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The dissertation is designed to address two basic areas: 1.) the text of the Genesis Apocryphon; and 2.) the scroll’s relationship to Jubilees in their analogous accounts of the division of the earth among Noah’s progeny (GenAp 16-17//Jub 8:11-9:15).

The introductory chapter surveys a number of issues dealt with in studies of the Genesis Apocryphon since its discovery. The designation of the scroll as “rewritten Bible” is kept, but qualified. The relationship to Genesis is explored, as well as previous claims of authorship by the Qumran sect of Essenes. The latter is most unlikely. The relationships to 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and other works from Qumran are evident, but prior evidence does not allow a more refined knowledge of their connections.

A new transcription, translation, and textual notes (with an apparatus of previous readings) are provided. These incorporate a number of corrections of earlier editions, and many new readings.
The background of the division of the earth includes the Table of Nations from Genesis 10 (and other biblical passages), the Ionian world map, the broader geographic setting of the Genesis Apocryphon, and Noah’s arboreal dream-vision (GenAp 13-15). An authorial interest in heightening Noah’s righteousness, stressing his role as divider of the habitable earth, and legitimizing the right of Arpachshad’s descendents (Abram, and later the Israelites) to inhabit the Levant, or biblical Land of Canaan, is revealed.

A comparison of the earth’s division in Jubilees and the Apocryphon shows that the latter is shorter, simpler, and employs a different ordering scheme. While Jubilees follows the biblical arrangement of Noah’s progeny, the Apocryphon lists them directionally. This may suggest that the Apocryphon preserves an earlier account than Jubilees, but the passages are best seen as dependent on a common cartographic source. Several new toponyms are proposed for both texts.

Based on a reappraisal of its language and comparison to Jubilees, the Apocryphon is dated to the early-mid second century B.C.E. It is an apocalyptic work concerned with the heavenly “mysteries” and interested in dream interpretation. It was apparently intended to be read alongside and interpret Genesis, attesting to the distinctive format of scriptural interpretation during this period.
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SECTION I

THE BACKGROUND AND TEXT OF THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON
CHAPTER 1

THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON: OBJECTIVES AND GOALS

In 1947 a tattered, brittle, parchment scroll was found in a well-hidden cave near the Dead Sea. At first, it was unassumingly called the “Fourth Scroll,” since it was the last of four manuscripts purchased by Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, the Syrian Metropolitan of Jerusalem, to be unrolled. 1 As the contents of the scroll slowly unfolded, however, it came to be known as the Book (or Apocalypse) of Lamech, and later still “A Genesis Apocryphon” (abbreviated as 1QapGen, 1QapGenα, or 1Q20). 2 While this title has some shortcomings, it has become sufficiently entrenched to deter further change. 3

In its present state, the Aramaic scroll tells the stories of the biblical patriarchs Enoch, Lamech, Noah, and Abram, mostly from a first person perspective. 4 While the

---

1 It was originally found along with six others, but three of the scrolls were eventually purchased by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, through the arrangement of Eliezer Lipa Sukenik.


3 See the opinions of D. Flusser, Kirjath Sepher (כִּרְיָת סֵפֶר) 32:4 (1956-57) 379 n. 3 [Hebrew]; J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea (Studies in Biblical Theology 26; trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM Press, 1959) 14 n. 1; and J. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 16. They (and I) prefer the suggestion of B. Mazar, ספר בראשית (Book of the Patriarchs).

4 Hence, the Apocryphon is frequently part of discussions on ancient pseudepigraphic works. First person narration occurs in most, but not all, of the scroll. A brief but penetrating discussion of its mix between pseudepigraphic and third-person narrative is found in the early review of David Flusser, Kirjath Sepher (כִּרְיָת סֵפֶר) 32:4 (1956-57) 379-83 [Hebrew]. Also see M. J. Bernstein, “Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls:
narrative is clearly related to Gen 6-15, the two texts are not synonymous (as the scroll’s latest name suggests). For example, Moshe Bernstein has detailed a number of instances where the author of the scroll has rearranged, anticipated, and harmonized aspects of the biblical account. To this we might also append a number of additions and subtractions.

1.1. Objectives

This dissertation is composed of three parts: 1.) an introduction to previous research on the Genesis Apocryphon; 2.) a new, annotated transcription and translation of the scroll; and 3.) a case study of one area in which recently or newly published portions of text improve our understanding of the scroll – namely, geography.

The introduction to prior research in the present chapter synthesizes a number of issues and proposals surrounding the Apocryphon raised since its initial publication in 1956. My aim here is to contextualize ensuing parts of the dissertation within the current stream of research, and to provide a backdrop against which final conclusions may be proffered. In order to prevent clutter and repetition, this section is designed to be representative of previous scholarship, rather than exhaustive. However, an effort has been made to provide adequate bibliography for further research on each topic presented.

The text, translation, and notes are preceded by their own introduction, in which I explain the need for a new edition. My goal in the second chapter is to provide those categories and functions,” in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 31; ed. E. G. Chazon and M. E. Stone; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 1-26 [esp. 15-17].

5 M. J. Bernstein, Re-arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon,” *DSD* 3:1 (1996), 37-57. This trait has often been compared to the autobiographical perspectives of the first portion of the Book of Tobit and the various patriarchal Testaments (e.g. the Aramaic Levi Document, the Testament of Qahat, or the Jewish portions of Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs) composed during the Second Temple period.
interested in the Apocryphon with a more comprehensive, accurate, and serviceable edition than those currently available.

The third chapter focuses on only one of many areas in which new or recently published material from the Apocryphon impacts not only our knowledge of this scroll, but also of other early Jewish texts, and Second-Temple Judaism in general. The subject of this chapter is the geography of the Genesis Apocryphon, particularly as it relates to geographic usage in the Book of Jubilees. While both of these texts appear to employ geography to similar ends, it will be seen that use of geography is more comprehensive in the Apocryphon, and that the two texts may not be as similar many have previously assumed. The goals of that chapter are to highlight a major exegetical and theological motif in the Apocryphon, and to enhance our understanding of its oft noted relationship with Jubilees.

A brief, concluding chapter is dedicated to offering some thoughts on the scroll’s composition, date, and provenance, especially in light of newly published or emended portions of text.

1.2. Current Issues in Study of the Genesis Apocryphon

As the contents of the Dead Sea Scrolls were revealed – a process that has taken over five decades – questions dear to modern text-critical scholars began to be asked of each work. What is this scroll about? How old is it? From which Jewish community did it initially emerge? Is it a product of the alleged Essene community at Qumran? How should it be classified? How does it fit into the history and literature of the period? How does it relate to the Bible? Ever since the initial publication of five of the Genesis Apocryphon’s columns by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin in 1956, efforts to answer such questions vis-à-vis the Genesis Apocryphon have centered around three main issues: 1.) literary genre; 2.)
relationship to Genesis; and 3.) relationship to other ancient Jewish works. In an effort to lay the proper groundwork for the following chapters these topics will be briefly surveyed below.

1.2.1. Literary Genre

Even before the first parts of the Genesis Apocryphon were published there was keen interest in what kind of text the it is. It was immediately clear that the Aramaic scroll was tied to stories known from Genesis, but how? Avigad and Yadin first described it as “a sort of apocryphal version of stories from Genesis, faithful, for the most part, to the order of the chapters in Scripture.” Despite their use of the words “Apocryphon” and “apocryphal” to characterize the scroll, Matthew Black, Paul Kahle, and Otto Eissfeldt preferred to label it a “targum” (i.e. translation). Black and Kahle, however, later changed their minds and began referring to the work as a “midrash,” perhaps following the lead of S. Zeitlin. M. Lehmann, arguing that the Genesis Apocryphon proves the early existence of targums, maintained that the Apocryphon “fits squarely into the main stream of Targumim

---

6 I am certainly not suggesting that these are the only issues that have been, or deserve to be, discussed regarding the Apocryphon. However, these three topics do represent (or at least relate to) the brunt of scholarship on the scroll up to the present, and thus provide a good starting point for this study.


and Midrashim, and probably represents the oldest prototype of both available to us."\textsuperscript{10} The classification "midrash" was eventually adopted by a bevy of scholars.\textsuperscript{11}

While some small, isolated sections of the scroll could be considered an Aramaic targum of Genesis, Fitzmyer correctly stated that "it is not really possible to label the whole composition a targum," since most of its text is much freer and more expansionistic than any known targum, including the so-called Pseudo-Jonathan and Fragment Targums.\textsuperscript{12} In the Noah section, for example, one can read for several columns (at least what is left of them) without meeting a strict translation of any known biblical version.

Although the term "midrash" may serve as a helpful description of the interpretive process used in the Genesis Apocryphon, it too has weaknesses. On the one hand, midrash can constitute a broad category roughly synonymous with "Jewish biblical interpretation,"\textsuperscript{13} while on the other it is frequently used to refer to a specific, rabbinic method of biblical interpretation which cites a lemma and then seeks to explain it in a discrete segment of commentary.\textsuperscript{14} Although the broad definition would certainly include the Genesis


\textsuperscript{12} Ibid, 18. This is also the opinion of R. Le Déaut, \textit{Biblica} 48 (1967) 142.

\textsuperscript{13} It is regularly employed in this broad sense by G. Vermes, \textit{Scripture and Tradition in Judaism} (Studia Post-Biblica 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961 [2\textsuperscript{nd} ed. 1973]). Also see A. G. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash (Part Two)," \textit{CBQ} 28 (1966), 456. The term is set in an even broader context by R. Bloch, "Midrash," in \textit{Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible} (Vol. 5; ed. L. Pirot, A. Robert, and H. Cazelles; Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1957) 1263-81. He traces the practice of Midrash from its ancient Near Eastern origins, through Jewish Intertestamental works such as Jubilees, and to its culmination in the rabbinic method. This important article has been translated into English by M. Howard Callaway in \textit{Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice} (Vol. 1; Brown Judaic Studies 1; ed. W. S. Green; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978) 29-50.

\textsuperscript{14} In other words, the biblical passage and its interpretation are formally distinguished from each other. See, e.g., the definition in H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, \textit{Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash} (trans. and ed. M. Bockmuehl; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992 [repr. 1996]) 235. Cf. G. J. Brooke, "Rewritten Bible," in
Apocryphon, it risks anachronistic confusion with the more narrow rabbinic method of interpretation.

Attempts to avoid such confusion are reflected by various commentators on the Apocryphon. H. Lignée correctly specified that “c’est un mirdash haggadique d’un genre spécial, qui n’est pas absolument semblable au mirdash rabbinique …”\textsuperscript{15} A. Dupont-Sommer further posited that the scroll is “un précieux specimen de mirdash essénien,” although one might expect this distinction to belong rather to the sectarian pesharim.\textsuperscript{16} C. Evans aptly summarizes the situation: “[t]he Genesis Apocryphon is certainly not a targum, nor is it mirdash in the sense of text and commentary.”\textsuperscript{17}

In 1961, Geza Vermes introduced the term “rewritten Bible” into his discussion of Jewish midrashic texts.\textsuperscript{18} By “rewritten Bible,” he clearly meant a subcategory within the broader spectrum of midrash. He wrote that, “[i]n order to anticipate questions, and to solve problems in advance, the mirdashist inserts haggadic development into the biblical narrative – an exegetical process which is probably as ancient as scriptural interpretation itself.”\textsuperscript{19} Included by Vermes under rewritten Bible were Sepher ha-Yashar, the Palestinian

---


\textsuperscript{19} Ibid, 95.
Targum, Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*, the Book of Jubilees, and the Genesis Apocryphon. As later noted by M. Bernstein, a defining characteristic of Vermes’ description was a “recapitulation of the narrative … of the whole or a large part of the biblical story,”20 as opposed to lemmatized commentary. Hence, in the works deemed rewritten Bible by Vermes, haggadic accretions are not formally distinguished from the biblical narrative.

“Rewritten Bible” has subsequently become a popular term to describe and categorize various ancient Jewish exegetical works, especially the Genesis Apocryphon.21 Unfortunately, it has not always been applied in a consistent manner, causing the genre to lose some of its usefulness.22 Especially confusing is the interchangeable and conflicting use of adjectives like “rewritten,” “parabiblical,” “midrashic,” “apocryphal,” “retold,” and “reworked” to describe ancient Jewish texts that interpret Scripture. For instance, the term “parabiblical” was coined in 1967 by H. L. Ginsberg:23

I … approve of [Fitzmyer’s] rejection of such labels as “targum” and “midrash” … To the question of literary genre, I should like to contribute a proposal for a term to cover works, like *GA* [i.e. *Genesis Apocryphon*], Pseudo-Philo, and the *Book of Jubilees*, which paraphrase and/or supplement the canonical Scriptures: parabiblical literature. The motivation of such literature – like that of midrash – may be more doctrinal, as in the case of the *Book of Jubilees*, or more artistic, as in at least the preserved parts of


22 Bernstein’s “Rewritten Bible” is a welcome corrective to this trend. He also provides a survey of how the term has been used.

23 H. L. Ginsberg, Review of Joseph A. Fitzmyer’s *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary*, *Theological Studies* 28 (1967) 574. Fitzmyer (*The Genesis Apocryphon*, 20) prefers this term to rewritten Bible, although he calls the Genesis Apocryphon “a good example” of the latter.
GA, but it differs from midrashic literature by not directly quoting and (with more or less arbitrariness) interpreting canonical Scripture.

Ginsberg’s use of “parabiblical literature” seems to be nearly synonymous with Vermes’ employment of “rewritten Bible.” However, when we turn to the more well-known use of “parabiblical” in Oxford’s Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series, we find the two terms juxtaposed in a different way:24

Within these volumes the parabiblical texts hold a special place since some of the literary genres represented by Qumran are becoming known only now, with the publication of the volumes. The volumes of the parabiblical texts contain various compositions which have in common that they are closely related to texts or themes of the Hebrew Bible. Some of these compositions present a reworking, rewriting, or paraphrase of biblical books.

Here parabiblical is used by E. Tov as an umbrella term, under which rewritten Bible would apparently be placed (i.e. more akin to Vermes’ use of “midrashic”). Evans makes a similar swap, this time between midrash and rewritten Bible: “Therefore, the Genesis Apocryphon is part of what is sometimes called the ‘rewritten Bible,’ a broad category that includes targum, midrash, and rewritten biblical narratives.”25 In contrast, Vermes and Bernstein would place the more narrowly defined rewritten Bible under the broader heading

---


of midrash, or biblical interpretation. The landscape of terms has obviously become cluttered and confusing.

To add to this dilemma, some have begun to question the validity of even using expressions like rewritten Bible or parabiblical literature at all. Such terms, they allege, imply a canonical situation that is anachronistic for many of the works typically gathered under them. John Reeves stated the argument forcefully:

The conceptual problem for modern researchers is further aggravated by a largely unreflective use of popular classificatory terminology like that of ‘rewritten Bible’ for works like Jubilees or 1 Enoch. One must first have ‘Bible’ before one can ‘rewrite’ it: the category presupposes and subtly endorses both a chronological sequence and an intertextual relationship.

…I would suggest that the notion of ‘Bible’ as a privileged category functioning as the fixed point of reference and discussion for the labeling, analysis, and evaluation of ‘non-canonical’ i.e., non-biblical works, requires a radical revision and reformulation. Our descriptive language should be altered in order to express this ‘revisioning’; instead of biblical ‘expansions’ or ‘rewritings,’ we should perhaps speak of ‘biblically allied,’ ‘biblically affiliated,’ or ‘biblically related’ literatures. Moreover, our accustomed way of perceiving and categorizing how Bible interacted with parallel literary corpora will require a serious overhaul. Instead of measuring all biblically allied or affiliated literatures against the Bible and then assigning labels like ‘expanded Bible,’ ‘rewritten Bible,’ ‘paraphrased Bible,’ ‘distorted Bible,’ and the like to those exemplars which depart textually and/or thematically from the Bible of the Masoretes, we should rather consider the bulk of this material, both biblical and non-biblical, as one culturally variegated literary continuum which juxtaposes a number of alternative or parallel ways of recounting a particular story or tradition.

Reeves’ advice serves as a healthy reminder of the fluidity of these traditions during the Second Temple period, yet few would argue that authors of works typically considered rewritten Bible did not base their accounts on a relatively fixed, received scriptural tradition.

---

roughly analogous to one of the known “variant literary editions.” If this is granted, then rewritten Bible remains a practical and helpful (albeit anachronistic) designation, so long as it is clear where it stands in the taxonomy of classificatory terms.

In this study I employ rewritten Bible as a subcategory of either biblical interpretation, midrash (in the broad sense of Vermes), or parabiblical literature (in the broad sense of Tov in *DJD*) – these three categories being roughly equivalent in my opinion. Under rewritten Bible I include the Genesis Apocryphon and any other ancient text seeking to interpret sacred Scripture by combining the biblical narrative and significant interpretive elements (haggadic or halakhic) without formally distinguishing between the two.

This definition leaves open two difficult questions, which I simply acknowledge here. First, how significant must the interpretive element be for a work not to be considered Scripture? Here a text such as 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q 364-367) is particularly thorny, since exegetical intrusions into the scriptural text are relatively minimal. Second, and on the other end of the spectrum, how much biblical narrative must be present? 1 Enoch, Life of Adam and Eve, Ascension of Isaiah, 4 Baruch, Aramaic Levi, and similar texts give pause in this regard, since their explicit scriptural grounding is very thin indeed.

27 This is, perhaps, more true for the Pentateuch than some other scriptural books. For a definition and defense of the term “variant literary edition” see E. C. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Leiden: Brill, 1999) 99-120 [especially 106-109].


ultimately pertain to “the degree of closeness of the exegetical composition to the biblical text,” and call for boundaries to be set at either end of the rewritten Scripture continuum. Wherever these outer limits may fall (and it is not my intention to set them here), we may confidently place the Genesis Apocryphon within their range, since it is one of a handful of texts to be included in every published list of rewritten Bible thus far.

Of course, it is worth reminding ourselves that the Genesis Apocryphon’s status as rewritten Bible is valid only when viewing the scroll in its entirety. Were we to possess only the first few columns, we would probably not consider this text rewritten Bible, but an Enochic writing. If, on the other hand, we had only column 22 it could legitimately be considered a targum.

1.2.2. Relationship to Genesis

Closely bound to the question of literary genre is the way in which the Genesis Apocryphon “rewrites,” or “retells,” parts of Genesis. A host of scholars have summarized the general character of the scroll in relation to the ancient versions, noting, for example, that it expansively paraphrases, reproduces and supplements, or freely reworks and rearranges the biblical narrative. Recently M. Bernstein has begun to supplement these


32 Some representative examples are Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 17; Nickelsburg, “Jewish Literature” 173; and VanderKam, Textual and Historical Studies, 277.
broad statements with careful, detailed studies of the specific exegetical techniques employed by the scroll, thereby filling a desideratum. His studies affirm earlier generalizations: the author of the scroll rearranged, anticipated, harmonized, added, and subtracted varied information from the scriptural narrative in order to provide a fuller, smoother, more coherent story. With this basic description of the scroll’s modus operandi in mind, there are four issues worthy of brief treatment before proceeding: 1.) the question of theological Tendenz; 2.) variation in exegetical expansion; 3.) the narratological break at 1QapGen 21.23; and 4.) the community of origin.

1.2.2.1. Theological Tendenz

Vermes, Fitzmyer, and others have understood the Apocryphon to be largely devoid of theological Tendenz, or interpretative bias. Vermes’ characterization of the scroll vibrantly reflects this viewpoint:

…it will be seen that Genesis Apocryphon occupies a privileged position in the midrashic literature in that it is the most ancient midrash of all. With its discovery the lost link between the biblical and the Rabbinic midrash has been found. Its freshness, its popular character, and its contribution to the understanding of the midrashic literary genre in its purest form, are unique. The pseudepigrapha related to it, or eventually dependent upon it (Jub., Enoch), as also most of the later midrashim, are too much concerned to graft upon the biblical story doctrines sometimes foreign to them. Beside Genesis Apocryphon they appear artificial and laboured, even though the relative weakness of their literary quality is often compensated by a greater theological richness…

The haggadic developments of Genesis Apocryphon are therefore organically bound to their biblical text. The author never attempts to introduce unrelated or extraneous matter. His technique is simple and he exercises no scholarly learning, no exegetical virtuosity, no play on words. His intention is to explain the biblical text, and this he does either by bringing together various passages of Genesis, or by illustrating a verse with the help of an appropriate story. The resulting work is certainly one of the jewels of midrashic exegesis, and the best illustration yet available of the primitive haggadah and of the unbiased rewriting of the Bible.\textsuperscript{34}

In like manner, F. Rosenthal wrote that “for the time being, we can be pretty certain that the text contains little of an ideological nature,” although he qualified this statement by noting that “the material preserved is limited.”\textsuperscript{35} He does, nonetheless, find a concern over the purity of the priestly line in the insistence of Sarai’s chastity while in Pharaoh’s house, and further proffered that, “[a]fter publication of the entire scroll, similar ideological attitudes, I am sure, will be discovered in the work upon closer scrutiny.” Fitzmyer agreed that “it is difficult to see what exegetical or doctrinal meditations were at work in the composition of this text.”\textsuperscript{36}

Other commentators have shown less reservation in assigning various theological tendencies to our author. We may cite as examples the contentions of P. Winter and R. Meyer that the scroll contains an anti-Samaritan prejudice.\textsuperscript{37} While this suggestion is difficult to rule out completely, it lacks the evidence and argumentation to instill confidence. More

\textsuperscript{34} Vermes, \textit{Scripture and Tradition}, 124-26.

\textsuperscript{35} F. Rosenthal, review of N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, \textit{A Genesis Apocryphon}, JNES 18 (1959) 82-84.

\textsuperscript{36} Fitzmyer, \textit{The Genesis Apocryphon}, 23.

convincing is Lignée’s perception of a “tendance sacerdotale” and a “tendance apocalyptique,” which he attributes to the work’s Qumranic milieu.\(^{38}\)

An exception to these tenuous suggestions is the fine study of G. Nickelsburg, who has outlined a number of techniques and tendencies employed in the Apocryphon’s retelling of events in Genesis.\(^{39}\) First, he refers to several places where an “Enochic” perspective is clearly discernible – not only in the scroll’s early columns, but also in the Abram story, where Abram instructs Pharaoh’s underlings by reading “from the book of the words of Enoch.”\(^{40}\) Second, he draws attention to a possible “eschatological Tendenz” based on a Urzeit/Endzeit typology also found in 1 Enoch, whereby the author associates the wicked generation of Noah and its impending punishment with his own age.\(^{41}\) Third, the author of the Apocryphon exploits channels of divine revelation not found in Genesis, such as the figure of Enoch and symbolic dream-visions.\(^{42}\) Fourth, there is a clear “psychologizing interest” in describing the interaction between characters in the narrative, especially patriarchs and their wives (e.g. Lamech/Batenosh; Abram/Sarai).\(^{43}\) Other tendencies are noted as well, such as an interest in eroticism, demons and apotropaicism, and the portrayal of patriarchs through the lens of other Israelite figures, such as Joseph and Daniel. According to Nickelsburg, several of these factors indicate significant concern over the sexual purity of Israelite women, which may give us some hint of the social setting behind the scroll.


\(^{39}\) Nickelsburg, “Patriarchs”

\(^{40}\) Ibid, 181-82, 190-91 (see 1QapGen 19.25).

\(^{41}\) Ibid, 182.

\(^{42}\) Ibid, 183, 188-89.

\(^{43}\) Ibid, 183-84, 188.
Nickelsburg has successfully shown that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon utilized certain literary techniques and theological perspectives in his rewriting of Genesis. However, he did not extensively incorporate the more recently published parts of the scroll into his analysis, instead focusing on those parts first published by Avigad and Yadin in 1956. An investigation of the techniques and concerns reflected in these parts of the Apocryphon has yet to be undertaken. Such a study may help clarify Nickelsburg's list, and perhaps add to it.

1.2.2.2. Variation in Exegetical Expansion

In passing, Nickelsburg mentioned a practice of the Genesis Apocryphon worth drawing further attention to here. While almost every commentator notes the expansive nature of the Apocryphon, he observed that there are at least two sections of the scroll which compress stories from Genesis: the story of Abram and Lot (Gen 13:1-13; 1QapGen 20.33-21.7) and the war of the eastern and Canaanite kings (Gen 14; 1QapGen 21.23-22.26). While not altogether surprising, this may suggest that the author of the Apocryphon was more interested in some parts of Genesis than in others, that there was simply more haggadic material available to draw on for certain portions of the book, or that he was using sources which varied in their exegetical approach. Analysis of individual facets of the narrative, such as the mixed employment of divine names or the noticeable shifts in Aramaic syntax, suggests that the latter is the more probable.

——

44 G. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature 177.

45 Get a reference from Moshe to his unpublished article on use of divine names.
1.2.2.3. **GenAp 21.23**

The autobiographical narration of the Genesis Apocryphon is one of its unique and most frequently cited attributes. Many scholars, however, have been careful to stress that this trait does not carry throughout the entire scroll, since at 21.23 there is a shift from the first to third person. 46 This shift is concurrent with the beginning of the story about the war of the four eastern kings against the five Canaanite kings (cf. Gen 14).

Fitzmyer, Vermes, and Alexander observed that this narrative break is accompanied by a more profound shift in the scroll’s style of biblical exegesis. 47 In contrast to the part of the scroll preceding 21.23, Fitzmyer observes that the portion following it “is marked by far less rewriting or embellishments than what is found in the preceding chapters of Genesis. Indeed, at times it is nothing more than a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew text into Aramaic; yet even this sort of translation does not last long. It is rather a paraphrase, which stays close to the biblical text.” 48 Although this later segment of the Apocryphon still contains a large number of novel interpretive elements, Fitzmyer’s distinction remains essentially correct. This change in style is, no doubt, partly responsible for early disagreement over whether the scroll should be labeled targum or midrash.

---

46 Most introductions to the text mention this fact. For a summary see Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 229-30.


1.2.3. Qumran Origins?

The most recent edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* inconspicuously states that the Genesis Apocryphon “is a good example of Essene biblical exegesis.” Yet, opinions over whether the Genesis Apocryphon was the product of the Essenes at Qumran have been mixed. Some, such as Michaud, Meyer, Lignée, de Vaux, and Dupont-Sommer perceived elements in the scroll suggesting a direct connection to the Qumran community, whose theology is reflected in sectarian writings such as the Community Rule, the War Scroll, and the Pesharim. J. C. Reeves has suggested that part of Noah’s sacrifice in 1QapGen 10.14 may also indicate that the Apocryphon was a sectarian or proto-sectarian product. His proposed reconstruction of Noah burning fat upon the altar has since been confirmed, and may display a ritual affinity with Jubilees and the Temple Scroll.

Fitzmyer is among those who have questioned this stance, asserting that “[t]here is nothing in this text that clearly links it with any of the known beliefs or customs of the Qumran sect. There is practically no Essene theology in this work…” This appears to be correct, and is now the position held by a large majority of scholars who have studied the

---


52 This fact that fat is burned is hardly determinative, since this practice is also common in the Hebrew Bible. Reeves’ observation that the Apocryphon employs a sectarian order for the sacrifices may be more meaningful, but its connection to the Temple Scroll does not seem particularly close. The sectarian status of the Temple Scroll has been a matter of some debate.

scroll, including P. Winter, F. Rosenthal, G. Vermes, D. Harrington, and G. Nickelsburg.\textsuperscript{54} This conclusion may be confirmed by the fact that the Apocryphon was written in Aramaic, since all Qumran writings of certain Essene origin are written in Hebrew.\textsuperscript{55} Although the Genesis Apocryphon was probably not written by the Qumranites, there has been unanimous agreement that it was written in the land of Israel. This is most clearly evidenced by the author’s impressive knowledge of regional geography.\textsuperscript{56}

1.2.4. Relationship to Other Ancient Jewish Texts

Sustained efforts have been made to compare and relate the Genesis Apocryphon to other literary works of the Second Temple and Rabbinic periods. Oftentimes these are aimed at settling questions regarding the composition’s date and provenance. A firm relative date, for instance, could help determine whether the Apocryphon was composed before or during the period when Qumran was settled, or with which Jewish group(s) it may have been associated. In addition, comparison with contemporaneous literature may help conjecture what some of the gaps in the fragmentary scroll once contained. Below I will outline some of the most pertinent connections scholars have drawn between the Apocryphon and other ancient Jewish texts.

\textsuperscript{54} Winter, NovT 2, 83; Rosenthal, JNES 18, 151-52; Vermes, “2. The Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran,” 323; Harrington, “The Bible Rewritten (Narratives),” 244-45; Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature, 177.

\textsuperscript{55} See S. Segert, “Die Sprachenfragen in der Qumrāngemeinschaft,” Qumrān-Probleme (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 42; ed. H. Bardtke; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963) 315-39 [322-23]; idem, JSS 13, 282; and A. Lamadrid, Estudios Bíblicos 28, 169.

\textsuperscript{56} See, e.g., Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, 124.
1.2.4.1. 1 Enoch and Jubilees

The Genesis Apocryphon’s close relationship to Enochic literature on one hand, and the Book of Jubilees on the other, has been noted since its initial publication by Avigad and Yadin. Unfortunately, 1 Enoch and Jubilees have often been uncritically grouped together, as if they were a single work, especially by earlier commentators. This seems to rest on the unverified conclusion that the Genesis Apocryphon must either be a source for, or dependent upon, both 1 Enoch and Jubilees – i.e. the relationship must be the same for both works. The early statement of Avigad and Yadin is typical: “we may confidently emphasize the close connection between the scroll and many parts of the Book of Enoch and the Book of Jubilees, leading at times to the conclusion that the scroll may have served as a source for a number of the stories told more concisely in those two books.”

The frequent conflation of these texts renders any attempt to treat either one in terms of its own relationship to the Apocryphon difficult. In an effort to avoid repetition, I will present the opinions of those who treat 1 Enoch and Jubilees together under my section on 1 Enoch, referring back to them only as needed in the subsequent Jubilees section.

1.2.4.1.1. 1 Enoch

A vague connection between 1 Enoch and the Genesis Apocryphon was first posited by J. C. Trever in 1949. Commenting on the first legible piece of the scroll, he wrote that “Dr. W. F. Albright … suggested from key words appearing on it that it came from Enoch,


58 Ibid [emphasis theirs]. The widely acknowledged composite nature of 1 Enoch has also not always been adequately taken into consideration.

though he found no exact parallels.\textsuperscript{60} With this general connection suggested, a number of scholars have attempted further to clarify their relationship.

**Genesis Apocryphon a Source for 1 Enoch**

From Trever’s early report on the emerging contents of the Fourth Scroll it is clear that both Albright and C. C. Torrey considered this “Book of Lamech” to be a source for the Book of Enoch. Torrey argued that:

> The consistent use of the first person in the Fragment shows that it was truly a Lamech apocalypse, quite distinct from the book of Enoch. In my judgment, this framework was given up when this portion of the work was made a part of Enoch and adapted to it; for there, as you see, Lamech is spoken of only in the third person, while the only one who speaks in the first person is Enoch! My guess, then, would be that your Fragment represents the original form of the apocalypse.\textsuperscript{61}

Albright added that “[a] strong case can be brought for considering the so-called Book of Noah which is imbedded in Enoch (Chapters 6-11; 54-55:2; 60; 65-69:25; 106-107, according to Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 1912, p. xlvi) as properly derived from the Book of Lamech.”\textsuperscript{62} Unfortunately, he did little to clarify this “strong case” beyond pointing to some well-documented difficulties in the Noachic sections of 1 Enoch.

Avigad and Yadin were the first to analyze the most complete, persuasive parallel between the Apocryphon and 1 Enoch in detail:

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid, 8.
\textsuperscript{61} Ibid, 9.
\textsuperscript{62} Ibid, 9, n. 4
the first five columns of the scroll as we now have it, deal with the birth of Noah in a manner that has no relationship at all to the brief Biblical account in *Genesis* v, 28-29. On the other hand, the narrative in the scroll resembles chapter cvi of the *Book of Enoch* in most essential points, though there are some significant additions in the scroll, such as the dialogue between Lamech and Bat-Enosh and Enoch’s long reply to Methuselah – some five times as long as the version in the *Book of Enoch*.\(^63\)

This fascinating story tells of Noah’s spectacular birth, Lamech’s suspicion that the child’s conception may be illegitimate, and his eventual assurance by Enoch (1QapGen 2-5.27; 1 En 106-7).\(^64\) The fact that the story is significantly longer in the Apocryphon than in 1 Enoch led the editors to conclude that the former was probably contemporary with or previous to the composition of the latter – i.e. 1 Enoch is a later, condensed version of the story of Noah’s birth, perhaps based on the Apocryphon.

Vermes was the only scholar to offer explicit support for the proposal of Avigad and Yadin regarding 1 Enoch.\(^65\) He went further than they did, however, in explaining his reason for this stance. For Vermes, the primacy of the Genesis Apocryphon is obvious based on “[i]ts freshness, its popular character, and its contribution to the understanding of the midrashic genre in its purest form.” It is “the most ancient midrash of all,” beside which other midrashic works like 1 Enoch and Jubilees “appear artificial and laboured, even though the relative weakness of their literary quality is often compensated by a greater theological richness.” Hence, it is the Apocryphon’s “unbiased rewriting of the Bible” that sets it apart, and proves its greater antiquity in relation to other similar works. It is surprising that Vermes cited Enoch as an example in this description, since he evidently based his

---

\(^63\) Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 19


estimation of the Apocryphon solely on passages paralleled in Jubilees and dealing with Abram. In fact, the more expansive passage of 1QapGen 2-5.27 would seem to contradict his blanket judgments.

More compelling is Vermes’ later defense of the Apocryphon’s priority, in which he noted a tendency in Intertestamental literature towards abbreviation. His examples of this phenomenon are Psalm 151, the Astronomical Book of 1 Enoch, and the Aramaic Testament of Levi. Echoing earlier sentiments, he further observed that it is easier to account for Jubilees’ insertion of doctrinal tendencies (e.g. calendrical matters) into an unbiased work such as the Genesis Apocryphon than the other way round. He was also the only commentator to question the traditional dating of the scroll’s language to the first century B.C.E., arguing that the only thing E. Y. Kutscher had shown in his renowned linguistic analysis was that the Aramaic of the Apocryphon postdates that of Daniel. Hence, he “slightly” preferred a date of composition in the early second century B.C.E. Despite these views, Vermes admitted that the opinion of others, who believed Jubilees to be the earlier text (see below), is also tenable.

Indeterminate Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch

A bevy of scholars reviewed the 1956 edition of the scroll by Avigad and Yadin, many expressing skepticism over the possibility of pinpointing the direction of literary


67 Ibid, 321.

68 For a significantly more skeptical assessment of the possibility of dating the Aramaic of the Apocryphon and other Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran see M. O. Wise, Thunder in Gemini (JSPSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994) 103-51.
dependence between the Apocryphon and 1 Enoch. David Flusser was among the first to express doubt:

The entire scroll bears a resemblance in its overall plot and in many details to parts of the Book of Jubilees and parts of the Book of Enoch, although not all of the composition’s features are found in those two works. The question pertains whether the composition before us was used as a source for the works mentioned above. The editors of the scroll are inclined to answer this question in the affirmative. Yet I do not know if the small amount of material from the scroll published thus far makes it at all possible to answer this important question... It is difficult today to assess the ways in which the authors manipulated their sources in order to create this literature; it appears that the authors put the words of their compatriots to use in a way similar to scribes of the Middle Ages, i.e. they relied on the texts at their disposal, intermingled them, arranged them according to their fancy, and added or subtracted to the extent that it is sometimes difficult for us to determine whether what lies before us is a new version or a new composition. 69

Similar, albeit less developed, opinions were expressed by H. Bardtke, J. Hempel, and R. Meyer, the latter adding that Avigad and Yadin’s hypothesis seemed to him “fraglich.” 70 There was a general consensus among these scholars that publication of other parts of the Genesis Apocryphon may shed light on the issue of literary dependence. Although significantly more of the text is now available, few efforts have been made to explore what they may add to our knowledge on this topic.

Most recently, and since the publication of all available columns, Moshe Bernstein has noted an ongoing scholarly inability to accurately determine the relationships between the Apocryphon and other Jewish works. 71 Having pointed out a number of connections

69 D. Flusser, Kirjath Sepher (קריית сыфер) 32:4, 382-83 [Hebrew; translation mine].
70 Bardtke, TLZ 83, 346; Hempel, ZAW 69, 234; and Meyer, DLZ 80, 587.
with Jubilees, 1 Enoch, and the Book of Giants, and without giving up hope of future advances, he concludes that “we cannot yet determine any genetic relationship among them.”

1 Enoch a Source for the Genesis Apocryphon

H. E. Del Medico was the first to disagree overtly with Avigad and Yadin’s relative chronology, and his judgment has since emerged as the *communis opinio*:

At the moment, it is impossible to give a definite date for this manuscript, but there is a clearly marked tendency in all writings of this kind which should not be overlooked: whilst an author leaves out a story he does not know, the general rule stands that “no author abbreviates; all amplify…” Moreover, it hardly seems probable that our roll could have been earlier to, or contemporary with, the Book of Jubilees, Enoch, etc., which are given dates from the fourth to second centuries B.C.

While Del Medico’s proposal to invert the direction of literary dependence suggested by Avigad and Yadin has been accepted by others, his dating of the scroll has been widely dismissed. He assigned the scroll a second century C.E. date at the earliest based on its employment of the name Hyrcanus, which he understands to be a reference to a member of the Tobiad dynasty.

---


72 Ibid, 64.


74 Del Medico, *The Riddle of the Scrolls*, 174-78. This Hyrcanus (son of Joseph and grandson of Tobias) was active during the late 3rd to early 2nd cents. B.C.E. Del Medico claims that the legend of Hyrcanus and the literary environment must have had at least three centuries (!) to develop before reaching the stage found in the Apocryphon. Sheer conjecture would be a benevolent characterization of Del Medico’s theory. It is also worth noting his obvious disdain for this text, passages of which he dubbed “highly improper.”
G. Lambert joined Del Medico in his rejection of Avigad and Yadin’s proposed relationship, if not his controversial dating, “Personellement nous avons plutôt l’impression que c’est notre auteur qui amplifie, à partir du Livre des Jubilés et d’autres sources, mais non l’inverse.”\(^75\) Like most commentators, Lambert discusses the Genesis Apocryphon’s relationship with Jubilees almost exclusively, although he would presumably include 1 Enoch among the “autres sources” mentioned.

Fitzmyer took the same stance in his 1966 commentary on the Apocryphon. Having explained Avigad and Yadin’s position, he observed that “the editors have given no reasons for their ‘assumption,’” leading him to assert that:

> just the opposite seems to be more likely, i.e., that the work in this scroll depends on Enoch and Jubilees. Such a view is more in accord with the general tendency of the scroll to fill out and embellish the Genesis narrative. One gets the impression that the scanty details in Genesis, Enoch, or Jubilees are here utilized in an independent way and filled out with imaginative additions.\(^76\)

Although Fitzmyer cited no specific examples, he would undoubtedly consider the longer version of Noah’s birth in the Genesis Apocryphon a “filling out” and “embellishing” of 1 Enoch 106-7.\(^77\) In 1984 K. Beyer followed suit, claiming that Enoch and Jubilees were used directly by the Apocryphon to fill out its retelling of Genesis.\(^78\)

G. W. E. Nickelsburg has offered the most comprehensive and well-reasoned argument for the priority of 1 Enoch 106-7 to date. Based on earlier suggestions by J. T. Lambert, “Une ‘Genèse apocryphe,’” 106.

\(^75\) Fitzmyer, \textit{The Genesis Apocryphon} (1966), 14. He had earlier expressed the same view, but with less developed reasoning, in “Some Observations on the Genesis Apocryphon,” \textit{CBQ} 22 (1960) 277-91 [277].

\(^76\) Cf. Fitzmyer, \textit{The Genesis Apocryphon}, 122.

\(^77\) K. Beyer, \textit{Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer}, 165.
Milik and F. García Martínez that both sources depend on an earlier Book of Noah (see below), Nickelsburg suggested that:

[A] Noah book may have provided source material for 1 Enoch 106-107, whose author enhanced the figure of Enoch and added some eschatological material drawn from other parts of the Enochic corpus. The Apocryphon’s author further elaborated the Enochic story with the haggadic motifs that were of interest to him and with the Enochic material, which has also influenced other parts of the Apocryphon.  

Four reasons were proposed in defense of this claim: 1.) The heated exchange between Lamech and his wife Batenosh (1QapGen 2) is paralleled by similar additions to the Abram story later in the scroll, indicating an authorial tendency rather than a remnant from an earlier tradition.  2.) Lamech’s first person narration fits the general technique of the scroll, and need not derive from a source.  3.) The Apocryphon devotes more space to Enoch’s discourse than 1 Enoch 106-107, suggesting an Enochic rather than Noachic source for the Lamech version of the story.  4.) The superscription “The Book of the Words of Noah” in 1QapGen 5.29 (i.e., directly following the birth of Noah story) seems to preclude the earlier columns of the Apocryphon belonging to a Book of Noah. Moreover, the stories of Noah’s life (col. 6) and Abram and Sarai in Egypt (cols. 19-20) incorporate Enochic motifs and language.

While point four does not directly apply to the present question, the first three claim that much of the material present in the Apocryphon, but not 1 Enoch 106-107, may be attributed to broader authorial mannerisms in the Apocryphon. Nickelsburg proposes that

---


80 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 76.
when these editorial tendencies are removed the remaining account more closely resembles that of 1 Enoch, suggesting the latter as a probable source for the former.

Nickelsburg has also argued that the Genesis Apocryphon relies on other parts of the Enochic corpus, such as the Book of Watchers (1 En 6-11), the Epistle of Enoch (1 En 92-105), and various other passages. He clearly understands these Enochic passages to be earlier, influencing the Apocryphon’s retelling. Except for perhaps the Book of Watchers (cf. 1QapGen 0-1), Nickelsburg’s examples speak more to a shared ideological background than direct borrowing or quotation from 1 Enoch.

**Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch Dependent on a Common Source**

J. T. Milik espoused a view unlike those presented above, arguing instead that the stories of Noah’s birth in the Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch are independently derived from a common source, which he called the “Book of Noah.” Milik remarked that:

> [I]n 106:7-8 Methuselah betakes himself, for a consultation on the miraculous birth of Noah, ‘to the limits of the earth’ where Enoch ‘dwells with the angels’. This so-called Noachic fragment is nothing but a summary which serves as a reference (a sort of catchword) to a work in which the birth and the life of the Hebrew hero of the Flood were recounted in greater detail.

> This ‘Book of Noah’ was summarized in Aramaic, undoubtedly in its original language, by the compiler of 1QGenesis Apocryphon… A Hebrew version of such a summary may be preserved in fragments of 1Q19. In En. 106-7, and the corresponding fragments of 4QEn, we have a third, and the most reduced, résumé of the ‘Book of Noah.’

---

81 Such as 1 Enoch 72-82, 83-84, and 85-90, where Methuselah is the mediator of Enochic revelation. Cf. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 172-77.

82 Milik, *Books of Enoch*, 55. The Book of Noah is an ancillary topic of significant interest to those interested in the Genesis Apocryphon, but for reasons of economy it will not be explored further here. For a recent and judicious review of the scholarship and issues see M. E. Stone, “The Book(s) Attributed to Noah,” *DJD* 13:1 (2006), 4-23.

This statement posits no direct relationship between 1 Enoch and the Apocryphon, although one gains the impression that Milik considers the account in GenAp 2-5.27 to be older than that of 1 En 106-107, or at least closer to its original Noachic source.\textsuperscript{84}

**Excursus: The Date of 1 Enoch 106-107**

Any attempt to date the Genesis Apocryphon relative to 1 Enoch 106-107 depends on a fixed date for the latter account. R. H. Charles isolated these chapters of Enoch as a fragment of a Noah Apocalypse, noting that they did not cohere with their surrounding context.\textsuperscript{85} He therefore attributed them to a late stage of the book’s editing.

Milik agreed with Charles’ judgment, reporting further that the story was partially preserved in one of the copies of Enoch from Cave 4 of Qumran (4QEn 5 i 24-25).\textsuperscript{86} Dated paleographically to the last third of the first century B.C.E., this discovery provides a *terminus ante quem* for the story’s composition. Following Charles and Milik, García Martínez wrote that these chapters “are clearly an insertion… and obviously represent a later addition.”\textsuperscript{87} Both Milik and García Martínez considered this interpolation an abridged form of an earlier Book of Noah.

Nickelsburg substantially agreed with his predecessors, but modified their position slightly by suggesting that 1 En 106-107 did not rely on an earlier Noachic source alone, but

\textsuperscript{84} See Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 56-57, 183-84), who considered chapters 106-107 to be an appendix to the Enochic corpus. Cf. F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 27-28; and Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 539.

\textsuperscript{85} R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 25, 32-33, 301. This is also the opinion of Milik (*Books of Enoch*, 55-57) and Nickelsburg (*1 Enoch 1*, 542), although the reasons for separating these chapters from the Epistle of Enoch and assigning them a later date have never been fully articulated.


\textsuperscript{87} García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 27-28.
on a number of older traditions. One of these sources, he argued, was the Epistle of Enoch, which he dates to the mid to early second century B.C.E. Hence, the version of the story as it stands in 1 Enoch 106-107 may be dated to sometime between the first third of the second century B.C.E. and the last third of the first century B.C.E. If Nickelsburg’s assessment is correct, a date between the mid second century and early first century B.C.E. is plausible.

Although this does not tell us with any assurance when the Genesis Apocryphon’s version of the story was composed, it does provide a plausible point for comparison. If Torrey, Albright, Avigad and Yadin, and Vermes are followed, we might expect the Apocryphon to be dated to the mid second century B.C.E. or earlier. However, if Del Medico, Lambert, Fitzmyer, and Nickelsburg are correct, a date around the mid first century B.C.E. may be reasonably argued.

Summary: The Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch

Thus far Nickelsburg has provided the most impressive case for a specific, genetic relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and 1 Enoch, arguing that most “non-Enochic” elements in the former may be attributed to the literary techniques of its author. Yet, the brief remarks of Torrey and Albright leave one somewhat ill at ease in accepting this proposal. Indeed, an extension of Torrey’s reasoning turns one of Nickelsburg’s strongest points on its head by suggesting that there is ample motivation for the redactor of 1 Enoch to change the main character of the story from Lamech to Enoch (i.e. subsume it under an Enochic perspective) in order to integrate it into the Enochic corpus. This argument gains

88 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 26, 542.

support from other passages in 1 Enoch (e.g. chapters 60 and 65) where the figure of Enoch either displaces Noah or narrates Noachic events, even though Noah was clearly the original speaker.\footnote{See R. H. Charles, \textit{The Book of Enoch} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893) 152-53, 169-70.}

To counter another of Nickelsburg’s points, it would not be surprising if the Enochic redactor quietly left aside the somewhat risqué exchange between Lamech and Batenosh, in which she details her sexual arousal during intercourse. The question thus becomes where the story seems most at home in its literary surrounding, to which we must answer: the Genesis Apocryphon. In sum, one could plausibly argue (with earlier scholars) that the redactor of 1 Enoch altered and abbreviated the Apocryphon, which would suggest a late 2nd cent. B.C.E. date for the Apocryphon at the latest.

Arguments based primarily on the relative length of these two related accounts are also troubling. To state simply that the longer text should be considered the younger (e.g. Del Medico and Fitzmyer) is extremely suspect, since this rule – if indeed it is a rule at all – is prone to have exceptions. As noted above, Vermes (no amateur to the field) believed just the opposite to be true: abbreviation, not expansion, is the rule. A good example of such abbreviation is found in Jubilees’ rewriting of portions of 1 Enoch.\footnote{E.g. Jub 5:1-13/1 En 6-11. See Milik’s (\textit{Books of Enoch}, 183) assertion that the Epistle of Enoch was longer in the original than in the later versions. Also J. C. VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and other Second-Century Sources,” \textit{SBLSP} (1978) 233-35.}

Judging by the preceding insights, the best we can muster at present is to say that the relationship between these texts remains highly debatable. While a clear connection between them exists, its specific nature is frustratingly elusive. Perhaps the most important point to take away from their relationship is a shared ideological and theological milieu, in which a
common apocalyptic worldview is embraced and Enoch is seen as a major conduit of divine revelation. Some further thoughts on this relationship will be offered in the final chapter.

1.2.4.1.2. Jubilees

Based on a large fragment of the Fourth Scroll, removed during its stay in the United States in 1949 (now column 2), Trever observed that “[t]he combination of letters, bt’nvš, became the clue to the text, when I found that according to the Ethiopian Jubilees 4:28 the wife of Lamech was Bētēnōs.”

Indeed, this was the first clue of many that the Genesis Apocryphon and Book of Jubilees share a special relationship. Some of the most significant parallels suggested to date are:

i. The name of Noah’s wife, Batenosh (1QapGen 5.3, 8; Jub 4:28)

ii. Noah’s expiatory sacrifice following the Flood (1QapGen 10.13-17; Jub 6:1-3)

iii. The location (Mt. Lubar) and five-year chronology of Noah planting a vineyard and celebrating its produce (1QapGen 12.13-15; Jub 7:1-2)

iv. The division of the earth between Noah’s sons and grandsons (1QapGen 16-17; Jub 8:10-9:15)

v. The construction of Hebron (1QapGen 19.9; Jub 13:12)

vi. The seven-year chronology of Abram and Sarai during their sojourn in Egypt (1QapGen 22.27-29; Jub 13:10-12)

As with 1 Enoch, scholars have explained these parallels in at least four different ways.

---


The assumption of Avigad and Yadin and Vermes that the lengthier Genesis Apocryphon served as a source for 1 Enoch applied to Jubilees as well. While Avigad and Yadin partially relied on parallels with 1 Enoch to reach this conclusion, Vermes appears to have based himself almost exclusively on comparisons with Jubilees. Vermes admits that “[t]he relationship between Genesis Apocryphon and the Book of Jubilees presents a particular problem which cannot be solved satisfactorily until all the fragments of GA have been published,” but goes on to claim that “from the material already accessible it would appear – as the editors themselves believe (p. 38) – that the corresponding portions of the Book of Jubilees may be no more than an abridgement of Genesis Apocryphon.”* In his opinion, Jubilees “should, perhaps, be regarded as a shortened, though doctrinally enriched, Essene recension of the original work.”

Prior to Vermes, P. Kahle had sided with Avigad and Yadin on the priority of the Genesis Apocryphon. Commenting on the manuscript’s proposed first century B.C.E. date he remarked, “I am convinced that it was composed earlier, as it seems to have been presupposed by the Book of Jubilees: the text actually found in the first cave may have been a copy of an older original.”** He did nothing, however, to defend this view.

In 1964 B. Z. Wacholder proposed an additional reason for considering the Genesis Apocryphon earlier than Jubilees.*** After studying the comparative chronologies of Abram and Sarai’s tumultuous sojourn in Egypt in both the Apocryphon and Jubilees, Wacholder found reason to believe that the former preserves the more primitive scheme. Moreover, he

---

*Vermes, Scripture and Tradition, 124.


understood a chronological recounting of Abram’s journeys by the Lord in 1QapGen 22.27-29 to signify a period when this school of pentateuchal chronology was struggling for acceptance. He concluded that:

Genesis Apocryphon uses a relative system of dating; Jubilees an absolute one. Less obvious, but nevertheless real, differences are that in the former the dating is an integral part of the narrative; in the latter it is superimposed. The author of Genesis Apocryphon still feels the need to defend his chronology by invoking the Lord himself; the author of Jubilees takes the chronology for granted.  

Although he believed the Genesis Apocryphon to be older than Jubilees, Wacholder withheld judgment concerning the precise nature of their relationship: “[o]n the basis of the available works, the chronology of Genesis Apocryphon is directly or indirectly the source of Jubilees.”  

P. Grelot made a very similar case in his 1967 review of Fitzmyer’s commentary on the Apocryphon. Compared to the fully integrated calendrical system employed by Jubilees, Grelot considered the less developed scheme in the parallel portions of the Genesis Apocryphon to be “une chronologie plus archaïque.” Based on this observation he supposed that the Genesis Apocryphon does not depend on Jubilees at this point, proving that the latter must depend on the former, or both on a common source. 

The most recent defense of the Genesis Apocryphon’s priority was undertaken in a pair of articles by Cana Werman. In an essay dealing with the Book of Noah at Qumran

97 Ibid, 52. 
98 Ibid, 53 [italics mine]. 
100 Werman is, to my knowledge, the only author to date to discuss the issue of literary dependence in light of the more recently published parts of the Apocryphon, made available in the 1990’s.
she wrote that “the author of Jubilees was acquainted with the Genesis Apocryphon and even made use of it.”

She supported her claim by citing two incidents found in both texts: the planting of the vineyard and יִשְׁרֹעַל (i.e. fourth year’s fruits of a young tree in 1QapGen 12.14-19; Jub 7:1-4, 34-37), and the sacrifices offered by Noah after disembarking from the ark (1QapGen 10; Jub 6). Not only are both of these passages longer in Jubilees, but, Werman claims, both passages in Jubilees can be shown to alter the Genesis Apocryphon in accordance with a priestly agenda.

In a subsequent article Werman drew attention to the portions of land allotted by Noah to his sons Shem and Japheth (cf. 1QapGen 16-17; Jub 8:10-9:15) during his division of the earth. Jubilees’ description, she argued, is longer, more detailed, and includes a greater admixture of Hellenistic scientific knowledge, thus revealing its dependence on the shorter and less scientifically informed Apocryphon.

A notable aspect of the above survey is the contrasting assumptions of Avigad and Yadin and Werman. While the former claim priority for the Genesis Apocryphon based on its greater length, Werman (and perhaps Wacholder) does so based on its shorter, simpler character. If nothing else, this serves as a warning that general statements about one work being longer or shorter than another may not accurately reflect the situation.

Indeterminate Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees

A number of scholars who believed a verdict about the relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees to be premature have been listed above, in the section

---


dealing with 1 Enoch (e.g. Flusser, Bardtke, Hempel, Meyer, Bernstein). The 1957 assessment of R. de Vaux, dealing specifically with Jubilees, mirrors their sentiment:

…les rapports entre cet apocryphe et Jubilés ne sont pas entièrement clairs. Ce sont peut-être de œuvres parallèles et le développement donné à certains passages ne prouve pas nécessairement que l’apocryphe soit antérieur aux Jubilés. Les texts de Qumrân nous apprennent de plus en plus que literature était riche et que son histoire est complexe.\(^\text{103}\)

It bears repeating that most of these scholars expressed hope that the relationship would gain more clarity with the publication of the remaining parts of the Apocryphon – a task now essentially complete.

Jubilees a Source for the Genesis Apocryphon

As seen above, many scholars reacted with skepticism to Avigad and Yadin’s claim that the Genesis Apocryphon served as a source for 1 Enoch and Jubilees, finding just the opposite arrangement to be more plausible (e.g. Del Medico, Lambert, Fitzmyer, Beyer). Most of these cited the first century B.C.E. to C.E. date of the manuscript and E. Y. Kutscher’s comparable date for the scroll’s language\(^\text{104}\) in support of their claim.\(^\text{105}\) That this view has gained preferred status is evidenced through its presumption by scholars such as C. A. Evans and G. W. E. Nickelsburg.\(^\text{106}\)

\(^{103}\) R. de Vaux, *RevQ* 64 (1957) 624.

\(^{104}\) Kutscher, “The Language of the ‘Genesis Apocryphon.’”


\(^{106}\) Evans, “Rewritten Bible,” 162; Nickelsburg, “Patriarchs Who Worry,” 199 n. 45.
Another scholar to argue for the priority of Jubilees was L. F. Hartman. Like Wacholder and Grelot, Hartman drew on the comparative Abramic chronologies of the Apocryphon and Jubilees to help discern their relationship. His observations, however, brought him to the opposite conclusion. Since Jubilees incorporates the ten years of Abram’s journey from Haran to Canaan into its broader chronological system of “weeks” and jubilees, Hartman understood it to be the earlier, more authentic account. The Genesis Apocryphon, in contrast, offers no special reason for its chronology, indicating that it must depend on a work containing such a motive – i.e. Jubilees.

**Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees Dependent on a Common Source**

In their chronological assessments, both Wacholder and Grelot left open the possibility that the Apocryphon and Jubilees might rely on a common source rather than directly upon one another. F. García Martínez further posited that this is the only viable option, proposing that “both writings depend on a common source, which is more reliably reproduced in 1QapGen than in Jub.”

To prove his point, he provided two examples – one textual and one literary. First, he considers the toponym “Mountains of Asshur” in Jub 8:21 and 9:25 to be a scribal error for Mount Taurus – a mistake that occurred when translating this passage from Aramaic to Hebrew. Although he does not elaborate, presumably García Martínez believes that the author of Jubilees read the Aramaic אֲשֶׁר (Taurus, or Ox) as אַחַת (Asshur) instead, thereby causing the mistaken identity.

Secondly, he points to the term

108 García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 1-44 [esp. 40-41].
109 García Martínez does little to defend his claim that the name Mountains of Asshur is a mistake, although his argument would benefit from such an effort. Although he asserts that the mistake would be
(Lord of Heaven; GenAp 7.7), which is found in 1 En 106:11 but nowhere in Jubilees. In the opinion of García Martínez these examples rule out a direct relationship between Jubilees and the Apocryphon. Like Milik’s suggestion for 1 Enoch, he believes the common source behind these two works to be the lost Book of Noah.

Excursus: The Date of Jubilees

As with 1 Enoch, any dating of the Genesis Apocryphon relative to Jubilees depends on a reliable date for the latter. Here I do not intend to give an exhaustive defense or rebuttal of any one stance, but rather to present briefly the opinions of others who have more fully articulated the relevant issues. In my opinion the most convincing date is that proposed by J. C. VanderKam, who has argued for a date between 161 and 140 B.C.E., and more probably between 161 and 152 B.C.E. VanderKam’s proposed date rests largely on Jubilees’ incorporation of certain battles of Judas Maccabeus (active 167-160 B.C.E.), along with other anti-Antiochian motifs, into parts of its narrative. He also takes into account which parts of 1 Enoch the author of Jubilees appears to know. Following his initial publication on the subject, part of a copy of Jubilees from the Qumran corpus (4Q216, or 4QJub) was paleographically dated to the mid to late second century B.C.E.

Of course, this is not the only proposed date for Jubilees’ composition. Nickelsburg leans toward an earlier date, circa 168 B.C.E., following the lead of L. Finkelstein and

“difficult to understand when taking the Hebrew... as a point of departure,” one could argue that scribal confusion of נשור (Ox, or Taurus) with נשור (Asshur) makes better sense.


111 VanderKam, “Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and other Second-Century Sources.”

others. Those who espouse an early date do not find the references to Maccabean wars convincing and date Jubilees in relation to slightly earlier times, just preceding the Maccabean Revolt. Taking into account these objections, VanderKam concluded that “it now seems safe to claim that the Book of Jubilees was written between the years 170 and 150 B.C.E.”

A minority of scholars, such as Wacholder, D. Mendels, and Werman, follow Charles and Dillmann in assigning the book a later date – typically in the last third of the second century B.C.E. However, the reasons offered for a later date vary considerably, some (e.g. Werman) proposing a connection with the Essenes at Qumran.

A related topic, appropriate to the present discussion, is the relationship between 1 Enoch 106-107 and the Book of Jubilees. VanderKam has suggested that Jub 4:23 may draw some of its inspiration from the Enochic story of Noah’s birth, since it records that Enoch was taken from human society by angels and placed in the Garden of Eden to write down a testimony against humanity. This observation is based on Enoch’s statement in 1 Enoch 106:8 that his son Methuselah came to him “at the ends of the earth,” where he dwelled with the angels. If Jubilees could be shown to use this portion of 1 Enoch it would have significant implications for the date of the latter, pushing it back into the early second century B.C.E. Unfortunately, the reference in Jub 4:23 is vague enough to leave considerable doubt, and the matter must remain undecided. Nevertheless, any serious

---


117 A similar statement is made in GenAp 2.23.
attempt to delineate the relationships between the Genesis Apocryphon, 1 Enoch 106-107, and Jubilees should keep the statement of Jub 4:23 in mind.

Summary: The Relationship between the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees

Although a majority of scholars accept the priority of Jubilees over the Genesis Apocryphon, there has been little serious argumentation in defense of this view. The difficulties inherent in judging such a relationship based primarily on the relative length of parallel accounts have been broached above. Perhaps the most convincing argument for Jubilees’ priority is the dating of the Apocryphon’s language and manuscript, but this too leaves ample room for doubt. In sum, the argument for Jubilees’ priority requires considerable bolstering in order to be persuasive. Rather than being founded on demonstration from actual parallels, it has survived largely on vague intuition.

It may not be coincidental that some who have argued for the opposite relationship – i.e. that Jubilees depends on the Apocryphon – believe Jubilees to be a product of the Qumran sect, and therefore significantly later than the early to mid second century B.C.E. date espoused by most scholars. This assumption clears the way for assigning the Apocryphon priority, and such priority, in turn, affirms a later date for Jubilees. Despite this questionable congruence of interests, scholars from this camp hold the advantage of having argued seriously for their position, and their opinions should be granted due consideration. It indeed appears that 1QapGen 12 and 17 contain more compressed forms of their respective stories than Jub 6-7 and 9, turning the already questionable argument of Del Medico and Fitzmyer on its head. Werman, however, does not take full account of the impressive differences that obtain for each of these parallels. Such differences might be better used to support the “common source” theory of García Martínez and others. The
matter of comparative chronologies in the Abram account is intriguing, but here too a final judgment seems premature in the absence of corroborating evidence.

While the current evidence appears to point toward the priority of the Apocryphon or to the common source theory, it seems best to keep an open mind in studying the existing parallels and newly published material from the Apocryphon. As with 1 Enoch, the matter remains unsettled.

Review: Dating the Genesis Apocryphon

Based on the above survey it is evident that the date a particular scholar assigns to the Apocryphon is closely bound up with her/his opinion of its relationship to 1 Enoch and/or Jubilees. Those who believe the scroll to be later than these two works tend to embrace Kutscher’s and Fitzmyer’s dating of its language to the first century B.C.E (– first century C.E.). In their estimation, this is the period of the scroll’s composition. In their estimation, this is the period of the scroll’s composition.

Those who ascribe priority to the Genesis Apocryphon have either ignored the issue of language, assumed that the scroll’s language evolved with copying, or disputed the first century B.C.E. dating of Kutscher and Fitzmyer. While an estimated date of composition is not always given by these scholars, the late third to early second century B.C.E. might be expected, unless a later date of Jubilees is espoused, in which case the date of the Apocryphon may also shift accordingly. Although not extensively dealt with in this study, it
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118 Avigad and Yadin dated our copy of the scroll between the late first century B.C. and middle first century A.D. on paleographic grounds. This was based primarily on comparisons with 1QM (the War Scroll). Fitzmyer (2004, 25-6) observed that their opinion was confirmed by J. T. Milik, F. M. Cross, and S. A. Birnbaum. This range subsequently gained affirmation from radiocarbon dating. See G. Bonnai et al., “Radiocarbon dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” Atiqot 20 (July 1991) 27-32. The data are also published in G. Bonnai et al., “Radiocarbon dating of Fourteen Dead Sea Scrolls,” Radiocarbon 34/3 (1992) 843-49.

119 Exceptions are Zeitlin and Del Medico, who believe the scroll to be significantly later than all other commentators do (Medieval and second century C.E. respectively).
is evident that the language of the scroll is an important component of this debate, and an area ripe for reassessment.

Those who have understood the Apocryphon to be independent of 1 Enoch and/or Jubilees – i.e. based on a common Book of Noah – have not commented on the scroll’s date. One gains the impression, however, that they hold the Apocryphon to be the earlier (or at least more accurate) representative of the Noah book, in which case an early second century B.C.E. date might be expected. At present, it is difficult to say with confidence which of the above views is correct, although a very broad period between the late third century and early first century B.C.E. is relatively certain.

1.2.4.2. Other Dead Sea Scrolls

Scholars have linked several other manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls to the Genesis Apocryphon, particularly in connection with the story of Noah’s spectacular birth in GenAp 2. While not containing exact literary parallels, these texts have often been discussed as derivations from a source or tradition also underlying the Apocryphon.120

1.2.4.2.1. 1Q19 (1Q Livre de Noé)121

Fragment 3 of this Hebrew text recounts an astounding birth, witnessed by Noah’s father Lamech. Avigad and Yadin were the first to suggest a mutual relationship between this fragment, 1QapGen 1-5, and 1 En 106-107. J. T. Milik went on to specify that fragments of 1Q19 may be a Hebrew parallel to the Aramaic account in 1QapGen. In his

120 A summary of these sources is provided by F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 1-44.

opinion, both are summaries of the lost Book of Noah, which is further abridged in 1 En 106-107. This theory has been accepted by F. García Martínez and J. Fitzmyer. While the remaining text of 1Q19 3 is scanty enough to leave questions regarding its literary proximity to the Genesis Apocryphon, it is probable that it recounts the same general story.

1.2.4.2.2. 4Q534 (4Q Mess ar; 4Q Naissance de Noé ar)

This incomplete Aramaic text recounts the birth, childhood, and physical characteristics of an astounding youth, hailed as the “Elect of God” (อนמם). Among other things, this individual is said to study “the three books” (1 i 5), possess counsel and prudence (1 i 7), come to know the mysteries of humanity and all living things (1 i 8), and have plans that will last forever (1 i 9). He is clearly an important figure for the text’s authorizing community. In the following column, significant events are mentioned, including objects being destroyed (1 ii 13), waters ceasing (1 ii 14), and a subsequent building project (1 ii 15). The subject’s activity is even compared with that of the Watchers (1 ii 15), which could be taken either positively or negatively. Presumably, the fantastic child and these events are linked to one another.
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122 Milik, The Books of Enoch, 55.

123 F. García Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic, 42; Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 258.


125 E.g., in Jub 4:15 they are presented positively, but in Jub 5 (cf. 1 En 6-11) negatively.
J. Starcky first took the child of 4Q534 to be the future, Davidic messiah,\textsuperscript{126} with similar views intermittently espoused by A. Dupont-Sommer, J. Carmignac, I. D. Amusin, M. Delcor, and J. Zimmermann.\textsuperscript{127} However, it did not take long for others to contest that the youth was, in fact, Noah. Fitzmyer first noted that “[i]n the Intertestamental Literature there is a certain fascination with the birth of Noah,” leading him to wonder “whether we are not really dealing with another text belonging to the Noah literature of late Judaism.”\textsuperscript{128} Fitzmyer’s speculative identification was subsequently adopted by A. Caquot, P. Grelot, J. T. Milik, F. García Martínez, E. Puech, and even a repentant Starcky.\textsuperscript{129} Alternative suggestions for the child included Enoch (A. Caquot), and Melchizedek (J. C. Greenfield).\textsuperscript{130} J. Davila has preferred to leave the central character anonymous, stressing instead the text’s prototypical relationship with Merkavah mysticism.\textsuperscript{131}

Those believing the “Elect of God” in 4Q534 to be Noah have generally drawn a connection with the beginning columns of the Genesis Apocryphon, supposing that the two reflect a common tradition venerating Noah’s spectacular birth. Puech’s statement is typical: “L’insistance sur les ‘circonstances’ de la naissance dans cet ouvrage semble correspondre à son aspect quasi-miraculeux dans d’autres texts (1 Hénoch 106, 1QApGn I-V et 1Q19 3).”\textsuperscript{132} Despite this and like statements, however, it remains very uncertain whether the child of

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{126} Starcky, “Un texte messianique,” 59, 66.
\item \textsuperscript{127} See E. Puech, “4Q534-536. 4QNaissance de Noé\textsuperscript{a-c} ar: Introduction,” \textit{DJD} 31 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001) 117-27 [esp. 117].
\item \textsuperscript{128} Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Elect of God’ Text,” 371.
\item \textsuperscript{129} See E. Puech, “4Q534-536. 4QNaissance de Noé\textsuperscript{a-c} ar: Introduction,” 118-20.
\item \textsuperscript{130} Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{131} J. R. Davila, “4QMess ar (4Q534) and Merkavah Mysticism,” \textit{DSD} 5 (1998) 367-81.
\item \textsuperscript{132} “4Q534-536. 4QNaissance de Noé\textsuperscript{a-c} ar: Introduction,” 124. Also see Fitzmyer (\textit{The Genesis Apocryphon}, 260), who includes it in his latest appendix of texts related to the Genesis Apocryphon.
\end{itemize}
4Q534 actually refers to Noah. The gist of the text does compare favorably with 1QapGen 2-5.27, where Enoch lectures at surprising length (nearly three columns) about young Noah. Although this speech is mostly lost, in 5.10-13 we find mention of Noah’s remarkable physical traits. The explicit connection of Noah to three books in the Samaritan Asatir, which appears to contain some early Jewish interpretive traditions, is another interesting coincidence. Still, the very best we can say presently is that 4Q534 might be speaking about Noah. Even if so, there is no proof of any direct link between 4Q534 and the Apocryphon. At times two other texts – 4Q186 and 4Q561 – have been considered different copies of the same work, but there is very little evidence to support this claim.

1.2.4.2.3. 4Q535-536 (4Q Naissance de Noé ar)

In 1978, J. T. Milik listed two other fragmentary texts from Qumran – 4Q535 and 536 – alongside 4Q534. In 1992, he included all three works under the rubric “Naissance de Noé.” The links between these three manuscripts has been confirmed by E. Puech, who lists two places where word for word correspondence occurs. While 4Q536 2 ii 11 contains the words “and he will not die in the days of evil,” which could be said of Noah, there is very little in these manuscripts to certify that Noah is the subject. Again, it is


134 See Puech “534-536. 4QNaissance de Noé ar: Introduction,” 121.


137 For Puech’s text and commentary see DJD XXXI (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001) 153-170.
uncertain whether there is a direct connection between these compositions and the Apocryphon.

1.2.4.2.4. 6Q8

M. Baillet and F. García Martínez argued that this fragmentary Aramaic papyrus contains references to an extraordinary birth, Noah’s father-in-law Barakiel, and Mount Lubar – all of which are present in various Noachic sections of 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and/or the Genesis Apocryphon. In the second edition of his commentary, J. Fitzmyer echoed the possibility that this “apocryphe de la Genèse” was related to the birth of Noah in the Genesis Apocryphon. However, he apparently retracts this opinion in his recent, third edition. L. Stuckenbruck, arguing in defense of Milik’s hypothesis that 6Q8 belongs instead to the Enochic Book of Giants, asserts that any reference to a miraculous birth is unlikely, and that the Baraq’el of 6Q8 1:5 is probably not the father-in-law of Noah mentioned in Jub 4:28. García Martínez eventually sided with Milik’s identification as well. Presently, the scholarly tide has turned toward identifying this scroll as a part of the Book of Giants, and a link to Noah’s birth appears very unlikely.


139 He includes the fragments in his “Appendix 1: Related Literature” in the second edition (1971; 187-92), but not the third (2004; 258-60).


1.2.4.3. Additional Texts

Connections between the Genesis Apocryphon and other ancient Jewish exegetical texts have occasionally been suggested, although these are generally weaker than the parallels listed above. It is not my intention to give a detailed analysis of proposed connections with these texts, but simply to raise awareness of the broader spectrum of Jewish literature in which the Apocryphon has been discussed.

1.2.4.3.1. Other Rewritten Biblical Works

Other examples of rewritten biblical texts, such as Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*, Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*, the Samaritan *Asatir*, and *Sepher ha-Yashar* provide logical points of comparison for the Genesis Apocryphon. The most in-depth comparison of these texts to date is Vermes’ study of Abraham’s life according to a number of the above works (what he termed a “retrogressive historical study”), and then according to the Apocryphon (a “progressive historical study”). Throughout his analysis Vermes also made copious reference to rabbinic literature, the targums, and various other works of the period. In conclusion, he offered four areas through which to evaluate the relationships between the Genesis Apocryphon and other Jewish works: 1) interpretations proper to Genesis Apocryphon; 2) disagreement in exegesis; 3) partial agreement in exegesis; and 4) identical exegesis. While he states that the last category is “frequent and characteristic, and is represented on all levels,” most of his examples pertain to individual details rather than large blocks of narrative. These parallels attest to a common Jewish exegetical milieu, in which

---


143 Ibid, 123. Some of his examples are that Sarah was wise (Philo), Abraham wept and prayed after Sarah’s abduction (Tanhum, Sefer ha-Yashar), royal presents were given to Abraham after the return of Sarah,
biblical issues and inconsistencies are handled in similar ways across a spectrum of texts. Yet, never do these details suggest a close connection or dependent relationship with the Apocryphon in the way that 1 Enoch and Jubilees do. One comes away from this group of texts with a sense that their similarities with the Apocryphon stem from a common genre and exegetical approach to the Bible rather than a genetic kinship. Fitzmyer has also provided many pertinent references to the above works, among others, in his commentary.

1.2.4.3.2. Rabbinic Midrashim and the Targumim

Rabbinic midrashic works, such as Genesis Rabbah, Tanhumah, Yalkut Shimoni, or the Tannaitic Midrashim, have also been sporadically mentioned alongside the Apocryphon. These are typically placed alongside the various Aramaic Targumim, especially Pseudo-Jonathan and Targum Yerushalmi. The studies of G. Sarfatti and M. R. Lehmann remain the most comprehensive comparisons available. Although these texts and the Apocryphon often express a shared interest in specific exegetical issues, rarely do they provide the same solutions to these questions. Even the closest connections between the Apocryphon and these texts are distant compared to the parallels with 1 Enoch and Jubilees.

A tenuous relationship between the rabbinic and targumic works and the so-called “outside books” (ה_synagoguеים; somewhat analogous to our concept of Pseudepigrapha

---

Hagar was a gift of Pharaoh (Genesis Rabbah, Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer, Sefer ha-Yashar), and Salem is Jerusalem (targums, etc.).


145 Sarfatti (following Theodor) has observed that the rabbis tend to distance themselves from exaltation of Enoch and Noah, who are considered of mixed character. G. Sarfatti, “Notes on the Genesis Apocryphon,” *Tarbiẓ* 28 (1958-59) 258 [Hebrew].
and Apocrypha), to which Jubilees, 1 Enoch, and perhaps the Genesis Apocryphon, belonged should come as no surprise. The rabbis often distanced themselves from the these writings and shied away from drawing on them in standard rabbinic biblical interpretation.\[146\] As with the texts mentioned in the preceding section, the relationships here belong primarily on the level of general exegetical phenomena, and not direct literary parallels. Many of the parallels suggested in this category could be arrived at independently by different exegetes.\[147\]

---

\[146\] Ibid. Sarfatti writes, “The question ‘and was he [i.e. Lamech] a prophet?’ was a rhetorical question, whose answer was, ‘No.’ Neither Lamech, nor his ancestor Enoch, were prophets, so argues the midrash, and this argument fits with the opinion of all the ancient midrashim, which did not want to accord Lamech the highly privileged status in keeping with that tradition which was gathered in the apocryphal books and later legends (see, for example, Genesis Rabbah 25:1 and the comments there of Theodor).” [translation mine]

\[147\] An example, cited by Lehmann (1958, 257), is Abram’s similar statements in GenAp 19.10 and Tanhuma that Egypt is well-stocked with food. This can be derived by a simple syllogism: 1.) there is a famine in Canaan; 2.) Abram and Sarai make for Egypt; 3.) there must be food in Egypt. While it is plain that both texts reacted to the same exegetical issue, there is no reason to suppose that the two interpretations are related in a linear way. This particular example may also be influenced by the Joseph story (Gen 41:55-42:1), which recounts a similar situation.
CHAPTER 2
TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES

2.1. Introduction to The Present Edition

2.1.1. History and Previous Editions

Of the cache of scrolls discovered in Cave One the Genesis Apocryphon was the most badly damaged.\(^{148}\) Because of this, the publication history of the scroll is lengthy and interesting, and deserves brief summary here. The following survey covers only major developments in publication of the Aramaic text (i.e. transcription), and does not deal with the numerous translations available. Minor contributions, such as new readings suggested in book reviews or articles, will be mentioned only where appropriate.\(^{149}\)

2.1.1.1. Pre-publication History

The Genesis Apocryphon was among the initial cache of seven scrolls found by a member of the Ta’amireh Bedouin tribe near the Dead Sea. It was one of the four


\(^{149}\) Many such contributions, however, are referenced in the notes accompanying the text.
manuscripts purchased from the Bedouin by Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, the Syrian Metropolitan of Jerusalem, for approximately two hundred and fifty U. S. dollars.\footnote{A lively autobiographical account of the purchase and resale of the four scrolls to the State of Israel may be found in A. Y. Samuel, Treasure of Qumran: My Story of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1968) 141-201. The other three scrolls were sold to E. L. Sukenik of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.}

In late February, 1948, the Metropolitan’s scrolls were wrapped in an Arabic newspaper, placed in a leather briefcase, and brought by a Syrian Orthodox monk and his brother from St. Mark’s Monastery, in the Armenian Quarter of the Old City, to the American School of Oriental Research, outside Herod’s Gate.\footnote{The school is still under the auspices of the American Schools of Oriental Research (ASOR), but is now named the Albright Institute of Archeological Research. The Albright Institute is, appropriately, where the present text was prepared.} Here, they were inspected and photographed by John Trever and William Brownlee, who first recognized the significance of the find. Around this time “a small leather fragment with disintegrated script,” later called the “Trever fragment,” separated from the Fourth Scroll and was photographed by Trever. This fragment provided the first hints that the scroll was written in Aramaic, rather than Hebrew.\footnote{For information on the fragment see J. C. Trever, The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977 [2nd ed.]) 26, 43, 52, 57, 65.} Another small piece of the scroll’s outer layer was soon after removed by Trever, but no positive identification of its contents could be made.\footnote{Trever, “Preliminary Observations,” 14-16.} The three Hebrew scrolls were identified over the following weeks, but the leather of the Fourth Scroll was so brittle and bonded together that a decision was made to suspend further study until it could be unrolled by experts under the proper conditions.

Due to the tension in war-ravaged Jerusalem, the scrolls were temporarily moved by Mar Samuel to a bank vault in Beirut, and, in early 1949, arrived in New Jersey in Samuel’s
own possession. In April of that year, a much larger leaf from the outside of the scroll was removed by Trever, revealing enough text (26 partial lines) for him to conclude that it contained the previously lost “Book of Lamech,” a title adopted in most early publications dealing with the Dead Sea Scrolls.\footnote{Trever, “Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll,” 8-10. Trever notes, however, that Noah is “the real hero of the story.”} This leaf (later designated col. 2) and its transcription were supposed to be published in the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, but never were.

In the January 30, 1950 issue of *Time* Magazine it was announced that the Fourth Scroll, “whose cracked leather surface looks like a dried cigar,” would travel to the Fogg Museum of Art at Harvard University in order to be opened and read. The magazine quipped that the scroll would be “on the operating table” for six months, but these plans also never materialized. Due to ongoing intrigue over the provenance and ownership of the scrolls, the Fogg Museum made financial demands deemed unacceptable by Mar Samuel.

On June 1, 1954, frustrated by the growing controversy surrounding the scrolls and the dire plight of his parishioners in Jerusalem, Mar Samuel finally placed an advertisement in the *Wall Street Journal*.\footnote{This is according to Mar Samuel (*Treasure of Qumran*, 173-201). A less flattering account is given in Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 7.} The now famous first lines read: “Miscellaneous For Sale: THE FOUR DEAD SEA SCROLLS.” All four scrolls were soon purchased by the State of Israel and brought to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem through the arrangement of Yigael Yadin and under the guise of a Chemical Bank and Trust Company official. The cost was

\footnote{Trever, “Identification of the Aramaic Fourth Scroll,” 8-10. Trever notes, however, that Noah is “the real hero of the story.”}

\footnote{This is according to Mar Samuel (*Treasure of Qumran*, 173-201). A less flattering account is given in Avigad and Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon*, 7.}
Thus, the Genesis Apocryphon, yet unrolled, had traveled twice across the Atlantic Ocean only to finally rest approximately 14 miles from the site of its discovery.\footnote{Ironically, $150,000 of this amount was donated by the Jewish philanthropist D. Samuel Gottesman, who held family connections to the ASOR, Jerusalem, where the scrolls were first inspected by Trever and Burrows (personal communication with Dr. S. Gitin).}

2.1.1.2. Milik (Mil) – 1955

In time more fragments were excavated from the cave that produced the first seven scrolls.\footnote{The scroll is currently stored in the vault at the Shrine of the Book (at the Israel Museum) in Jerusalem.} These were published by Oxford University as the first volume in a series dedicated to the Dead Sea Scrolls and other finds from the Judean Desert.\footnote{See O. R. Sellers, “Excavation of the ‘Manuscript’ Cave at ‘Ain Fashkha,” BASOR 114, 5-8.} Included in this volume were eight small fragments, belonging to the fourth scroll, which were bought from a Bethlehem antiquities dealer nicknamed Kando and edited by J. T. Milik.\footnote{DJD I: \textit{Qumran Cave I} (eds D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).} Milik named the work represented by these fragments \textit{Apocalypse de Lamech}, based upon Trever’s identification, and gave it the publication number 20, which eventuated in the entire Genesis Apocryphon being designated 1Q20 by Joseph Fitzmyer.

Milik was only moderately successful in reading these badly deteriorated fragments, but his effort did add some information to the content of the scroll.

\footnote{Ibid, 4. It is unclear whether the Bedouin returned to the cave and excavated the fragments, or whether they had simply fallen off the scroll while in Kando’s possession (Kando was one of Mar Samuel’s parishioners, and had initially served as mediator between the Metropolitan and the Bedouin).}
2.1.1.3. Avigad and Yadin (AY) – 1956

Once at the Hebrew University, the task of unrolling the fourth scroll was entrusted to J. Biberkraut, whose wife also took the earliest photographs of the text as it was being opened. Biberkraut did a masterful job, facilitating an initial publication by Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin in 1956. In their preface, the authors specified that this was a “preliminary survey, dealing mainly with the last three columns which are very well preserved.” Elsewhere, they mentioned an upcoming final publication, which never came to fruition.

Avigad and Yadin’s edition includes plates, transcription, and translation (Hebrew and English) of cols. 2 and 19-22. Diacritical marks of either a single or double dash over the letter indicate uncertainty in readings. Their transcription was meticulously executed, and has stood up surprisingly well against subsequent re-readings and advances in photographic technology. The major limitation of this edition, of course, was that it presented only 5 of the known 22 columns. Brief descriptions of the unpublished columns were, nonetheless, provided, and at times these included excerpts of easily readable text. A major contribution of Avigad and Yadin was their observation that the material concerning Lamech constitutes but a small part of the narrative, and that the scroll included stories about a number of the patriarchs of Genesis, stretching from Enoch to Abram. In addition, several intriguing parallels with the books of 1 Enoch and Jubilees were identified. All of this, along with its obvious dependence on the biblical book of Genesis, led Avigad and Yadin to rename the text \textit{A Genesis Apocryphon} (מעילה יוהונת黎馬詩 in Modern Hebrew).

\footnote{161 Avigad and Yadin, \textit{A Genesis Apocryphon}, 8.}
\footnote{162 Ibid, 13.}
\footnote{163 There are now thought to be 23. Cf. below.}
Several valuable corrections or alternate readings were provided by E. Kutscher (Kut)\textsuperscript{164} and H. Ginsberg (Gin)\textsuperscript{165} in response to this edition, and it was at this time that a definite article was added to the scroll’s title.

In 1984, Yadin unexpectedly died of a heart attack, leaving the work of final publication to Avigad alone. Shortly thereafter (1988), Avigad handed over the responsibility for publication of the unpublished columns to the Israeli scholars Jonas Greenfield and Elisha Qimron.

