even here it is highly unlikely. Supporting literary dependency, and thus suggesting rewriting, is in the first case the variation of Psa 14:5 in 53:6 (see *nh* in 1 Sam 26:3, 5), which is motivated by the context of the biography of David (Psa 52:2 and 54:2 according to 1 Sam 22:9ff; 23:19 and 26:1). The second case is the anthological character of Psalm 108, which is composed of more than just traditional formulas.

Likewise, with all the other parallel traditions, including Ezra 2 // Nehemiah 7, it seems to me that there is a more or less direct literary dependency. The qualification “more or less” is used here because we cannot exclude that dependency may be based on a text other than the Masoretic Text and that some variants can therefore be explained on text-historical grounds. The greater the text deviation, however, the more the theological intentions come to light. The deviations come from the scribe’s interpretation of the original according to the new context. As is sometimes the case with citations in extra-biblical literature, this is responsible for text variants, surplus and minus, etc. We are able to observe this most clearly in Chronicles, where we can study how, by means of inner-biblical exegesis, a new literary version of the *Vorlage* emerges from the textual transmission to safeguard and preserve the text. This, in turn, opens up a new chapter in the history of the text.

⁶² Psalm 14 // 53; Psa 57:8–12 + 60:7–14 // 108; Psa 115:4–11 // 135:15–20; Psalm 18 // 2 Samuel 22; Exodus 20 // Deuteronomy 5 (for the harmonization see Pap. Nash); 2 Kings 18–20 // Isaiah 38–39; 2 Kings 24–25 // Jeremiah 52; 1 Chronicles 16 // Psalms 105 + 96 + 106:47f; Ezra 2 // Nehemiah 7.

When we compare the manuscripts and the parallel traditions we can therefore observe features also suggested by literary and redaction-critical reconstruction: changes in the text ranging from the individual gloss to *Fort-schreibung* and new versions of entire works. Even if we never reach all the stages of textual history, the external evidence provides us with sufficient criteria to understand inner-biblical exegesis, not only in the late stages of books, but also from the very beginning, as driving texts' evolution and development. Likewise, the external evidence explains how textual and literary critical evidence are clues to the history of interpretation and reception in the genesis of the biblical books and the development of the biblical text.

With certain restrictions, we can say the same even about the translation into another language. Although it is exceptional within the Hebrew Bible, it does occur; and like later versions, it contributes to the interpretation and the literary growth of the biblical text. The best example is the gloss in Gen 31:47, which anticipates v. 48 and renders the etymology of the location Gal-ed "stone heap of witness" literally as Aramaic גַּר שֶׁהָדוּתָא.⁶³ It seems to me that the reason for this is not so much the idea that Laban and Jacob would have spoken different languages, but more as a means of locating the scene on the border for the Aramean Laban and the east-Jordanian Hebrew Jacob. This prompted the scribe to record bilingual names for the location only.

Another example of literarily productive translation within the Hebrew Bible is the reproduction and Midrash-like implementation of several pieces of information from the Aramaic chronology of the building of the temple in Ezra 5–6 in the Hebrew pre-history of Ezra 1–4 (see also 6:16–18, 19–22),⁶⁴ along with multiple attempts at translating and interpreting the Aramaic title "the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven" from Ezra 7:12, 21 in 7:(1–)6, 10, 11 (cf. Neh 8:1ff).⁶⁵ To an extent, one is a Targum, but in the opposite direction; the other shows the semantic difficulties and implications of translating law terminology, with which the Septuagint also had problems. Finally, I would like to point out Dan 1:1–2:4a (followed by the gloss אַרְמִיָּה as transition to the further narrative) which is often suspected to be a translation from the Aramaic in the course of addition of the Hebrew visions in Daniel 8–12,⁶⁶ and the Hebrew explanation of the

63 In the Septuagint, the gloss is to be found between v. 46, 48a (= v. 46 LXX) and v. 51, 52a (= v. 48a LXX), to which v. 48b–50, 52b (= v. 48b, 49–50 LXX) forms a link.

64 See Kratz, *Composition*, 58–62.

65 See Kratz, *Translatio imperii*, 236–239.

66 Ibid. 42.

Aramaic vision Daniel 7 in Daniel 8.⁶⁷ One seems to be primarily a translation, the other is again a kind of Targum.