2.1.1.4. Fitzmyer – 1966

In 1966, Joseph Fitzmyer published a commentary on the Genesis Apocryphon, focusing largely on the language and exegetical traditions of the available text.\textsuperscript{166} It included a transcription and English translation based primarily on the editio princeps, although the excerpts from the unpublished columns, mentioned by Avigad and Yadin only in their commentary section, were incorporated by Fitzmyer into the body of his text (i.e. small portions of cols. 1, 3, 5-7, 10-12 and 16-17). In addition, he included a number of emendations that had been suggested by subsequent reviewers, and offered fuller restorations in some places. The fragments published by Milik as 1Q20 were placed prior to col. 1, since they clearly came from the outside layer of the scroll, but Fitzmyer was not able to place them in any more specific context than this. Unfortunately, no diacritical marks were used to indicate the certainty of readings. It is clear that Fitzmyer’s primary purpose


\textsuperscript{166} J. A. Fitzmyer, \textit{The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary} (Biblica et Orientalia 18; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).
was not to produce a new edition of the text, but simply to re-present and analyze what was already at his disposal.

2.1.5. Fitzmyer – 1971

Fitzmyer produced a second, revised edition of his commentary in 1971. The revisions pertained almost solely to the introduction and commentary, although a few changes were also made in the transcription, translation, and reconstruction based upon reviews such as that of Ginsberg (Gin²). Muraoka (Mu¹) followed this edition with a significant discussion of the scroll’s syntax and morphology, but few new readings were offered. Again, no diacritical marks were used.

2.1.6. Jongeling, Labuschagne, and van der Woude (J) – 1976

The transcription and English translation of Bastiaan Jongeling, Casper Labuschagne and Adam van der Woude produced in Groningen, the Netherlands covers the columns first published by Avigad and Yadin (i.e. 2 and 19-22; without the other excerpts or 1Q20). While agreeing largely with the editions of Avigad-Yadin and Fitzmyer, the editors must be commended for offering fresh readings at certain points, based on the photographic plates available in Avigad and Yadin’s edition. Less commendable is the lack of diacritical marks,


although the authors indicate that this is meant only as a study edition. An important review is that of Puech (Pu), who offered several new readings.\textsuperscript{171}

2.1.1.7. Beyer (B\textsuperscript{1/2}) – 1984/1994

In 1984, Klaus Beyer produced a transcription and German translation of the Genesis Apocryphon as part of his large collection of Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea.\textsuperscript{172} His edition differs in several respects from its predecessors. First, Beyer uses a single, diacritical sign (a circle) for uncertain letters. This is a welcome addition and noteworthy improvement over Fitzmyer and Jongeling-Labuschagne-van der Woude. Second, based on his many deviations from earlier editions, it is clear that Beyer undertook an entirely fresh reading of the available photographs. A number of his new proposals are incorrect, but this is partially offset by those instances where a correct reading is offered, or attention is called to a previously unnoticed textual issue. Like Fitzmyer, Beyer incorporated the additional excerpts from Avigad and Yadin’s commentary and Milik’s 1Q20 fragments into his text, although this was done in an extremely confusing manner.\textsuperscript{173} In a 1994 Ergänzungsband, Beyer updated a few readings in the text’s early columns and incorporated col. 12, which had by then been published by Greenfield and Qimron (see below). He also took into account Muraoka’s second study on the scroll (Mu\textsuperscript{2}).\textsuperscript{174}

\textsuperscript{171} RevQ 9 (1977-78) 589-91.


\textsuperscript{173} Particularly in his cols. 0-1. Cf. the textual notes to these columns.

2.1.1.8. Wise and Zuckerman - 1991

In the early 1990’s Michael Wise and Bruce Zuckerman endeavored to arrange the eight fragments of 1Q20 and the Trever Fragment into a more coherent order.\textsuperscript{175} The result was a new reconstruction that has gained general acceptance by subsequent scholars working on the scroll, and will be followed in this edition. In their reconstruction, a good deal more of what are now called cols. 0 and 1 may be read, with Milik’s 1Q20 mainly comprising parts of col. 0, and the Trever Fragment being placed in the lower portion of col. 1.

2.1.1.9. Qimron (Qim\textsuperscript{1/2}) – 1992/1999

In 1992, Elisha Qimron published an article outlining a plan to complete the protracted publication of the remaining columns of the Genesis Apocryphon, which he and Greenfield had inherited from Avigad.\textsuperscript{176} After a brief survey of previous editions, he offers eighteen useful textual notes, including some new readings, in cols. 2 and 19-22. These are presented as a sample of what the new edition will contain. In a 1999 article, following the untimely death of Professor Greenfield, Qimron reiterated these plans. The work was now to be completed with the help of a newly organized team of experts, including Matthew Morgenstern, Daniel Sivan, Gregory Bearman and Sheila Spiro.\textsuperscript{177} This later article also includes a few new textual suggestions.

\textsuperscript{175} Unfortunately, their work has been published only in newsletters that are rather difficult to obtain (they are not, so far as I can tell, available on the internet). See M. Lundberg and B. Zuckerman, “New Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Cave One,” \textit{CAL-News} 12 (1996) 1-5. A photograph of the new arrangement may be found in B. Zuckerman and M. Lundberg, “Ancient Texts and Modern Technology: The West Semitic Research Project of the University of Southern California,” \textit{AJS Perspectives} (Fall/Winter 2002) 14. A drawing of col. 0 (1Q20) by Zuckerman is included in Fitzmyer, \textit{The Genesis Apocryphon}, 115.


2.1.1.10. Greenfield and Qimron (GQ) – 1992

The first major advance since Avigad and Yadin came in 1992, with the publication of col. 12 by Jonas Greenfield and Qimron. Trailing the editio princeps by over 35 years, the authors provided a transcription with diacritical dots and circlets to indicate the certainty of readings, as well as an English translation. Textual notes, focused mainly on grammatical and lexical issues, accompanied the text. This article was intended as the first in a series dedicated to presenting the scroll’s unpublished columns. Pending the publication of this new material, a comprehensive, revised, and annotated edition of the text was to be issued. Unfortunately, the untimely death of Greenfield in the spring of 1995 slowed this process, and a new team including M. Morgenstern and D. Sivan was formed by Qimron to complete the task.

2.1.1.11. Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan (MQS) – 1995

The remainder of the unpublished columns appeared in 1995, although only in preliminary form. Following a brief discussion of content, grammar and vocabulary, a transcription and partial English translation were provided for the readable portions of cols. 1, 3, 4-8, 10-11 and 13-17. In general, the readings presented are reliable, although there are places where improvements should be made and mistakes emended. Modeled on the

---

30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) 107-109. The paper, although published in 1999, was given shortly before the publication of the outstanding columns in 1995.


publication of Greenfield and Qimron, diacritical dots and circlets were employed, as well as a supralinear dash to indicate ambiguity between the similar letters yod and vav. In contrast to the publication of col. 12, however, the authors did not include textual notes. Presumably, this was due to their admirable desire to publish the text as quickly as possible, since it was originally intended that a more complete edition would follow. It now appears that these plans have been abandoned.\(^{180}\)

2.1.1.12. García Martínez and Tigchelaar (GMT) – 1997

The most widely available compilation of texts from Qumran is undoubtedly Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar’s 1996 *Study Edition*, which provides transcriptions and English translations of the non-biblical scrolls and fragments.\(^{181}\) The project was to include a complete reevaluation of the available photographs for each text. For most of the Genesis Apocryphon, however, it appears that this was not done, probably due to difficulties obtaining photos for much of the text. Rather, the authors appear to have drawn heavily upon their academic forebears in Groningen (Jongeling, Labuschagne and van der Woude) for the initially published columns, and Greenfield, Qimron, Morgenstern, and Sivan for the more recently published material. Milik’s 1Q20 was presented apart from the text of the Genesis Apocryphon, although the Trever Fragment was incorporated into col. 180

---

\(^{180}\) In 1996, M. Morgenstern completed his (unpublished) M.A. thesis at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem. The thesis is published in Hebrew, but bears the same name as the 1995 article published along with Qimron and Sivan (המשובות שארם התפרנסים ממעלא החכמה הלשונית). In it, a text nearly identical to that of the article is presented (although the copy at the National and University Library at the Givat Ram campus of the university contains multiple hand-written corrections by Morgenstern), along with much helpful material regarding the grammar and vocabulary of these new columns. Included is a concordance.

1. García Martínez and Tigchelaar’s text contributes little in the way of novel readings and
omits freely where there are not extended sections of coherent text. As such, this is not the
best edition for those wishing seriously to investigate the Genesis Apocryphon (as the
editors themselves admit). Still, it is apparent that they have weighed the various textual
options while compiling their transcription, and for this reason they are included in my
textual notes. Unfortunately, they do not employ diacritical marks.

2.1.1.13. Fitzmyer (F) – 2004

A third edition of Fitzmyer’s now standard commentary was issued in 2004. Its
main contribution, of course, was the inclusion of the newly available columns published by
Greenfield, Qimron, Morgenstern, and Sivan. It also incorporated cols. 0-1 as reconstructed
by Wise and Zuckerman. The new portions of text were reproduced without significant
revision, to the point of perpetuating a number of mistakes from previous editions. Again,
this may be partially attributed to the fact that there was no easily accessible set of
photographs for the more recently published columns. The revised edition also contains
commentary on the new material, although it is generally of a less thorough nature than the
comments brought over from previous editions. One step forward is the employment of a
single, diacritical dot to mark uncertain letters, although these are simply imported from the
editions on which this text relies. Fitzmyer appears to have done little fresh paleographic
work, especially on the newer material, but has attended mainly to the presentation of a

---

182 See ibid, 26-7, for 1Q20.
183 Ibid, ix.
continuous text and comprehensive commentary. This is no slight contribution, and to date his text remains the best available. In the following textual notes I incorporate only the text from the third edition, since it seems best to use his most recent judgments on the matter. This has also kept the notes from becoming unwieldy.

2.1.1.14. Beyer (B$^3$) – 2004

Recently, Beyer has added a Band 2 to his *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*. In it, he re-presents and updates some of his text of the Genesis Apocryphon in light of the publications of Greenfield, Qimron, Morgenstern, Sivan, and others. Included are parts of cols. 1, 3-8, 10-17 and 19, again with a single, diacritical circlet for uncertain characters. The nature of Beyer's transcription and German translation are similar to that of his earlier volumes – creative, but erratic. Due to the uneven, and sometimes contradictory, character of the portions of text included in each of Beyer’s volumes (in contrast to Fitzmyer), all three are included in the textual notes.

2.1.1.15. Abegg and Wise (AW) – 2005

Martin Abegg and Michael Wise’s transcription and English translation of the Genesis Apocryphon is the most recent complete edition of the text. Wise was responsible for transcribing cols. 0-1, and Abegg for the remainder of the scroll. Happily, they have employed diacritical dots and circlets throughout. Abegg notes that for cols. 2, 12

---


and 19-22 he relied mainly on Garcia-Martinez and Tigchelaar, while cols. 3-8, 10-11 and 13-17 are based on Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan. The entire translation is that of Wise. This is perhaps the least reliable edition of the scroll, especially in the early portions of the text and its translation. One is frequently impressed that originality is being sought over correctness, while previous mistakes are frequently followed and added to. In addition, the spacing of the transcription is often misleading.

2.1.1.16. Other Commentators

Occasionally, I have drawn upon the textual suggestions of various scholars who have dealt in some way with the Genesis Apocryphon, but were unmentioned in the preceding survey. These are incorporated into my textual notes and catalogued below in the list of abbreviations.

2.1.2. The Present Edition

2.1.2.1. The Need for a New Edition

With so many editions available, why is there need for a new one? From the above survey it is clear that the “preliminary” editions of Avigad and Yadin, Greenfield and Qimron, and Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan have served as the basis for nearly every subsequent edition of the Genesis Apocryphon, typically with little revision. This extensive dependence on each other, rather than a close reading of the manuscript, is the main reason for my reexamination of the evidence. An exception to such recycling is Beyer, who frequently suggests original readings. Unfortunately, many of these do not inspire
confidence in his text as a whole, leaving one skeptical whether it is an improvement over
the preliminary publications.

For those columns first published by Avigad and Yadin, the far better condition of
the text, numerous reviews, and successive editions have produced what may satisfactorily be
called a “final form” of the text (keeping in mind, of course, that details can be quibbled
over endlessly). The same is not true, however, for the columns published in the 1990’s.
These have been largely overlooked, textually and paleographically speaking, by subsequent
scholarship, and it was only through my perusal of some photographs of these columns (on
the advice of Professor VanderKam) that I realized the need to undertake a comprehensive
rereading of the entire manuscript. This need may be illustrated by one of my first
examinations of a photograph of the Genesis Apocryphon, when I realized that the
beginning of 14.17 could be filled in significantly in relation to the text presented by
Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan. Hence, where they read מזון temasHALA
[&nbsp; הראה, I see
iidv[&nbsp; הראה. Other such improvements are presented in the following text.

There are other, more minor reasons to produce a new transcription of the scroll.
For instance, there is no current edition which lays out, in an easily accessible format, the
various and sundry transcriptional disagreements between all editions now available. It is for
this reason that I include extensive textual notes. In addition, the spacing and relative line
length of the manuscript are not adequately reflected in any of the previous publications,
save that of Avigad and Yadin. I hope to have filled some of these voids in the present
edition.

For the above reasons it seemed unwise to proceed to a study of the scroll’s contents
without gaining more confidence about what is written in it. Of course, the badly damaged
nature of the scroll regularly mitigates against this, and I must stress that throughout my
work I have been deeply indebted to the scholars listed in the survey above. Any contributions that my edition may make are merely adornments on the edifice they have constructed.

2.1.2.2. Spacing

As mentioned above, previous editions have regularly ignored the factors of proper spacing and line length in relation to the manuscript. Because of this, I have tried to be as precise as possible regarding the spacing of words and lacunae, as well as the length of lines, in my transcription. Of course, absolute precision is impossible using a standardized font, so that at times line length has been slightly adjusted to accommodate the proper spacing of words or lacunae, and vice versa.

2.1.2.3. Diacritical Marks

I have chosen to use the same diacritical marks employed by the DJD series. This includes a dot (8) to indicate that a letter is relatively sure, but partially missing or obscured, and a circlet (8), specifying that the letter is significantly missing or obscured, and that the reading is tentative. Readings of letters with supralinear circlets should, in fact, be viewed as no more than educated guesses.

2.1.2.4. Reconstruction and Tenuous Readings

My approach to the reconstruction of missing text is conservative, limited mainly to the completion of phrases and expressions common elsewhere within the scroll. Use of

---

187 This is less of a problem in Avigad and Yadin, since they include plates alongside their transcription.
brackets indicates both where the leather is completely eaten away and where leather remains but there is no legible text. This is somewhat unfortunate, but was done to avoid confusion between parts of the manuscript that were effaced by time and those that were originally left blank by the scribe. The latter are indicated by the Latin word *vacat*.

When one stares at a manuscript as long as an edition such as this requires, especially one as fragmentary and damaged as the Genesis Apocryphon, it becomes easy to imagine readings based on very little physical evidence. This makes it most difficult to decide when to include a less than certain reading. I have endeavored to tread the fine line between speculation and what I consider a valid suggestion to the best of my ability. Still, I must stress that letters with diacritical circlets are merely suggestive, and not authoritative, readings. It is my great hope that these readings will be tested by other scholars who take recourse to the photographs and manuscript. Eric Turner, speaking about the practice of paleography and its classification into “styles,” has put his finger on one of the realities of reading ancient manuscripts:

> “…paleography is neither a science nor an art, but works through a continual interaction of the methods appropriate to both approaches. And in the last resort a judgment has to be made – and judgment is fallible.”

Such “last resorts” have been reached at a number of junctures during my work on the Apocryphon.

---

2.1.2.5. Translation

In translating the Aramaic of the scroll I have aimed for correctness rather than originality, and have derived much from my predecessors. Fitzmyer deserves special mention in this regard, providing an exemplary translation that is often best left untouched. I am also heavily indebted to my mentor, James VanderKam, who made numerous translation suggestions and revisions. His expertise in such matters is indisputable, and has been happily received. Unlike the transcription, I have not attempted to reflect accurately the spacing and line length of the manuscript in the translation, since this seemed redundant and would take up much extra space. Translating is effectually an act of interpretation, since any word – especially a Semitic word – may bear several or more meanings. This is compounded in the Genesis Apocryphon, where the words are commonly partial or tenuous. In a certain sense, therefore, my own translation may be viewed as a commentary of sorts on the language and content of the scroll.

2.1.3. Textual Notes

Due to the poor condition of a large portion of the manuscript, there have often been disagreements among previous editions over the reading of words and letters. This has necessitated a textual apparatus in which various readings are displayed and my own readings defended. The notes are not exhaustive. Rather, I have sought to include only those differences which impact our understanding of the text. For instance, I have typically not included disagreements over letters in a context whose meaning would be unclear, whatever the reading. The notes are intended as primarily “textual,” and deal with exegetical aspects of the text only where it proves useful for the establishment of a reading.
2.1.3.1. Photographs

I have availed myself of all obtainable photographs in order to produce the most reliable text possible. The ensuing list roughly follows the order of the scroll’s columns:

DJD 1, Plate XVII.

The black and white photographic plate presented in DJD 1 is not exceedingly helpful, since the script is somewhat blurred. Later, infrared photographs are far more useful.

Inscriptifact Photographic Plates

Among the photographs currently available to scholars on the Inscriptifact website ([www.inscriptifact.com](http://www.inscriptifact.com)) are a number of plates containing 1Q20 (cols. 0-1). These photographs are superb, and represent the gamut of photographic technology available, from black and white to color, natural light to narrowband infrared. They are significantly more useful than the plate in DJD 1 and are denoted by the prefix “ISF_DO_.”

Avigad and Yadin Photographic Plates

The black and white plates in the editio princeps are still among the most useful for the columns represented (2 and 19-22). They are taken in wideband infrared light, and present the parchment at the earliest recorded stage relative to the scroll’s modern discovery, before its subsequent decomposition.

---

189 As of summer 2006. The site is being added to continually and will hopefully contain all of the Genesis Apocryphon photographs in due time.
Israel Museum Negatives

The Israel Museum in Jerusalem retains a number of negatives of the Genesis Apocryphon at the Shrine of the Book. Included in these are the original photographs for all of the columns, contemporary with those used by Avigad and Yadin. There are also more recent photos. A number of photographic technologies are represented. Among the most important of these photos for this project is the fine photograph of the Trever Fragment (IMneg. 6x6), while the many pictures of the scroll before and during its opening by Biberkraut are both charming and noteworthy. Photographs from this eclectic collection will be prefixed with “IMneg.” or “IMneg. x” in the textual notes. The numbers are those assigned by the museum.

Bearman and Zuckerman Photographs

In 1994 Gregory Bearman, from the Jet Propulsion Laboratory at NASA and the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center in Claremont, California together with Bruce and Ken Zuckerman, from the West Semitic Research Project at the University of Southern California, produced a useful set of narrowband infrared photos of the Genesis Apocryphon. The photographs cover the standard columns of scroll (1-22), but do not include Milik’s 1Q20 or the Trever Fragment. These photos are especially helpful for the columns published in the 1990’s (i.e. not included in Avigad and Yadin). Photographs from this collection will be prefixed with “BZ” in the textual notes.
Bearman Photographs

Gregory Bearman also took a different set of narrowband infrared photographs in 1997. These have been utilized in the few places where the BZ set was not available (i.e. cols. 7-8).

Note on Digital Enhancement

All photographs, except the plates in DJD 1 and Avigad and Yadin, have been used in a digital format. Due to this, I have frequently enhanced portions of the manuscript in order to read its contents more easily. This entails manipulation of the size, contrast and brightness of a letter or word. Unfortunately, it has been impractical to recreate such enhancements for the reader, but I have tried to use these tools equitably, and have often called attention to their use in the textual notes.

2.1.3.2. List of Abbreviations for Sources Consulted in the Textual Notes


190 Citations of readings offered in the introduction, rather than the main text, will be indicated by page numbers (for both the English and Hebrew introductions) in parentheses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>J. Fitzmyer, <em>The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20)</em> [3rd ed.].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


¹⁹¹ This is Morgenstern’s unpublished M.A. Thesis completed at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1996. The copy consulted was that available at the University and National Library at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem’s Givat Ram campus. Most of the contributions from this work come from the marginal notes, added in handwriting later either by Morgenstern or Esther Eshel. Such marginalia will be indicated by “(margin)” following the citation.
2.1.4. The Manuscript

2.1.4.1. Description, Length, and Dimensions

When discovered, the Genesis Apocryphon was somewhat flattened. It had a softer, more pliable side, and a brittle, more disintegrated side. Both ends were brittle and crumbling. This unevenness in the scroll’s preservation is likely due to its lying exposed (i.e. not inside a jar like some other scrolls) during its long tenure in Cave One, during which one side was more susceptible to the environment. For this reason the unrolled scroll alternates between better and worse states of preservation. As expected, the manuscript condition improves near the center of the scroll (i.e. the higher numbered columns).

An extensive physical description of the parchment and script is provided by Avigad and Yadin, including a report of the strange, whitish material found covering the lower part of columns 10-15. Much of this material has now been removed by experts at the Israel Museum, facilitating the commendable work of Greenfield, Qimron, Morgenstern, and Sivan in publishing these columns in preliminary form.

The scroll currently contains four sheets of parchment, which are very finely executed. The tanning, ruling, joint stitching, and script are among the finest found in the

---


193 Ibid.
eleven caves at Qumran. The final sheet of leather is worthy of note, since it is clear that another sheet was originally sewn to it, but that it was cut off with a sharp instrument in antiquity (it was at the center of the rolled scroll). The motive for this is unclear, and has been the cause of some speculation.\textsuperscript{194} Whatever the reason, it is obvious that the scroll originally included at least one more parchment sheet of five or more columns. Logic would suggest that the scroll continued at least through the Abram and Sarai cycle.

In 1996 M. Morgenstern suggested that the beginning of the scroll would have included another 14 to 15 sheets (70-105 columns!) based on the letters א, ו, and ע discovered at the top right corner of the last three sheets.\textsuperscript{195} This proposal has not been widely accepted, and the letters might be better explained as part of the leather preparation process.

\subsection*{2.1.4.2. \textit{Present Condition}}

On May 25, 2006, I had the opportunity to examine the manuscript in detail at the Shrine of the Book, the Israel Museum of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{196} To the naked eye, the manuscript is now almost completely unreadable, rendering my attempts to clarify tenuous or problematic readings unsuccessful. In fact, the script has continued to deteriorate while in storage, even

\footnote{\textsuperscript{194} The most widely proposed explanation seems to be manuscript repairs, although this is merely speculative. For a summary of the current views see E. Schuller, “Response to ‘Patriarchs Who Worry about their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon,’” in \textit{George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning} (2 vols.; JSJSup. 80; ed. J Neusner and A. J. Avery-Peck; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 1:209-11.}


\footnote{\textsuperscript{196} I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Adolfo Roitman, current curator of the Dead Sea Scrolls, who allowed me access to the manuscript, and especially to Irène Lewitt, who provided gracious assistance (not to mention coffee) throughout my visits to the Shrine.}
in comparison with the narrowband infrared photographs taken by B. Zuckerman and G. Bearman in the mid 1990’s.

The ongoing deterioration of the script only (while much of the surrounding leather remains in-tact) may be linked to scribal use of a bronze inkwell instead of the more well-known ceramic models.\(^{197}\) Other such inkwells are known from this period.\(^{198}\)

The final and best preserved columns, published by Avigad and Yadin in 1956, are now in far worse shape than when the photographic plates for their *editio princeps* were taken. Portions of the scroll (most notably the left side of col. 17 and central parts of col. 13) have chemically broken down, turning into a reddish-black pitch type of material. The most well preserved areas of leather retain a medium chestnut color. Unfortunately, the continued corrosion of the scroll – especially its script – makes it unlikely that future technological advances in photography will help salvage more of the Genesis Apocryphon’s text. Hence, we must rely primarily on the sets of photographs that have already been taken.

---

\(^{197}\) This idea was first suggested to me in personal communication with Dr. Hanan Eshel, of Bar-Ilan University. High levels of copper (Cu) and lead (Pb) were found in inks from some of the scrolls at Qumran, as Y. Nir-El and M. Broshi have shown. They linked this phenomenon to the storage of ink in bronze, rather than ceramic, inkwells. See Y. Nir-El and M. Broshi, “The Black Ink of the Qumran Scrolls,” *DSD* 3:2 (1996) 157-67 [esp. 161-62]. DeVaux found one such inkwell *in situ* in locus 30 at Qumran, while a second (now part of the Schøyen collection), more elaborate example, is purported to have come from the site. See T. Elgvin in collaboration with S. J. Pfann, “An Incense Altar from Qumran?” *DSD* 9:1 (2002) 20-33. Ceramic inkwells from the Hellenistic and Roman periods have been found in Jerusalem, Meiron, Qumran, and elsewhere. See S. Goranson, “68. Inkwell,” in *Sepphoris in Galilee: Crosscurrents of Culture* (ed. R. Martin Nagy et al.; Raleigh: North Carolina Museum of Art, 1996) 202.

2.2. Aramaic Transcription

Column 0

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 8.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 9.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 10.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 11.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 12.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 13.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 14.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 15.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 16.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 17.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 18.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 19.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 20.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 21.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 22.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 23.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 24.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 25.

\[\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\text{\ldots}\ ] 26.
ליארחא הלפתת התאריך עמק

וטמא המנהר ליארחא

ולחנו דכר ואורל בשרו

Column 2

1. היא בצרית תשבה לבבי או מעדית הראיה אוום קדישת זגרת ועזרתים

2. לוביל עלי משני על עליים זנ

3. בוחדו אנה לזך אתכלת והעלת על תחאנה אנתה [מרחتل לה

4. ана נברע עליי במרח במרח באבך מלך עליים

5. [חד מוך] בגר שמי עלי בקשתו תחותינו ח

6. [בקשותו] תחותינו לא בכרב זרה פגד

7. באור באתנה אתנה בחלף תקף עמי מלקת בגדה

8. אימרות איה בוהי מר דכר על עליות אֶלוה

9. [בוותא ושתתי לה נותרה עגלה בקשתו חולא [חוטינה] ]

10. [ואה בבליא עליי יחר אורי אשתני

11. ] vacat והל שלבי עלי אורי אשתני

12. ועדת באתנה ושתתי די אשתני אמפי עלי בגדה[ו

13. באחד אנסת וחתונה עומיות מלך כי אמור יוא ואף

14. עדותי אמיים אנפו כי בקרושו באבך [מיא

15. די מӀנ ער וד חFormField וחתונה ומי לשבת פירא] ו

16. ולא מיך ויא ויא מיך יעיל ולא מיך ביני שעון[ו

17. האנה[ו
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בведение
18. בקושט מללהו עמק
19. באדני האנים על מותשת בור מבלה

20. אבון ויולה הנה בצוואא שונים הימים וו
21. על חן אבון לנדס הנה כללה בקושט
22. והאישה למה לארק מאפורית והחן אפוקלה לתק [ערע]
23. [ע]אמונה 같이 אבון ואבי ורי די אגנה ליכ [ית]
24. [י]האמה כללה הベン יא אבוי ורי די אגנה אהת לתק [ערע]
25. [י]דאלה לעליך [י]
26. [י]לעלו
27. [י]
28-36?

Column 3

1. [ק] לולע [י] לא להוראה
2. [ק] אורי בזית רד אב
3. [ק]شبב ב
4. [ק]
5. [ק] [שמם]
6. [ק]جريدة
7. [ק] לא להקול
8. [ק] [א] כתיב אניל קא
9. [ק] להוה על אראעו בוללה
10. [ק] באראגי לים
11. [ק] או בוללה פלא אחר יför אבראום
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| כותב על-

שנתו | 10 - 4 |
| 23 - 19 |
| 36 - 33 |
| 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 |
| 14 |
| 29 |
| 18 |
| 15 |
| 12 |
| 28 |
| 13 |
| 17 |
| 30 |
| 16 |
| 31 |
| 32 |
| 33 - 36 |
### Column 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>הוחב חלוחת בפומילא להביה ימל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>על מחושל בחרי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>לע פע ונה תנו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>שמך לה ומן ובלק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>נбедה לע ונה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ולא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>חוה דוד תל indefinitely and ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>בקושט מנו יד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>בכשת הל נגא אמרי יד ונה מניחת כל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ואיל אתי תלמד בכר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>רמוהו יבורה מכל עבד שופט ונתב הל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>לאנפגתי סכמא וזכות ענייה כשופט</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>סולאנו זה נור ונה הנל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>וריעא ומ נל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>אבב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>איך בנוית ישנהו ונהבל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>שלמה 알아 בפומילא להביה הל</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Column 6

1. μὸν ἀναθέματι ἄνωθεν ἔχετο ὑπὸ τόπος καὶ ἤδη, τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων συμβολής

2. περίποιησις οὐκ ἦν ἐν τῷ κώμῃ καὶ τῷ ὄρει, ἀλλὰ συνιστούσα σύνεδρον τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

3. μεσεῖα τῶν θαυμάσιων ἀνθρώπων, μετὰ δὲ τὴν σκέτην ἤλθον ἀνέπλευσαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

4. ἀνέφεραν δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ καὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῇ κόσμῳ

5. vacat

6. ὑπὸ τόπος ἄνωθεν καὶ οἰκῶν ἦν, καὶ διήκει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

7. βασιλεύσαν δὲ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ

8. ἔφθασαν δὲ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ.
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אנחתה בחירה חולמה אלדリスト

1. [ everlasting seven]

2. בקעת

3. [ מתא]

4. עלמה

5. בטאט

6-8. [ everlasting seven]

9. [ everlasting seven] בכלה המבילה

10. [ everlasting seven] מקו

11. [ everlasting seven] בכתוב

12. [ everlasting seven] מקו

13. [ everlasting seven] מקו

14. [ everlasting seven] מקו

15. [ everlasting seven] מקו

16. [ everlasting seven] מקו

17. [ everlasting seven] מקו

18. [ everlasting seven] מקו

19. [ everlasting seven] מקו

20-28. [ everlasting seven] מקו

29. [ everlasting seven] מקו

30. [ everlasting seven] מקו

31. [ everlasting seven] מקו

32. [ everlasting seven] מקו

33. [ everlasting seven] מקו
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Column 9

vacat

Column 10

vacat

 parses
Column 11

(Column 11 continued)

ףמטצוא שסיפא פלע בה בתו בעובד אל תאני יילו

vacat

[ןזגא דעלא ב[ד] דעלא ב[ד]

[ןזגא דעלא ב[ד] דעלא ב[ד]

Vacant

18.

vacant

17.

vacant

16.

vacant
Column 12

1. [בוגר י"ח המבית ול المتوות על ולא函数 למלתות]

2. [שנוי
3. [שנוי
4. [שנוי

5. [שנוי

6. [שנוי

7. [שנוי

8. [שנוי

9. [שנוי

10. [שנוי

11. [שנוי

12. [שנוי

13. [שנוי

14. [שנוי

15. [שנוי

16. [שנוי

17. [שנוי

18. [שנוי

19. [שנוי

20. [שנוי

21. [שנוי

22. [שנוי

23. [שנוי
Column 13

[ ] 말라야 드시오 [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 3

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 4-6

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 7

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 8

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 9

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 10

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 11

vacat

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 12

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 13

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 14

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 15

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 16

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 17

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 18

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 19

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 20

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 21

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 22

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 23

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 24

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 25

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 26

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 27

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] 28-35
_COLUMN 14_

[ ] .22

[ ] .23

[ ] .24

[ ] .25-35

[ ] .21

[ ] .20

[ ] .19

[ ] .18

[ ] .17

[ ] .16

[ ] .15

[ ] .14

[ ] .13

[ ] .12

[ ] .11

[ ] .10

[ ] .09

[ ] .08

[ ] .07

[ ] .06

[ ] .05

[ ] .04

[ ] .03

[ ] .02

[ ] .01

[ ] .00

.25-35
Column 15

7. רוחמה נלחה ונויהו יהוה נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון

8. ואננו לולא תני

9. כל פלך נאמנה ויהוה נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון

10. נהנה רכש אשת נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון

11. כל שני בחרוה נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון

12. מנהל גרשון ובי נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון

13. מנהל יהודית נבון נבון

14. מנהל שני שני נבון נבון נבון

15. כל שני נבון נבון נבון נבון נבון

16. כל שני נבון נבון נבון נבון

17. כל שני נבון נבון

18. כל שני נבון נבון נבון

19. vacat
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_Column 16

ה ב

vacat

לטש למוי זמא יד גולות (ל"ז) [27 -25 .

19 .

18 .

לצ"א [92 ]

17 .

16 .

15 .

14 .

13 .

12 .

11 .

10 .

9 .

8 .

לטש למוי זמא יד גולות (ל"ז)

vacat

רגнем ב—who הדבר עלינו קדש ב[25] [21 .

20 .

19 .

18 .

לצ"א [92 ]

17 .

16 .

15 .

14 .

13 .

12 .

11 .

10 .

9 .

8 .
לְחַלֵּפָה [ ]

[ ]

vacat

[ ]

[ ] 22

.23

[ ] 24

vacat

[ ] 25

16

13

22.

.26

לְחַלֵּפָה [ ]

עֲבֹדָה תִּתְלֵית לְלֵיהוּ [ ][ ][ ][ ] [ ]

.27

עִבְּדָה [ ]

גּוֹזֵר [ ]

.28

לְחַלֵּפָה [ ]

.29

-35


column 17

vacat

[ ]

6

.7

ןָשְּמֶה הֵרַב [ ]הַלְּחַמֶּה מֶלֶךָ לְלֵיהוּ [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.8

שְּמַעְתָּה לְחַשֵּׁב וּבֵצִים בָּהִלָּה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.9

לַאֵרֵם אֵרֵם דּוֹי [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.10

אֵן שָׁמָּה לְהַהֲבִּיב וּלְהוֹלֵק קָדָם לְהַהֲבִּיב דּוֹי [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.11

בּוֹתַרְתָּה דּוֹי [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.12

לְוַתְרָה דּוֹי [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.13

בּוֹתַרְתָּה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.14

לְוַתְרָה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.15

לְוַתְרָה דּוֹי [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.16

לְוַתְרָה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.17

לְוַתְרָה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.18

לְוַתְרָה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]

.19

vacat

[ ]

לְוַתְרָה [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ]
Column 19

בנין תנך [ח] [ק] [ק]: gros [א] [א] [א] [א]

vacAT 000° בובולי

[ ] 0 [ ] 0 [ ]

[ ] 000° [ ]

vacAT 000° [ ]

.20

.21

.22

.23

.24

.25-35

אלו 000° מל Zika' עולם המ打交[א] עולם ממיב שעון לאbracht שלורא דרישת גנט

 banc את הח[א] עולם המ[א] שעון לאbracht דה[א] עולם ממיב שעון לאbracht שלורא דרישת גנט

vacAT שים [תמה][תרתי]


.6

.7

.8

.9

.10

.11

.12

.13

.14

.15

.16

.17

.18

.19

.20

.21
Column 20

[ ]

vact
12.平板הו כ"ה ובחנהו והונתה בפתיעה כמתתועבב ומשנהות אתברך אתנה אלעלין חיר כבל.

13.עלמין די מתנה מהוועה על הברכה כולה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

14.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

15.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

16.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

17.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

18.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

19.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

20.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

21.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

22.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

23.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

24.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

25.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

26.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

27.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

28.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

29.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

30.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

31.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

32.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

33.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.

34.בראך הנה אחד מברך וברכת אתנה בברכה וברכת אתנה ששלבשבו בברכה וכנן.
לאחרishi שיתיית דע כי בדקתי את הנל ולא מצאתי דenido התקפה ובחינה חקרת.

בתר ימים דày_DISTANCE כוונתה ויאלי התשובה על הדיבור שער תוכנה ויתר ויתנה דע כי ויב דאי дня Replies בטתי ויד海淀区.

ניתנה זו התוכנה קבצי אחיה על البلد נכנש עם דינו ויתרים.

vacat

עומד ימיה ואספה את עליה שולחני היה ראייה בלשוון וודיד谲 יון דע בדיקה דת לבשו.

יתבה בו ענה היות побוורה דית על באה על דה פרות לה בחרי מRails.

אותחיה כי אתנה בוחנה דית ולpacim יא מאור כי סלפ דלי חפה וחוי דע Shelley.

בית לא אוחרו דת ענתה בב שוקל ענייך ויתלמודה הלפアクセים וידרדרו והיו ילב

ארענו עדי אני י Parses שלער דלי עליון שלפסת למלחת מיכל חפת וחוי אוראו מגר.

רמותי עד אני מרגר דע לבנה ו大切なים כי כא רב דע חונים ילב אראו דגל דע קדיש ילב מדרבר.

באירו דת מרדיה ושני דע פורח וbuscar ילחרד אנחת כל אראו דא והיה ראייהابل עליון.

אושנהה דעם בophage אירנו כי לא שישנה כל בז אתיוסיה ומגיפה בודא וידאטע דכן שלכל יאול

vacat

והימן אשרנה כבום פנהיו ארי ילחרד גותנה אתייר עכ בול עליוה.

ואולתה גנא אביזה המוסר הלמותה אירנה ושירה للمסח מניון ו損害 אתית דל יא עד י

בתקת להורו והמיתיה מניון [ vídeo באה די ימלואו ואולדה דלי תור היות תלמדנה לפנות אירנה.

דע כי בתקת שלורה תמרות דלי פורת דע כי בתקת שלורה תלמדנה להית אנה דלי.

יאו שימוקו דע כי בתקתי להשלב מפק דני ימה שימוקו תמרות תלמדנה דע כי בתקת גונו.

נההו והבח וחיה כי בולי בגשלה ואושכננה לכל אגשיש שולחן יולת והבח ובאוול מהמער יבו לוחיר.

בלפרמות הם חברון יכתי ומ⟦ת אספתי עלויה ועלים מנהלו עליה燚 אניWalpcim ואושכננה עמי.

אנק הכל יאש חיתי שחלחת קירע תלמדנה הלועיגים ואושכננה תחת אליים אפרואו ודומי ואוביל חתירה.

vacat

עומד ואשכנני עמי

κεδίμα ιμών ακολουθεί μέλλει υπόλοιπο υπόλοιπο μέλλει γιαρού μέλλει μεμονωμένα μέλλει γιαρού μέλλει.
Column 22

1. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

2. ונהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך עומר ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

3. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

4. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

5. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

6. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

7. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

8. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

9. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

10. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערב מלך סודים ועב בראש מלך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.

11. ויהי יונתן עובד עב בערבملך עומר ולעומת עום נשב התם.
שביתא יי שבואו אחים שמעוملך סודו יי אחיך אברך גול שיביתא

כמל בזת סקל לערמה והחית עלשלח היא ורשלו אברך שאר תעמך.

שוא חיו עמק מחצץ לקטת ית רמואים ממלוכניק מחצץ דשלח טפכ.

מאכל המשתה אברך גול שמעו היא יי חיו חכ מח לאל עליון בברך.

אברך יאמר בריך אברך לאל עליון мирו שמעו יארא טבריך לא עליון.

וי נבר נון ברך יהודה הל משערו מגל כמיו יי מח עלים תורהו.

באנד קריב מחצץ יי מוסד יאמר ליברך מיר אברך vacat.

הכי נפשו יי חתי יל יי שביר עמק יי אתחלו מח מח עלים טמרוכ.

אדיר אברך מחצץ סודו מרסו וגה vacat.

ייר הלא יי הטיל עליון мирו שמעו יארא שאמח יי חתי ערקו דכמוא

ואאב מח כל יי זכרו לאל חתיך האמר דמח נמי כל עטרה יי.

אברך יאמר מי יי אכלו בני עלים יי עמי עבר למיח חתיתו וברך יי.

אלתי עוגו יאנס ש膂יק מחחלקה מחמצת לילאמ לאיבי אברך שבל כמינו ועלים.

שיביתא יאבר מחצץ סודו גול שיביתא יי חתו עמק יי אריגה יא שבק.

שהלח מחחלקה vacat.

בח הפתוגパソコン אכל חתיך (1) אלאה אברך בחוזו יאמר חנה היא יעה שנין.

שלמה מיח יי דמחה מח תרגים עבורה התנה שבעא מקוריו והדיא.

מק יי חתיו מمشاه בני נקר ומיח יי יאתי יל יי חתיו המח מחני מיח.

נפל יי עמק יי יח מקור מח תמר מח עכמה המח האמח המח.

טוע חתיך יאנה מח עלייל אוסטרפס מח שתימק יאבר מח Manor המח.

ואומר אברך מיר אלאה שמי יעה מחמ המח יאלו.

ויל [א]ויל יאנה ימי אומת עטרת אוח יי 알려 יי וחו מחי בתי תודינה.

אילויו יר פנים חגי יוחל מחמח מחי מחי מחי ימח.
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2.3. English Translation

Column 0

8. [ … and all of us from…

9. [ ] for in every (way) let us undertake an adulterous act

10. [ ] vacat

11. [ ] all that you shall…

12. [ ]… you will intensify your anger and will be unrelenting, for who is there

13. [who… ]… the heat of your anger vacat

14. [ the simple and the humble and the lowly ones quiver and tremble

15. [ ] And now we are prisoners!

16. [ ]… this

17. [ ]… hasten (?), and [to] relent from your anger[ ] vacat

18. [ ] by your anger … since we will depart to the house of…[ ] the Great [H]oly One

19. [ ] And now your hand has come near to strike …[ ] and to do away with all

20. [ ]… because he ceased his words at the [time] of our imprisonment[ ]… a fire that has appeared

21. [ ]… before the Lord of Heaven…

22. [ ] th[em] and attacking from behind them. And no longer

23. [ ] vacat

24. [ ]… seeking favor and… from the Lord of Eternity

25. [ ]… before the Lord of Eternity. vacat

19-36(?).
were descending, and with the women

...and also the mystery of wickedness, which

times, and the mystery that

we did not make known

... not

... until

the mystery, whether they

... great..., medicines, acts of sorcery, and divinations

... part of

... which is upon

see,

... and if

... strike against

vacat

... them a strong bond

... ... [ ]

... and from

... and as a curse for all flesh
25. [ ]the Lord, and by messengers he sent to you
26. [ ]to the earth, and to go down to strengthen the people
27. [ ]…what to do. Mankind to the earth
28. [ ]he did to them, and also to all flesh
29-36(?).