Thus, it appears that the principles of interpretation both of textual transmission and translation are already to be found in the biblical text itself, and are involved here in the formation of biblical scripture.

5. Redaction

Having approached matters from the aspect of the empirically proven phenomena of inner-biblical exegesis, and having drawn conclusions about the literary formation of the biblical text, we now turn to the origins of the text itself and its reconstruction. The identification of inner-biblical exegesis presupposes that within the biblical books we can distinguish *Vorlage* from interpretation, and therefore older from younger material. The distinction is made by applying the methods and techniques of literary and redaction criticism, and it is precisely this which makes things difficult, if not implausible, for many scholars.

The methods of literary and redaction criticism⁶⁸ have nowadays somewhat fallen into disrepute, not only among those who have always rejected them on religious grounds, but also among those who apply them to a certain degree yet believe them impracticable in detail and so replace them with more or less successful paraphrases, structural analysis, or relief descriptions of the traditional biblical text (usually in the version of the Masoretic canon). Inner-biblical allusions are therefore not discussed as inner-biblical exegesis, but simply as inner-biblical allusions or biblical intertextuality, i.e. they are stated but not explained.⁶⁹ Questions of text genesis, i.e. decisions on the direction of the dependency of inner-biblical references, are no longer required. Not only is historical curiosity disappointed, but also diverse theological profiles are lost.

But external evidence is available even for the literary and redaction history of the Hebrew Bible. Based on empirical data, analogies permit conclusions to be made about the formation and transmission of ancient texts in general and the biblical and para-biblical books in particular.⁷⁰ The cases

⁶⁷ Kratz, "Visions," 99–105.

⁶⁸ See Kratz, "Redaktionsgeschichte"; Schmid, "Schriftauslegung."

⁶⁹ Thus, e.g., L. Eslinger, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis and Inner-Biblical Allusion: The Question of Category," VT 42 (1992): 47–58.

⁷⁰ Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models*; H.J. Tertel, *Text and Transmission: An Empirical Model for the Literary Development of Old Testament Narratives* (BZAW 221; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994); see also Carr, *Formation*.

that are closest to the Bible itself are those where the biblical text is the subject, and which we have already discussed: the various versions of the biblical text in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Septuagint, as well as the rewriting of biblical books within (Samuel–Kings // Chronicles) and outside the Hebrew Bible. A close second are the analogies from the ancient Near East, where primarily the Epic of Gilgamesh⁷¹ and Assyrian royal inscriptions⁷² have been studied and more recently the works of the writer Ilimilku of Ugarit.⁷³ In addition, occasionally examples from the Talmud and Midrash, from the early Christian and Arabic literature, the Homeric epics, and even more recent literature, have been consulted as analogies. The writings of Qumran were previously more or less neglected under this aspect. At least for the War Scroll (QM) and the community rules *Serekh ha-Yachad* (QS) we can demonstrate text development in the manuscript transmission, and in the manuscripts of Hodayot (QH) we find evidence of variations in the number and organization of hymns, which are also evidenced in the tradition of the Psalms of Qumran.⁷⁴

What is the significance of external evidence? Basically, empirical data verifies the hypothesis that ancient texts, and thus also the biblical books, did not fall from the sky, but have a history. Although this is a commonplace to which everyone would subscribe, it still needs recalling from time to time, as well as the fact that we can verify it empirically. What the various textual witnesses of biblical books and the various versions of the canon already suggest is confirmed by ancient Near Eastern analogies. The Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible is one version among many and, moreover, the late product of a long, complicated literary history of the individual biblical books.

Whoever calls on the “final form” of the Bible must, therefore, give an account of the “final form” to which he or she is referring, and why it is that particular form and not any other. He or she has to be aware that fixation on

71 J. H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982); idem, “The Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic,” in *Empirical Models* 21–52; see also Carr, *Formation*, 40–48; for the textual material, see A. George, *The Epic of Gilgamesh: The Babylonian Epic Poem and Other Texts in Akkadian and Sumerian* (London: Penguin 2000); idem, *The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition, and Cuneiform Texts*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

72 Tertel, *Text and Transmission*, 67 ff., 171 ff. The available material is, however, much more extensive and has barely been examined under redaction historical aspects.