Column 2

1. Then suddenly it occurred to me that the conception was from Watchers, and the seed from Holy Ones, and of Nephil[ ]
2. and my mind wavered concerning this infant.  
3. Then I, Lamech, was upset, so I approached Batenosh my wife and said to her [one of] the sons of Heaven, that you must truthfully recount everything for me, whether[ ]
4. …I bear witness by the Most High, by the Mighty Lord, by the King of all Ages [ ]
5. you must [truthfully] recount for me, without lies. The son (born) from you is unique (?) [ ]
6. by the King of all Ages that you will speak truthfully with me, without lies.[ ]
7. Then Batenosh my wife spoke with me very harshly, and wept[ ]
8. and she said, “O my brother and my husband, you yourself should remember my pleasure…[
9. in the heat of the moment, and my panting breath! Now I [am telling] you everything
   truthfully…[ ]
10. [ ]… entirely.” Then my mind wavered greatly within me.  
11. And when Batenosh my wife saw that my demeanor had changed because of [my] anger[ ]
13. Then she controlled her emotions and continued speaking with me. She was saying to me, “O my husband and my brother,[ ]
14. my pleasure. I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the King of Heaven.

15. that this seed is from you, and from you this conception, and from you the planting of [this]
   fruit.

16. and not from any stranger, nor from any of the Watchers, nor from any of the sons of Heaven.
   Why is the appearance of

17. your face changed and contorted like this, and your spirit…[ ] upon you like this? [ I

18. am speaking truthfully with you. vacat [ ]

19. Then I, Lamech, ran to Methuselah my father and told him everything[ ] to Enoch
   his father in order to learn everything from him with certainty, since he is a beloved and …[ with the Holy Ones]

20. his lot is apportioned, and they make everything known to him. When Methuselah my father heard[ ]

21. he ran to Enoch his father to learn everything truthfully from him[ ]
   his will. And he went through the length of the land of Parvain, and there he found the end of [the] earth

22. [and] he said to Enoch his father, “O my father and my lord, I have come to you[ ]

23. …to me, and I say to you, do not to be angry that I came here to seek you[ out]

26. fearful of you[ ]

27-36(?).
1. [ ] not
2. [ ] all … and not for the length
3. [ ] for in the days of Jared my father
4. [ ]…the sons of
5. [Heaven] (were) living [ ] vacat
6. [ ]…until the day of
7. [ ]… … and they will be for you
8. [ ]…the houses of mankind…[ ]and upon…
9. [ ]…will be over all the earth
10. [ ]…in my land to that sea
11. [ ]…he will place all of it as one fruit. The earth
12. [ ]…the earth…he called his people. Now go
13. [ ]… …truthfully that without lies
14. [ ]…[ ]…[ ]…
15. [ ]… And… reaches by way of a spring to… …
16. [ ]… everything …with
17. [ ] he is the one who will divide the entire earth, and with…
18. [ ] vacat
19-23.
24. [ ]… and for food…
25. [ ]
26. [ ]… he gave to Methuselah his son
27. [ and he gave to Methu|selah his son understanding and...[ ...[ ...]
28. [ ]... ...[ ...to him th[at] in every sea[ ...]
29. [ ]the Lord[ will give]to [him] an ever|las|ting name... ... forests ...[ ...]
30. [ ]...and unt[il] ...
31. [ ]... [fr]om the womb... ...[ ...]
32. [ ]until...and on his... name (?)...[ ...]... and he gave to...[ ...]
33-36.

Column 4

1. Now... ...[ ]... they will cause much trouble
2. and... ...[ ]... and why...[ ... ...[ ...]
3. above... [ ]...[ ]... for all ages... ...much, and the evil
4-10.
11. I decided to enact judgment and ju|stice] upon [ ]... the name
12. of the Great H[o]ly One, and an end [ ]...them from the face of the earth
13. not..[ ]... ... ...
14. [ ]... ... ...
15-36.
1. He wrote all of them in the scroll as a remembrance, all...

2. Now to you, Methuselah [my] son... of this

3. child, for when I, Enoch,... [ not from the sons

4. of Heaven, but from Lamech your son [ ]...

5. and in resemblance he is not...

6. and not... [ because of]

7. his appearance your son Lamech was afraid, and also from... [ and truly... [ ]

8. truly trusting that... [ vacat ]

9. Now I am talking to you, my son, and making known to you that, then truthfully... [ ]

10. Go, say to Lamech your son, “The child truly from you [and ] not from the sons [ of Heaven...” ]

11. and his exaltation on the earth, and every act of judgment I will entrust to him...

12. he lifted his face to me and his eyes shone like [the] sun

13. this child is a light, and he...

14. the seed from a stranger

15. ...

16. Then they will be ensnared and destroyed [ ]

17. forever, giving according to their impurity... [ ]

18. doing much violence, they will act (thus) until[

19. they will boil over, and every path of violence... from[

20. And now I am making known to you, my son, ...

21. your son make known by this mystery all...[ that]
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22. will be done in his days. And look,…[

23. blessing the Lord of All…[

24. When Methuselah heard [my] w|ords

25. and he spoke with Lamech his son of a mystery[

26. And when I, Lamech, h|eard

27. rejoicing that from me [the] Lor[d of… ] had brought forth[

28. vacat [  


30-36.

Column 6

1. from iniquity. Through the uterus of she who bore me I burst forth for uprightness, and when I emerged from my mother's womb I was planted for righteousness.

2. All of my days I conducted myself uprightly, continually walking in the paths of everlasting truth. For [the] Holy One had instructed me to w[alk]

3. in the ways of the paths of truth and to keep myself away from the highway of deceit, which lead to everlasting darkness, and to c[ons]ider whether

4. I would… the Lord. So I girded my loins in the vision of truth and wisdom, in the robe of supplication, and…[

5. [ ]…[vacat]… all the paths of violence.

6. T[h]e[n] I, Noah, became a grown man. I held fast to righteousness and strengthened myself in wisdom …[  
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7. … I went and took Emzera his daughter as my wife. She conceived by way of me and gave birth to th[r]ee sons,

8. [and daughters.] Then I took wives for my sons from among the daughters of my brothers, and gave my daughters to the sons of my brothers according to the custom of the eternal statute,

9. [which] the [Lo]rd of Eternity [gave ] to humanity. vacat In my days, when there were completed for me, according to the calculation by which I reckoned,

10. [ ]… ten jubilees. Then the time of my sons taking women for themselves in marriage came to a close,

11. [and the Lord of] Heaven [appeared to me] in a vision. I looked and was shown and informed about the conduct of sons of Heaven, and how all

12. [ ] heaven. I hid this mystery within my heart, and did not make it known to anyone. vacat

13. [ ]… to me, and the great Watcher on an errand to me, and by an emissary of the great Holy One to me[ ]

14. [ ] he r[e]ealed, and he spoke with me in a vision. He stood before me and loudly (?!) proclaimed, “To you, O No[ah]

15. [ ] And from an em[issary of the great Holy One to me I was hearing a voice, “They are speaking to you, O Noah, …

16. [ ]… before me. So I considered all the behavior of the sons of the earth. I understood and saw all of[ ]

17. [ ]… they would succeed, and they chose among them… [ ]

18. [ ]…two weeks. Then was sealed up… [ ]

19. [ ] bearing witness to the blood that the Nephilin had poured out. I was silent, and waited until…[ ]… …
20. [ ] … holy ones, who with the daughters of me[n]…

21. [ ] making (it) un[cl]ean by the divinatory arts. And I approached [one] of them and he said, “To you… [ ]

22. [ ] … and examining …[

23. [ ] But I, Noah, f[o]und grace, prominence, and righteousness in the eye[s] of [the] L[ord of… ]

24. [ ] … the eternal people, and the blood of je[al]o[usy] the Most High, who …[

25. [ ] … unto the gates of heaven, which the Kin[g] of a[l]l [Ages]

26. [ ] … to humans and cattle and wild animals and birds and[

27. [ ] the[ enti]re deed, and [ever]y… [ ]

28-36.

----------

Column 7

1. [ ] … [you shall r]u[le] over them; the earth and all that is upon it, in the seas and on the mountains

2. [ ] … every heavenly body; the sun, the moon and the stars, and the Watchers

3. [ ] … and throughout this entire year, and the jubilee, and the years, their activity] and …

4. [ ] … on account of… …to you and to… …from all of them

5. [ ] … honor, and my reward I am paying to you
6. [ ] 

7. [ ]... the great Holy One. Then I rejoiced at the words of the Lord of Heaven, and I cried out...

8. [ ]... and everything, and with... ...concerning this...

9. [ ]... he caused me to prosper and testified (?) to me. ...vacat...

10. [ ]... until they proclaimed... the blood...

11. [ ]...he will render this pure by the blood upon...

12. [ ]... with him will be ... for him...

13. [ ]... to all humanity through you...

14. [ ]...vacat...

15. [ ]...I have... to you [ ]...much...

16. [ ]...and who will force him to...[ ]... branching off (?), which he sought...

17. [ ]... the heavens very much, and the ends of...[ ]... to remove me and to build...

18. [ ]...concerning what I dreamt. So I blessed the great Holy One, and... the insight...

19. [ ]...and I... every deed of...

20. [ ]...spoke with me and made known to me, and revealing all...

21. [ ]...their sons, and the assembly of...

22. [ ]...110
1. its mate after it, ... ...[ ] ...[ ] I tied. And each was

2. in... to the end of[ ] ... ... 

3. Then I, Noah, 

4. forever ...[ ]

5-8. 

9. and throughout the entire flood ...[ ]

10. ... that ... you by the King of Heaven 

11. by you. And with me...[ ]

12. ... this... and all[ ]

13. and he showed (?) ... [ ]

14. and...[ ]

15. in your week ...[ ]

16. ... ...[ ] ... ...[ ]

17. and according to its week and a written account, which

18. its week, and... ...[ ]

19. and about three weeks [ ]

20-29. 

30. [ ] ...[ ] ... to every...

31. [ ] ... these, and... in a garden and...

32. [ ] ... take for yourself and for your...

33. [ ] ... to your sons after you for all

34. [ ] ... do not fear and do not go
Then I went

... your father... to his...     vacat  [ ]...     ...

... all he will not save, and...   all...[ ]... to... and to ...

[ ]... [ and ]I am gi]ving this irrevocable decision to...[

4-37.

Then [I] bles[sed] the Lord of All, who from me... and kept safe...[

to Noah ... words, all of th[em  ] in... [ ]...   vacat

Then [I] went[ ]

Now (you all) go... and give praise and glory, for... the Creator... [ ]...

... [u]ntil all... ...and listen to...[all of you to your Lord, and...

to the King of all Ages forever and ever, unto all ages.       [ ]   vacat

Then (it) was on the earth... ...and he took from...[

the ark rested on one of the mountains of Ararat, and the eternal fire ...
13. ... ...[ ... and I atoned for all the earth in its entirety. To begin, the [he-goat] was
14. placed upon first, and after it came upon... [ ... and I burned the fat upon the fire. Second, ...
15. [Th]en... all of their blood to the base of the altar and [I] poured (it) out, and all of their flesh I burned upon the altar. Third, I offered the young turtledoves
16. with them upon the altar; their blood and all (of the rest) of them upon it. I placed fine wheat flour, mixed together with oil containing incense, for their meal-offerings.
17. ...portion of (?)... I said a blessing, and was putting salt on all of them, and the scent of my offering rose up to the [he]avens. vacat
18. Then the Most High b[lessed]... ...
19-35.

Column 11

1. [ ] N[o]w I, Noah, was at the door of the ark the springs rec[eded... ]
2-4.
5. [ ]... ...which... ... And my son... ...their sons[ ]
6-7.
8. [ ]...and [all] of them... all... [ ]
9. [ ]... the mountains and the wildernesses, the hinterlands and [the] co[astlands], a[l]l...[ ]
]... ... not
10. [ ]... four. vacat
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11. [Then] I, Noah, went out and walked throughout the land, through its length and through its breadth, [   ]...

12. [   ]upon it; rejuvenation in their leaves and in their fruit. The entire land was full of grass, herbs, and grain. Then I blessed the Lord of

13. [Heaven,] whose praise endures forever, and to whom (be) the glory! Once again I blessed the one who had compassion on the land, and who removed and obliterated from it all those doing violence and wickedness and deceit, but rescued the righteous man... one, and he obtained all for his sake.  

14. [   ]

15. And ... appeared to me from heaven, speaking with me and saying to me, “Do not fear, O Noah! I am with you and with those of your sons who will be like you forever.

16. [   ]be fruitful and multiply, and fill the land. Rule over all of all of them; over its seas and over its wildernesses, over its mountains and over everything that is in them. I am now

17. [gi]ving everything to you and to your sons for food; that of the vegetation and herbs of the land. But all blood you shall not eat. The awe and fear of you

18. [   ]forever. He said to ... [   ]... years [   ]

19. [   ]... I am for you... through years (?) your children...[   ]

20-35.

Column 12

1. [   ]... I [have] now placed my bow [in a cloud], and it has become a sign for me in the cloud, in order to be...

2. [   ]the [ea]arth

3. [   ]many. And... was revealed to me
4. [ ]... the Lord...[ ]... ...[ ]...

5. [

6. [ ]... vacat

7. [ ]... my son...[ ]... on the mountains of

8. [Ararat]...on the mountains of Ararat. After this, I went down to the base of this mountain, my sons and I, and we built

9. cities for the devastation on the land was great. Then [son]s[ and daught]ers were born to[ my sons] after the flood.

10. To my oldest son [Shem] was born first a son, Arpachshad, two years after the flood. And all the sons of Shem, all together, [wer]e

11. [Elam and Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud and Aram, as well as five daughters. And the sons of Ham (were) Cush, Mitzraim, Put, and Canaan, as well as

12. seven daughters. And the sons of Japheth (were) Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras, as well as four daughters.

13. [Then] I, along with all of my sons, began to cultivate the earth. I planted a great vineyard on Mount Lubar, and in four years it produced abundant wine

14. for me, and I brought forth all of the wine. vacat When the first feast came, on day one of the first feast, which is in the

15. [first] month,[ ]... in my vineyard, and in the midst of my vineyard I opened this vessel, and began to drink from it on the first day of the fifth year

16. [after the planting of ]the vineyard. On that day I called together my sons, my grandsons, and all of our wives and their daughters. We gathered together and went

17. [ ]the[ altar]. I was blessing the Lord of Heaven, the Most High God, the great Holy One, who saved us from the destruction
18. [ ]... ...[ ]... us, and for all... his... , which my fathers hid and... until[ ...]
19. ... beautiful...[ ]... by my righteousness. And I lay down upon my bed, and the wine [ ]...
20. [ ]... pure and... [ ]
21. [ ]...[ ]...[ ]... ...[ ]... I... from you, who... the Most High God
22. [ ]I stirred...[
23. [ ] which I, Noah, ...[
24. [ ]...
25. [ ]
26. [ ]
27. [ ]... every year on... ...
28-35.

Column 13

3. [ ]... and to you [ ] the king, and... began[ ]
4-6.
7. [ ]... and the decree... [ ]... [ ]... to all
8. [ ]... the wood [ ] the bir]ds of the heavens, the beasts of the field, the [catt]e of the land, and the creeping things of the dry ground going... [ ]...
9. [ ]... the stones, and the clay objects (they) were chopping, taking of it for themselves. As I continued watching, the gold, the sil[ver],
10. the... the iron, and all of the trees (they) were chopping, taking of it for themselves. As I continued watching, the sun, the moon,
11. and the stars (they) were chopping, taking of it for themselves. I was watching until the
swarming things of the earth and the swarming things of the water consumed it. So the water
12. ceased, and it ended.
13. I turned to see the olive tree, and the olive tree had grown in height! [This continued] for many
hours, with a bursting forth of many branches… [ ]…
14. good and beautiful fr[uit] appearing in them. I was pondering this olive tree, and the abundance
of its leaves[ ]…
15. [ ]everything, and tying ropes (?) onto it. Now I wondered very greatly about this olive
tree and its leaves. I was (still) wondering when[
16. the [four] winds of heaven blowing powerfully and violently against this olive tree, knocking off
its branches and breaking it to pieces. First, [a wind] swelled up from…
17. … west. It struck it, caused its leaves and fruit to fall from it, and scattered it to the winds. And
after this [a wind swelled up]…
18. and a northern wind from[ ]… and from its fruit…[ ]…
19. [ ]
20. [ ]… and its fruit [ ]
21-34.

Column 14

4. [ its] fruit. You were contemplating the [wo]od, an upper part
being knocked off from
5. [ ]…
6. [ all] of [the] branches, and all the fr[ui]t of the foliage
7. [we know. Look!]

8. [... in you, take... [... vacat]

9. [Now] listen and hear! You are the great cedar tree that was standing before you on a mountain top in your dream.

10. [And] the shoot which emerged from it, grew high, and was rising up to its height (concerns) three sons... ...water from... the earth.

11. As for the fact that you saw the first shoot adhering to the cedar trunk, note too the one division branching off, and the wood from it...

12. [No]w the first son will not separate from you for all of his days, and among his seed your name shall be recalled. From his division all your sons...

13. and in him... the [fi]rst son shall come forth as a righteous planting for all... the day, and...

14. [... standing fast forever. As for the fact that you saw the shoot adhering to the trunk [of the cedar tree... ]...

15. [... As for the fact that you saw the branch of the last shoot, which... from it...

16. vacat... the darkness, and a few of their boughs entering into the midst of the boughs of the first one, (concerns) two sons... ...branches

17. [... one to the south of the Land and one to the north of the Land. As for the fact that you saw a few of their boughs entering into the midst of the boughs of the first one

18. [... of this shoot were settling in his land and all the coastlands... to the Great Sea, and not... ...they [settled in the midst of the [coast]lands

19. [...to comprehend the mystery, there will be to you an end... you will search... ...

20. [... and the mystery... entering into it, and [the] first one... for himself their every god (?) which... [... ]
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21. [...]…for himself… ...in an allotment in Amania, next to Elam… the [Gr]eat Sea [...]

22. [...]…serve, first, exchanging his allotment for an allotment [...]


25. [...] by a miracle (supra) [...]

26. [...] and a seed (supra) [...]

27. [...]the cedar tree [...]

28-34.

Column 15

5. [...]with evil to all… [...]

6. [...]until there was… [...]

7. the Merciful One to... ...[...]these[...]

8. and them to all… [...]from them a profusion of wrongdoing, and settling in your [lan]d...

9. the ends of the earth. As for the fact that you saw all of those crying out and turning away, the majority of them will be evil. As for the fact that you saw [...]

10. the great warrior coming from the south of the Land, the sickle in his hand and the fire with him, he has crushed all… [...]

11. [...]... and the Mighty Lord is the one who will come from the south of the Land[...]...

12. [...]the torches and the evil one. And he threw all [the reb]ellious ones onto the fire [...]
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13. and the pits (?) were covered, and… [        ]the… As for the fact that you saw (that) they
plucked up…[        ]south

14. …[        ]… a chain on them, four mighty angels[        ]

15. [        ]… for them a chain, from all the peoples of the earth who will not have power
over[        ]

16. …[        ]the [ag]itated one because of their conduct, their inadvertent error, their
waver[        ]ing on account of a great bl[asph]emer, and their fruit…

17. … such that he may couple this people to himself. He will cut out a great mountain, and from
it he will consecrate and separate between…

18. … [        ]between all the peoples, and all of them will be serving them and getting
entangled…[        ]all

19. vacat You, Noah, do not be amazed at this dream, and may there not be
added upon it [        ]

20. [        ]I have related everything to you in truth, and thus it is written
concerning you[        ]

21. and I will joi[n] some of your people to you… to you. [Then I], Noah, [awoke] from my
sleep. The sun rose, and I, [Noah,        ]

22. to bless the Everlasting God. And[        ]I[we]nt to Shem, my son, and relat[ed]
everything to [him]

23. [        ]… to you… …to you… the righteous one[        ]to make known what… to
you[        ]

24. to you[        ]to take for yourself the Mo[st High] God[        ]

25-27.

28. [        ]their…        [        ]… in it
8. [ ] as a spring in [ w] est [ un] til it reaches [ ]

9. of the sea that is between them; the source of the Mahaq up to the Tina [R]iver. It then passes as a spring the entire length

10. of the land of the north, all of it, until it reaches to (the) source of [ ] and up to the land [ ]

11. This boundary line crosses the waters of the Great Sea until it reaches Ga[de]ra, and …

12. And Noah divided (it) by lot for Japheth and his sons to receive as an inheritance forever. vacat

13. vacat

14. For Shem emerged the second lot, for him and his sons to receive as[ an inheritance forever ]

15. [ ] the waters of this Tina River emerge, until… [ ]… as a spring[ ]

16. [up] to the Tina River, which… … the Maeota Sea, which reaches … the gulf of

17. the Great Salt Sea. And this boundary goes as a spring from this gulf, which [ ]

18. to… … [ ] up to the gulf of the sea that faces toward Egypt. It then passes… [ ]

19. [ ]… [ ]…[ ]… until it reaches the allotment of [ ]… [ ]

20. … [ ]… … [ ] to the east

21. [ ]… [ ] their sons, all the sons of Noah [ ]

22. [ ] to Noah…

23. [ ] and went

24. [ ]… [ ]… between [ ]… [ ]… [ ]… [ ]

25. [ ]… vacat

26. And for Ham[ there emerged] the third share… to inherit for him[ and his sons forever]
6. [                       ]... ...[                       ] vacat

7. [And] Shem divided his [po]rtion between his sons. There fell first to [E]lam (an area) in the north, along the waters of the Tigris River, until it reaches the Erythrean Sea, to its source which is in the north. And aft[er him ](there fell) to Asshur (the area) toward the west, until it reaches the Tigris...[   ]... And after him

8. (there fell) to Aram the land that is between the two rivers until it reaches the peak of Mount Ar[arat], at this settlement. And after him to Lud...

9. fell this Mount Taurus. This portion passes to the west until it reaches Magog; everything al[ong ]the... gulf that is by the Eastern Sea,

10. in the north, adjoining this gulf – that which is above the three portions to [the] its south. For Arpachshad... ...un[til ]it reaches

11. to... ...which turns to the south; the entire land irrigated by the Euphrates, and all... [   ]...

12. [   ]...a[l]l of the valleys and the plains that are between them, and the coastlands that are within this gulf; a[l]l... un[til] it reaches...[   ]...

13. [   ] to Amana, which abuts Mount Ararat, and (from) Amana until it reaches the Eup[hrates ]...to[   ]... until it re[aches... ]...

14. [   ] the portion that Noah, his father, divided for him and gave to him. vacat
16. [And] Japheth divided between his sons. First, he gave to Gomer (an area) in the north, until it reaches the Tina River. And after him (he gave) to Magog, and after him

17. to Madai, and after him to Yavan; all the islands that are alongside Lud, and between the gulf that is next to Lud and the second gulf. To Tubal (he gave) that which is across

18. [the] second gulf. To Meschech… [ ] To [Tiras] (he gave) four island[s, and up to the… next to it, within

19. [the Sea that reaches alongside to the portion of the sons of Ham… [ ] for]ever 

20. [ ]

21. [ ]… that he gave… [ ]… all…[ ]

22. [ ]the sons of Noah [divid]ed [th]eir allotment[s between their sons]

23. [ ]

24. [ ]and his sons… [ ]…[ ]

25-35.

Column 19

6. [ ]… [ ]… …

7. [ ]… … I called there on the na[me of G]od, and I said, “You are

8. God… …and King of Etern[ity].” And he spoke with me in the night “… and why wander? Up until now you have not reached the holy mountain.” So I set out

9. to [g]o there. I was going to the south of Moreh… , and went until I reached Hebron. For this region Hebron was b[u]ilt, and I lived
Now there was a famine in all of this land, and I heard that there was wheat in Egypt. So I set out to go to the land that is in Egypt and there was [I reached] the Carmon River, one of the heads of the River, I said “...[...[ until now we have been within our land.” So I crossed over the seven heads of this river, which afterwards enters into the Great Sea of Salt. [After this I said], “Now we have left our land and entered the land of the sons of Ham, the land of Egypt.”

Now I, Abram, dreamt a dream in the night of my entry into Egypt. I saw in my dream that there was a single cedar and a single date palm on a mountain, having sprouted together from one root. And men came seeking to cut down and uproot the cedar, thereby leaving the date palm by itself. But the date palm cried out and said, “Do not cut down the cedar, for the two of us are sprung from one root!” So the cedar was left on account of the date palm,

and they did not cut me down. Then I awoke in the night from my sleep, and I said to my wife Sarai, “I dreamt a dream, (and) on account of this dream I am afraid.” She said to me, “Tell me your dream, so that I may know (about it).” So I began to tell her this dream,

and I said to [her], “… this dream… …who will seek to kill me, but to spare you. Yet, this is all the kindness that you must do for me: in all cities that we will enter of me, ‘He is my brother.’ I will live under your protection, and my life will be spared because of you.

[they will seek to take you away from me, and to kill me.” Sarai wept because of my words on this night
22. ... when we entered into the district of Egypt... And Pharaoh Zoan... then Sarai to turn toward Zoan

23. ... and she was secretly very concerned that no man would see her (for) five years. Now at the end of those five years

24. ... to me, and three men from nobles of Egypt... his... by Pharaoh Zoan because of my words and my wisdom, and they were giving

25. me many gifts They asked erudition and wisdom and truth for themselves, so I read before them the book of the words of Enoch

26. in the womb in which he had grown. They were not going to get up until I would clearly expound for them... the words of

27. with much eating and much drinking... the wine

28. ...[ ]...[ ]... to you, I...[ ]...[ ]

29. he was entering... and I said to... I... to Zoan, by...[ ] all the words of Enoch

30. [... ]...[ ]

31. [ vacat ]

32-35.
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1. [... ]...

2. ...[ ]... how irresistible and beautiful is the image of her face; how

3. lovely her forehead, and] soft the hair of her head! How graceful are her eyes, and how precious her nose; every feature
4. of her face is radiating beauty! How lovely is her breast, and how beautiful her white complexion! As for her arms, how beautiful they are! And her hands, how perfect they are! Every view of her hands is stimulating! How graceful are her palms, and how long and thin all the fingers of her hands! Her feet are of such beauty, and her legs so perfectly apportioned! There is not a virgin or bride who enters the bridal chamber more beautiful than she.

5. Her beauty surpasses that of all women, since the height of her beauty soars above them all! And alongside all this beauty she possesses great wisdom. Everything about her is just right! Now when the king heard the words of Herqanos and his two companions – that the three of them spoke as one – he greatly desired her, and sent someone to be quick in acquiring her. When he saw her he was dumbfounded by all of her beauty, and took her for himself as a wife. He also sought to kill me, but Sarai said to the king, “He is my brother,” so that I would be benefited on account of her. Thus I, Abram, was spared because of her, and was not killed. I, Abram, wept bitterly in the night – I and Lot, my brother’s son, with me – when Sarai was taken from me by force.

12. That night I prayed and entreated and asked for mercy. Through sorrow and streaming tears I said, “Blessed are you Most High God, my Lord, for all ages, for you are Lord and Ruler over everything. You are ruler over all the kings of the earth, having power to enact judgment on all of them. So now I cry out to you, my Lord, concerning Pharaoh Zoan, king of Egypt, for my wife has been forcefully taken from me. Bring judgment against him for me, and manifest your mighty hand through him and all of his house, that he might not prevail this night in defiling my wife for me! Thus, they will come to know you, my Lord, that you are Lord over all the kings.
16. of the earth. So I wept and was deeply troubled. During that night the Most High God sent a pestilential spirit to afflict him, and to every person of his household an
17. evil spirit. It was an ongoing affliction for him and every person of his household, so that he was not able to approach her, nor did he have sexual relations with her. She was with him
18. for two years, and at the end of two years the afflictions and hardships grew heavier and more powerful over him and every person of his household, so he sent
19. a message to all the wise men of Egypt, and to all the magicians, in addition to all the physicians of Egypt, (to see) if they could heal him and (every) person
20. of his household of this affliction. But all of the physicians and magicians and all of the wise men were not able to restore him to health. To the contrary, the spirit began afflicting all of them (as well),
21. so that they fled the scene! At this point Herqanos came to me and asked that I come and pray over
and asked that I come and pray over
22. the king and lay my hands upon him, so that he would live. This was because he had seen [me] in a dream… But Lot said to him, “Abram, my uncle, cannot pray over
23. the king while his wife Sarai is with him! Now go and tell the king that he should send his wife away from himself to her husband, so that he (Abram) can pray over him and he may live.”
24. Now when Hyrcanus heard the words of Lot, he went (and) said to the king, “All these afflictions and hardships
25. that are afflicting and troubling my lord, the king, are due to Sarai, the wife of Abram. Just return Sarai to Abram her husband
26. and this affliction and the putrid spirit will depart from you.” So the king called me and said to me, “What have you done to me?! Why were you saying
27. to me, ‘She is my sister,’ when she was your wife? That is why I took her as a wife for myself!

    Here is your wife. Take her, go and get yourself out of

28. the entire district of Egypt! But now pray over me and my household, that this evil spirit may be
    expelled from us. So I prayed over [him in order to] heal

29. him, and I laid my hands upon his [h]ead. Then the affliction was removed from him, and the
    evil [spirit] rebuked [from him]. So he recovered, rose up, and the king gave

30. to me on t[hat da]ly many gift[s], and the king swore to me by an oath that he did not have sexual
    relations with her, [nor] did he [de]file her. Then he returned

31. Sarai to me, and the king gave to her [m]uch si[l]ver and g|old and much clothing of fine linen
    and purple, which… …[               ]

32. before her, as well as Hagar. Thus he restored her to me, and appointed for me a man who
    would escort me [from Egyp|t to[ ]… to your people. To you [  ]

33. vacat Now I, Abram, grew tremendously in many flocks and also in silver and gold. I went up
    from Eg[y|p|t, [and] my brother’s son [Lot wen]t

34. with me. Lot had also acquired for himself many flocks, and took a wife from the daughters of
    Eg[y|p|t. I was encamping [with him]

Column 21

1. at every place of my (former) encampments until I reached Bethel, the place where I had
    built the altar. I built it a second time,

2. … and offered upon it burnt offerings and a meal offering to the Most High God. And I
    called there on the name of the Lord of the Ages. I praised the name of God, blessed
3. God, and gave thanks there before God because of all the flocks and good things that he had given to me, and because he had worked good on my behalf and returned me to this land in peace.  

4. After this day Lot parted from me due to the behavior of our shepherds. He went and settled in the Jordan Valley along with all of his flocks, and I also added a great deal to what he had. He continued pasturing his flocks, and (eventually) reached Sodom. He bought a house for himself in Sodom, and lived in it while I was living on the mountain of Bethel. It was disturbing to me that Lot, my brother’s son, had parted from me. 

5. Then God appeared to me in a vision in the night, and said to me, “Go up to Ramat-Hazor, which is to the north of Bethel, the place where you are living. Lift up you eyes and look to the east, to the west, to the south, and to the north, and look at this entire land that I am giving to you and to your descendants for all ages.” So on the following day I went up to Ramat-Hazor and I saw the Land from this high point: from the River of Egypt until Lebanon and Senir, and from the Great Sea to Hauran, and all the land of Gebal up to Kadesh, and the entire Great Desert that is east of Hauran and Senir, up to the Euphrates. He said to me, “To your descendants I will give all of this land, and they will inherit it for all ages. I will make your descendants as numerous as the dust of the earth, which no one is able to reckon. So too your descendants will be beyond reckoning. Get up, walk around, go and see how great are its length and its width. For I shall give it to you and to you descendants after you unto all the ages.”
15. So I, Abram, went out to go around and look at the Land. I began to travel the circuit from the Gihon River, and came alongside the Sea until

16. I reached Mount Taurus. I then traversed from alo[ng] this Great Sea of Salt and went alongside Mount Taurus to the east, through the breadth of the land,

17. until I reached the Euphrates River. I journeyed along the Euphrates until I reached the Erythrean Sea, to the East, and was traveling along

18. the Erythrean Sea until I reached the gulf of the Red Sea, which extends out from the Erythrean Sea. I went around to the south until I reached the Gihon

19. River, and I then returned, arriving at my house in safety. I found all of my people safe and went and lived at the Oaks of Mamre, which are near Hebron,

20. to the northeast of Hebron. I built an altar there and offered upon it a burnt offering and a meal offering to the Most High God. I ate and drank there,

21. I and every person of my household. Then I sent an invitation to Mamre, Arnem, and Eshkol, three Amorite brothers (who were) my friends, and they ate

22. with me and drank with me. vacat

23. Before these days, Chedarlaomer, the king of Elam, Amraphel, the king of Babylon, Arioch, the king of Cappadocia, (and) Tiral, the king of Goiim, which

24. is Mesopotamia, came and waged war with Bera, the king of Sodom, and with Birsha, the king of Gomorrah, and with Shinab, the king of Admah,

25. and with Shemiabad, the king of Zeboiim, and with the king of Bela. All of these banded together for battle at the Valley of Siddim. The king of

26. Elam and the kings who were with him overpowered the king of Sodom and all of his allies, and they imposed a tribute on them. For twelve years they were
27. paying their tributes to the king of Elam, but during the thirteenth year they rebelled against him, so that in the fourteenth year the king of Elam brought together all of his allies. They went up the Way of the Desert, destroying and plundering from the Euphrates River (onward). They destroyed the Rephaim who were in Ashtera of Karnaim, the Zumzamim, who were in Amman, the Emim, [who were in] Shaveh-Hakerioth, and the Hurrians, who were in the mountains of Gebal, until they reached El-

29. Paran, which is in the desert. They then turned back and destroyed Ein-[Dina,...], which is in Hazazon-Tamar.

31. Now the king of Sodom went out to meet them along with the king of [Gomorrah, the king of Admah, the king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela. They engaged the battle in the Valley of Siddim] against Chedarla[omer and the kings] who were with him, but the king of Sodom was crushed and fled, while the king of Gomorrah fell, and many from [all]...[ The king of Elam plundered all of the goods of Sodom and of Gomorrah, and all that they found there], while Lot, the son of Abram’s brother,

Column 22

1. who was living in Sodom together with them along with his flocks, was taken captive. But one of the shepherds

2. that Abram had given to Lot, who had escaped the captors, came to Abram. At that time Abram
3. was living in Hebron, and he informed him that his brother’s son Lot had been captured, along with all of his property, but that he had not been killed. Also that
4. the kings had set out (on) the Way of the Great Valley toward their province, (all the while) taking captives, plundering, destroying, killing, and heading
5. for the city Damascus. Then Abram wept over his brother’s son Lot. Having collected himself, Abram got up
6. and chose from his servants three hundred and eighteen warriors fit for battle. Arnem,
7. Eshkol and Mamre also set out with him. He chased after them until he reached Dan, where he found them
8. resting in the Valley of Dan. He swooped upon them at night from all four sides, killing
9. among them throughout the night. He crushed them and chased after them, and all of them were fleeing before him
10. until they reached Helbon, which is situated to the north of Damascus. (There) he took away from them everyone they had captured,
11. all that they had plundered, and all of their own goods. Lot, his brother’s son, he also saved, along with his property. All
12. those whom they had taken captive he brought back. When the king of Sodom heard that Abram had brought back all of the captives
13. and all of the plunder, he went up to meet him. He came to Salem, which is Jerusalem, and Abram encamped in the Valley
14. of Shaveh, which is the Valley of the King – the Valley of Bet-Hakerem. And Melchizedek, the king of Salem, brought out
15. food and drink for Abram and for all of the men who were with him. He was the priest of the Most High God, and he blessed
16. Abram, saying, “Blessed be Abram by the Most High God, the Lord of heaven and earth!
And blessed be the Most High God,
17. who delivered those who hate you into your hand!” So he gave him a tenth of all the
property of the king of Elam and his allies.
18. Then the king of Sodom drew near and said to Abram, “My lord, Abram,
19. give me anyone who belongs to me of the captives with you whom you have rescued from
the king of Elam. But as for all the property,
20. it is left to you.” Then Abram said to the king of Sodom, “I lift up
21. my hands this day to the Most High God, the Lord of heaven and earth, (swearing) that I
will take neither string nor sandal strap
22. from all that which belongs to you, lest you should say, ‘All the wealth of Abram (derives)
from my
23. property.’ (This) excludes that which my young men who are with me have already eaten,
and also the portion of the three men who
24. went with me. (Only) they have authority to give you their portions. So Abram returned all
of the property and all
25. of the captives, and gave (them) to the king of Sodom. Every last one of the captives who
were with him from that land he set free
26. and sent all of them away.
27. After these things God appeared to Abram in a vision, and said to him, “Look, ten years
28. have elapsed since the day you came out of Haran; two years you spent here, seven in Egypt,
and one (has passed)
29. since you returned from Egypt. Now inspect and count all that you have; see that by
doubling they have increased beyond
30. all that came out with you on the day of your departure from Haran. And now do not fear; I am with you, and will be for you

31. support and strength. I am a shield over you, and a buckler for you against those stronger than you. Your wealth and your property

32. will increase enormously. Abram said, “My Lord God, I have wealth and property in great abundance, yet what are

33. all [th]ese things to me while I, when I die, will go stripped bare, without children. One of my household servants will receive my inheritance;

34. Eliezer, son of Dameseq, he… the one acquiring an inheritance from me.” But he said to him, “This one will not receive your inheritance, but one who will go forth”
2.4. Textual Notes

Column 0: This column has been tentatively reconstructed by B. Zuckerman and M. O. Wise, and was subsequently incorporated into F’s commentary (3rd ed.). The fragments used were those originally published by Milik as 1Q20 in DJD 1. While I have followed the general placement of fragments in the reconstruction, I differ with some of the specific readings based on the excellent, scaleable set of photographs now available through Inscriptifact (www.inscriptifact.com). The original readings of Milik are incorporated into the notes where available, as are two re-readings of the 1Q20 fragments published prior to their reconstruction: GMT (listed as 1Q20, p. 26) and B¹ (listed as col. 0 of “Das Genesis-Apokryphon,” p. 166). The material in B¹ is extremely confusing, since he includes under col. 0 the beginning of some lines from what is now termed col. 1 (= col. II in Milik).

0.1: In infrared photo ISF_DO_0067 the bottom of a lamed precedes what Milik read as a nun (I follow him, although the top of this letter is missing). The horizontal base stroke of a possible mem begins the next word, which is followed by a final nun. This letter is difficult to discern unless magnified, since it runs into the top of the lamed below it (line 2). In Zuckerman’s drawing of the reconstructed column (cf. F, p. 115), the fragment containing the top margin (1Q20, frg. 6) is flipped over, so that the back side is viewed – a mistake pointed out to me by Daniel Falk. This seems to have skewed the placement of the lamed in the final word of the line, although a lamed is also present when the fragment is flipped back to the front (approx. 1 letter space closer to the margin line). When flipped back over, the placement of the earlier lamed is also confirmed.

0.2: The fragments used were those originally published by Milik as 1Q20, GMT/F, and B¹. Milik’s reading of a tav to begin this word seems best, based on the left upper and lower corners of the letter remains. Remnants of at least one letter follow the lamed.

0.3: The penultimate letter is too large to be a yod, and fits well the expected shape of an aleph.

0.4: A crack runs from top right to bottom left of the first three letters. When enlarged, the left downstroke of the mem and lower right bend of the kaph are easily seen.

0.8: The outline of a final aleph is clear on ISF_DO_0065. In addition, the preceding two letters appear to be separated, making a penultimate tav unlikely.

0.10: The reading of F/AW is problematic. First, there is a space of 6-8 letters between their final nun and the beginning of nun. Second, a large blank space (at least that of a word break) between the letter combinations yod-shin and shin-bet would be required. Third, what they read as the right part of a shin is clearly an ayin in ISF_DO_00661 (the joint of the left and right strokes is visible). Finally, the faint remains of a final nun can be seen preceding נון. My letters י and ב are far less certain.

0.13: The final word is quite certain, but the beginning of נון is obscured and may be directly preceded by other letters. It does, however, fit with the use of this word at several other points in the scroll.

0.15: Although the resh is slightly obscured, the upper part of the letter is far too large to be that of a yod.

0.17: The end of this word is written compactly, making the fourth and fifth letters difficult to read. The bet and nun (as separate letters) are quite clear on an enlargement of ISF_DO_00661, with the following letter being either a gimel (with the lower
extension of its vertical stroke hidden by the bottom, horizontal stroke of the preceding nun), or a nun. I find a nun to be more likely based on physical remains, meaning, and context.

Column 1: This column has been pieced together from several disjointed pieces of the manuscript. The ends of lines 1-22 (i.e. the left edge of col. 1) are found along the right edge of the fragment containing col. 2. The beginning of lines 6-13 are preserved in Milik’s IQ20, fig. 1, Col. II. The so-called Trever Fragment accounts for the remainder of the column, from lines 23-29. Because several fragments are involved, this column has been the object of several critical mistakes in line numbering and word placement. These are noted below.

1.1: B1/GMT/F/AW; MQS/F/AW have mistakenly skipped a line here. Their lines 6 and 8 (my line 7) clearly follow one of lines 1-22 (i.e. the left edge of col. 1) are found along the right edge of the fragment containing col. 2. Very little remains before the word הַנִּבְגָּד, and appears to be part of this line. The correct placement is ... (0:28).

1.13: GMT/F/AW; MQS/F/AW; AW. The ayin is relatively clear on IMneg. 3854, although a shin should not be ruled out absolutely. It is certainly not a samekh, as transcribed by AW.

1.4: In MQS/F/AW, the letters מַרְמַר יִתְרוֹפֵּהוּ precede מַרְמַר יִתְרוֹפֵּהוּ. This is apparently a mistake first made by MQS, and followed by F and AW, in which letters belonging to the previous line were included on this line instead (i.e. my מַרְמַר יִתְרוֹפֵּהוּ of the previous note). The mistake is apparently attributable to IMneg. 3853, on which a fragment from line 3 is askew, and appears to be part of this line. The correct placement is apparent on all other photographs. Very little remains before the word מַרְמַר יִתְרוֹפֵּהוּ, certainly not enough to read confidently the letters suggested.

1.7: MQS/F/AW have mistakenly skipped a line here. Their lines 6 and 8 (my line 7) clearly follow another in the photographs, and account for a disagreement in our line numbering until 1.23 (cf. note below). B1’s numbering is correct for those portions of col. 1 not originally included in Mil’s IQ20. However, B1 inexplicably places Mil’s col. II (the right side of col. 1 elsewhere) in his col. 0! The problem remains uncorrected in B1.

1.7: B1/GMT/F/AW; AW. The aleph is clear, especially on IMneg. 3853.

1.10: On ISF_DO_0067 several unidentified letters can be made out. What all others read as a tav I have broken into a tav and dalet, since the initial vertical stroke is leaning to the left and does not have the left leg expected of a tav. The ink of this word appears very blurred on the original photos, but is clarified by infrared photography.

1.11: יִשְׂרָאֵל. The three letters are close together, but the bottom of a kaph for the third letter is clear on ISF_DO_0067. There is no paleographic evidence for the bottom horizontal stroke of F’s bet. Another possible reading is [ayin] “[they] arranged.”

1.12: בָּשְׂרֵית מִיתָּאֵת לָמָּכָה, both letters are paleographically possible, but the latter makes much better sense following the preposition לע at the end of line 11. The final three letters of מִיתָּאֵת לָמָּכָה are uncertain, with only the very top portions remaining.

1.13: בָּשְׂרֵית מִיתָּאֵת לָמָּכָה, B1/GMT/F/AW. There are horizontal rips through both words, making this reading far from sure. More letters are required than the readings of Mil/B1/F provide, and
it appears that two words should be read on ISF_DO_03796, 00661, and 00665. The letters with
circlets are speculative, and the final nun certain.

1.18: מַעֲלֵה

1.23: Here begins the Trever fragment. The line numbering is uncertain from this point forward, since the

sequence is split apart by a crack in the leather.

1.25: The bet is clear for both words on IMneg. 6x6, neither letter containing the short, leftward overhang of the top cross-stroke

expected of a heh. B’s kaph is undoubtedly a mem.

1.26: פְּה הַכֹּל הַנָּשָׁב הָאָרֶם. The reading is certain.

1.27: פְּה הַכֹּל הַנָּשָׁב הָאָרֶם. The letter preceding yod does not have the left downstroke characteristic of an ayin. It appears instead to have the upper, horizontal stroke more common for a resh or dalet.

Column 2: The first of the columns originally published by AY, col. 2 has been widely commented upon,

accounting for many sources cited in the textual notes. Col. 2 exists on a single leaf of parchment,
detached from the “soft side” of the scroll by Trever in 1949. Photos for this column are found in the
AY, IMneg., and BZ collections.

2.1: יָרָמִי. Kutscher’s suggestion is impossible based on available space. Although Qimron’s reading is attractive on linguistic
grounds, the left leg of what I read as tav appears too close (and the foot too short) to the following aleph

to be a nun. Since an Aramaic form similar to ours is known from 11Q1g1b 4:9 (ןוֹרְחָא), it seems that

in this line we find the standard Aramaic word, while that used in 2.15 (ןוֹרְחָא) is a Hebraism.

2.1: רָמִי. The readings of B and MBE are incorrect based simply on space considerations and letter remains. B3 is no improvement.

Qimron was the first to point out that what is read by AY/J/GMT as a bet is actually the combination

גַּבִּין-רִשּׁ. Indeed, the upper horizontal stroke of the resh is visible on BZ1-2T, as is the following ayin, which is split apart by a crack in the leather.

2.4: דִּ֖נְי דְּנָה. The reading of J/GMT/AW is the least likely, since what they transcribe as mem does not have the horizontal bottom stroke required by that letter in BZ1-2T or IMneg. 3853 (this reading seems to favor grammatical

considerations over the physical evidence). Puech reads the aleph as part of the following word (i.e. a 1 sg. imperfect ʼaphal), which is grammatically possible. However, the word break discerned by all others is

quite clear, and the imperfect would seem strange in this context (direct speech to Batenosh). The

erlier letters of his reading do not look correct to me. I largely agree with the readings of AY/F/B1, but opt for a yod instead of tav in דִּ֖נְי. F noted the enigmatic nature of this form, which he leaves untranslated, and argues that the preceding letters נָּה cannot be the 1 sg. pers. pro. (as J/GMT/AW and I read), since at this time it always ends with be′er. In his discussion of orthography (p. 263),
however, he notes the substitution of aleph for an expected bet in numerous other places, raising the possibility that this was a scribal slip based on phonetics. The form מ is widespread in subsequent Palestinian Aramaic (cf. Sokoloff, DJPA, p. 64). F also notes that “some word like ‘swear to me’ is expected before מתקメーカー.” I tentatively take מ to be a (unique) denominative part. related to the noun מ “witness, bearer of testimony.”

2.6: ב[א] י/מ ג/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] הר[מ]. The final two letters are very clear on the plate of AY and IMneg. 3854#1. The top of the initial מ is apparent in IMneg. 3854 and 3854#1, but is difficult to discern in AY’s plate. The letters following this word can be seen on the IMneg. photos.

2.9: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. What all others have read as one word may justifiably be split into two based on the very close spacing between words elsewhere in the scroll (e.g. מ[א] in 2.3 and מ in 2.23). The right horn of the dalet is clear in BZ1-2T.

2.10: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. Either reading is possible, since the text is badly damaged here (although one would not gather this from J/GMT). Yet, the overall ink remains seem to fit מ[א] slightly better. The best photograph is IMneg. 3854#1, in which the downstroke of a qoph does appear possible in the first position. It may very well be that neither suggestion is correct.

2.11: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א] מ/מ ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. When enlarged, IMneg. 3854 and 3854#1 show clearly that there is no letter between the lamed and aleph at the end of the word. The first two letters of the last word have the long, horizontal base strokes expected of a bet, kaph, or mem. Puech asserts that this word is “précédé sans doute” by מ, although the negative imprint of an aleph is quite evident.

2.17: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. I am convinced that the penultimate letter is a kaph, and not a bet. את[ל] seems paleographically preferable when IMneg. 3854 and 3854#1 are enlarged (although a bet cannot be ruled out absolutely), and mirrors the syntax used earlier in the line. A plane spelling is also used for this suffix in 5.9 (where it is subsequently corrected) and 20.26 (with a bet), showing that it was pronounced “kba” by the scribe/community who wrote or copied the scroll. This type of ending is common in Qumran Hebrew (see Qimron, Hebrew, p. 58-9).

2.20: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. At least one letter can be seen following the resh, but the ink is severely blurred. Puech noted that J/GMT/AW’s reading “est une lecture paléographiquement exclue,” with which I agree. There is not the sweeping right to left downward stroke expected of an ayin, but a more vertical stroke (possibly the gimel suggested by F). In any case, the basic idea suggested by both J and F seems plausible (i.e. a word roughly parallel to מ[א]).

2.22: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. Two facts are relatively clear: 1) there is a space between the lamed and resh; 2) there are at least four letters preceding resh at the beginning of the line. This rules out the readings of AY/J/GMT/AW, while leaving F/B²’s proposal quite possible. The ayin is more easily discerned than the preceding 2 (or 3) letters, which are highly speculative.

2.23: ב[א] י/מ פ[א] ה/מ ב[א] ב[א] מ[א]. The readings of GMT and AW are easily dismissed on physical grounds, since more than one letter would be required between the qoph and tav of GMT, and the lower extension of a final letter form is clearly seen in the third or fourth space (contra AW). It appears that AW have strictly followed MBE’s (p. 41, n. 1) suggestion that these letters represent the word הת不合理 “the upper layer, stratum (of the three)”. Not even Milik, however, ignored the final kaph, confessing that his reading was “in spite of the final form of the Kaph in the middle of a word (which does occur occasionally in the script of the Qumran manuscripts).” He ignored to mention, however, that this practice never occurs elsewhere in the Genesis Apocryphon, which may have caused GMT to propose the even less plausible הת不合理. The other readings (except for AW; cf. note on 2.9 above) are also paleographically untenable, aside from being unlikely on other grounds (cf. Lignée, Textes, p. 223-5; and F, p. 137 for discussion). These words are fairly clear on IMneg. 3854#1, and F’s interpretation remains the most reasonable.
been perpetuated, since even the plates of AY show it to be untenable on paleographic grounds. My reading is supported by the parallel in 1 Enoch 106:8, “And when Methuselah heard the words of his son, he came to me at the ends of the earth.”

2.25: \[\text{AQ}/\text{F}\] \(/\text{J}/\text{GMT}\) \(\text{Aw} /\text{MQS}\). The \text{lam} is much closer to than it seems in the transcriptions of AY and F, with only one, small letter between them. This also renders the readings of B and AW untenable.

2.25: \(\text{B\&\text{D}}\) \(\text{Y}\) \(\text{Z}\) \(\text{A}\) \(\text{W}\) \(\text{B}\). Both are material, but the latter is preferable on grammatical grounds. B’s proposal may stem from his misreading of the preceding (without the \text{vav} and following \text{ayin}), which then forced him to provide a \text{vav}, rather than \text{dalet}, in order to make sense of the phrase. Here the \text{dalet} introduces direct discourse (cf. F, p. 138). Ginsberg argues that this word is written \text{junctum} with the following \text{vav}, but this is very unlikely.

2.25: \(\text{B}\) \(\text{J}\)/\text{GMT}\)/\text{AW}. Qimron finds this reading materially preferable, although the word is blurred and difficult to read. This finds support in the \text{vav} of 22:28. It is true remarkable that those including diacritical marks in their text do not make use of them here. Happily, the meaning remains the same in either case.

2.25: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{Y}\) \(\text{B}\) \(\text{B}\). The readings of B and F can be excluded with certainty, since the second letter has a bottom, horizontal stroke not characteristic of an \text{aleph} or final \text{kaph}. The extended downstroke of the last letter assures that it is a final form.

Column 3: This column is very badly damaged, with the most helpful photos being the BZ set. There are a number of lines in the lower portion of this column (cf. BZ3-4B or IM neg. x 86-4447) that have not been transcribed by MQS, F, AW, or B. They contain little readable text.

3.4: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{F}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{Y}\) \(\text{B}\) \(\text{B}\). The \text{bet} of my \text{vav} is clearly visible on BZ3-4T, ruling out the transcription of B.

3.10: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{Y}\)/\text{B}\). The \text{yod} at the end of this word is quite clear when enlarged, while there is not enough room to accommodate an \text{aleph} before the following \text{lam} (contra F). The question remains as to what this word may mean. MQS does not translate, and AW’s translation, “lower for this sea,” fails to convince. I believe that it must either be the noun \text{ayin/land, earth} plus the 1 sg. possessive suffix (“my land”), or a 

3.11: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{F}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{B}\)/\text{A}\). All four letters of \text{vin} are confidently identified on IMneg. x 86-4447, 4453.

3.12: \(\text{B}\)/\text{A}\). B’s reading is not correct. Perhaps he is referring to the clear \text{ayin} earlier in the line?

3.15: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{Y}\)/\text{B}\). The text is in very poor shape here. Apart from the initial \(\text{vav}\), the only word of B containing any plausibility is the last. His overall reading falls several letters short of the number required for this space.

3.17: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{F}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{Y}\)/\text{B}\). Upon scrutinizing BZ3-4M and IMneg. x 86-4447, 4453 it is apparent that B has read the first word incorrectly. The \text{gimel} is especially decisive in this regard. The \text{ayin} of \text{vin} is also quite clear, and the \text{bet} and \text{dalet} of B may be dismissed on material grounds – there is no base stroke for the first letter, while the second clearly has a break in the top (i.e. the valley between the two strokes of my \text{ayin}).

3.24: \(\text{MQS}\)/\text{F}\)/\text{AW} \(\text{v}\). The reading of MQS/F/AW cannot be correct. It is clear on BZ3-4M that there are three letters between the two \text{lam} and, there is far too much space for the second \text{lam} to be followed by the phonematic suffix \text{vav}- alone. The \text{mem} and \text{aleph} are quite clear, while the \text{kaph} could also be a \text{bet}.

3.29: \(\text{vin}\). This phrase is very clear on BZ3-4B, with the only question being whether the final letters are \(\text{vav}\) or \(\text{v}\). (I first read the latter, but the foot of the left leg required by a \text{vav} seems to be missing). I have
chosen the former, which I translate as the plural of  
יר   “forest, reed marsh,” and which may allude to
the dominion over creation given to Noah. The latter option (i.e. with a tav) would constitute a suffixed
verbal form from יֵעַ “study, work” (i.e. “I studied them”), also possible in this context. Reading
as two words (“… to me cities”) is unlikely, since the yod/vav runs directly into the ayin.

Column 4: This is another poorly preserved column, of which only some parts along the outer edges remain. It
is the last column of the present sheet of parchment. By following the left margin we are able to
determine that, like the next sheet, it contained 36 lines per column. The BZ photos and IMneg. 3838
are the most helpful.

4.1: פֶּן ] MQS/F/AW מִן; F מ. There is clearly a letter before what I read as a kaph, and the others as a mem
(contra F). Due to a crack in the leather running through the word in BZ3-4T, the tops and bottoms of
the letter are unaligned. However, the sloping line on the left side of MQS/F/AW’s mem has a
noticeable convex shape to it, suggesting that it is, rather, the right stroke of an ayin. Indeed, the top of
the ayin’s left stroke can be seen to the top of the final nun in the photographs.

4.1: יֶשָּׁה ] B יָשָׁה. Either reading is possible, but it is astonishing that B has not included any diacritical marks.
The second letter is almost completely missing in every available photograph, yet the remaining right,
slanting stroke appears to me that to be of a gimmel.

4.11: מִלְּנָה ] MQS/F/AW מְלָכָה. B has not transcribed the mem, which is evident on all photographs.
4.12: מְלָכָה ] MQS/F/AW מְלָכָה; B מִלְּאמָה. The lower stroke of a final letter at the end of the second word is
readily seen on IMneg. 3838.

Column 5: This column begins a new sheet of parchment containing columns of 36 lines, with the majority of
preserved text for this column adjoining the right margin. A small peh, written in a different scribal
hand, may be seen in the top, righthand corner of the sheet. This, along with similar markings in the
same corner of cols. 10 and 17 (both also at the beginning of new parchment sheets), must have been
part of the manuscript preparation process. All three letters were written rather crudely in comparison
to the neat hand of the scribe(s) of this manuscript, and were first noted by M. Morgenstern, “A New
Clue to the Original Length of the Genesis Apocryphon,” JJS 47.2 (1996), 345-47. I do not see any
reason to assume automatically that the sheets comprising this manuscript began with the letter aleph, as
Morgenstern does. It seems more likely that the letters were by penned by those who initially prepared
the leather, in order to assure proper joinery. One can imagine a large stack of such sheets from which
some were taken (beginning with the next letter in the stack) when a new manuscript was
commissioned.

5.1: נָהֲלָה ] MQS/F/AW נָהֲלָה; B נָהֲלָה. The reading of B is implausible for two reasons:
1) where he has the combination tav-space-ayin there is clearly a letter with a flat, horizontal base stroke
(my kaph) followed by a yod/vav; and 2) there is no yod between the lam and beh.

5.1: מַלְוֹת ] This is a highly speculative reading, since there is a crack running through the entire
phrase in BZ4-5T and the correct alignment of letters is difficult to ascertain. Further work on this line
may yield more certain results.

5.3: עֶלִי ] I follow the reading of AY (18), B et al. with some reservation. In support of this proposal, the 1
sg. pronoun is typically followed by a proper name (but cf. 5.9).

5.5: מֶנֶּה ] MQS/GMT/F/AW מֵנֶה. The horizontal top stroke of the bet (as opposed to sloping stroke
of a mem) is clear on BZ4-5T.

5.7: בַּל ] Although I follow B here, the reading is extremely tenuous (more than B’s transcription
suggests). His foregoing words, [ד א], are far from certain.

5.8: עָה ] MQS/F/AW בָּה. The letters have a large, horizontal crack running through them, and are
unreadable. At best, B’s reading should be viewed as a reconstruction.

5.9: בַּל ] MQS/AW בַּל; B בַּל; F בַּל; B בַּל; F בַּל; B בַּל. The transcription of F is misleading, since there are at least two intervening words between
bakheth and bakheth (not including the supralinear אֲוִי). B is incorrect in reconstructing בַּל, since there are
are clearly one or two letters placed between the lam and bakheth.
5.11: ]MQS/F/AW \[ניבי שמשי; B3 יב. B3's confident reading is clear in BZ4-5M and IMneg. x 86-4445, ruling out the reconstruction of MQS/F/AW. B3's confident reading is unwarranted, and a simple letter count proves it incorrect. It is relatively clear that the first word contains the letters for שמש, although the peh is least certain. The following words are less sure – the aleph may actually belong with שמש, the bet could also be a peh, and there may be a word break after the lamed. Whatever the case, the initial word indicates a different implication for this line than that first suggested by MQS or B3, revealing that Noah, not the giants or Watchers, is the subject.

5.12: ]MQS/F/AW \[ג. B3's reading is plausible, but far from certain. The first letter appears to be a kaph rather than a bet.

5.13: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. For a similar expression see 2.15-16.

5.14: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. In IMneg. x 86-4445 it is clear that B3 is correct in transcribing a yod rather than an aleph for the imperfect prefixes of these two verbs. There is not enough room, however, for both bet and beh between the tav and lamed of his מֵאֵלוֹת.

5.15: ]MQS/F/AW \[ב. B3's reading is plausible, but far from certain. The first letter appears to be a kaph rather than a bet.

5.16: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. In BZ4-5M it is plain that the yod of מֵא is a vertical crack running through it, and is also blurred, making it appear larger than a typical yod. This has resulted in MQS/F/AW's tenuous aleph.

5.17: ]MQS/F/AW \[כ. The suggestion of B3 is supported by IMneg. x 86-4445, where the tops of all of the letters are discernible. Especially notable is the top of the shin, where the join between the left, upright stroke and the short, intermediate stroke is visible. A question lingers regarding a noticeable basestroke standing between the lamed and qoph, which remains unexplained in my transcription.

5.18: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. However, what MQS/F/GMT read as 'ayin appears to be a yod based on the larger head and shorter downward extension typical of the latter. ב also better fits the typical syntax of the scroll.

5.19: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. BZ4-5M reveals that the illegible letter of MQS/F/AW/ב is a yod. According to their reading, this would have to be the definite object marker י, which is not found elsewhere in the scroll. It is preferable to read this as a 3 m. sg. impf. *itpeel from בּוּדככ “be done.” B3's reading is incorrect, since there is plainly a space after the dalet of ותעבכ, and no evidence for the base stroke of his nun.

5.20: ]MQS/F/AW \[ג. No lamed is visible on BZ4-5M or IMneg. x 86-4445. Rather, the right, lower corner of what may be a mem, bet, or kaph appears less than one full letter space after חותמ. Thus, the reading of MQS/F/AW may be ruled out, while my and B3's suggestions remain speculative.

5.21: ]MQS/F/AW \[ג. B3's reading is correct on IMneg. x 86-4445, and fits the context well.

5.22: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. The yod of מֵא is quite clear in the photographs, but has been overlooked by AY and B3. The first letter of the following word is tentative, both mem and bet fitting the scant ink remains.

5.23: ]MQS/F/AW \[אכ. The central words מֵא are easily read on the infrared photographs. The surrounding words, however, are more difficult to discern because of an additional layer of parchment covering them. The name מֵא is assured based on the work of Bearman and Zuckerman, even though the word cannot be seen on the plates available to me (cf. Ste, 66). The initial word is almost completely obscured by the overlying piece of leather, and so no conclusion can be reached with certainty. Nevertheless, in BZ4-5B some ink traces can be seen through this layer, appearing to represent the upper, left corner of a shin (in the ante-penultimate position) and perhaps a final nun. If we reconstruct the name מֵא based on its occurrence five lines earlier, it is approximately 1.5 letters too long for the space available between the right margin and ב. This proves B3's suggestion unlikely. The word
Column 6: The IMneg. and BZ sets of infrared photographs provide useful information for reading this column. The column begins with full lines at the top and the right margin preserved, but slowly tapers toward the bottom, gradually losing text from the beginning and end of its lines.

6.1: The bet is discernible on BZ6T when it is enlarged and the contrast is enhanced. Neither the ink remains nor spacing fit the reading of B^3.

6.2: The wordם is abundantly clear on BZ6T.

6.3: It is not impossible that the initial letter is kapb instead of bet, but the latter makes better sense in connection with the nounמקל “path.” There is no doubt regarding the samekh, which is especially clear on BZ6T.

6.3: Previous attempts to interpret the beginning of this line have provided as many difficulties as solutions. First, we should expect an infinitive to precede the phrase based on the related, following expression, לְאָלָהוּ, “and to put me on guard.” I have suppliedם at the end of line 2 for this reason, although the specific form of the word is far from certain (especially given that we might expect a peel here when considering other Aramaic dialects; a Hebraism perhaps?). As for 返回, the area where the downstroke of a yard/rav would be expected (based on the placement of its head in relation to neighboring letters) is entirely blank, while the thin vertical downstroke of what must be a resh or dalet can be plainly seen clinging to the left side of the aleph. This reading is further supported by its better contextual sense. I take 返回 to be part of an extended construct chain (so also B^2; for this form cf. Dan. 4:34, 5:23), although the defective spelling is uncharacteristic, and the indefinite שְׁמַע seems odd (but cf. the following שֵׁם, which must be translated as definite to make sense). A 1 sg. peal verb is also conceivable, but is difficult to make sense of in relation to the following phrase … לָאָלָהוּ. B^3 and I arrived at this reading independently.

6.3: B^3 reads aleph in place of the prefixed rav of the following word, which stands in direct contradiction to the physical remains.

6.3: The ink remains fit well (see especially BZ6T). The penultimate letter has the indisputable head of a yard/rav, not a resh (contra B^3).

6.3: While the גֶּנה is not certain, a rav may be ruled out, based on ink remains and spacing. The fact that B^3 does not include a circlet over his rav undermines confidence in his reading.

6.4: Although intriguing, I cannot reconcile the reading of B^3 with the physical evidence. The second letter (my גֶּנה) is especially decisive, as is the upper loop of what appears to be a qoph. BZ6T is the best photo here.

6.6: Here I follow the reading of B^3, which suitably fits the letter remains and narrative context.

6.7: These words have a large horizontal crack running through them, making them very difficult to read. F’s proposal cannot be correct, since it is clear that a letter with a horizontal top stroke follows the lamed, and that he has too few letters within his brackets (there must be at least 8 letters overall). The individual characters suggested by MQS/AW are not impossible, but their reading also contains too few letters. Qimron’s initial proposal of תְּלָהָן for the second word fits the ink remains well and is followed here (as well as by B^3). On BZ6T, the possible negative imprint of a lamed (now eroded away) precedes תְּלָהָן, making it
quite possible that some form of the name of Emzera’s father once stood here. Unfortunately, it is now impossible to tell the precise combination of letters, since only the very tops remain. F’s reading (Bakiel, brother of my father) can be ruled out based on available space, but remaining possibilities are Bakiel, brother of my father (cf. Jub. 4:33), or something similar. Qimron reconstructed ‘Bakiel, brother of my father’ at the end of line 6 and ‘Bakiel, brother of my father’ preceding line 6 (‘Bakiel, brother of my father’), but this is unlikely based on the space and ink remains at the beginning of this line. B’s suggestion “meinem Onkel [Raguel]” is impossible based on the word ‘Bakiel alone, since it falls at least two letters short of the available space. His absence of diacritical marks is utterly nonplussing.

6.8: [MQS/F/B] AW [ ] MQS/F/AW/B (as well as Qim) place at the end of the preceding line, but two factors make this improbable. First, there is no final mem visible where it would be expected in line 7 (i.e. this line appears to be shorter than line 8). Second, there is far too much space for the word mem alone before the mem in line 8 (there is space for 7-10 letters). AW’s mem does not make sense syntactically, and is presumably an error.

6.9: The mem of Ullem is obscured, but the nearly effaced bottom stroke is discernible on BZ6T (for the theologumenon of Ullem cf. mr 0.18). I refer those who might argue that there is not enough space for a mem (as I first thought), to the occurrence of mem in line 2, where the letter is pinched and overlaps the ensuing aleph.

6.11: The descending, diagonal cross-stroke of the second aleph is apparent on BZ6T and IMneg. x 86-4447, 4452. The superscripted tav is written in a different hand and, apparently, with a different composition of ink (it has not eaten away the leather like the original script).

6.13: The bet of GMT/F is incorrect, as plainly seen on all photographs. It appears that this line contains a poetic triplet of corresponding phrases, describing who is speaking to Noah in his vision. In this configuration, each figure is paired with a descriptive nominal clause (“on/ by a…” and the word Ullem, all of which must have been preceded by a (now lost) verb at the beginning of the line. This explanation alleviates much of the trouble previous commentators have had making sense of the line. It should be noted that AW has misplaced the superscripted ayin of the second Ullem.

6.13: Although the letters mem and bet often look similar in this scroll, the second letter is better read as a bet (see especially BZ6T).

6.13: B’s interpretation of sin (which is paleographically possible) as the city “Tyros” (Tyre) is very unlikely given the similarity in meaning between sin “errand” and the following “visitation, sending,” and the general structure of this line (see note to 6.13: above).

6.13: B has mistakenly omitted the preposition bet, which is clearly seen on BZ6T (although it is less clear on the other photographs).

6.13: There is an intervening letter after mem and preceding B’s Ullem. A sweeping right to left stroke, discernible on BZ6T, suggests the possibility of ayin.

6.14: This could also be read Ullem. The meaning is uncertain, and may be meant to serve as either an adverb (i.e. “solemnly, loudly”), or a subject (cf. Ullem in the following line).
6.15: מְלַכָּא הָאָשְׁמָן I (along with AW) take this as a subject followed by the 3 m. sg. apelh of שָׁמַע, which makes better sense of the line than other suggestions.

6.16: MQS/F/AW מָכַר [B3 מָכַּר]. The right horn of the dalet is clear in BZ6B, as are slight ink remains of the lower extension of the qoph and the upper extension of the lamed. The final letter could also be a ran, although the 1 sg. suffix makes better sense in this context.

6.16: MQS/AW מַחַּשַׁתֵּת מִלֶּלֶל מְשַׁפְּתָּה... There is a large crack running vertically between these words in BZ6B and IMneg. x 86-4447, but neither the space nor ink remains suggest two additional letters here.

6.16: MQS/GMT/F/AW בּוּרַת. Although not impossible, B3’s reading is paegographically and contextually less satisfying than the initial transcription of MQS.

6.16: מִשְׁפַּת M (margin) [MQS/GMT/F/AW] בּוּרַת. The third letter is quite clearly a gopp, as noted by M.

6.17: נִבְּשָׁת בְּאָמָה [MQS/AW בּוּרַת]. A single, vertical line can be clearly seen following the resh in BZ6B. The bottom portion of a bet, or similar letter, is also clear at the beginning of the following word. A bet is to be preferred, since in Hebrew the verb הָרָב regularly takes this preposition with the direct object when meaning “choose, select” (perhaps another Hebraism; cf. Jastrow II, p. 155).

6.18: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/GMT/F/AW בּוּרַת. The second letter is clearly a samekh on BZ6B and IMneg. x 86-4447. This word may indeed be based on the verbal root סֵחָל, close up,” as suggested by MQS/GMT/F/AW (most likely as a pael act. part. [AW], and not the assimilated preposition ב plus the pass. part. [F]). In this context, however, it is also possible that we have a phonetic parallel of the biblical and Qumran Hebrew noun מְמַשֶּׁת “hostility, hatred, enemy.” This noun is used only twice in the Hebrew Bible (Hos. 9:7-8) to describe the sin of the adulterous and idolatrous Israelites, who by their deeds have brought near the day of God’s vengeance. Among the Dead Sea Scrolls the word enjoys wider usage, both as a general noun (e.g. 1QS 3:23; 1QM 13:4; 4Q286 frg. 7 ii:2) and a proper noun (e.g. 1QM 13:11; 4Q390 1:11; cf. also Jub. 11:3-7, 19:28). The form מְמַשֶּׁת is found in 4Q475, line 5. (Cf. DDD, 1033-35).

6.19: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/F/AW מְמַשֶּׁת; B3 מַשֶּׁת. I find no evidence for a fifth letter in this word. The lower part of the vertical stroke that others read as a ran should be read as a dalet or resh, since an upper, horizontal stroke is visible on IMneg. x 86-4447, 4452. This also rules out B3’s suggestion. Here Noah is referred to as a witness to the bloodshed set in motion by the Watchers.

6.19: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/GMT/F/AW בּוּרַת. A horizontal crack runs through the word on all photos, but a peh appears to fit the upper remains of the letter better than a kaph.

6.21: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/F/AW מְמַשֶּׁת; B3 מְמַשֶּׁת. The samekh is clear in all photographs, while a peh remains paleographically possible (along with nun) in the penultimate position.

6.21: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/F/AW מְמַשֶּׁת; B3 מְמַשֶּׁת. This word is uncertain but makes sense in conjunction with the preceding מְמַשֶּׁת. If correct, this is an irregular usage of the root מְמַשֶּׁת in the apelh, perhaps with an object suffix.

6.21: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/F/AW מְמַשֶּׁת; B3 מְמַשֶּׁת. The ran, aleph, and lamed are the only sure letters in this reading. I admit that for my proposal to be correct the leather would have to be shrunken (as is often the case near the end of lines in this column), or the two words placed very close together, since there does not appear to be enough room for these words as typically written and spaced. The final letter does not have the curved tail typical of a final nun in this scroll.

6.23: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/F/AW מְמַשֶּׁת; B3 מְמַשֶּׁת. The reading is very difficult, and remains tentative. The first word (and especially the first letter), however, disproves the proposal of B3. Additionally, there is no sign in any of the photographs of his second qopp.

6.24: מְמַשֶּׁת MQS/F/AW מְמַשֶּׁת; B3 מְמַשֶּׁת. The reading of MQS/F/AW is surprising for several reasons, not least the certainty ascribed to their final two words, both of which cannot be correct. Their דָּתָּה is actually דָּת, with the top of the dalet visible in BZ6B. What they read as three letters following this word can be no less than five, with the lamed followed directly by yod and aleph. Both MQS/F/AW and B3 have the lamed following the qopp too closely. My suggestion אַלְפִּי is quite uncertain, but it seems that a noun in construct relationship with דָּת is needed.
The expression “blood of anger and jealousy” is found in Ezek. 16:38 to express the coming judgment of God on Israel the harlot (הנה). The bottom stroke a mem, or similar letter, can be seen in the third position of MQS/F/AW/B’s של. Alternatively (and perhaps more fitting in this context), the של may refer to burnt offerings sacrificed by Noah, in which case the following words may be reconstructed תברא דה.

6.25. Column 7: This column is missing much of its right side. The piece of parchment containing what remains of Column 7 also preserves most of the top and left margins, in addition to the right edge of col. 8. There are no BZ photographs for this column, and so I have relied primarily on the IMneg. set. These are quite good in all parts save the leftmost edge of the column, where they are slightly blurred.

7.2. Column 6. There certainly existed more at the beginning of this line than what is reconstructed by B. I do not find convincing evidence for his הבמה את, especially for hisญין, which appears to me to be the lower portion of a lamed.

7.2. Column 3. GMT/F/AW/B begin a new sentence with this word, which is certainly possible. However, for the conflated relationship between the stars and Watchers in Enochic literature cf. 1En. 18:14-16, 21:1-6.

7.3. Column 2:pmat (“their passing”) would also make good sense here.

7.4. Column 1: Either reading is paleographically tenable, but I favor based on the ink remains at the beginning of the word.

7.5. Column 0: There are clearly other letters between the lamed and the word (that is, if MQS/F/AW are referring to the same lamed as read in my preceding word – I see evidence of no other).

7.9. Column 4: Both the reading and meaning of this word are far from certain. I have translated it as a denominative paal/pael verb from the noun(s) דעה/דעת “witness/testimony.” This, however, is typically a Hebrew word only, with my proposed meaning found only in the hiphil conjugation.

7.10. Column 3: I do not find the tav of MQS/F/AW’s malhה convincing, since there appears to be only one vertical stroke at the end of the word. If the following word once read מקטיבב, this could be connected to a “Book of Noah” mentioned in the Greek Mt. Athos ms. of the Aramaic Levi Document, “For thus my father Abraham commanded me, for thus he found in the writing of the book of Noah concerning the blood.” (Cf. J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone, and E. Eshel, The Aramaic Levi Document, Leiden: Brill, 2004, 7).

7.17. Column 0: The first letter is obscured, but the lower stroke of what may be a bet is visible in IMneg. x 86-4444 and 4446. The third letter is almost certainly a tsade, with the small, upper stroke also perceptible in these photos. The second letter could also be a yadin. Although very tentative, I take this word as a 3 m. participle from the root ביטל “split, divide, branch off.” If this were the case, the use of tav would constitute a Hebraism.

7.17. Column 0: An alternative meaning of this root (בעית) in Hebrew is “lay bare,” which makes good sense in this context but is typically found only in the hiphil.
and stand in a partitive relationship (“to one of the beautiful ones”), although we would expect an intermediate מַן if this were the case (cf. 10.12, 19.11; 22.1, 33). MQS/AW translate as an adjective modifying דִּים in לְדוֹר (“one beautiful”), but this seems unlikely. B’s initial דִּים is quite plausible (which would change the dynamics of the phrase’s meaning), although his final word אָדָם is not correct (the first letter is not a ד, but has the sloping right stroke of a shin, or, less likely, an ayin).

7.19: MQS/F/AW לא华侨ה ימי הלוח. The samekh of B is probable in the second position (providing the meaning “to help me”) based on the right, sloping side of the letter seen in IMneg. x 86-4444 and 4446. A penultimate nun, however, is not present on either photograph – the yod directly follows the sin. Presumably, the final yod is still a (defective) form of the 1 sg. pronominal suffix.

7.20: One very obscured letter may be seen preceding the possible bet, but I see no evidence to support the overconfident reading of B.

7.20: MQS/F/AW לא华侨ה. Although its top slightly overlaps the following lamed, the second letter is quite clearly a kaph.

7.21: The tsade and tav are very close together, leaving too little space for a bet.

7.22: A horizontal crack runs through the word, but a tav can be seen preceding the aleph in IMneg. x 86-4444. There is no lamed present. I adopt B’s following לא华侨ה, although with some reservation.

7.23: This letter, here I have used the narrowband infrared photo of Gregory Bearman #0325 (1997), which gives a much clearer reading than the IMneg. set. A letter, probably var, precedes B’s resh, which may alternatively be read as a dalet.

7.23: The tav is very clear in Bearman #0325 (cf. previous note), although it could easily be mistaken for an aleph in the IMneg. set.

Column 8: Very little is preserved of this column and the script is badly disintegrated. A few words cling to the right margin of the fragment containing partial remains of col. 7. For this portion I have used Bearman #0324 and the IMneg. photographs. A bit of text from the upper two lines adjoins the left margin of the column on a separate piece of parchment, containing remains of col. 9. The same is true of eight lines in the lower portion of the column. The BZ set of photographs are extraordinarily clear for what remains of the upper portion of this side, while the lower eight lines are preserved only on the IMneg. photos.

8.1: It is quite possible that this is a reference to the animals entering the ark, rather than to Noah and his wife (as suggested by F). In Gen 7:2 the phrase יְשָׁוַיָּהוֹן is used twice to speak of an animal and its mate.

8.1: MQS/F/AW לא华侨ה. The entirety of this phrase is tentative, but the letters can be made out with certainty in BZ8-9, showing that MQS/F/AW’s final nun is actually the downstroke of a qoppa. The tav suggested by MQS/F/AW/B is at the end of לא华侨ה is very unlikely. Rather, this letter has the base stroke of a kaph/mem/tsade. The negative impression of a lamed is plainly seen to the left of the margin line in BZ8-9, prompting my reading לא华侨ה.

8.9: This reading is uncertain, and would require the bet to be contorted somewhat by the shrunked leather. An aleph at the end of the word appears quite tenable based on Bearman #0324.

8.15: This word, along with the following lines, can be read on both Bearman #0324 and IMNeg. x 86-4444. It is also possible that the preposition here is a kaph, rather than a bet. Based on the content of the following lines – apparently a teaching concerning the dispensation of weeks (cf. Jubilees) – I understand this to be a defectively spelled form of שָׁבַע “week” with a 2 m. pl. pronominal suffix (which is also a stark Hebraism). The m. form of the number seven (שבעה) is another possibility, but it is difficult to make sense of it with a suffix. It may alternatively derive from the roots שָׁבָע “to swear an oath” or שָׁבַע “to satiate, satisfy.”

146
lower right corner of the letter is blurred in Bearman #0324. The key fifth letter of the following word is now little more than a large smudge of ink, with the preceding letter certainly being a yod or ran. I had first read this as הַבַּר, which would also make sense in this context, but the lower and upper horizontal strokes of a bet or kaphe appear to be present on IMneg. x 86-4446.

8.29: Here begin eight lines of text from a floating fragment which, according to IMneg. x 86-4444/4446 and IMneg. 3839/3839#1, belongs to the lower, left portion of column 8, and should be attached to the right margin of col. 9. This portion of text was apparently available to B3, since he includes words and phrases from it in his edition. The line numbering is unsure, although the first line should be placed approximately here according to the fragment’s position in the above mentioned photos. B3 begins his transcription at line 22, which does not appear to be correct. Bearman #0327, 0328 and 0329 also contain this fragment, although there the script is further disintegrated and more difficult to read.

8.33: בְּלִまとめ בֵּלִまとめ. A space is visible preceding the lamed in IMneg. x 86-4444 and 4446, while the lamed itself is touching the following bet.

8.34: בְּלִまとめ בְּלִまとめ. The first two letters are nearly imperceptible. I follow B3 with reservation.

8.35: בְּלִまとめ בְּלִまとめ. B3’s tet and bet may be ruled out based on the physical remains. The first two letters of my לְまとめ are very difficult to read, and may be incorrect.

Column 9: This column is very badly damaged, and little of certainty can be recovered because of the advanced disintegration of its script. The only preserved portions are those segments attached to the upper right and left margins, adjoining the columns on either side. The best photo for most of the preserved text is IMneg. 3839, which has picked up the ink remains quite well. There appear to be 37 (rather than 36) lines in this column, based on a count along the fully preserved left margin.

9.3: הַלָּאת הַלָּאת seems to be a form of the noun הַלָּאת “final decision, irredeemable sentence.” (cf. Jastrow I, p. 467).

Column 10: Portions of each margin are preserved for col. 10, although the center is in various stages of disintegration. A new sheet of parchment begins here, with the joint seam and scribal dots (to indicate where the manuscript preparer should inscribe lines) clearly seen in all photographs. The standard length of the columns on this sheet is 35 lines, and there is a very crudely written tsade (indeed, I continue to question whether it is a tsade) in the upper, righthand corner of the sheet (cf. cols. 5 and 17).

10.1: אֶרֶם GMT/AW/B3 ] MQS/F/AW. The aleph is clear on BZ10T.

10.1: בֲּまとめ בֲּまとめ. There are at least three letters between the bet and lamed, the word חָרָב fitting well the remaining traces of ink. Likewise, there is room for two letters between MQS/F/AW’s lamed and tan (= my bet); I see no persuasive evidence for a tan in BZ10T). For a similar phrase cf. 5.23, בֹּשַׁי מִלֵּהֶרֶפָּלָי. B3’s reading is impossible based upon spacing alone.

10.1: מְנע B3 ] MQS/GMT/F/AW. The left, upper part of the mem is quite clear on IMneg. x 86-4451.

10.1: בֿまとめ מַמצֵי. This part of the line bows downward and is very difficult to read. I see no grounds for B3’s proposal.

10.2: בּまとめ בּまとめ. While my reading is far from certain, the reading of MQS/F/AW/B3 is impossible. First, between the end of לָまとめ (the last letter of which is undoubtedly a bet) and the following lamed there are no less than four letters. Second, the letter between the two lameds of their לָまとめ is definitely not a yod, since in BZ10T a lower, horizontal stroke is readily apparent in this position (i.e. a mem, or similar letter). Finally, it is clear that there is a word break between the nun of myまとめ and the following letter. Following this phrase there appears to be a short segment of text (3-4 letters) which has been effaced.

10.3: בּまとめ בּまとめ. I follow the reading first offered by MQS with reservation. There appears to be too much space between the lameds for a yod alone, but BZ10T is very difficult to read here. Additionally, the lameds of לָまとめ in 20.12 are also spaced farther apart than one might expect.

10.8: בּまとめ בּまとめ. The transcription of B3 may be safely ruled out based on ink remains and the fact that nowhere else does the scroll use the (later) definite object marker תָּי. The word יִבְּרַי could also mean “sound, healthy.”
10.9: \[\text{MQS/AW} \] א"תא; \[\text{F} \] א"תא; \[\text{B} \] א"תא. The final two letters are surprisingly plain on IMneg. 3840 (most notably the join of the \text{ayin}'s two strokes), but difficult to read on the other photographs.

10.9: \[\text{MQS/F/AW/B} \] The second letter is not absolutely clear on any of the photographs, and "to your son" should be considered a possibility.

10.9: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] א"תא; \[\text{B} \] א"תא. B's reading is not impossible, but the word is too obscured to posit with any certainty.

10.11: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] א"תא; \[\text{B} \] א"תא. There is not enough room for B's reading.

10.11: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] א"תא. If this phrase is correct, a subject would need to be supplied. Perhaps הָוָיָה following הָוָיָה?

10.12: \[\text{MQS et al.} \] י (20/2) וָיָה. The second letter is clearly not \text{aleph}, but \text{vav} (cf. 12.8 for the same spelling).

10.13: \[\text{MQS et al.} \] י (20/2) וָיָה. The first letter is clearly a \text{vav} in all photographs, and is probably used here in its temporal sense.

10.13: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The first letter is definitely \text{vav} in all photographs, and is probably used here in its temporal sense. The tops of the letters are eroded, so that the proper reading could also be ב or ל. The middle letter has the long base stroke of a \text{bet/mem/nun}, and not a \text{vav}, while the first letter has a single downstroke (contra B). The best photo here is IMneg. x 86-4451.

10.14: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] ל(3) וָיָה. Although a bit obscured, it is clear in BZ10M that there is at least one other letter between the \text{bet} and \text{aleph}. In the IMneg. photos it is clearly distinguished as an \text{ayin}.

10.14: \[\text{MQS et al.} \] ב"תא. The samekh is unmistakable in IMneg. 3840 and x 86-4451. The other letters are less difficult to distinguish.

10.14: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The \text{heh} is clear in the IMneg. photos.