73 M. C. A. Korpel, “Exegesis in the Work of Ilimilku of Ugarit,” in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (ed. J. C. de Moor; OTS 40; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86–111.

74 See A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger, “Qumran,” *TRE* 28 (1997): 45–79, esp. 55 f., 60–62, 63 f.; Kratz, “Der ‘Penal Code’ und das Verhältnis von *Serekh ha-Yachad* (S) und Damaskusschrift (D);” idem, “Law and Narrative”; idem, “Rewriting Torah.”

one of the many “final forms” might be accommodating a certain theological or homiletical interest, but not providing a scholarly explanation. The latter involves historical questions concerning the formation and understanding of the many relevant “final forms” in their times. Some people may consider this question to be irrelevant, in which case it would be better to ignore it completely than to polemicize against it and the attempts to answer the question using historical-critical means, and surreptitiously set a description of the “final form” of a text as identical to a historical explanation. One is the theological, and also homiletic understanding of a text in its time, which is the endeavour of historical-critical research; the other is the understanding of the same text in our time, which is the endeavour of theological hermeneutics on the basis of historical research. If we look at the big picture, we can see that empirical data lead to a clear conclusion: just as elsewhere in the ancient Near East and ancient Jewish tradition, we can expect a gradual growth of the texts in the biblical books.

When we go into detail, things are much more complicated. All conceivable cases of text development are empirically verified. The formation of a larger composition from individual pieces which were previously either independent or in a different context and which underwent a complete or extensive transformation and reformulation of the *Vorlage* (Gilgamesh, Temple Scroll); the later supplementation of a given context by pieces, which have been more or less cited literally (12th. tablet of Gilgamesh, scroll IQS with IQSa and IQSb); and a copy of a *Vorlage* from a literal reproduction up to complete reworking with more or less pronounced changes, such as additions, omissions, word replacement, shortening or expanding reformulations, and restructuring of the material (Gilgamesh, Assyrian inscriptions, various versions of the biblical text, Chronicles, and the other examples of the rewritten bible, QM, QS, and QH).

If we compare the empirical data with the methods and results of literary and redaction criticism in the writings of the Hebrew Bible, the result is by no means clear. Jeffrey Tigay wants to prove the accuracy of the documentary hypothesis in the Pentateuch using the tradition history of Gilgamesh. Hans Jürgen Tertel, on the other hand, attempts to prove the impossibility of reconstructing *Vorlage* from traditional biblical text versions by referring to Assyrian inscriptions, and, where there is doubt, to prove the originality of the complex final composition.

Disagreement is not only based on the differences of the material, but also on a different line of questioning. Tigay seeks an analogy for the process of evolution. He therefore studies the evolution and transmission of the epic from the *Vorlage* and multiple intermediate stages, and applies this

model to the biblical stories and hypothetical documentary sources in the Pentateuch. Tertel, on the other hand, seeks a (mostly formal) analogy for the present biblical text in the evolutionary process of extra-biblical material. He does not regard the redactional tendency in the Akkadian epics to harmonise parallel sections by addition as being evidence of textual growth, but compares their contents with available biblical texts, where such things are rarely found.⁷⁵ Similarly, Tertel also does not want to concede a heuristic significance to the book of Chronicles, but only an illustrative or corroborative significance like the Akkadian epics. In doing so, he unnecessarily strains the problems of the literary relationship to Samuel and Kings, and in Chronicles only regards meaningful that what has emerged from the Assyrian inscriptions after applying his criteria.⁷⁶

Tertel examined the Assyrian inscriptions in turn according to a predetermined, highly formalistic grid of plots. He then compares them with present biblical texts to find out which version of the inscriptions corresponds to most closely to the biblical text. He is not so interested in the literary phenomena, but only in the degree of complexity at the beginning of textual history, which represents the decisive criterion for the comparison.⁷⁷ However, if we consider the full range of redaction-historical possibilities, then, with the Assyrian inscriptions, we must also make the same qualification that Tertel made with the Akkadian epics and Chronicles: "It reminds us that the application of any analogy necessarily implies some inaccuracy. An empirical model can only give a broad picture."⁷⁸

Nevertheless, the external evidence helps us to survey the vast field a little better, and to mark out more clearly the possibilities and limits of both the empirical models and of literary and redaction history. The empirically proven possibilities of text genesis make us realise the limits of literary and redaction-historical reconstruction.