10.15: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The reading is very uncertain, but B cannot be read based on the spacing of the \text{lamed} (to name only one reason).

10.15: \[\text{MQS/GMT/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The superscripted \text{aleph} is of a different scribal hand.

10.16: \[\text{MQS/GMT/F/AW} \] ב"תא. It is relatively clear that there are three words here, the last two ending with the 3 m. pl. suffix. Much of the phrase may be read with confidence on IMneg. 3840 and x 86-4451.

10.16: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] ב"תא. In all available photos it appears that this word ends with a final letter form (i.e. an extended downstroke). It definitely contains at least two more letters than previous suggestions allow.

10.17: \[\text{MQS/GMT/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The \text{vav} is placed above the extended base stroke of the \text{kaph}, giving the initial appearance of two letters with shorter base strokes.

10.18: \[\text{MQS/GMT/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The lower horizontal stroke of a \text{bet} or similar letter is visible in BZ10M, but beyond this nothing is legible. In Gen 9:1 the Lord blesses (יָרָוָי) Noah after he makes his offering.

Column 11: Col. 11 is attached to col. 12, and in similar condition (see below).

11.1: \[\text{MQS/GMT/F/AW} \] ב"תא. Either reading is possible based on the scant ink remains, but the reading of MQS et al. makes better sense here.

11.1: \[\text{MQS/GMT/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The superscripted \text{yod} appears to be in a different scribal hand than the surrounding script, having a much larger head than is typical.

11.1: \[\text{MQS/AW} \] ב"תא. The reading of MQS/AW is preferable to F, since the letters א"תא are the most clearly discernible of this difficult word. While I follow the transcription of MQS/AW, AW's translation "lion" does not seem plausible. The following letters may belong to a form of קָלָם "to relent, retard."

11.5: \[\text{MQS/F/AW} \] ב"תא. The space between the \text{yod} an \text{aleph} seems rather large. While the reading of MQS and F may be correct, I find this rendering more compelling based on the very limited context (i.e. Noah speaking) and the following word אֶלְבָּא. These letters may also be the latter part of the word אַלְבָּא, which occurs in 11.9.
11.9: מָדוֹרָה. The dalet is clear in BZ11T.

11.9: מָדוֹרָה. I follow F with hesitation, since the first few letters are very difficult to read on the photographs. F translated the word as “thickets,” taking it to be related to the feminine noun מָדוֹרָה ("branch, sprout"). This strikes me as unlikely, especially since the Aramaic words מָדוֹרָה ("transient, passerby") and רָעָר ("traveler, border, side") might lend themselves geographic extrapolations, such as my “intermediate regions” or some similar term (perhaps “plains”). B’s transcription is not impossible, nor an improbable and would not be expected based on other usage of divine titles. A possible part. + pron.

11.13: extraplations, such as my “intermediate regions” or some similar term (perhaps “plains”). B makes sense of the phrase, which I take (with F) to be in a periphrastic relationship with the following.

11.14: [uni05D0/uni05D9 /uni05AF /uni05E8/uni05D1/uni05D3/uni05DE/uni05D3/uni05D5 /uni05D0/uni05D5/uni05D4 /uni05AF /uni05D5 /uni05AF /uni05D8 /uni05AF /uni05D1 /uni05AF /uni05D4] The first word is too disintergrated to read with certainty. The bottom of the yod in מָדוֹרָה is perceptible on BZ11TM.

11.15: There is too much space between לָבָּד and מֵאָה. The words מֵאָה and מָדוֹרָה (cf. 6.13) seem equally implausible in this gap and would not be expected based on other usage of divine titles. A possible mem stands before the word מֵאָה, but there is not enough room following it for both a resh and a bet. I have taken the following, faint, vertical stroke as a final nun (so also B), although this is far from certain. This מֵאָה would make an intervening resh much more plausible. AW curiously follows F’s translation, but not his transcription.

11.16: MQS/F/AW | בַּלְבָּד מֵאָה. B’s reconstruction is too short to start at the beginning of the line. In addition, it is clear in BZ11TM that the word כָּלָל direktly precedes אֲדֻנָּא.

11.16: MQS/GMT/F/AW | בַּלְבָּד מֵאָה. The suffix is prospective, referring to the following list of geographic features. It is best read in BZ11TM or BZ11BM.

11.16: MQS/AW | בַּלְבָּד מֵאָה. F’s suggested reading fits the context and letter remains well, however there is too much space for only a yod and mem at the beginning of the word. A preceding bet fits the letter spacing well and mirrors the following prepositions.

11.18: יָאָרָה | Perhaps יָאָרָה, as the second letter has the bottom portion of nun, bet, kaph or peh. Certainly not בַּלְבָּד.

11.19: יָאָרָה. In BZ11BM there appears to be a horizontal top stroke before the shin of MQS/F/AW, suggesting that it is not a yod/tav. If the tav is correct, it may refer to the period of time in which something occurred (i.e. “in the years of your sons”), as in 12.13 (שֵׁנֶין אֲדֻנָּא; also cf. F, p. 161), although we might then expect a construct phrase. The shin may possibly be a het.

Column 12: Here begins the column first published by Greenfield and Qimron (hence the switch from MQS to GQ). The left central portion is its best preserved part, with much of the surrounding area being severely disintegrated. The BZ photographs are glossy, and are at times difficult to read.

12.1: [uni05D0/uni05D9 /uni05AF /uni05E8/uni05D1/uni05D3/uni05DE/uni05D3/uni05D5] There does not appear to be room for all the letters suggested by GQ, nor is there any evidence of a final nun, even though the leather where it should be is in tact. I follow their proposal with hearty reservation, although the general import is, no doubt, correct.

12.1: [uni05D0/uni05D9 /uni05AF /uni05E8/uni05D1/uni05D3/uni05DE/uni05D3/uni05D5] GMT/AW | בַּלְבָּד מֵאָה. The aleph is certain.

12.1: [uni05D0/uni05D9 /uni05AF /uni05E8/uni05D1/uni05D3/uni05DE/uni05D3/uni05D5] בַּלְבָּד מֵאָה. Either reading is possible for the first word, with the crucial fourth letter being badly damaged. A horizontal crack runs through the final word, but there appear to be more than two letters preceding the aleph.

12.3: בַּלְבָּד. There seems to be space for at least two letters at the beginning of this word. The left downstroke of the ayin can be faintly seen, while a full shin would nearly overlap the following aleph.

12.7: בַּלְבָּד. There is not sufficient room for בַּלְבָּד to be reconstructed at the end of this line.
12.8: GMT/AW GQ/F. The leather has a wide, horizontal split in it, and the penultimate kaph/nun, along with a following letter (resh/daleth) are easily mistaken for a final mem. In BZ12T the letters preceding this are unreadable. The mention of a vineyard (ברכה) here would be odd, given its introduction in line 13.

12.8: GQ/B2/3/GMT/F/AW. The aleph is clear on BZ12T and IMneg. 3841, ruling out the reading of GQ et al. While the top of the penultimate letter is slightly obscured in the photos, it is almost surely a nun, or less likely a kaph. The 2 m. sg. ending (ט-כ) is grammatically acceptable, but makes little sense in this context. I have read the letter as a nun, thus representing a 1 pl. perf. form of the verb יבר “we built” (for other examples of this form cf. 12.16) – a reference to the more widespread tradition that Noah and his sons built cities after leaving the ark (cf. Jub. 7:14-17; 35; 4Q244 frg. 8).

12.9: This area is badly damaged and any reconstruction is speculative. The suggestion of GMT/AW can be ruled out based on available space (at least 8-9 letters between the lamed and the final bracket), while the reconstruction of GQ makes little sense in this context (Noah begets his sons and daughters already in col. 6). B2/3/F’s proposal is attractive, and is essentially followed here, although the spacing for this phrase does not seem quite right (perhaps due to distortion of the leather). The phrase בּוֹרָה, commonly employed in the scroll, is not possible based on space and remains. Bernstein’s suggestion (p. 41) is based on a mistaken reading at the end of the previous line (cf. previous note), and is therefore doubtful.

12.14: GQ/GMT/AW. In general, the reading first offered by B2 fits the slight ink remains quite well. F’s addition of an aleph at the end of שָנִּים is speculative, since the very beginning of the line is gone. It is kept here only because it better fits the conventional grammar of the scroll. B2/3/F’s reconstruction is unlikely based on available space and ink remains, although there may be one vertical stroke between the י and the final bracket, while the letter remains do not support the suggestion of B2/3/F. Most conspicuously absent is the lamed. The occurrence of בּוֹרָה here (best seen in BZ12M) also disproves GQ’s reconstruction.

12.16: GQ et al. The first letter plainly has the lower bend of a caph, not the join of a bet. The same expression (with caph) is found at 21.21, 25; 22.1.

12.17: None of the previously proposed reconstructions is satisfying. First, there is far too much space for any of them to fit as proposed – somewhere between 15 and 20 letters. Furthermore, there is no trace of the top of a lamed, as reconstructed by GQ/B2/3/F. I find no evidence for B2/3/F שָנִּים. My own suggestion is speculation based on narrative context.

12.18: GQ/F. The base stroke of the left leg of the tav, as well as the letter combination bet-daleth-vav of והם, are plain on BZ12M.

12.19: The first word is uncertain, although the tet is quite clear. Only the vertical stroke of the qoph, read by GQ/F as a final nun, remains. There does not
appear to be room for a vav (i.e. full orthography) between the qoph and shin. Alternatively, it may read "my folly" or "my drinking" (spelled with a tet rather than the typical tet), but this seems less likely. Remains of the upper, horizontal stroke of a kaph are faintly visible in the text, as well as the tops of shin and kaph in the photograph.

12.27: The bottom stroke of a letter other than yod can be distinguished preceding the lambel in BZ12B.

Column 13: Most of the right margin of this column is shared with the left side of col. 12, forming one, large leaf. Large portions of the upper and lower sections of the column are completely eaten away, leaving us to wonder about the full content of Noah’s dream. In addition to the BZ photographs, IMneg. x 86-4449 is especially useful.

13.8: The right horn of the dalet and base stroke of the mem are plainly seen on BZ13T.

13.8: The reading is very uncertain, but the peh of MQS/AW/F does not appear correct based on the fragmentary top of the letter.

13.11: The small, right strokes of the final tsades are quite plain on IMneg. 3843, solving the interpretive conundrum of F.

13.12: The first two letters of the first word are almost entirely missing on the photographs, but the two legs expected of the lower portion of an aleph are absent. The beginning of the following line.

13.13: This phrase has obviously puzzled commentators, although much may be gained by a careful study of the infrared photographs. The initial bet is abundantly clear on BZ13TM and IMneg. 3834, as is the base stroke of another bet following it. A full ayin may be discerned in the next position, the sloping lower line of which renders all previous proposals very unlikely. An obscured (but small) letter finishes the word, likely a yod, making it probable that here we have an infinitive construct (acting nominally) of "a bursting forth." This makes good sense in the present context. The first letters of the next word are somewhat obscured, but the top of the second letter does not resemble a typical vav/yod, and a bottom stroke is visible running into the base of the following peh (cf. especially IMneg. 3834). The word "branches" also fits the context well (for use of this same root cf. line 16).

13.14: Every letter of the word, except the yod, is clear in BZ13TM. The letters of my bet are starkly visible in IMneg. 3834, although the area preceding these letters is mostly missing. F’s reconstruction of anabolic works with the available space, despite the spacing proposed by MQS and B3 (the former with too much and the latter with too little). The letter rebah is known as an alternate form of the adjective veh, but is often used as an ippad verbal form (so B3), which should not be absolutely ruled out here.

13.15: Significantly more text is preserved on IMneg. x 86-4449 than on the other available photographs, although the ink is somewhat blurred. The final letters of MQS/F/AW appear to be correct there, while the vav-kaph combination of B3 may be confidently ruled out. The meaning of this word is not entirely clear, although it may reflect a binding activity involving woven ropes or cords (cf. 1 En. 10:4), which fits the limited context well. Jastrow (p. 1524) provides the related meaning “yarn”.

13.15: MQS/GMT/F/ AW B3 has apparently skipped this word by mistake. It is clear on BZ13TM.

13.16: F’s reading seems correct based upon IMneg. x 86-4449, but he and others ignore a number of other letters following this word. The final word appears to be yd, making it likely (but not certain) that the intervening word is veh and arguing against previous reconstructions of the beginning of the following line.
13.17: MQS/AW תמרב; GMT תמרב, F תמרב ד.は何 מいま תמרב; B תמרב ד. The
proposals of GMT, F and B are incorrect, since the letter preceding תמרב is neither aleph nor final nun.
A final mem is more likely, but not assured. This line may begin with the word יִשָּׂ.
13.18: MQS/F/AW תמרב}. The nun of the תמרב is fully preserved in IMneg. x 86-4449. The ink traces of the following word do not fit B's אֹהְבָּֽו.
Column 14: This column has no top, bottom, or right margins but is attached to col. 15 by its partially intact left margin. Even the available IMneg. photographs appear to have been taken some time after the unrolling of the scroll and are in an advanced state of deterioration. In general, the BZ set is superior for this column.
13.19: MQS/AW תמרב; GMT תמרב ד. B תמרב ד. B תמרב ד. The bottom of the word僖, as well as the letter beh, are visible on BZ14T and BZ14M. There is insufficient room for the transcription of B.
13.9: IMneg. B תמרב The final מ is plainly seen on BZ14T.
13.9: MQS/GMT/F/AW תמרב. Portions of the final mem (especially its right, lower bend and left, upper protrusion) are visible on BZ14T.
13.10: IMneg. B תמרב. If the letter following the lamed is a peh (which is not entirely clear), there must be another letter between it and the aleph because of spacing and ink remains. The left portion of an upper, horizontal stroke can be seen near the aleph in BZ14T, suggesting that this is probably the emphatic form of אֹהְבָּֽו, as in lines 11, 14 and 15. A tav fits the existing ink remains well.
13.10: IMneg. B תמרב. Either reading is possible, since the top of the final letter is missing.
13.10: MQS/GMT/F/AW תמרב; M (margin). The word יִשָּׂ is relatively clear on BZ14T.
13.10: Four letters appear in the middle of the margin separating cols. 14 and 15 at this point. The last letter, which may have a space between it and the others, is a gimmel. Might this be a mark from scribal preparation of the manuscript?
13.11: MQS/GMT/F/AW תמרב. The right horn of the dalet is easily seen on BZ14T and BZ14M.
13.12: IMneg. B תמרב. Despite efforts, I am not able to find either of the final kaphs transcribed by MQS/F/AW and B in any of the photographs. There is a gaping, horizontal tear in the leather here. I see possible evidence for only one extended downstroke preceding ב, which I take as the qoph of אֹהְבָּֽו. This word is highly uncertain, but fits the available space reasonably well.
13.12: MQS/GMT/F/AW תמרב. The parchment is split and shrunk here, but it seems that there are actually two final letters very near to each other (my final kaph and final nun).
13.14: MQS/GMT/F/AW תמרב. The word יִשָּׂ, along with its medial yod/rav is surprisingly clear on BZ14T. If the preceding kaph is read correctly, this is apparently a rare usage of the infinitive absolute plus participle in order to add emphasis.
13.15: MQS/F/AW תמרב. GMT's reading is incorrect. MQS/F/AW read an aleph preceding מִנָּה, which is possible (and in which case I read מִנָּה), but the ink remains actually overlap the following bet, and seem more likely to be transferred or smeared ink. The peh and samekh of מִנָּה are relatively clear, and this word must stand in the construct state with מִנָּה.
13.15: IMneg. The base stroke of the nun is clear in BZ14M. This is a peculiar orthography, and the expected form (מאֹהְבָּֽו) may have prejudiced previous readings. Perhaps here we see influence from the Hebrew נְהָה?
13.16: B תמרב ד. There is a hole in the leather (on the BZ photos) where my circlets are placed, but there does not appear to be the space or ink remains to support the reading of B. IMneg. 3846 was taken before the hole split apart, but the ink is so blurred that the letters are illegible.
14.16: MQS/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. My suggestion is tentative, but there does appear to be a letter between the aleph and lamed transcribed by MQS/F/AW. The conjunctive ו preceding מ is clear.

14.17: MQS/GMT/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. This entire phrase is discerned with relative ease on BZ14T and BZ14M. The reading has been independently confirmed by the collaborative study of E. Eshel and M. Bernstein. B’s proposal is definitely not correct.

14.18: MQS/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. The lower, left leg and foot of the ת are visible in BZ14T.

14.19: MQS/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. This phrase is largely effaced on BZ14T and BZ14M, but, when contrast-enhanced, the remains of a lamed can be discerned preceding the ש for מ. In addition, the two rightmost, slanting arms of a shin are visible preceding the ת of חפמשל, making the ש/ת improbable. Just as unlikely is the preposition ת, proposed by MQS/F/AW. I must stress the uncertainty of my own proposal for this word, although the initial בה and יו/ת (the בה may even be preceded by a small additional letter) are fairly certain. The subsequent lamed of ת is also unsure, and it is possible that these letters should be read as a suffix attached to the preceding word.

14.20: MQS/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. Two letters attached to the end of מ are visible in BZ14B, making it likely that this word is a form of the שפה verb שגפל to exchange, change.”

Column 15: Although parts of each margin are preserved, this column is badly damaged and missing most of its upper and lower sections. Much of the text is eaten away by the corrosive ink in the available photos (BZ and IMneg.; IMneg. 3844 and IMneg. x 86-4448 appear to have been taken when the column was in slightly better condition).

15.9: MQS/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. It is clear that there are at least four, and likely five, letters in this word. Two horizontal base strokes, belonging to two ה or similar letters, are visible in BZ15T. In IMneg. 3844 the ink remains of the first letter rule out an א impatient (contra B).

15.9: MQS/GMT/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. The reading of MQS/GMT/F/AW may, of course, be correct, but I have transcribed the word thus because of the preceding word, which is itself uncertain. In addition, there is a dot of ink above the penultimate יו/ת, which is likely only an accidental spill. B’s transcription is simply incorrect.

15.9: MQS/GMT/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. B has presumably transcribed this word incorrectly due to the ink at the top of the ת (and previous three letters) being eroded away. In reality, the base stroke of the left leg of the ת (B’s מ") would require the transcription מ, and not that of B.

15.10: MQS/GMT/F/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. There is simply too much space for מ to be written. This is most evident in IMneg. x 86-4448, where 8-9 letters are clearly discernible (even if some of them are difficult to read). The base stroke of the ה of מ is also visible in IMneg. x 86-4448.

15.10: MQS/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. A casual glance at BZ15M and BZ15T shows that B’s transcription is impossible (albeit creative), and that there can be no doubt about the proposal of MQS et al. The meaning of this word has troubled commentators (cf. the various translations, or lack thereof), but this must begin a descriptive phrase concerning the “great man” mentioned at the beginning of the line. The root can mean “squeeze, crush,” and is translated by F as “oppress”.

15.11: MQS/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. Although F was correct in his reconstruction, he has placed these words at the beginning of the line when there are, in fact, at least three words preceding them. A letter directly preceding the ה of מ is visible in the photographs, but it is too obscured to be read with certainty. B’s suggestion is safely ruled out based upon the clear base stroke of the ה in מ.

15.12: MQS/AW מִן מִן חָפָש מ. Although any of these options may potentially be correct, paleographically the מ is to be preferred. The first letter extends even farther down than is typical for a ו/ת, while the final letter is particularly short.
15.13: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  These words are more difficult to read than they first appear. On IMneg. x 86-4448, the first seven letters appear to form one word. The important fourth and fifth letters are likely bet and bet, although this is not absolutely certain (I see no evidence for an intervening yod, as transcribed by B'). The second word definitely has one letter (dalet or resh) standing between the lamed and qoph, and ends with a tav. This argues against previous transcriptions, yet it remains unclear what this word is or means. There may be a base stroke (i.e. a bet or similar letter) in the penultimate position.

15.13: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The reading of MQS/F/AW is understandable when examining the manuscript. The head of the dalet has split apart on several of the photographs, making it look like the partial loop of a qoph (but see IMneg. x 86-4448, where the dalet is unmistakeable). The downstroke of the following resh, which extends no further down than any of the other letters, was taken instead as the qoph's downstroke. It is also conceivable that this should be read as the common prepositional phrase יד הע.

15.14: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The shin and resh are abundantly clear on BZ15M.

15.15: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  There is a hole in the leather here, distorting all letters but the final yod. The two middle letters (which may even be the first and second of three) have base strokes typical of mem, bet or other such characters. Another possibility is מ"בבכ.  

15.16: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The left leg of the second gimel is partially effaced, but the joint is very comparable to that preceding it (and is too low for the stroke interchange of a yod). The bet is also obscured, but discernible. Each photograph has proven helpful for this word, depending on which letters are being examined.

15.16: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The superscripted mem is most visible on BZ15M.  

15.18: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  This word is made out with certainty on BZ15M.  

15.19: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  MQS/F/AW ו sonate.  B is to be credited with this perceptive reading, which is most easily distinguished on IMneg. x 86-4448.  

15.19: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The first three letters of this apbel verb are discernible in all of the photos, especially when the contrast is enhanced.

15.20: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The tav is clear in BZ15M.

15.22: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The best photograph here is BZ15B, where the reading of the last two words is relatively clear despite the damaged parchment. The word was first suggested by M, and makes good sense in this context.

Column 16: Col. 16 is the last of this sheet of parchment, and is significantly narrower than those surrounding it. Like the preceding columns, it is missing a sizable portion of its upper and lower parts. The BZ photos for this column are washed out in places, but remain very valuable in others. In general, the IMneg. set is read more easily.

16.9: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  Whatever the letter preceding the aleph, it is not a mem or yod. On BZ16M and IMneg. 3844 there is a clear upper, horizontal stroke, assuring that it is either a kaph or a mem. Graphically, the letter looks more like a typical kaph, but the following mem of מ looks very similar, and a mem makes better sense of the word. It is preceded by the bottom of a short, vertical stroke – almost surely a yod. I see no clear evidence of a lamed at the beginning of the word in any of the photographs.

16.9: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  The penultimate tav is plainly visible on BZ16T, BZ16M, and IMneg. x 86-4450.

16.9: קסועה ותת 준ג ב.  Scrutiny of the photographs certifies that previous readings are not correct. First, the initial letter is definitely not a bet (contra MQS/F/AW), but quite possibly a mem. In IMneg. x 86-4450 and BZ16M the upper part of this letter, with its characteristic upward slanting (from left to right) stroke and small horn in the upper, righthand corner, is plainly seen. This judgment is confirmed when closely compared with mems from this and surrounding lines. It appears that the slanting, upper stroke of this mem has been mistaken as the rightmost stroke of an ayin.
by others. Second, the last letter is not a final nun, as transcribed in previous editions, but a qoph. This is especially clear on IMneg. 3884, but can be discerned on any of the photographs by examining the letter’s lower extension in comparison with surrounding qophs and final nunus (the qoph of בָּשָׁם, almost directly under this word, provides the nearest parallel). The nun has a characteristic right to left curve at the end of the tail, while the qoph is straight throughout. When these factors are taken into account, it is most plausible that the central letter is a beh or bet, the right leg of which has been taken by previous readers as the left stroke of the qolin. The left leg has been transcribed as a yod/vav. This is further confirmed by a horizontal stroke connecting the two legs at the top, visible in IMneg. 3845. Perhaps the most convincing refutation of the proposals מַעְטָן and מַעְטְנָן is a simple comparison with the assured occurrence of בָּשָׁמ. This leads to my proposed מַעְטָן, which appears to be a parallel to the “Mauk Sea” of Jub. 8:22, 26, exhibiting a spelling similar to a Syriac Chronicle containing this portion of Jubilees (cf. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, I.266 and II.54 [n. to 8:22], who argues for the Syriac being a better witness to the text at this point). In fact, when it is recognized that the Genesis Apocryphon is describing Japheth’s allotment in the opposite direction as Jub. 8:25-29, it becomes clear that this reference fits nicely with the placement of the Mauk in Jubilees.

16.9: בָּשָׁמ. The base stroke of the bet is seen clearly in IMneg. x 86-4450.

16.9: בָּשָׁמ M (margin) MQS/GMT/F/AW/B/Esh בָּשָׁמ. The letters bet and kaph look very similar in this portion of the manuscript, and while the first letter of this word has an angular bend at its lower, right corner (presumably causing others to transcribe it as bet), there are nearby instances (e.g. אָנוּ סוּacağını in line 10) where an assured kaph has the very same characteristic. In fact, if any single factor distinguishes bet from kaph in this section of the scroll it is the height of each letter – the bet being shorter and more compressed than the kaph. If this is taken into account, the present letter should certainly be read as a kaph. Furthermore, when compared to the word in line 17, transcribed by all as בָּשָׁמ, one recognizes that almost no difference exists between the first letters of each the two. Whatever one judges this letter to be, the two words should be read the same. In addition to this paleographic reasoning, I prefer kaph because a geographic adverb seems plausible in both cases, and a translation such as “regarding sight” (cf. the use of בָּשָׁמ in Ezek 1, 8:2, 10:29 and Dan 10:6) or “as a spring” (so F) makes the best sense in this context. Interestingly, M appears to have corrected his initial reading of בָּשָׁמ to מַעְטָן in the margin of the copy of his M.A. thesis available in the Judaica Reading Room of the University and National Library at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Givat Ram.

16.9: מַעְטָן. Another word plainly follows מַעְטָן at the end of the line in BZ16M, and especially BZ16T.

16.11: מַעְטָן MQS/AW גַּלֶּשׁ; GMT/F גַּלֶּשׁ; Esh גַּלֶּשׁ. The gemel and resh are badly damaged, but fit the remaining ink traces well. I do not find enough space for both dalet and yod, as reconstructed by GMT/F/Esh. The penultimate letter is definitely not an ayin, as transcribed by B. Esh has apparently forgotten to add brackets around the letters dalet and yod.

16.12: מַעְטָן MQS/GMT/F/AW תּוֹחֵל; B תּוֹחֵל [רָכִי]. There is a wide, horizontal crack running through these words, and the bottom portion has shrunk and shifted significantly in relation to the top. MQS et al. begin the line with תּוֹחֵל, but when looking below the crack it becomes obvious that other letters precede this word. Once this is recognized, the letters nun, vav and bet/beh may be made out, supplying the subject of the verb. This reading was arrived at with the gracious assistance of E. Eshel.

16.12: מַעְטָן MQS/GMT/F/AW תּוֹחֵל. The order of the last three letters, and especially the vav, is evident in all of the photographs.

16.12: שְׁלַפֵּל MQS/AW שְׁלַפֵּל; B שְׁלַפֵּל. Slight traces of a lamed may precede this word.

16.15: בָּשָׁמ MQS/GMT/F/AW בָּשָׁמ. The letter following the (uncertain) word בָּשָׁמ has a base stroke, and should be read as a bet despite the frequent employment of the prepositional phrase בָּשָׁמ throughout this section.

16.17: בָּשָׁמ MQS/GMT/F/AW בָּשָׁמ. There is a vertical split in the leather along the margin line, but I do not see evidence of a lamed preceding the word בָּשָׁמ.
16.17: Esh 3: Eshel (41, n. 16) mentions as F’s reading alone, but it is also espoused by MQS and others. The initial letter, which she reads as bet, is indeed “clearly visible”. That it is a bet is less sure, however. Like the same word in line 9, the letter is taller than a typical bet in this part of the scroll, and almost certainly is a kaph.

16.17: MQS/F/AW... B3 is correct in transcribing the, as seen on any of the photographs (but see especially BZ16M). The join between the two leftmost strokes of the shin is visible on IMneg. 3845, especially when the contrast is enhanced.

16.18: F’s reconstruction is untenable, since the final nun preceding mem is plainly seen on BZ16M.

16.18: MQS/GMT/F/... B3 is correctly transcribed by BZ16M. This word is badly eroded, with only the very tops (and a few other bits) of the letters remaining. The best photo is IMneg. x 86-4450, where the top of the tsade is very clear, and too high relative to the surrounding letters to be the valley of an ayin. A “Branch of the Egyptian Sea” is mentioned in the parallel account of Jub 8:14.

Column 17: This column begins a new sheet of parchment containing 34-35 lines per column. It is in similar condition as col. 16, although less of the top and bottom margins remain. It is also among the wider columns of the scroll. A gaph, written in a scribal hand very different than that of the scroll’s main text, is easily seen in the upper, righthand corner of this sheet. The BZ photos are again more washed out than the IMneg, but are quite useful in several crucial areas.

17.7: MQS/F/... There is almost nothing left of these letters, save some slight ink remains of their lower parts. The first letter could be either bet or pel, while the others are too fragmentary to reach a definite conclusion. Supplying a verb, along with GMT/F, seems to me the better option (cf. Jub 9:2a and F, 173).

17.7: MQS/GMT/F/... There is a vertical crack along the margin, and it appears that the word mem has simply pulled apart at the mem.

17.8: MQS/GMT/F/... The second letter of this word does not resemble a samekh. The lower, right corner (which should be gently sloping from right to left if MQS et al. are correct) is clearly the angular corner of a bet, mem, kaph or nun. Nor does the spacing favor reading mem/pel, which would fall short of filling the available space. Both the spacing and ink remains support reconstructing the ha-ba-ba, as at the end of the line.

17.8: MQS/F/... B3 is correct. The remaining ink traces and spacing do not correspond to B3’s suggested reading. The articulat aleph at the end of the is plain on BZ17T and IMneg. x 86-4450, making it less likely that folowed this word. The fits well the existing tops of the letters at the end of the line. This possibility is further strengthened by the following mem, which would mirror the repetitive syntax of this section.

17.9: MQS/F/... It is quite clear on BZ17T that the word following is not. Rather, the word begins with two parallel vertical strokes (of which only the bottoms are visible), which I read as a bet. This is followed by another vertical stroke, which appears to be a reib or dalet, making the designation bet or being likely. Arran is mentioned as a range elsewhere in the scroll (cf. 10.12; 12.8), but as a single mountain here and in 17.14.

17.9: MQS/F/... The first two words close the description of Aram’s portion, the word Torah being especially clear on BZ17T. The end of this line solves the problem of where Ldd fits into the apportionment among Shem’s sons. In IMneg. x 86-4450 the final three words are read with much more confidence than in BZ17T, where the letters are badly skewed and blurred. There is no sign of a gaph (or final nun), as transcribed by B3, which is one of several reasons that his reading should be rejected. The letters following are, at the end of the line, are enigmatic and difficult to contextualize. The tet is quite certain, and I had first read , although it is unclear what this might mean. I continue to wonder if the scribe
had begun a word (e.g. נָתַן – note the phrase at the beginning of the next line), but then abandoned it for some reason.

17.10: MQS/F/GMT/AW. These words are easily recognizable on BZ17T.

17.10: MQS/F/AW. There seems to be too much space and ink for מַגֵּן alone to precede the בָּשָׂר of my הָלַע. The מַגֵּן of הָלַע is followed directly by another in BZ17T, although its upper portion is effaced. Mention of Tubal (B3) makes very little sense at this point in the description, while the next line seems to require previous mention of a דָּבֶּק. In general, the last half of this line is in very poor shape.

17.11: MQS et al. | AY (22/3). Although irregular in the scroll’s morphology, there is no doubt that here the relative pronoun ו in has elided with the preposition לע (cf. also 17.7; 20.7; 21.29; 22.14, 21).

17.11: MQS/GMT/F/AW. B3 is certainly correct in reading the second letter as a dalet rather than a yod, since the head of the letter (with its two horns) is easily seen on IMneg. x 86-4450. Hence, we must have here a directional reference to “south.” This makes good sense in describing Lud’s portion, which we would expect to run along the north of the “three portions” (i.e. Aram, Asshur, and Arpachshad) mentioned in this line. MQS et al. appear to be correct, however, in reading the penultimate letter as a dalet (or resh – the upper, right-hand corner is missing) rather than yod/resh. This is best seen on IMneg. x 86-4450 and BZ17T.

17.12: oooooo. MQS/F/AW | B3. The suggestion of MQS et al. does not fit the ink traces or the context particularly well. The spacing, however, is approximately correct for their reconstruction.

17.13: MQS/GMT/F/AW. B3. This entire phrase is abundantly clear on IMneg. x 86-4450 and BZ17M, despite B3’s lack of diacritical marks.

17.14: MQS/F/AW/B3. I find the proposal of MQS et al. completely unconvincing. Following the lamet, a mem (possibly bet) can be made out, yet it is at least one letter space removed from the lamet (hence, my aleph). In addition, my mem is quite clearly followed by the letters nun and aleph. The following word is less certain, but the relatively sure מְרִיעַת two words later makes a relational preposition or verb such as this plausible. Although the entire line is quite clear in BZ17M, and I see no evidence for a possible vertical stroke before the mem continues to give me pause.

17.16: MQS et al. | AY (22/3). The word is בְּחַנֵה, as elsewhere.

17.17: MQS/AW רֹאֵב; B3 רֹאֵב. The initial letters dalet and bet/mem are discernible in BZ17M, ruling out the proposal of F/B3. Although the second letter may possibly be a mem, this does not greatly alter the meaning. The base word is apparently the noun בָּשָׂר “border, side,” preceded by a compound preposition, used in a manner similar to the biblical expression בָּשָׂר בְּעַד “on the other side, beyond, across from.” If correct, this phrase is paralleled in Jub. 9:11, where Tubal receives “the other side of the second branch.” A defective apbel participle is less plausible, as is a paesl form, which typically carries more idiomatic meanings (e.g. “be with child”).

17.18: לָעַע | B3. Very little remains of the first two words, and it must be admitted that any of the proposed readings is possible. My suggestion does not contradict the physical remains, and is based partially on Jub. 9:11. There is definitely no resh preceding the lamet of לָעַע.

17.18: My restoration follows Jub. 9:13.

17.18: B3. The bet of ו in is clear in BZ17M, and I see no evidence for a final letter. In addition, it is obvious in all the photographs that there are one to two letters standing between the two lamets.
While a large portion of the middle of this column is extant, the leather itself has been almost completely destroyed by the ink, leaving nothing but the long shreds of leather intact between each line. Because of this, there is nothing left to recover but stray letters here and there. The right and bottom margins are completely missing.

Column 19: This column resumes once again the columns first published by AY, and has, therefore, been commented upon by many more scholars than most of the preceding columns. It has been conventional to follow the line numbering of AY for this column, even though it has been observed multiple times their numbering is one line off (e.g. line 7 should actually be line 6). I have chosen to adhere to this convention in order to avoid confusion. The plate of this column in AY (i.e. IMneg. 3856) remains very useful, but recourse to the scaleable photos of the IMneg. and BZ sets has proven crucial in certain cases. For the remaining columns the BZ photographs show the scroll with a netting over it, presumably intended to help keep the leather in-tact.

A final nun is easily identified preceding the word קור in IMneg. 3856 and BZ19TM. This rules out the reconstruction first suggested by J and followed by F/AW. AW has apparently made a curious scribal error by placing this reconstruction in line 6 instead of line 7, as it is situated (but not numbered) in J. This may be due to the confusion mentioned in the previous note.

It is difficult to know where to begin when critiquing previous reconstructions of this line, but it must be admitted at the outset that the beginning several words are almost entirely missing and may never be recovered with any certainty. Consideration of all the photographic evidence proves every reconstruction to date untenable, and unfortunately reveals more about what is not there than what is. Rather than try to reconstruct a coherent text in this line (my actual readings should be viewed as tentative) I have attempted to reflect as accurately as possible the extant letter remains and spacing. This is no small task, since many parts of the line have split and pulled away from each other. Particularly troubling is the reconstruction of Du-So/Mi-To/F, who seem to have spent very little time assessing the spacing of the line. For instance, I can find no grounds for their transcription הלא בבליתנה at this point in the line. Furthermore, it can be clearly seen in BZ19TM and IMneg. 3856 that the letter preceding רע is not a final mem, but a dalet. The proposal of J/GMT/AW is slightly better, but still far from accurate, while that of B\(^{1/3}\) is impossible. Sufficient to say that at any point in this line where I differ in transcription with any of the previous reconstructions (which is nearly every letter) it is purposeful and meant as a rejection of their reading. The word נמנים seems an allusion to the mantra that the Israelites are commanded to recite in Deut. 26:5, “A wandering Aramean (אריר אב) was my father…,” which also refers to the descent of Abram into Egypt.

J’s reconstruction appears unlikely. The lower extension of what is probably a final letter is visible in the fourth position on BZ19TM, and there also seems to be too much space for the word שלדהו alone. The same phrase is used in 19.10-11.

On all of the photos it is clear that there are at least two intervening words between those transcribed successively by F. The first word is not certain, but agrees with Gen 12:6, where Abram camps at the Oak of Moreh and receives a visitation from the Lord. This has implications for the debate (cf. F, p. 180) whether שמח הקירש, at the end of the previous line, refers
the mountain east of Bethel (Gen 12:8), or Jerusalem, arguing strongly for the former. It should be noted that Jub. 13:5-7, 15 also makes much of the same mountain, between Bethel and Ai.

19.11: B1 [יולא] אבגפחר י bn. GMT/F/ AW: I/Mneg. 3856 and BZ19TM reveal beyond doubt that previous proposals are not correct. I/Mneg. 3856 shows a broad base stroke (my mem) following the lamed, while it is also clear that the letter preceding the nun is not a mem (cf. F’s אכ), a final letter is visible preceding the bet of השב, which renders the transcription השב impossible. Hence, it seems that here we have reference to Abram himself founding the city of Hebron, which may also be the implication of Jub 13:10 “When he reached Hebron (Hebron was built at that time), he stayed there for two years.”

19.10: בנה B1 [ד]נו. There is not enough space for a beh between the lamed and aleph.

19.10: גנ ב[bת] בז מז גין B1 [ת]א זג בז מז גין. Ginsberg was the first to suggest that the initial letter has the shape of an ayin rather than bet (cf. AY), and this judgment appears correct (see especially I/Mneg. 3856). J/GMT/ AW were correct in placing an aleph at the end of the word, since in both BZ19TM and I/Mneg. 3856 the rest and aleph can be seen touching each other.

19.11: בנה תק G/ GMT/AW: א Y/B1. The top of the second letter is partially effaced, but does not appear to be a nun (cf. I/Mneg. 3856).

19.12: בנה ב B1/GMT/F/ AY. AW’s transcription is incorrect.

19.13: בנה ב B1/GMT/F/ AY: א. It is surprising that the kaph, which is entirely visible in BZ19TM, has been overlooked by so many commentators. It is, however, more difficult to discern on the original plates of AY than on other photographs. G. Anderson and P. Beaulieu have helpfully pointed out that the root ב is used in the sense of “go out” in Gen 26:26, as well as in Assyrian texts.

19.14: בנה ב B1/GMT/F/ AY. The spacing appears to fit מנה best, although the end of the word is badly damaged.

19.15: בנה ב B1. B’s reading is plausible, although it remains far from certain. F’s reading fits neither the available space nor the ink remains, and AW has forgotten the word אד.

19.15: בנה ב B1/Qim1/GMT/F/ AY: קינדנש. The letters bet and qoph are directly next to each other, leaving no room for a vav. See Qim1 (pp. 14-15) or Ck (p. 372) for further discussion.

19.16: בנה ב B1/GMT/F/ AY: אד. This reading is recognizable even on the original plates of AY, although more certainty is gained by consulting BZ19TM. The words following have been the subject of much speculation in the past (cf. F, p. 186), but are now quite widely agreed upon. The spacing is acceptable for these and the following words, despite Mu’s objection (p. 44).

19.17: בנה ב B1/Qim1/GMT/F: אד. These words are very faint on the manuscript, but the first six letters can be recovered with relative certainty by enhancing the brightness and contrast of BZ19BM. The aleph and qoph are read as one word (with an intervening tav) by Qim1/F, although F must emend the reading to פס אד in order to make sense of it. Such close proximity of words is not uncommon in the scroll, and, despite F’s claim to the contrary, there is no evidence of a tav between what is quite clearly an aleph and a qoph. The final word is longer than even Qimron recognized, although the final two or three letters are unclear even with modification. The penultimate letter appears to have a single, upright stroke, making it probable that here we have an object suffix referring to either the cedar tree alone (אא) or both the cedar and date palm (אאא) attached to a-peal 3 pl. perf. verb from קץ.
The suggestions of J/GMT/AW and Mu/F may be ruled out by the certainty of the mem after כות, which is apparent on BZ19BM. Following מ (the nun of which is almost completely effaced) there is room for an intervening letter before the aleph of הס. I propose a dalet here, which would make sense of the phrase and agree with syntactic convention in the scroll (cf. 0.11; 22.29). There is no physical evidence of an aleph form of the verb למד (contra B1), while a participle is quite coherent in this context. The spacing for several of the proposed readings, in particular J/GMT/AW and Mu/F, is not even close to accurate. Given the above factors, it is remarkable that the reconstruction of J has been carried over into the recent texts of GMT and AW.

The aleph is clear in all of the photographs and has been duly noted by a number of commentators (cf. F, p. 187).

The reconstructions of J/GMT/AW and F do not adequately fit the ink traces visible on BZ19TM and BZ19BM, in which the aleph and mem of בֹּטָה are clearly visible (as is the mem following כות, when contrast is enhanced). Furthermore, the lower extension of a final letter preceding הבט is rendered the reconstruction nonsensical. All three of the previous proposals are also a bit short in relation to the available space.

There are more letters here than is reflected in previous readings, and I do not see convincing evidence for the word תמר. The tav of GMT/AW is definitely not present.

Although a hole has disintegrated most of the bet, all three letters can be discerned on BZ19BM (the last two clearly).

The word אָמוֹר is not correct. A hole has destroyed part of each of the letters, but in BZ19TM the last letter clearly has a left leg, which appears to belong to a tav. In any case, it is not a resh. The first letter has the right to left, sloped stroke of an ayin, while the two (or perhaps one?) middle letters, of which only the very tops remain, are compatible with my reading.

My own reconstruction is obviously very tenuous but draws attention to some shortcomings of earlier suggestions. For example, the upper remains of a lamed are visible (ruling out the proposal of J/F), and there appear to be two letters between it and the aleph of ימָר. Fortunately, the basic meaning is clear from the surrounding context.

The ink traces seem to cover too large an area to be those of a yod, although there is a hole in the leather here.