Only those processes of text evolution can be reconstructed where the *Vorlage* has entered the transmitted text more or less entirely, i. e. where its essence remains untouched, but is copied down and at most expanded to include supplements of whatever kind. We cannot, however, reconstruct a *Vorlage* which has been completely reworked, reformulated or undergone text omission, unless traces are left in the final text. For example, if we only had the book of Chronicles at our disposal, it would be difficult to isolate from it the text of Samuel and Kings as *Vorlage*. And where it is possible to

⁷⁵ Tertel, *Text and Transmission*, 54 f.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 67, 156, 171.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 186, 221, 231, 233 f.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 233

elicit a *Vorlage* as such in the transmitted text, we could be dealing with a verbatim copy or a reformulated version. And at least theoretically, that can no longer be determined.

Supplementations of all kinds are empirically evidenced. However, there is no known case in which we are able to track in the manuscripts the details of gradual textual growth without substantial changes to the text as it was at that particular stage, from the beginnings of a meagre document to a full writing or collection of writings – as we tend to assume with the literary and redaction-historical reconstruction of the biblical books. Only the relationship of the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint (Jeremiah, Daniel, etc.), and the manuscripts of the War Scroll (QM) and the Community Rule (QS) of Qumran point in this direction in some passages.

Does this evidence empirically prove the unsuitability of literary and redaction criticism?⁷⁹ I do not think so, since it is clear that even empirical models have their limits. The data are derived from a variety of text types, each with its own specific conditions for evolution and transmission. An ancient Babylonian epic put together from Sumerian originals is not a Neo-Assyrian royal inscription, and both are worlds away again from biblical narratives, the books of the prophets, psalms, and wisdom literature. Each medium and each genre follows its own rules of tradition, and the nature of tradition in the ancient Near East is not necessarily identical with the culture of Jewish tradition encountered in the biblical and para-biblical writings, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Qumran and rabbinic tradition.

To explore the possibilities and limits of applying empirical data in literary and redaction criticism, we, therefore, must be clear about the peculiarity of this tradition culture.⁸⁰ What we have before us in biblical and para-biblical literature, when also compared with the ancient Near Eastern literature, is a mixture of tradition and redaction. There is hardly a text that does not reveal that it is deeply rooted in the ancient Near Eastern world in some way. This is due to the fact that Israel and Judah, like all other cultures in the Northwest Semitic region, were part of the ancient Near Eastern world. Relevant studies⁸¹ have shown that the literature production and reception in ancient Israel (including pre-exilic Judah on a much smaller scale) at the onset of

79 Carr, *Formation*, 147 f., tends in this direction, and so suggests a “middle way” between “reconstructing everything” and “rejecting the enterprise altogether” and reconstructs the formation of the Hebrew Bible according to his own, somewhat idiosyncratic, criteria.

80 For the following, see Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*, especially parts B and C.

81 See D. W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Juda: A Socio-Archaeological Approach* (JSOT.S 109 / SWBAS 9; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991); C. Schams, *Jewish Scribes in the Second-Temple Period* (JSOT.S 291; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998);

the monarchy and limited to the inner circles largely complies with common practices of ancient Near Eastern scribal culture. This similarity concerns not only the official archives, but also the literature production and librarianship. The findings at Al-Yahudu, Elephantine, Samaria (Mt Gerizim) and Qumran each prove in their own way that conditions in and after exile had changed little.⁸²

On the other hand, the material from Qumran also shows something else. In Judaism, with, in, and alongside the usual administrative and school activities, a new and distinctive culture of scribal tradition developed. And it was not only that here, as in Egypt, Mesopotamia and Greece, a collection of classical or authoritative, so-called “canonical” works of reference had emerged that were carefully copied, learned and interpreted in schools.⁸³ Beyond that, the study, copy, and composition of holy books came to embody a pious life (Deut 6:4–9; Psalm 1; Sir 38:34–39:11) and a Jewish identity, replacing the lost national identity. The Israelite or Jewish scribe (*Schreiber*) became the Jewish scribal scholar (*Schriftgelehrter*) who lives and passes on the ideal of the biblical “Israel”.

The phenomenon of the scribal culture in the Dead Sea Scrolls was certainly not first invented in Qumran. Its development neither starts nor stops here in Qumran. Qumran is more of an intermediate link, which, in spite of differences in opinion, is placed between the beginnings in the biblical writings and what follows in the rabbinical writings. The biblical texts themselves differ markedly from the remnants of ancient Israelite or Judean scribal culture still preserved within them or proven by archaeology, in both form and content. These books are the best witness of Jewish biblical scribalism (*Schriftgelehrsamkeit*) and its corresponding, idiosyncratic tradition culture. This development is sparsely documented in the external evidence, with the exception of Qumran. While ancient Near Eastern analogies remain within the usual framework of scribal culture as far as form and content are concerned (e.g. epic fiction, official annals, etc.), biblical scriptures go their own way along traditional and theological paths. In this respect, literary and redaction-historical reconstruction is superior to the

for an overview, see Schmid, *Buchgestalten*, 35–43; for the wider perspective Carr, *Writing*; idem, *Formation*; van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*.

⁸² See Kratz, *Historical and Biblical Israel*.

⁸³ See W. W. Hallo, “The Concept of Canonicity in Cuneiform and Biblical Literature: A Comparative Appraisal,” in *The Biblical Canon in Comparative Perspective: Scripture in Context IV* (ed. K. Lawson Younger, Jr. et al.; ANETS 11; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1991), 1–19.

empirical models, since it alone takes account of the genre, the content and the particular culture of tradition in the biblical and para-biblical literature.

A further point is that we have clearly shown above the limits that empirical data impose on literary and redaction criticism. In particular omissions and reformulations, as we have seen, can barely be recognised without knowledge of the *Vorlage*. The best example of this is given by the genre of rewritten bible, even if the representatives of this genre (Chronicles, Book of Jubilees, Temple Scroll, etc.; also Deuteronomy in relation to the Covenant Code or the Priestly writing in relation to non-Priestly texts) do not replace the previous texts. Instead of being replaced, they continue to be transmitted and interpreted. Thus, at first glance, it seems difficult if not impossible to decide whether we are really dealing with the *Vorlage* or with a reformulation; with altered *Vorlage* to fit the context or with supplementations in the different branches of the text in the main and secondary lines; or with deletions in the event of text disturbance or secondary amendments of the scribe (redactor or author).

But the difficulties are theoretical. In practice, the different text components usually show different theological profiles as well, which allow various hands or literary layers to be differentiated. This also has to do with the particular Jewish tradition culture, which, unlike the ancient Near Eastern analogies, produced a great diversity of theological opinions and preserved these in the Hebrew Bible. The decisive criterion is the tendency criticism (*Tendenzkritik*), which, based on literary and redaction critical evidence from empirical data, tips the scales for decision-making and differentiation of literary levels. As a result, hypothetical reconstructions that go beyond empirically proven cases of text growth are possible.

This does not mean, however, that by means of literary and redaction criticism we can, in every case, reach the oldest, original text, recognise each layer of growth, and be able to understand each redactional intervention. We can only penetrate as far into the history of a text as it itself reveals, on some occasions more, on others less. We will only be permitted to go as far as the surviving sources and the text in question allow, and we must live with the proviso that some stages of text and literary history will elude us. But still, it is possible to relate the various ideological or theological profiles of the text, distributed over different literary layers, in order to recognise a relative chronology and explain texts historically.

Whoever proceeds along these lines will be aware of the ongoing interpretive process in the formation of the text, inner-biblical exegesis as the driving factor of biblical texts' evolution. Just as the empirically demonstrable rules of inner-biblical exegesis lead to the successive growth of the texts, so also

the process of text evolution (reconstructed according to the empirically validated rules of literary and redaction criticism, esp. tendency criticism), uncovers the process of inner-biblical interpretation. In this sense, inner-biblical interpretation and redaction history are the same.

Reinhard G. Kratz

University of Göttingen