The tet is obvious in all photographs.

The letters following this phrase, combined with the clarity of the reading on BZ19BM, leave no doubt that this is a reference to Pharaoh Zoan.

What I have read as yod at the end of the word preceding יש may equally be placed at the beginning of the next word (where it would be read as a tav), as Ay/F propose. B’s יש is not correct, since on BZ19BM it is clear that his gimel does not have the righthand leg required by that letter. In addition, the letter preceding it does not have the characteristics of a sin. This may instead be a verb meaning something like “be reluctant, fear,” referring to Sarai’s reticence to go to Zoan. F’s reconstructed דָּעָה, earlier in the line, does not appear correct due to the lower extension of a final letter following the lamed.

This reading is highly uncertain, but the upper remains of a lamed appear in approximately the expected place for F’s proposed לָדוּד, and the other ink traces do not contradict such a reading. The word מְמוּר is not implausible at the beginning of the line.
19.23: J/GMT/AW's suggestion is too short to fill the available space, while F's is much too long. B's reading does not fit the ink remains, some of which are visible on BZ19B. These remains generally fit the letters and spacing suggested here, although the spacing would have to be compact.

19.23: AY/J/B. This mistake of the earlier readings was first noted by Qimron and is quite obvious on the photographs.

19.24: J/GMT/F/AW. Pu had already noticed the lamed preceding אתלדה, apparent even on the plates in AY, but this observation went unheeded by all but F. Furthermore, the space before this word is far too large to read simply ואתלדה. The line may, however, begin with this word, since what remains of the first letter may be interpreted as an aleph. The upper portion of the aleph in אתלדה is apparent in BZ19B (despite F's assurances to the contrary), as is the var at the beginning of this word. Mu1 also reads אתלדה.

19.24: I am indebted to M. Berstein (with E. Eshel) for this reading. I first read אֲרֵבֵב, but when the first letter is compared to the samekh of לָכֵן in 19.23 the similarity of the sloping, righthand stroke and the protrusion at the upper, lefthand corner are clear and decisive. The peh is the least definite letter paleographically speaking and could also be read as bet, since the critical top portion is somewhat obscured. This would result in the equally plausible אָבָב, “brilliance, understanding.” Either word makes good sense in the present context. The resh is sure in BZ19BM and BZ19B, rendering all earlier proposals untenable. Based on the context, I take אָסָר as a reference to “book learning, scribal wisdom, erudition” (safrab or safarab), rather than an actual book (sefor). This meaning is also found in the Syriac אַסָר (sefor).

19.25: Pu's foregoing transcription אֶת ה in 19.23 is the least definite letter paleographically speaking and could also be read as ב. Nevertheless, his reading also fits the remains, and I follow him here. The word אתלדה is reasonably certain.

19.26: The third letter is plainly not a peh, but a tet, as may be seen when the size and contrast of BZ19B are enhanced. Both letters preceding the tet have horizontal base strokes characteristic of a bet or similar letter. This noun has the advantage of making sense with the following הבתר (the first letter of which is very uncertain).
19.26: This entire phrase is marvelously clear and intact in BZ19BM and BZ19B. The meaning, however, is more obscure. The first word must be a 1 sg. imperfect verb, which I take to be from the root נוי. This verb typically means “to bubble up, flow forth,” but can also be used of speech, i.e. “to utter, expound.” This is especially true in the abhil. The second word typically means “brilliant, shining, clear” as an adjective, but is used once in the Isaiah to refer to clarity of speech (Is. 32:4; תמר התוח). Hence, I tentatively take this as a reference to the purity of teaching given by Abram. One should note that AW consistently transliterates what are intended to be ellipses in GMT as three, undiscernible letters.

Column 20: This column is the first whose text is preserved nearly in its entirety, although a few lines at the top are obscured by decay. For this and the following columns the BZ photos generally portray the scroll in worse condition than the Ay plates and certain of the Imneg. photographs. Despite this, there are isolated cases where the BZ set provides clear evidence against previous readings.

20.2: Judging from the plates of Ay (which are much better than the others in this area) there is no room for another letter between the tsade and het, while the bottom tip of a yod/vav can be discerned before both letters. Indeed, the expected (plane) form would have a yod in the second position, not the third as in F (cf. Jastrow II, p. 928). B’s transcription is not plausible.

20.3: The readings of J and F do not posit enough letters to fit the available space and ink remains and must be incorrect. When BZ20T is enlarged, and the contrast enhanced, the remains of a mem and tsade can be recognized, leading to my proposed reading, and rendering B’s suggestion improbable (the word kir “soft” was first suggested by Kutscher). My reading requires the bet and beh to be spaced compactly and so remains uncertain. I am quite convinced, however, of the presence of some form of the word מתנה “forehead” for the second word of the line. The first word of the line, and the vav preceding kir, are very uncertain.

20.4: BZ20T shows quite convincingly the letter combination shin-peb-vav/vav in the middle of this word, leading to my proposal. The most certain of these letters is the peb, leaving the suggestions of B1 and Pu doubtful. If correct, this word appears to be a m. sg. paal part. paired with the preceding noun chain אנפה motivating יד. If correct, this word appears to be a m. sg. paal part. paired with the preceding noun chain אנה מ胰 motivating יד. F’s transcription is not plausible.

20.5: The bottom stroke of the first letter can be seen below the lamed in BZ20T and Imneg. 3859.

20.6: F’s reading המדות was first suggested by Michaud, and fits the letter remains fairly well. The traces of the first two letters do not support the suggestion of Puech (especially the second, which appears to have a semi-horizontal base stroke), and the final dalet of this word extends no farther down than the surrounding letters (contra B1). J’s proposal is too short.

20.7: Once scrutinized, it is quite clear that the final letter is a tav that has had its lower, left leg effaced (the upper, left leg and joint are the key indicators).

20.8: The letters are undisputed, but there has been a longstanding debate over whether they should be divided into two words. If the letters are divided as in Ay/Gin/B1, the noun היל is difficult to make sense of, while the compound preposition (dalet plus lamed) has disturbed other commentators. I find the latter problem less troubling, and better fitting the context here. For a fuller discussion cf. F, p. 197.

20.10: F understands this to be the 3 f. sg. ind. personal pronoun, rather than a 3 m. sg. paal perfect verb. His position accords better with the following הנעך, since others must
either take בנה to be a mistaken verbal form (i.e. it is meant to be the feminine בנה; so AW?) or the suffix of הבן to be feminine, despite its typical morphology (בת-) in the scroll.

20.22: [J/GMT/F/AW [B] is not accounted for the available space. B’s suggestion is more acceptable with regard to space, but still falls approximately one letter short.

20.23: The slight ink remains visible on BZ20M and IMneg. 3859 do not allow a decisive judgment regarding B’s proposed aleph. The first letter is almost completely effaced, and his reading remains possible, but the yod of an imperfect form would better fit the expected syntax and morphology.

20.24: B’s suggestion is also far too short. There does not appear to be a word break before the remains of this letter exclude the reconstructions of J/GMT (already disputed by Puech) and F. F’s states that “the adj. is not found on the photograph of this column” (p. 214). He is mistaken, as noticed of my implausible for two reasons. First, Qim either take account for the available space. B the 3 m. sg. pronoun (cf. F, p. 212). AW’s transcription is difficult to make sense of, and appears to approximately where the subject for the end of the line is graphically tenable and makes better sense than AY’s.

20.25: The proposal of B is the 3 m. sg. pronoun (cf. F, p. 212). AW’s transcription is difficult to make sense of, and appears to approximately one letter short.

20.26: The reading of Kut/Gin is not paleographically plausible. Kut/Gin was first suggested to Kutscher by Moshe Greenberg (cf. Kut, 31).

20.27: AY/B/J/GMT/F/AW. The reading of Kut/Gin is not paleographically implausible for two reasons. First, Qim noted the oddity of a convergent imperfect such as יתמה, which is not known elsewhere in Qumran Aramaic. Second, the word רש יתма would fall at least one letter short of filling the available space. The proposal of B/Qim/F is preferable by all accounts.

20.28: Ros/J/B/GMT/F/AW. The reading adopted here is supported by several of the targums (Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, and Neofiti; cf. F, p. 211).

20.29: The faint remains of an aleph can be seen at the beginning of my transcription of J/GMT (already disputed by Puech) and F. F’s proposal is also far too short. There does not appear to be a word break before the resh, as posited by B. He likely broke the word here (and created an additional vav at the end of the word) based on his belief that this word is continued on the following line – something which happens nowhere else in the manuscript. The word ית, at the beginning of the next line, is better understood as an aberrant form of the 3 m. sg. pronoun (cf. F, p. 212). AW’s transcription is difficult to make sense of, and appears to have incorporated two distinct readings from variant editions of the text – one which read ית and the other ית – to begin the phrase! There are definitely not two occurrences of ית here.

20.30: The first word is badly damaged and very difficult to read, and the transcription of B/F should not be absolutely excluded. The word ב[ה] at the end of the line is graphically tenable and makes better sense than AW’s ית(ב).

20.31: In reaction to J’s transcription of נשיא, F states that “the adj. is not found on the photograph of this column” (p. 214). He is mistaken, as noticed by all other editions. A full word is plainly visible immediately following [ב] on the plate in AY.

20.32: I follow the suggestion of B with hesitation, since on all the photographs there appears to be a final כפפ approximately where the dalet of ה[כ] would be placed. It is nearly impossible, however, to tell what was written in this area.
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20.32: אנה וב/Qim\textsuperscript{1}/F ] AY ו[ ]Ros; Gin/J/GMT/AW נפ[ ]אר. The root הבש, first suggested by Ginsberg, appears correct. The ending, however, must be longer than a הב alone based on space and ink traces (despite a crack in the leather between this and the following word).

20.32: עמק ] AY ][תפכ \textsuperscript{1} ]\textsuperscript{[ב]} [ ] B\textsuperscript{1} ]\textsuperscript{[ג]} [ ] GMT/AW רכ[ ] הב[ ] ... The second half of this line is largely effaced, accounting for the wide range of readings to date. Some issues can, however, be resolved. First, there is clearly no רכ at the end of the line, as GMT/AW suggest. The ending יננ, first proposed by J, is not at all sure (contra GMT/AW), and one might more tenably expect a sg. verb to go with the.sg. noun אנה. Later in the line, the remains of what may be a final nun and then a לamed may be discerned, where I read the end of ש[ ] הב. B\textsuperscript{1}'s proposal, apparently reading the final letter at the end of the line as the end of the word ש[ ] הב, is grossly inaccurate with regard to available space, and also does not take due account of the לamed less than halfway between ... הב and the end of the line.

20.33: רלבש ] AY/F רלבש; J/B\textsuperscript{1}/GMT/AW רלבש. What is perceptible with difficulty on AY's plate is starkly obvious on BZ20B. The second and third letters are very clearly גימל-בét, not aleph-גימל (the bottom of the בét is also easily seen on IMneg. 3859). The typical Aramaic meanings of this verb are “knead, create, grow in size [used only of parasites]” (Jastrow I, 207; Sokoloff, p. 119). While the last meaning must be the general sense in which the word is used here, this attestation represents a novel usage and so adds to our knowledge of the Aramaic lexicon at this time. Context dictates the meaning to be something such as “I grew, became wealthy,” – a meaning which seems distantly related to the nominative meaning “border, outer limits” (i.e. the limits of Abram's possessions were affected).

20.33: [עמל [ ][ ][ ] ] F ] AY/GMT/AW [עמל]; J [עמל לא[ ]]; B\textsuperscript{1} [עמל[ ]]. The best view of the לamed is found on AY's plate, which shows only the negative imprint where the ink has eaten away the leather. This imprint looks too far away from the nun of מlarıyla (approx. 2-3 letters) to have a רכ alone intervening.

20.34: מתש ] J/GMT/AW מתש; F מתש. A single, vertical stroke is visible following the רכ on BZ20B, making a הב likely. The variant spelling מתש is, however, found in 22.13.

Column 21: Only a small portion of the bottom of this column is missing. The text is otherwise in excellent condition compared to the rest of the scroll.

21.1: א ] AY/GMT/F/\textsuperscript{[ב]}/AW אל[ ]Ros/Qim\textsuperscript{1}/B\textsuperscript{1} [ ] לכל. The split in the leather at the inscribed margin line appears to be quite clean, and I am unconvinced that an entire letter has been lost. J certainly did not see an intact בét when viewing the photograph and should have placed this letter in brackets. The letter preceding the לamed is unlikely to be an גימל judging from the length of the stroke still visible, which is not intersected by another line. If two strokes did intersect above what is currently visible, the space between letters would be rather large. Qim\textsuperscript{1} is undecided on whether this letter is an גימל or קסף but agrees that there was no letter preceding it. The only other defective spelling of ב[ ]ט is in 20.6.

21.2: יקח ] AY/J/GMT/AW יקח[ ]\textsuperscript{[א]}; B\textsuperscript{1} יקח; F יקח. It is puzzling that no previous editions have incorporated what is quite clearly the upper portion of a לamed at the beginning of this line. This letter can be seen in both AY's plate and BZ20B. It appears that the לamed was followed by a small letter and then the word יקח. The לamed may also have been preceded by another letter. Which word stood here is difficult to surmise, but the clear physical evidence should not be disregarded. Perhaps it is the word יכ, “for myself”?

21.3: אנה[ ] Qim\textsuperscript{1}/B\textsuperscript{2}/F ] AY/J אנה[ ]; GMT/AW אנה. Qimron first noted the trace of a לamed, the direct object marker, at the beginning of this line. It is also visible in BZ21T.

21.6: כותג ] Gin/Kut/Ros/J/B/GMT/F/\textsuperscript{[א]}/AW בכ[ ] ר[ ]iner. Although the middle letters are obscured, and either reading is paleographically possible, there has been overwhelming agreement that כותג is to be read here.

21.8: יקח ] Kut/Gin/J/B/GMT/F/\textsuperscript{[א]}/AW יקח. Kutscher observed that this is a misprint in AY (see F, p. 219, for discussion).

21.9: א[ ]\textsuperscript{[ג]} ] AY/J/B\textsuperscript{1}/GMT/F/\textsuperscript{[ב]}/AW א[ ]\textsuperscript{[ג]}[א]. This should be read as two words, as elsewhere (cf. lines 1 and 7). For other examples of close spacing see the note on 2.9.
21.10: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת Gin/J/B/GMT/F/AW  AY יָדוֹת יָדוֹת. For the linguistic reasoning behind this change see Ginsberg, p. 148.

21.23: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת VdK/B  AY/J/GMT/F/AW יָדוֹת. One could not ask for a clearer resh than in this word (cf. the plate in AY), and only adherence to the form expected from the MT/SP could have prompted the transcription of יָדוֹת by AY/J/GMT/F/AW. The interchange between dalet and resh is a common one, and related forms are attested in the LXX (Θεσπρύαλ) and Jub. 13:22 (Targel).

21.24: בֵּית בֵּית B/F  AY/J/GMT/AW בֵּית. The transcription of this word determines to which referent it belongs, and even if it is a pronoun or verb (for discussion cf. F, p. 233). The letter is very short, prompting me to read רד, although רד is also possible.

21.26: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת Kut/Gin/J/B/GMT/F/AW  AY יָדוֹת יָדוֹת. This is a misprint in AY.

21.30: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת J/Qim (? 1) AY יָדוֹת יָדוֹת; B יָדוֹת יָדוֹת. The reading has garnered widespread support based on the toponym יָדוֹת יָדוֹת in Gen 14:7. The word יָדוֹת יָדוֹת cannot be read (contra B and AW), although it makes good sense in light of this usage in Targum Onkelos. The bottom of a single, vertical stroke can be seen following the final nun in BZ21B, which may represent a dalet. The following reconstructions of B/F and AW are conjectures, but are likely close to correct, conflating the various people groups of יָדוֹת יָדוֹת in Gen 14:7 into a single designation (for further discussion cf. F, p. 237). Qimron does not give a reading, but seems generally to agree with J.

21.31: בֵּית בֵּית B/F/AW AY/J/GMT בֵּית בֵּית. There is a large, vertical crack in the leather from line 30 downward. One can observe in the word יָדוֹת יָדוֹת (discussed in the previous note) that the leather to the right of the split has shrunk significantly. This shrinkage accounts for the space left by AY/J/GMT, and allows for the words to be written continuously.

21.32: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת Pu/B  AY יָדוֹת יָדוֹת; J/Qim יָדוֹת יָדוֹת; GMT יָדוֹת יָדוֹת; F/AW יָדוֹת יָדוֹת. Gin and F/AW have superior readings based on linguistic grounds alone. Both בֵּית יָדוֹת יָדוֹת (from פִּנֹּת; cf. Jastrow II, p. 873) and עָבָד יָדוֹת יָדוֹת (cf. 21.24; Dan. 7:21; 4QEnGiants 1:4) are verbs commonly used with the noun קָרָא קָרָא to describe engagement in battle. However, Puech (p. 591) is correct in his paleographic analysis, stating that “traces de toutes les lettres, π, ταυ, βετ ligature avec ταυ” are visible on the plate in AY (as well as in BZ21B). F may be correct that the root נָחַת נָחַת has not previously been known to carry this meaning, but it seems best to follow the physical evidence of the manuscript. Despite its lack of previous attestation, the verb נָחַת נָחַת makes good sense in context here, referring to the act of “entering into” or “engaging” the battle.

21.33: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת בֵּית יָדוֹת יָדוֹת ] J/GMT/F/AW יָדוֹת יָדוֹת. Contra Pu, there does not seem to be enough room for the longer reading (it is approximately 2-3 letters too long). Mu1 (pp. 25-26) has provided additional argumentation for a shorter reading, positing several possibilities. F does not include these words in his translation, causing one to wonder if he meant them to be in his transcription.

21.34: יָדוֹת יָדוֹת Qim/F  AY/J/GMT/AW יָדוֹת יָדוֹת. The concern here is whether the verb is active, and belongs with a hypothetical pl. subject (i.e. “they took captive”), or passive, and belongs with Lot (i.e. “Lot was taken captive”). Either is plausible, although the latter form is used in 22.3, and is therefore adopted here. Cf. Qim1, 18 for further discussion.

Column 22: Like col. 16, this column stands last on its sheet of parchment, and is significantly narrower than those preceding it. An especially curious trait of this column is that the following sheet was cut off in antiquity. The reason for this is not clear, although the photographs plainly show that the seam and its thread are intact, and that to the left of the seam is a clean cut-mark. That the cut was made in antiquity
is assured, since this column was rolled at the core of the scroll and could not have been tampered with before its unrolling by Biberkraut. Along with the fact that the last line of the column ends mid-sentence, the cut proves that this is not the end of the original scroll. The BZ photographs present the column in worse condition than the AY plate and some of the IMneg. photos but again shed light on a few readings that are unclear in the others.

22.27: אָתָה הָבָרָד

AY יָהָוי. The fourth letter should be read as a <yod>, as in 21.8.

22.28: אָתָה הָבָרָד

KY יִמְצָא. Кutscher (p. 34) was the first to note that the verb בָּרָד carries the meaning “to spend time,” assuring that this is the correct reading.

22.30: אָתָה הָבָרָד

Qimי צָא. AY transcribes the Hebrew form rather than the Aramaic, as Ginsberg noted. Qimי argues that “the third letter is not a bet,” and that the last letter “looks like a waw-shaped letter crossed by a diagonal line.” It appears to me, however, that the final bet has simply been partially effaced (particularly the left leg; cf. the <yod> at the beginning of this word and ה in the following line for such effacement), while the third letter has been partially destroyed by a crack in the leather (and perhaps effaced as well).

Despite being in significantly worse condition, BZ22B reveals some aspects of the first word that cannot be discerned on AY’s plate. First, it is apparent in both photos that the bottoms of some of these letters have been effaced. The top of the first letter clearly has the two horns of a <hey> (this is visible in IMneg. 3865 as well). It also has a vertical downstroke on the right side. More crucial is the fourth letter, which can clearly be identified as the top of a <yod> in BZ22B. Thus, it is likely that we have here neither ה nor י but instead י. In any case, this word is part of Eliezer’s enigmatic description in Gen 15:2. The slight traces following this word fit the letters of אָתָה. The illegible final word does not appear to be הָבָרָד, as suggested by B1, since a horizontal bottom stroke can be perceived on AY’s plate for the letter preceding the <hey>. Qimי’s reading will be dealt with below.

22.34: אָתָה הָבָרָד

AY transcribes the Hebrew form rather than the Aramaic, as Ginsberg noted. Qimי argues that “the third letter is not a bet,” and that the last letter looks much more like a mem that (like the <yod> at the beginning of this word and ה in the following line for such effacement), while the third letter has been partially destroyed by a crack in the leather (and perhaps effaced as well).
SECTION II

THE DIVISION OF THE EARTH IN GENESIS APOCRYPHON 16-17: A CASE
STUDY ON ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE BOOK OF JUBILEES
CHAPTER 3
THE BACKGROUND OF GENESIS APOCRYPHON 16-17

The primarily textual work of the preceding section is aimed to provide a more solid foundation for future textual, linguistic, and exegetical analysis of the Genesis Apocryphon. While it is impossible to comment adequately on all parts and aspects of the Apocryphon here, the remainder of the dissertation is dedicated to one area where new textual discoveries may enhance our understanding of the scroll’s content and theological outlook – the apportionment of the earth among Noah’s sons and grandsons in GenAp 16-17. These columns were chosen for several reasons: 1.) they include a number of substantial advancements in reading the scroll; 2.) they represent our most direct parallel with the Book of Jubilees, whose relationship with the Apocryphon remains unclear; and 3.) they attest to one broad, thematic concern in the scroll, as will be demonstrated below. The thesis of Section II is that the Genesis Apocryphon preserves a simpler, shorter account of the earth’s division than Jubilees, and that the two texts are more likely based on a common source than directly related. The evidence suggests that the shared source may well have included an actual map.

To avoid unwieldiness, this section has been split into two chapters. The present chapter seeks to contextualize Chapter 4 within the wider settings of: 1.) the book of Genesis; 2.) the ancient Hellenistic map of the inhabited earth (oikumene), on which both the Apocryphon and Jubilees partly depend; and 3.) the extant narrative of the rest of the

3.1. External Background I: Genesis 10 and Other Biblical Texts

Genesis 10, or the so-called “Table of Nations,” forms the primary biblical backdrop to the various geographic accounts to be discussed in the following chapters. The Table of Nations stands between Noah’s drunken episode, after which his grandson Canaan receives a curse (Gen 9:18-28), and the confusion of tongues and dispersion of peoples at the Tower of Babel (Gen 11:1-9). It is essentially a genealogy that has been inconsistently supplemented with geographic, folkloric, and etiological information. The following tables attempt to present the information of Gen 10 succinctly:

199 A biblical parallel to Gen 10 is found in 1 Chr 1:1-24.

200 The traditional source-critical interpretation of this uneven combination is that it represents the two distinct sources comprising the chapter, J and P. The most popular theory is that P has provided the genealogical framework for the chapter, while most of the ‘non-genealogical’ material may be attributed to J. For a clear survey of the standard views see James C. VanderKam, “Putting the in their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool,” Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday (ed. J. C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 46-69 [esp. 50-53]. A more detailed explanation is given by Skinner, Genesis (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930 [2d ed.]) 187-95; or W. Zimmerli, 1. Mose 1-11 (Zürcher Bibelkommentare; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1943) 367-96.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gomer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashkenaz</td>
<td>Seba</td>
<td>Elam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripphath</td>
<td>Havilah</td>
<td>Asshur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togarmah</td>
<td>Saftah</td>
<td>Arpachshad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magog</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elishah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarshish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/Dodanim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tubal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meshech</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiras</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canaan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jebusites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amorites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girgasmites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hivites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aravdites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zemarites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamathites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 2

ADDITIONAL (NON-GENEALOGICAL) INFORMATION

**Japheth**
1. “From these the maritime nations branched out.” (10:5)

**Ham**
1. Nimrod (10:8-12):
   a. is the first mighty man (בוגר) on the earth
   b. is a mighty hunter before the Lord (ברר יד נמר)
   c. ruled over Babylon, Erech, Accad, and Calneh in the land of Shinar (from which Asshur went forth)
   d. built Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen
2. “Afterward the clans of the Canaanites spread out. The Canaanite territory extended from Sidon as far as Gerar, near Gaza, and as far as Sodon, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboiim, near Lasha.” (10:18-19)

**Shem**
1. Shem is the father of all the sons of Eber and the older brother of Japheth (10:21; וַיהי בָּנָי כָּלְכֶל בָּרָי שֵׁם הַנֶּרֶגֶל).\(^{201}\)
2. In the days of Peleg (פֶּלֶג) the earth was divided (תְּקֵלָת הָאָרֶץ).
3. The settlements of Joktan’s descendants “extended from Mesha as far as Sephar, the hill country to the east.” (10:30)\(^{202}\)

---

\(^{201}\) There has been some scholarly disagreement whether Shem or Japheth is the older brother (i.e. the referent of הבוגר), but the former seems preferable. See Skinner, *Genesis*, 219.

\(^{202}\) On the possible placements of these toponyms see Skinner, *Genesis*, 222-23.
The LXX closely resembles the MT version, differing in only a few details. The chapter ends with the statement, “These are the groupings of Noah’s descendants, according to their origins, by their nations; and from these the nations branched out over the earth after the Flood” (10:32). There is no explicit indication that the geographic locations connected with individuals or people groups are divinely appointed, or assigned by Noah, although the first point may have been assumed by an ancient audience. It simply appears to be the way things happened according to the inclinations and wanderings of Noah’s various descendents. This passage forms the scriptural foundation upon which Noah’s division of the earth in both the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees is built.

There are several other passages that deserve brief mention alongside Gen 10 as potentially influencing the geographic strategy and content of the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees. The strongest impact may well have been made by Deut 32:8, which reads:

בנהלעלןגורםហפרידוהניامة
יצבנעלאלהענמחלפאסרבהנלאלהים[ישראל]

When the Most High dealt nations their inheritances; upon his separation of human beings; He set up the boundaries of peoples, according to the number of the sons of God [Israel].

203 For a brief summary see VanderKam, “Putting them in their Place,” 50; or J. M. Scott Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002) 24-27. A much more detailed analysis is provided by Skinner, Genesis, 195-223; or U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis (Vol. 2: From Noah to Abraham; trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1964) 172-224. These commentators also discuss the importance of the 70 or 72 person scheme of Gen 10 as representative of the common ancient conception that the world was populated by this number of nations.

204 Most LXX manuscripts (reading either ἀγγέλων θεοῦ or ὑψώσει θεοῦ) and two Qumran manuscripts (4QDeut 1) reflect the non-bracketed reading. The MT contains the bracketed “Israelites” instead, which seems to be a later gloss. For details see M. S. Heiser, “Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God,” BSac 158 (Jan-March 2001) 52-74.
This piece of ancient poetry lent itself naturally to an association with the Table of Nations. Indeed, the two were explicitly connected by a number of ancient interpreters. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan was among these, expanding the first phrase to read, “When the Most High dealt the world as an inheritance to the peoples who went forth from the sons of Noah.”

It is likely that this passage also left its imprint on the author of the Genesis Apocryphon, suggesting that it was the “Most High” (a favored appellation for God in the Apocryphon) who ultimately instigated the division of the earth.

A passage that seems to have had a more specific impact on portions of the Genesis Apocryphon is the description of Israelite tribal allotments in Josh 15-19:48. Here we find some remarkable affinities in the vocabulary, phraseology, syntax, and overall structure used to describe geographic districts. Similarities to Joshua’ description are most clearly seen in GenAp 16-17, but are also present in GenAp 21.15-19.

A number of other passages delineating the borders of the Israelite’s territory likely influenced the Genesis Apocryphon’s description of Arpachshad’s, and later Abram’s, apportionment. Among these Gen 15:18-19, Ex 23:31, Num 34:2-12, and Deut 11:24 must have figured prominently, along with the later Davidic and Solomonic reports.

---

205 The same association between these passages may be found in Sifre Devarim, Yalqut Shim’oni, and Rashi’s Metsudah.

206 These passages were the recipients of frequent geographic expansion by later exegetes. The authoritative study of the targumic and rabbinic traditions associated with Gen 10 and Num 34 remains the unpublished thesis of P. S. Alexander, The Toponomy of the Targumim with Special Reference to the Table of Nations and the Borders of the Holy Land (D. Phil. thesis; Oxford University, 1974). The first of the above passages includes a nuance that may have influenced the fundamental rhetorical argument taken up by the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees. In Gen 15:18 the Lord says, “to your seed I have given this land, from the River of Egypt to the Great River, the Euphrates.” A number of early rabbis, commenting on this verse, noted that “[this phrase] does not read ‘I will give ( Honolulu),’ but ‘I have given ( Honolulu)’” (Genesis Rabbah [Theodor-Albeck] 44:22). The fact that the land had already been given to Abram’s descendents before he had received this promise may also have raised questions for earlier commentators.

207 E. g. 2 Sam 8:3 (Qere); 1 Kgs 5:1 (Hebrew); 2 Kgs 24:7; Ezek 47:13-23.
3.2. External Background II: The Ionian Map of the Inhabited Earth (oikoumene)

Several scholars have noted the dependence of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon on notions of the inhabited earth (Greek oikoumene) current in contemporary Hellenistic culture.\(^{208}\) Such dependence is indeed striking when the Greco-Roman sources are consulted, and therefore it seems best to sketch briefly some basic tenets and developments of Hellenistic geographic science before examining the geography of our Jewish works.

The most ancient Greek source envisioning the world is the description of Achilles’ spectacular shield in Homer’s *Iliad*, thought by modern scholars to date to the 8\(^{th}\) century B.C.E.\(^{209}\) Unlike later geographic descriptions this account tells of a cosmological, and not simply terrestrial, map. The important thing to note regarding the shield for our purposes, however, is that it is circular in shape and surrounded by the encompassing “Ocean (\(\Omega k\epsilon\alpha\nu\omega\iota\alpha\iota\), that vast and mighty river” (18:606). The importance of Homer’s description in shaping later conceptions of the world is attested to by Strabo and the Stoics, who declared Homer the founder of geographic science.\(^{210}\)

A significant advancement in the study of geography appears to have emerged in the 6\(^{th}\) century B.C.E., as Greek philosophers were seeking more systematic and naturalistic explanations for the world around them.\(^{211}\) Much of the geographic innovation during this

---

\(^{208}\) See (on Jubilees only) P. S. Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi’ of the Book of Jubilees,” *JJS* 38 (1982), 197-213; and idem, “Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish),” *ABD* 2.980-82. This will be discussed more fully in the following chapter.


\(^{210}\) Strabo, *Geography* 1.1.2 (Jones, I.C.I.).

\(^{211}\) *History of Cartography*, 134.
period was attributed by later authors to Anaximander (ca. 610-546 B.C.E.), who studied under the renowned Thales in the Carian city of Miletus. The early 3rd century C.E. geographer, Agathemerus, reported that Anaximander was the first “to venture to draw the inhabited world on a map.” Hecataeus (fl. ca. 500 B.C.E.), also from Miletus, was considered the first to compose a Circuit of the Earth (περίοδος γῆς), and is believed to have improved considerably on the map of Anaximander. Both authors described the world as a flat, circular-shaped disk, much like the shield of Achilles. The available evidence leads us to believe that the basic layout of world maps like those drawn by Anaximander and Hecataeus were first produced in Ionia, on the western seacoast of Asia Minor. This has led modern scholars to speak of a relatively standardized “Ionian” world map (oikumene), which exerted considerable influence over geographic science well into the Middle Ages. An Ionian understanding of the cosmos is also reflected in numerous rabbinic works.


213 Agathemerus, Geographiae informatio 1.1.

214 Neither the writings of Anaximander nor Hecataeus have survived. We are dependant upon later references to them in authors such as Herodotus, Strabo, and Agathemerus. The flat disk is sometimes described as one end of a drum-shaped cylinder.

215 History of Cartography, 135. For the close relationship between Ionia and Caria see Strabo, Geography 1.4.7.

216 Along with the other secondary works referred to in this section see R. Talbert, “Kartographie,” in Der Neue Pauly Enzyklopädie der Antike (ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider; Stuttgart, Weimer: J. B. Metzler, 1999) 6:301-308. The Ionians are also closely associated with maps and geographic conceptions by Herodotus (e.g. 2.15-17).

217 One famous late example is the Hereford Map, produced by Richard of Haldingham around 1290 A.D. For a rudimentary overview of the later reception of the Ionian map see P. S. Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 201-203; also J. M. Scott, Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity, 159-70. A far more detailed account is given in History of Cartography, 283-370.

218 E.g. y. Aradah Zarah 3.42c; Pirqa Rabbi Eliezer 3; Derekh Eretz Zuta 9; Genesis Rabbah 4.5, 3.10, 23.7; Numbers Rabbah 13.16; Esther Rabbah 1.7; Midrash Psalm 93:5; etc. See Z. Safrai, “Geography and Cosmography
Map 1: A Reconstruction of Hecataeus' World Map

Herodotus (late 5th cent. B.C.E.) attested to some of the standard traits of the Ionian-based maps common in his day. Although largely dependent upon the Ionians, he upbraided them when he said, “[f]or my part, I cannot help but laugh when I see numbers of persons drawing maps of the world without having any reason to guide them; making, as


they do, the ocean stream to run all around the earth, and the earth itself to be an exact
circle, as if described by a pair of compasses, with Europe and Asia of just the same size.”

Through this critique we learn that Greek maps depicted the general shape of the earth very
much like Achilles’ shield, with the earth forming a planed circle and surrounded by the
Ocean River. Aristotle (4th cent. B.C.E.) and the later Stoic philosopher Geminus (1st cent.
B.C.E.) shared Herodotus’ disdain and disparagement of these flat, round maps, attesting
to their enduring popular use well after it had been argued that the inhabited world must be
greater in length (east to west) than in breadth (north to south), and that the earth was not a
plane, but spherical in shape.

Herodotus went on to state that contemporary Greek maps divided the earth into
three continents: “I wonder, then, at those who have mapped out and divided the world into
Libya, Asia, and Europe; for the difference between them is great.” Here he appears to
ridicule the fact that the three continents are depicted as roughly equal in size, when it is
clear from basic observation that they are not. According to Herodotus, the boundaries
separating these three continents were the Nile river in the south, and the Phasis or Tanais
rivers in the north, with the northern river apparently fluctuating depending on the particular
map consulted. The Great Sea (i.e. Mediterranean), which was itself subdivided and

---

220 Herodotus 4.36 (Godley, LCL).
221 Aristotle, Meteorologica 2.5.362b.13 (Lee, LCL).
16.4.5.
224 Herodotus 4.42. Also cf. 2.16.
225 Ibid, 4.45. The Phasis is the modern Ister, and the Tanais the modern Don. For the alternative
practice of dividing the oikumene by isthmuses, see Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 198-99.
named according to region, formed a massive inlet, dividing Europe from Libya and connecting to the Ocean River at the Pillars of Heracles, or Gadira.\textsuperscript{226} It is such Ionian maps that Alexander the Great likely consulted during his campaign to the East, as Arrian may suggest.\textsuperscript{227} While little physical evidence of Ionian maps has come down to us from antiquity, there can be no doubt of their existence. In fact, such maps may have been known to the general populaces of major Greek cities.\textsuperscript{228}

Greek geographic science continued to develop, although many fundamental aspects of the Ionian map appear to have persisted. Democritus (ca. 460-370 B.C.E.) and Dicaearchus of Messana (fl. ca. 326-296) argued that the \textit{oikoumene} should be drawn as an oval, being half again as long as it is broad, in a proportion of three to two.\textsuperscript{229} Dicaearchus and Timosthenes of Rhodes (fl. 270 B.C.E.) placed the navel (\textit{omphalos}) of the earth at Rhodes, rather than Delphi – a practice which many followed.\textsuperscript{230} Eratosthenes (ca. 275-194 B.C.E.), a brilliant polymath who worked largely in Alexandria, is considered by many to represent the zenith of Greek cartography. He noted the advances made possible by the conquest and discoveries of Alexander the Great.\textsuperscript{231} Although his work is preserved only in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{226} The modern Straights of Gibraltar.
\item \textsuperscript{227} See Heidel (\textit{The Frame of the Ancient Greek Map}, 26-7) citing Arrian, \textit{Anabasis} 6.1.2.
\item \textsuperscript{228} There is both archeological and textual evidence to support this. A number of coins types have been found (especially around Ionia) which incorporate maps, while the prop of a map is incorporated into Aristophanes’ (5th century) Athenian comedy \textit{The Clouds}. Cf. \textit{History of Cartography}, 138, 158-9; and Heidel, \textit{The Frame of the Ancient Greek Map}, 11-12.
\item \textsuperscript{229} \textit{History of Cartography}, 137, 152.
\item \textsuperscript{231} \textit{History of Cartography}, 153-7.
\end{itemize}
the writings of later authors (e.g. Strabo and Pliny the Elder) it is clear that Eratosthenes also knew of the earth being divided into three continents by the Tanais and Nile rivers.

Map 2: A Reconstruction of Dionysius Periegetes’ World Map

Geographic treatises continued to be composed by Greek and Roman authors, such as Strabo, (ca. 64 BCE to 21 C.E.), Claudius Ptolemy (c. 90-168 C.E.), and Agathemerus. Others, such as Polybius (ca. 200-118 B.C.E.), Manilius (fl. ca. 90 B.C.E.), Diodorus Siculus (ca. 80-20 B.C.E.), Pliny the Elder (ca. 23-79 C.E.), Dionysius “Periegetes” (fl. ca. 124 C.E.) and Arrian (ca. 97-175 C.E.), borrowed from common geographic knowledge in treating associated areas of philosophy or poetry. The individual contributions of each of these

---

authors (especially Strabo and Ptolemy) could be enumerated at length, but here it is
necessary only to note several commonalities shared by them. These few points may also
serve as an apt summary of the Ionian world map in general, especially as it relates to the
Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees:

1. The inhabited world was viewed as flat (earlier) or spherical (later), and is drawn in the
shape of a circle (earlier) or oval (later; after Democritus).

2. It is divided into three continents: Europe, Asia, and Libya (i.e. modern Africa). The
continents were considered to be either roughly the same size (earlier) or to vary (later;
after Herodotus). Since east always stood at the top of the ancient map, Asia would be
portrayed in the upper central portion, with Europe on the lower left and Libya on the
lower right.

3. The three continents were typically divided by rivers, or alternately (and less commonly,
it seems) by isthmuses. When divided by rivers, the Nile is consistently the southern (i.e.
rightward) border, separating Libya and Asia, while either the Phasis or Tanais River
separates Europe from Asia in the north (left).

As we will see in Chapter 4, the main points of contact between the Hellenistic maps
and the geographic picture underlying the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees are the division
of three continents by way of the Tanais and Nile rivers and the employment of numerous
terms not mentioned in Genesis (e.g. Gadera, the Maeotan Sea, and the three “gulfs”
representing the Aegean, Tyrrhenian, and Adriatic Seas). It should be emphasized, however,
that the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees freely combined Hellenistic geography with other

---

233 A yet later elaboration of the regular, flat oval is an arch-shaped oval.
conceptions of the earth based on other sources, such as Scripture and geography native to Judea and the surrounding regions.

That Hellenistic geographic conceptions of the earth were well-known in Judea during the 2nd century B.C.E. is not surprising, since the process of Hellenization begun by Alexander and carried on by his successors would certainly have included this aspect of Greco-Ionian philosophy. It is not difficult to imagine Hellenistic governors and aristocrats compelled to move to a new and foreign region relying on and taking with them available maps and ideas about geography.

**Excursus: Babylonian Geography**

A late-Babylonian map of the world, first published in the late 19th century, has drawn the attention of some scholars of Judaism, especially as it relates to 1 Enoch 77. James VanderKam has convincingly shown that such a connection is tenuous at best, and there is no reason to believe that the Babylonian map relates directly to the geography of the Genesis Apocryphon or Jubilees.

At first glance, the Babylonian map displays two basic affinities with the Ionian world map: 1.) the circular shape of the map; and 2.) the earth-encompassing marratu, a river surrounding the terrestrial sphere much like the Greek Ocean River on Achilles’ shield. However, there are also significant differences between the two maps. These include: 1.) the nagû regions on the Babylonian map, which lie outside the marratu and have no analogue on

---


the Ionian map; and 2.) the severely restricted scope of the Babylonian map, which depicts only a limited portion of Mesopotamia inside the *marratu*. While it seems possible that there were some basic, early points of contact between Mesopotamian and Ionian cartography (e.g. the notion of a disk surrounded by water), it is plain that the geography of the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees depends upon a developed form of the latter, and not the former.

3.3. **Internal Background I: The Geographic Substructure of the Genesis Apocryphon**

Noah’s division of the earth in GenAp 16-17 should not be viewed in isolation from the rest of the extant scroll, especially since close investigation shows that these columns present only one component of a more widespread set of rhetorical and theological assertions: 1.) that Noah was destined from birth to oversee the post-diluvian apportionment of the earth among his descendents; 2.) that this role was divinely granted and viewed as highly important; and 3.) that this apportionment did not agree with the description found in Gen 10. The goal in this part of the chapter is to examine some of the passages which attest to this stance, and also to point out that Jubilees was not as concerned with these matters.

3.3.1. **Getting to Know Noah**

The following list of passages attests to a Noah’s divinely appointed role as apportioner of the earth. It also makes clear that he was granted significant authority over the earthly, or geographic, realm.

---

3.3.1.1. *Genesis Apocryphon* 3.17

The early columns of the scroll contain tales generally paralleled in *1 Enoch*.\(^{238}\) Column 2 opens with Lamech, Noah’s father, deeply concerned about the conception of his son, whom he fears may be the fruit of an illicit union between his wife Batenosh and one of the angelic Watchers. Despite Batenosh’s vehement denials, Lamech thinks it best to consult his father Methuselah on the matter. Methuselah, in turn, makes haste to his father Enoch for counsel. *GenAp* 3.1-5.24 narrates Enoch’s lengthy response to these allegations (it is far longer than the parallel version in *1 En* 106), in which he quells all fear regarding Noah and foretells the child’s key role in the post-deluge reestablishment of righteousness upon the earth. Amid this badly damaged section a few words are preserved, with which Enoch predicts one of the activities that Noah will undertake, “He is (the one) who will divide the entire earth” ([בָלָה וּלְפָלַת כַּלּוֹת אָדָם](bala v'lepalt kolot adam)).\(^{239}\) Fitzmyer comments that these words are “an echo of Gen 10:25,” which plays on the name of Shem’s great-great-grandson Peleg ([-peerah]), by indicating that in his days the earth was divided ([בתֵילוֹת](be'ilot)).\(^{240}\) While this word-play may indeed be in the background here, the statement should also be read in light of Noah’s role as “divider” of the earth in *GenAp* 16 and *Jub* 8. Here Enoch is forecasting one of Noah’s tasks following the Flood – to designate the boundaries within which each of his...

---


\(^{239}\) Previous editions read only מַלְתִּי כָּלָה אָדָם [Melati kalah adam]. See the textual notes.

\(^{240}\) Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 140.
sons and their offspring should sojourn. That Enoch prophesies Noah’s future task is significant, since it is he who has special access to the divine mysteries.241

3.3.1.2. *Genesis Apocryphon* 7.1-2

These lines contain a statement of Noah’s newfound role as master and caretaker of the earth. Gen 9:3-4 declares that the fear and awe of Noah will be over all living creatures of the earth, but in GenAp 7.1 this governing role is extended to the earth’s various topographic regions as well, “[You shall ru[le] over them, the earth and all that is upon it; over the seas and over the mountains…” ([השע[ות יא] /uni05E9/uni05EA [ויתא יא יא ד יאתה בים ובמורוהא)). Both in Genesis and the Genesis Apocryphon such language harks back to Adam’s position of authority in the Garden of Eden (cf. Gen 1:26-30), casting Noah as a “new Adam” of sorts.242 A novel feature in the Apocryphon, however, is its extension of Noah’s lordship to the geographic features of the earth, a feature absent in Gen 9:26-30.

3.3.1.3. *Genesis Apocryphon* 11.9-12

In the middle of a fragmentary section following Noah’s exit from the ark a few partial lines relate, in geographic terms, his post-flood inspection of the earth. Line 9 reads, “the mountains and the wildernesses, the intermediate regions243 and [the] coa[stlands,

241 In light of the scroll’s keen interest in the area of the earth received by each of Noah’s descendents it is significant that the same language of “receiving an allotment” is employed for Enoch in GenAp 2.20-21, “[… and with the Holy Ones] is his lot apportioned.” In contrast to the earthly allotments of Noah’s progeny, Enoch’s “lot” (יאתה) is a heavenly one.


243 See the textual note on this word.
This statement apparently recounts what Noah surveyed upon leaving the ark, providing a geographically enhanced version of the concise reports in Gen 8:13-14 and Jub. 5:30-31 that the earth had dried up and become visible. This innovation emphasizes the vast scope of what Noah was able to see from the top of Mt. Lubar. Two lines later (following a *vaut*) we read, “[Then] I, Noah, went out and walked through the land, through its length and through its breadth” (לארשי ול.favorite באירוטא). The specific combination of surveying the earth from a height and then walking through its length and breadth clearly gestures forward to Abram’s analogous survey and walking tour in col. 21 (cf. Gen 13:14-18 and below), thereby forging an explicit literary link between Noah and Abram.

3.3.1.4. *Genesis Apocryphon 11.16-17*

Here again is an expanded assertion of Noah’s dominion over the land, perhaps the actualization of the prediction in col. 7, “and rule over all of it; over its seas and its wildernesses and its mountains, and over everything in it. For I am surely [giving the whole of it to you and to your children…” (Send ממלאתך ובמקורותך ובמערותך ובכולך ובמה אתה [giving of] תַּלְךָ֖ לפָּנַיּוֹת פָּנַיּוֹת). As in col. 7, the effect is to draw attention to Noah’s divinely granted control over the various geographic features of the earth. Like the preceding example, language reminiscent of the Abramic promises of Gen 12 and 15 is employed.

---

244 So Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 155.

245 This connection is made even more explicit by the words of God to Noah in GenAp 11.15, which are clearly fashioned after God’s blessing of Abram in Gen 15:1.
3.3.1.5. *Genesis Apocryphon* 16-17

Although cols. 16-17 will be detailed in the next chapter, a few important aspects must be noted here. First, these columns appear to be an equivalent to the Table of Nations in Gen 10, yet it is clear that the Genesis Apocryphon differs from the biblical account regarding where Noah’s descendents belong. To be sure, Genesis hands out geographic information parsimoniously. The most direct indicators are that Japheth’s sons receive the “islands/coasts of the nations” (10:4-5), Ham’s sons the great cities of Mesopotamia (Gen 10:6-12) and the Levant (10:15-19), and Shem’s sons various sites assigned by scholars to Arabia and Mesopotamia (10:27-30). By this account, one might justifiably infer that the Land of Canaan was thus named in the Pentateuch because it was simply the region where this particular group of Hamites settled following the Flood. This, however, is a markedly different picture than one gains from reading cols. 16-17 of the Genesis Apocryphon (or Jub 8:11-9:15), in which it is unmistakably clear that each son is apportioned a different continent with sharply drawn borders: Japheth receives Europe, Asia goes to Shem, and Ham ends up with Libya.

Within this basic scheme, the Levantine lands of Lebanon, Syria, and Phoenecia – typically called “the Land of Canaan” in the Pentateuch – *originally* had nothing to do with Hamites, or Canaanites. Rather, it was apportioned to Arpachshad, son of Shem. This is not an entirely surprising move by a Judean author, but it does create tension with the verses in Gen 10 mentioned above. The Apocryphon’s partial resolution of this tension will be examined in the following background segment.

---

3.3.2. Abram, Heir of Arpachshad’s Share

Noah’s role as apportioner of the earth and the various boundaries set in GenAp 16-17 reverberates throughout the remainder of the scroll, as evidenced in a pair of passages recounting the exploits of Abram.

3.3.2.1. Genesis Apocryphon 19.12-13

These lines are part of a major exegetical expansion on the narrative of Abram and Sarai entering Egypt in Gen 12:10-20. Reaching the Carmona River, one of the seven tributaries of the River of Egypt, Abram exclaims, “[Up till] now we have been inside our land” (עֲרוֹן בְּבֵית אָבְרָם). After crossing the seven tributaries, Abram makes another announcement, “Look! Now we have left our land and entered into the Land of the Sons of Ham, the Land of Egypt.” (כֹּרְמֵן הַלֹּאֵל לַאֲבָרֹם וּלְאָרָה בְּנֵי חֲמָן וּלְאָרֶץ הָאָיֹת). This river is the landmark used to distinguish the land granted to Shem from that of Ham elsewhere in the Genesis Apocryphon (16.27; 21.11, 15, 18-19), as well as in Jubilees (8:15, 22-23; 10:29). It is particularly interesting that this statement occurs here in the narrative, since it indicates that Abram is aware of the borders of the lands allotted to Noah’s sons, and that he considers the Levant “our land,” even before its borders are laid out for him by God in GenAp 21.8-22 (or Gen 15:18-21). This suggests that when God promised Abram the land in the latter passage he was simply reemphasizing a previously ratified (but now defunct)

---

247 Cf. the discussion in Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 182.

248 The names River of Egypt (נהר מצרים) and Gihon River (נהר הגוון) are used to refer to the Nile in the Genesis Apocryphon. Both are used of the Nile in the Bible (cf. Gen 2:13; 15:18), and this may have been a conscious effort by the author to associate the two names. There most certainly would have been other references to this river in what is now missing of cols. 16-17.

249 As noted above, it is also the standard topographic feature dividing Asia from Libya according to Ionian maps.
promise, rather than making an entirely new one. Indeed, the Apocryphon’s author may have gathered this from Genesis itself, since in 15:18 God tells Abram, “to your seed I hereby give (יִתֵּן) this land,” with the verb יִתֵּן in the perfect tense.

3.3.2.2. *Genesis Apocryphon* 21.8-22

A large portion of col. 21 consists of an elaboration on Gen 13:14-18. In Genesis, Abram is told to survey all the land around him and then to hike about through its length and breadth. This, God promises, is the land that he and his descendants are to possess for eternity. Genesis and Jubilees contain no further elaboration of what Abram could see while gazing north, south, east and west, nor where he trekked afterward, before settling in Hebron. In the Genesis Apocryphon, however, all curiosity is put to rest. Here Abram is told in a nocturnal dream (the preferred mode of revelation in the scroll) to climb up Ramat-Hazor, the highest hill in the region of Bethel, and from there to survey the Promised Land. From this height Abram is able to see from the River of Egypt in the south to Lebanon and Senir in the north, and from the Great Sea (i.e. Mediterranean) in the west to Hauran in the East, including the whole land of Gebal, up to Qadesh, and the Great Desert east of Hauran and Senir, up to the Euphrates River.

---

250 This event was also expanded upon in Rabbinic literature. See G. Sarfatti, “Notes on the Genesis Apocryphon,” 258; M. R. Lehmann, “IQ Genesis Apocryphon in the Light of the Targumim and Midrashim,” 251; and G. Vermes, Scripture and Tradition in Judaism, 111-12.

251 Cf. note 9, above.

Abram’s subsequent walking tour provides even more geographic detail. Following a circuit beginning in the southwest, at the Gihon River (i.e. River of Egypt), Abram skirrs the Great Sea up to Mount Taurus in the north, strikes eastward to the Euphrates and then southward to the Erythrean and Red Seas, whence he arrives back at the Gihon. When placed on the map, it becomes apparent that this is the very same area previously allotted to Abram’s ancestor Arpachshad in GenAp 17.11-14 and Jub 9:4. The border is even narrated in the same, counterclockwise direction as in col. 17.

Both additions to the Abram narratives from Genesis reinforce the earlier division of Noah and his sons, and reveal that Abram was aware of his ancestral claim on the Levant. In lieu of this, we should read God’s promise to give Arpachshad’s portion to Abram and his descendents in GenAp 21.8-14 not as a pledge *ex nihilo* (as one may gather from Genesis), but rather as a vow to restore to Abram what has rightfully been his since the days of yore.

3.3.3. Summary

Viewed together, these passages give us a glimpse of what the author of the Genesis Apocryphon is doing. The prominence of Noah’s role as distributor and the way in which the earth is divided under his watchful eye bring legitimacy to the bold claim that the Levant was intended for Shem, Arpachshad, Abram, and eventually the Israelites from the very beginning of the earth’s repopulation after the Flood. As noted above, the reader of Genesis 253

---

253 In order to define clearly the land promised to Abram, the Genesis Apocryphon has no doubt drawn upon other biblical passages providing such information. Most relevant is Gen 15:18, in which the Lord again promises the Land to Abram, but goes on to define its extremities as the River of Egypt and the Euphrates River – two terms used in the Apocryphon’s description here. The author probably also intended other biblical passages to be evoked and subsumed by the boundaries listed, such as those defining the kingdoms of David and Solomon. E.g. Exod 23:31; Num 34:1-15; Deut 11:24; Josh 15:1-12, 21-62; 2 Sam 8:3 (*Qere*); 1 Kgs 5:1 (Hebrew); 2 Kgs 24:7; Ezek 47:13-23.
struggles to discern such a claim. In fact, the opposite appears to be the case – as soon as the biblical writer is on the scene, the “Land of Canaan” is filled with Canaanites and related tribes, and there is no indication that things were originally meant to be any different.

Although it is clear from the geographic allotments of Jub 8:11-9:15 that its author is making the same basic claim as the Apocryphon, an outstanding difference exists: in Jubilees this theme is seriously truncated, being confined to chapters 8-9 and a few, isolated passages nearby.\(^{254}\) Not one of the “geographic” passages listed above is paralleled in Jubilees. Where we might expect to hear something of Abram’s clear right to the land later in Jubilees, there is only silence. Instead, the land is promised to him anew, precisely as recounted in Genesis. The sustained presence, even prominence, of the theme of land and land rights woven throughout the extant narrative of the Genesis Apocryphon is unique, and signifies an important distinction over against Jubilees.

### 3.4. Internal Background II: Noah’s Arboreal Dream in Genesis Apocryphon 13-15

GenAp 13-15 contain the patchy remains of a symbolic vision given to Noah while he is asleep. Because it is so damaged, the vision has been largely ignored by those studying the Apocryphon. Yet new readings made possible by narrowband infrared photographic technology allow more information to be culled from these columns – information that may help explain how the Genesis Apocryphon eased some of the tension with Genesis brought about by its distinctive geographic substructure. Based on these readings it appears that the dream provides the reader with background information that is crucial for understanding the

---

\(^{254}\) Primarily Jub 10:27-36.
following columns and ingeniously designed to resolve tension with Genesis. At the same
time, the dream addresses some of the thorny exegetical issues of Gen 9-10.

3.4.1. *What can we say about Columns 13-15?*

In order to understand these columns it is first necessary to establish what may be
said with relative certainty about their content. Seven points will be proposed here, although
the list may grow with future research.

1. *Noah is the recipient of an apocalyptic, symbolic dream and its interpretation*

Noah’s visionary experience may be termed apocalyptic, if judged according to the
widely accepted definition of John Collins.\(^{255}\) In cols. 14-15 we find Noah being told the
meaning and significance of the symbols in his dream, as clearly seen in the recurring use of
second person verbs and phrases such as נ現代ת (“and concerning what you saw…”). It is
likely that the dream’s interpretation is being related by the same “great watcher” (עראת רבא)
or “great holy one” (קיהתא רבא) who Noah says “spoke with me in a vision” in GenAp
6.11-14. At the very least, we may assume that a divine being is speaking to Noah, since “the
mystery” (חואא) is mentioned in 14.18-20, just as it is in 6.12. The two-part format of self-
described dream and supernatural explanation resembles that of other apocalyptic visions,
such as those in Daniel, 1 Enoch, and 4 Ezra. Most notable for our purposes are Dan 2 and

4, of which precise wording, and several symbolic elements, are mirrored in the Genesis Apocryphon. It is evident that the author of the Apocryphon is drawing imagery and language from Daniel, or at least that the two works spring from the same social and interpretative circles. The transcendent reality envisioned in the dream will be touched upon in the following points.

2. *The dream employs tree or garden imagery to portray a succession of historic persons or periods, at least some of which are brought to a destructive end*

   Beginning at the top of col. 13 we encounter what seems to be the destruction of a garden, or tree, including mention of bringing the destruction to an end (GenAp 13.11-12). The imagery and language of this section are strongly reminiscent of the Flood in Gen 6:11-8:19, and it seems likely that this is the event being cryptically described. Next, we find Noah (in the first person) describing a great olive tree, which grows astoundingly, but is then debranched and scattered by the four winds of heaven. When the text is picked up once again, in col. 14, Noah is being *addressed* in the second person, indicating an intervening shift from the dream to its interpretation. Although the text is badly damaged, the top of the column depicts Noah having the destruction of an unidentified tree explained to him. The language used here is similar to that of the olive tree in col. 13, but it is difficult to know whether the same tree is the subject in both places. Beginning at GenAp 14.9, and continuing until we lose the text again in line 22, an explanation of a great cedar tree standing upon the mountaintops along with its shoots, offshoots, and boughs, is given to Noah. It soon becomes clear that this cedar is none other than Noah.\(^{256}\) The vision

\(^{256}\) The choice of trees as symbols of various persons, groups, or generations should be viewed in light of biblical and broader ancient Near Eastern use of tree imagery. For background see G. Widengren, *The King*
culminates in col. 15 with a description of wickedness and a subsequent judgment brought about by the Mighty Lord, who is symbolized as a fearsome warrior coming from the south, with sickle in hand and fire at his side.\textsuperscript{257} This may be followed by a short description of restoration, after which Noah awakes (GenAp 15.21). While it is very difficult to guess how all of these components relate to one another, it is relatively clear that underlying these columns is a historical framework, which begins with or precedes Noah and continues until an eschatological consummation of divine judgment.

3. In col. 14 Noah is portrayed as a great cedar tree, and his three sons are symbolized by three shoots springing from its trunk.\textsuperscript{258}

GenAp 14.10 recounts a shoot that rises from the cedar, representing three sons. Since Noah has just been informed in the preceding line that he is the cedar, this is a transparent allusion to Shem, Ham, and Japheth. As we will see below, the portrayal of Noah and his sons as a tree is of great interest, since a number of other Jewish authors depend on this same imagery. John Reeves has noted the especially interesting association of Noah and his sons with the well-known “tree planted beside still waters” of Ps 1:3 in

---

\textsuperscript{257} See point 6, below.

\textsuperscript{258} The portrayal of Noah as a cedar is echoed in GenAp 19.14-17, where Abram also has a symbolic dream in which he is a cedar and Sarai a date palm (cf. Ps 92:13-16). This parallel raises the possibility that the Genesis Apocryphon associates patriarchs with the symbol of the cedar tree, and may imply that the olive tree of col. 14 does not represent one of the major patriarchal figures. At present, the identification of the olive tree must remain a mystery.
Bereshit Rabbah 26:1-2.259 This image also seems intertwined with the description of righteous Noah as an “upright planting.”260 In GenAp 14.11 it becomes clear that each son is symbolized by a separate shoot, since there we read of “the first shoot adhering to the cedar stump,” and later in 14.15 of “the last shoot.” So far, then, we can envision a cedar on the mountaintops (i.e. Noah) with three shoots branching off from it (i.e. Shem, Ham, and Japheth).

4. The future of the three cedar shoots, as well as their offshoots and boughs, is elaborated upon in considerable depth

From line 10 to at least line 22 of col. 14 various tree parts are described as animated objects, while the collection of tree-related terms attests to the detail employed by the author to describe the interactions and altercations between them. The “first shoot” (לולמית כדקימה) is said to cling to the cedar, and not branch off from it for all of its days.

Moreover, Noah’s seed is to be called by this shoot’s name, and in the future it will produce an “upright planting” that will stand fast forever. This shoot is undoubtedly Shem, whose line will eventually produce Abram and the Israelites. Following a break in the text, there is a somewhat confusing section mentioning: 1.) the “last shoot” (לולמית אותרנה), which must be either Ham or Japheth; 2.) an “offshoot” (פילו) turning aside from “his father” (i.e. the last shoot); and 3.) some of “their boughs” entering the boughs of “the first one,” with


260 Significantly, the author of the Apocryphon employs this imagery several times (2.15; 6.1; 14.13). The metaphor is dependent on biblical usage (e.g. Isa 60:21; 61:3), and the same imagery is used to refer to other blameless individuals or groups during the Second Temple period. See S. Fujita, “The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period,” JSJ 7 (1976), 30-45; and Reeves, Jewish Lore, 100.
“their” being ambiguous in the text as it stands. This last mention of boughs is in connection with two sons, who can safely be identified as Ham and Japheth due to the following line (14.17), which contains the expression “one to the south of the Land, and one to the north of the Land.” This phrase must reflect the geographic distribution of the earth narrated in GenAp 16-17 and Jub 8:11-9:15, where Ham inhabits the southern portion of the earth, Japheth the northern portion, and Shem the center. In sum, the last shoot (i.e. Ham or Japheth) produces an offshoot (i.e. a son) which turns away from him, while some boughs, most likely of the two shoots or their offshoots, enter into the boughs of the first shoot (i.e. Shem).

5. Geographic allotments and boundaries play a role in the description of future interactions between the shoots, offshoots, and their boughs

In GenAp 14.21, shortly after the mention of some boughs entering the boughs of the first shoot, we find the phrase “in an allotment in Amania, next to Elam,” which may also be followed by a reference to the Great Sea. The following line appears to contain the additional phrase “exchanging his allotment for an allotment…” These lines show that the dream’s interpretation includes specific geographic details in close proximity to the explanation of the cedar tree’s various outgrowths, and reflects once again the author’s geographic concern outlined above. Notably, the region mentioned in line 21 (Amania/Amana) is included as part of Arpachshad’s allotment in GenAp 17.14 and Jub 9:4, which also lay “next to Elam.”
6. The dream culminates with a judgment scene

GenAp 15.10-11 relates that “the warrior coming from the South, the sickle in his hand and fire with him,” whom Noah saw in his dream, is none other than the Mighty Lord. The foregoing lines describe the apostasy and evil to precede the Lord’s coming, while the following lines elaborate the punishment to be imposed upon the wicked, including being thrown onto the fire, and bound with a chain. These punishments are probably inflicted by the four angels mentioned in 15.14, as in 1 En 10. The entire episode is rife with biblical and non-biblical imagery of eschatological judgment drawn from a variety of sources.

7. Noah begins dividing the earth between his sons shortly after awaking from his dream

Upon waking in 15.21, Noah blesses God and tells Shem everything about his dream. The column becomes almost completely unreadable at line 24, where Noah seemingly enjoins Shem to dedicate himself to serving God Most High. The next readable portion of text begins at GenAp 16.8-9, at which point we are part way through a geographic

---

261 It is not impossible that 15.10-12 refers to two figures: a great warrior coming from the south (15.10), and the Mighty Lord (15.11). According to this understanding, which has been argued in personal communication by E. Eshel, the one coming from the south could be considered an evil individual (one of the Seleucid or Ptolemaic kings, according to Eshel), and line 11 could be read with the Mighty Lord as the subject (preceded by a now lost verb) and the following “one who will come from the south of the land” as the object of the Lord’s presumed action. I find this explanation unlikely for a number of reasons: 1.) the Lord is expected to come in judgment, typically from the south, in Deut 33:1-3, Judg 5:4-5, Ps 18:5-20, 50:1-6, 68, Isa 42:13-25, 63:1-6, Zech 9:13-17, and 1 En 1:ff., 61:ff., 77:1; 2.) a number of these passages portray the Lord coming with fire, an element accompanying the great warrior of GenAp 15.10; 3.) the imagery of a sickle, or harvest, also associated with the great warrior in 15.10, is used to describe the Lord “reaping” judgment in Joel 4:11-16, Matt 13:30, 39, Mark 4:26-29, and Revelation 14:14-20; 4.) the syntax of the phrase in 15.11 “/uni05D9/uni05D3 /uni05D0/uni05D5/uni05D4 /uni05D0/uni05E2/uni05E8/uni05D0 /uni05DF/uni05D9/uni05DE/uni05D9 /uni05DF/uni05DE /uni05D4/uni05EA/uni05D9” seems most easily read as a further qualification of the preceding /uni05D0/uni05EA/uni05D5/uni05D1/uni05E8 /uni05D4/uni05E8/uni05DE; and 5.) the general context of wickedness and wrongdoing in these and surrounding lines would fit well with a divine judgment scene. The following mention of throwing rebels onto the fire (15.12) and four great angels (15.14) further support this idea. Together, these points argue strongly that the great warrior and Mighty Lord should be viewed as synonymous in these lines, thus presenting a climactic scene of divine judgment on human (and perhaps angelic) evildoers.
description of the lands allotted by Noah to Japheth. This description must have already
been underway for at least two or three lines, leaving approximately sixteen lines
unaccounted for between the end of Noah’s dream and the beginning of Japheth’s
allotment. When we consider that Noah is still instructing Shem in 15.24, and that there
must have been some introduction to the earth’s division (likely several lines; cf. Jub 8:10-
11), it becomes very likely that one episode (the dream) led into the other (the earth’s
division).

3.4.2. Some Associated Traditions

The previous survey explored only what may be gathered about Noah’s dream and
its interpretation by reading the extant text of the Genesis Apocryphon. There are, however,
some traditions preserved in roughly contemporaneous or later Jewish and Manichaean
works, which appear somehow related to these columns and may help us understand better
their obscure content.

3.4.2.1. The “Dream of the Garden”

First, there is an intriguing link between the Genesis Apocryphon and a tale that I
will call the Dream of the Garden; a dream preserved in several ancient corpora, including the
Dead Sea Scrolls. In his Books of Enoch, J. T. Milik observed that the so-called Book of Giants,
which he related to the Enochic corpus, had a healthy representation among the Dead Sea
 Scrolls.²⁶² He further ventured that these fragments contain an earlier form of the

²⁶² Milik, Books of Enoch, 57-58. For analysis of Milik and the Book of Giants at Qumran see the
studies of F. Garcia Martinez, “The Book of Giants,” Qumran and Apocalyptic (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill) 97-115;
Reeves, Jewish Lore; and L. T. Stuckenbruck, The Book of Giants from Qumran (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,
1997); and Reeves, Jewish Lore.
Manichaean Book of Giants. An abbreviated form of the Manichaean version, dubbed by Milik the Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael, later found its way into the rabbinic corpus via a certain Rav Yoseph.\(^{263}\) The Midrash is preserved in several medieval rabbinic sources, including Bereshit Rabbati, Yalqut Shimoni, and the Chronicles of Jerahme’el.\(^{264}\) While Milik’s proposed line of transmission has subsequently been questioned,\(^{265}\) it is clear that the Qumran, Manichean, and rabbinic sources all share some form of the Dream of the Garden.

The portion of the Midrash of Shemhazai and Azael of present interest is one of a pair of dreams had by Heyah and Aheyah, sons of the Watcher Shemhazai, and may be translated as follows:\(^{266}\)

ואוהד מחא ראוה בחולמה מרדה גודל משושנה בהיה אוהדה פרדה גורם כל פנימי עד אלוהים ממ
מנדרו הוהי מלךכסים באים הקרדומים ביניהם ויהי קוצרם אתחלולה עד שלם נשאר אלה אלוה
שלג ענופים


\(^{264}\) The texts are presented synoptically by Milik (Books of Enoch, 321-26 [325]), although caution has been urged by Greenfield and Stone (“The Books of Enoch,” 102) regarding the uncritical use of this collection. Jerahme’el’s version may now be found in the recent, critical edition by E. Yassif, The Book of Memory, that is The Chronicles of Jerahme’el (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 2001) 117 [Hebrew]. The text of Yalqut may also be found in A. Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch [ Beit ha-Midrash] (6 sections; Jerusalem: Wahrman Books [ספריอารม], 1967) 4:128. Some of these above texts are thought to depend on the now lost Midrash Abkir; cf. A Marmorstein, “Midrash ’Abkir,” Debir 1 (1923), 113-44; and Reeves, Jewish Lore, 86.

\(^{265}\) Greenfield and Stone, “The Books of Enoch,” 102; Stroumsa, Another Seed, 167; Reeves, Jewish Lore, 88.

\(^{266}\) This is the version found in Bereshit Rabbati (Milik, Books of Enoch, 325). The other versions are generally the same, but vary in details and wording.
And one of them saw in his dream a large and glorious garden, planted with various species of trees and various types of choice fruits. And angels were descending with axes in their hands, and were cutting down the trees until none remained except for one tree of three branches.

This dream is analogous in meaning to the previous dream, which is about a great stone surface covered with lines of writing. In this dream an angel comes with a knife and scrapes all lines off the stone save one, which contains four words. The common meaning of the dreams is then related to the brothers by their father, Shemhazai: 267

My sons, in the future the Holy One, blessed be He, is going to bring a flood on the world and cause it to be destroyed, and none will remain in it except one man and his three sons.

The man and his three sons are, of course, Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, as one version of the Midrash specifies. 268 The fragmentary Manichaean version of the dream states that one of the giants (Nərîmān) 269 “saw (in his sleep) a gar[den full of] trees in rows. Two hundred … came out, the trees…” 270 Enoch explains that these represent the Egregoroi, or

---

267 Milik, Books of Enoch, 326.

268 See the excerpt from Yalqut (or Midrash Abkir) in Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrasch, 4:128.

269 Who equates to Hayah in the Qumran Book of Giants. See Reeves, Jewish Lore, 94.

270 This is found in the Middle Persian Kawān. For the text (see W. B. Henning, “The Book of Giants,” Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 11 (1943) 52-74 [57, 60; Fragment j 39-41]. For a rich, creative commentary on the Qumran and Manichaean dreams cf. Reeves, Jewish Lore, 95-102.
Shortly after this, the same fragment contains the isolated verb “pulled out,” or “uprooted,” which may refer to the destruction of these trees, as in the rabbinic Midrash.

The discovery of a *Book of Giants* among the Dead Sea Scrolls supported the earlier suspicion that the Manichaean *Book of Giants* is somehow related to 1 Enoch. Focusing only on the Dream of the Garden, we find several pertinent fragments:

4QEnGiants\(^{b}\) ar (4Q530), fragments 2ii + 6 + 7i + 8, lines 3-6

Then the two of them (i.e. Hahyah and Mahavai) dreamt dreams, and the sleep of their eyes fled from them. And [they] rose up, opened their eyes, and came to [Sh’mihazah, their father(?). Then they told him their dreams in the assembly of [their] compatriots, the Nephilin[… …] in my dream I was seeing this very night…

---


273 Aramaic transcriptions are those of Puech, DJD XXXI, 28, although I do not subscribe to all of his reconstructions. Puech gives reference to the earlier editions of Milik, Beyer, and Stuckenbruck (whose notes are particularly useful). Translations are my own (ellipses do not necessary reflect the correct spacing).

274 There is presumably a case of dittography here, which I have not included. Cf. Puech, DJD XXI, 28, 33.

275 The *vav* is superscripted (an apparent scribal correction) in the manuscript.
A following fragment (8, lines 7-8) from the same scroll confirms that one of the dreams concerns a garden scene and the trees in it:

... וַהֲזָה [זֹהֶז]...
עד וְלְשֵׁנָּה יָד נֶר מִן...
...
בַּכָּל מְאֹד נוֹרָה הָדָק בַּבָּל

...gardeners, and they were watering [every tree in this garden... gigantic roots went up from their trunk [... I was [watching] until tongues of fire from [... ]... in all the waters, and the fire burned in all...

Another manuscript, 6Q8, appears related to these Cave 4 fragments. Fragment 1 depicts Mahavai fearfully recounting for his brother Hahyah something that had been shown to him, presumably in a vision. In fragment 2 we find the phrases “its three shoots” (כְּלָל שְׂרֻשֵּׂיה), “I was [watching] until they came” (זָהָה [זָהָה]), and “this garden, all of it” (פְּרוֹדֵסָה דָּוָם כְּלָל) on successive lines. Other fragments, clearly related to these lines, preserve the expressions “all gardeners” (כְּלֵנִי) and “and he cut” (פָּסֵל). While there is some disagreement whether the texts from caves 4 and 6 represent variant versions of the dream, as proposed by Beyer and Stuckenbruck, or two copies of the very same text, as Puech reconstructs, it is clear that both include a garden, trees, gardeners, shoots, and...
are visionary in nature. There is no reason to doubt, therefore, that both texts refer to the same basic dream, even if they represent two distinct versions of it.

Turning to the Genesis Apocryphon, several correlations with the *Dream of the Garden* are evident. Both accounts concern the fate of trees in general, which are symbolic representations of divine or human beings. Both present Noah, who was mistaken as semi-divine by his father at birth, as a tree with three shoots equating to three sons. In all versions other trees are destroyed by divine means, and this typically involves “cutting.” Finally, the destruction of the earth and its inhabitants by the Flood is the general topic of each dream. It is clear that these texts all draw on a flexible but common tradition – a parable of sorts – wherein Noah and his sons constitute the only “tree” in the garden to survive the destructive cutting, burning, and demolition (i.e. the Flood) inflicted by the Lord’s agents. In all of these works the parable is given to the recipient by way of a symbolic dream before the Flood occurs, even if its message held a radically different significance for Noah versus Shemhazai’s two sons.

The above similarities, however, should be viewed alongside some important differences. For instance, in the Genesis Apocryphon: 1.) it is Noah, not a giant, who receives the dream; 2.) specific trees are singled out and explained rather than referred to collectively; 3.) the three shoots of Noah’s tree are extended to offshoots and branches; and 4.) instead of simply ending with the Flood, Noah’s dream takes us well beyond it, to the judgment of sinners by the Mighty Lord. Thus, while the Genesis Apocryphon contains imagery which bears a family resemblance to the *Dream of the Garden*, here that imagery is

---

280 It is interesting, however, that Noah is mistaken by Lamech as a giant in the early columns of the scroll. Noah’s close connection to the Watchers and Giants in this genre of Aramaic literature (inherited by the Essenes of Qumran) is an area deserving of further study.
couched in a work focused largely on the progeny of Noah until the end of time, rather than only on the Flood and related plights of Hahyah and Mahavai.

3.4.2.2. “Cursed be Canaan”

The second connection concerns the book of Jubilees. Although the parallel of GenAp 16-17 and Jub 8:11-9:15 has already been touched on, and will be dealt with at length in the following chapter, a close examination of GenAp 14 reveals that the connection with Jubilees may go deeper than simply the sharing of geographic data. It appears that the connection also extends to the ideological and theological outlook underlying the earth’s division. Jub 10:27-36 relates the dispersion of Noah’s sons to their previously allotted inheritances following the Tower of Babel episode. Focusing largely on Ham and his sons we hear that, while traveling to his proper heritage in the southwestern extremity of the earth (somewhere around ancient Mauretania), Canaan sees the beauty of the area “from Lebanon to the stream of Egypt,” and decides to settle there despite the fact that it is given to Arpachshad in Jub 9:4. Appalled at this breach of their solemn oath before the Lord and Noah (cf. Jub 9:14-15), Ham and his other sons beg Canaan to rethink his rash decision and avoid a terrible curse. Undeterred, Canaan and his sons stay put, and so doom their progeny to pay the heavy price of such an act. This little vignette is an exegetical windfall for the author of Jubilees, simultaneously explaining how a portion rightfully belonging to Shem could be called the “Land of Canaan” in the Torah, validating the curse being given to Canaan instead of Ham after Noah’s drunken episode in Genesis 9:25-27, and providing Shem’s descendants pre-approval for the eventual re-conquest of this region under the command of Joshua son of Nun. Following Canaan’s infraction we read of another glitch in the dispersion of Noah’s sons, in which Madai, son of Japheth, also settles in a region
belonging to Shem. Madai, however, petitions his kin and receives the proper permission for his move, thereby avoiding a curse. As with Canaan, one purpose of this story is etiological, explaining why there is an area named Mediqin (Media) within Shem’s allotment.

Turning to the section concerning the cedar shoots in GenAp 14, we read the following phrases:

“As for the fact that you saw the offshoot of the last shoot, which… (14.15)

…a few of their boughs entering into the midst of the boughs of the first one, (concerns) two sons… …one to the south of the Land and one to the north of the Land. As for the fact that you saw a few of their boughs entering into the boughs of the first one… …of this shoot were settling in his land and all the coastlands… …to the Great Sea… (14.16-17)

…exchanging his allotment for an allotment… (14.22)

These statements gain significance when read alongside Jub 10. As proposed above, “the offshoot of the last shoot” in line 15 must be a son of either Ham or Japheth, assuming that “the first shoot” is Shem. The phrase “settling in the Land and the coastlands” helps us narrow the identity of this offshoot to Canaan, since in Jub 10:29 we read that Canaan and his sons illegally settled “in the land of Lebanon…and on the seacoast.” The last shoot, therefore, appears to be Ham, with the few boughs “entering into the boughs of the first one” being the symbolic representation of Canaan and his sons entering the region belonging to Shem’s progeny. If so, “the boughs of the first one” must refer to Arpachshad and his family. It is even possible that the exchange of allotments found in line 22 refers to Madai’s move into Shem’s territory, though this is far less certain. These similarities suggest
that Genesis Apocryphon shares Jubilees’ concern for defending Israel’s claim to the land called Canaan in the Pentateuch. According to both texts, the eventual conquest of this land by the Israelites merely restored to Shem’s descendants what was rightfully theirs from the beginning, at the same time providing Canaan his just desserts.

As with the Dream of the Garden, however, this parallel is only partial. While Jubilees first mentions this episode after the earth has been divided and the confusion at Babel, the Genesis Apocryphon places it before the division, and in the context of a divinely inspired dream. By drawing on both the Dream of the Garden and Jub 10 one is able to deduce that at least a part of Noah’s dream in GenAp 13-15 concerns the patriarch and his offspring, symbolized by trees and their various parts, and that the dream likely addresses (prophetically) Canaan illegally settling in the inherited lands of Arpachshad.

3.4.3. The Setting and Import of the Dream in the Genesis Apocryphon

A final area of interest is the setting and function of the dream-vision, especially as they relate to the book of Genesis. By the time the dream begins in GenAp 13.7 it appears that the Flood is being recounted to Noah (13.7-12). The last sure phrase preceding this is found in 12.19, where we read “And I lay down upon my bed, and the wine […]” (שהבת על המ鞫), which follows the celebration of Noah’s vineyard harvest in the foregoing lines (12.13-18). This parallels the much shorter account of Gen 9:20-21, where we read of Noah planting a vineyard, pressing wine from its produce, and then lying

---


282 Cf. the similar language in Dan 7:1.
down drunk and uncovered inside his tent. In the ensuing verses of Genesis Ham enters, sees Noah’s nakedness, and proceeds to tell his two brothers outside. The episode culminates in Noah cursing Ham’s son Canaan, but blessing Shem and Japheth. This brief story contains a number of interpretative perplexities. First, how did Noah “know what his youngest son had done to him” if he was asleep (Gen 9:24), and what, precisely, had Ham “done”? Further, how is it that Noah goes on to foretell what will happen to his sons at a future time? Perhaps most perplexing, why does Noah curse Ham’s son Canaan for what appears to be an offense by Ham himself? Such difficulties have led modern biblical critics to speculate about the muddle of various sources and textual corruptions that could have produced such confusion, or to hypothesize that something has erstwhile dropped out of an earlier, more coherent version of the story. Ancient commentators, unsurprisingly, saw things quite differently. For them, any exegetical difficulty implied a shortcoming on the part of the reader, not the text. Hence, the wise interpreter discerned that Noah was able to forecast his sons’ future dealings through the gift of prophecy, and that there must be perfectly reasonable explanations for what happened inside the tent, or why Canaan was cursed rather than Ham.

283 E.g. Skinner, Genesis, 181-87. Cf. W. Brueggemann, Genesis: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Interpretation; Atlanta, GA: John Knox, 1982) 90-91. Brueggemann suggests that, because of the complicated transmission process of this passage, we are no longer able to know “what was intended by the shaping of this text” (91).

284 E.g. N. M. Sarna, Genesis (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1989) 63-64, 66.

The lines following GenAp 12.19 (which concerns Noah falling asleep) are very fragmentary, but it appears that the present topic of Noah’s narration continues until a *vacat* at 12.25. The approximately fifteen lines between this *vacat* and our first glimpses of Noah’s dream in 13.7 almost certainly contain the earliest part of the vision, which is now almost entirely lost. From this we may gather that Noah’s wine-induced sleep was followed closely by the beginning of the dreams, and that his tent-enveloped slumber provides the immediate context for the following columns.

Noah’s reception of a dream during his sleep is not unique among ancient exegetical treatments of Genesis, but it is very rare. The only other sure instance of this motif occurs in the Palestinian Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, where Gen 9:24 reads, "And Noah awoke from his wine, and he knew through the narration of a dream what his son Ham had done to him". Less certain is a Greek variant found in the same verse of some LXX manuscripts. These witnesses replaced the last word of the phrase "eγνένησεν δὲ Ναὸς στῆνα τοῦ οἴνου" ("And Noah awoke from the wine"), which depends on the Hebrew יִשָּׂרָאֵל ("his wine"), with the words "υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.

These words could simply mean “his sleep,” which would make perfectly good sense in this setting, or it may carry the secondary meaning “his dream.” In this case, we would have

---

286 Judging by isolated words in GenAp 12.21-22, it is possible that the vision begins even before the *vacat*, shortly after Noah lay down on his bed.


288 Which include Origen in the Greek; see *The Old Testament in Greek, Volume I. The Octateuch, Part I. Genesis* (ed. A. E. Brooke and N. McLean; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1906) 22.

289 The first possibility strikes me as the more likely, since the standard Greek word for dream would be ονειδος. See H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (9th ed. with revised supplement; Oxford: Oxford University, 1996) 122.
another rare example of the tradition found in Pseudo-Jonathan and the Genesis Apocryphon. The Apocryphon, however, is unique in relating the contents of the dream. In doing so, its author apparently breaks from the overwhelmingly dominant reading of these verses, for the events of Gen 9:20-24 have widely been interpreted by Jews and Christians to reflect very poorly on the otherwise admirable Noah.\(^{290}\) A number of contemporary scholars refer to the incident as the “sin of Noah,” despite any explicit statement to this effect in the text itself.\(^{291}\) John Calvin sums up the traditional reading of these verses in his commentary on Genesis:

> The holy patriarch, though he had hitherto been a rare example of frugality and temperance, losing all self-possession, did, in a base and shameful manner, prostrate himself naked on the ground, so as to become a laughing-stock to all… God brands him with an eternal mark of disgrace.\(^{292}\)

In contrast, the dream of GenAp 13-15 is divinely inspired and involves the transmission of otherworldly knowledge, suggesting that this episode is viewed by our author in a positive light. The author of the Apocryphon, therefore, did not understand the incident in the typical negative way, but rather crafted a decidedly positive portrayal of Noah – a portrayal that would cohere with the ultra-righteous, idealized characterization of the

\(^{290}\) A representative example is found in Bereshit Rabhah 36:4 (Theodor-Albeck): רָאָשָׁה שָׁלוֹם מִמְּדוֹת הָשָּׁתְרָה הַתָּחוּם, אָמְרָה לְיִחְיָא בְּאָד בְּיוֹם שָׁתְוָה בְּיוֹם שָׁתְוָה. Also see the commentaries of Rashi or Ibn-Ezra on this passage, and b. Sanh. 70a, 108a.


\(^{292}\) Jean Calvin, Commentaries on the First Book of Moses Called Genesis (Vol. 1; trans. Rev. J. King; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948) 300-301. What Calvin saw as a moral breakdown on Noah’s part some modern scholars have assigned to dichotomous sources (cf. Skinner, Genesis, 181-82).
patriarch throughout the rest of the scroll. Although in the minority, other ancient and modern commentators have also made cases for Gen 9:20-24 reflecting neutrally, or even positively, on Noah. These have typically shifted all shameful and sinful behavior to Ham and Canaan. Several ancient rewritings of Genesis appear to have handled these issues by simply leaving the events out of their compositions altogether.

The motive for wishing to reinforce Noah’s righteous image is not difficult to discern. There are numerous indications that during the third to second centuries B.C.E. Noah enjoyed a flurry of interest among certain Jewish groups, perhaps because of his relevance for those who adopted an apocalyptic worldview and felt that they too lived

---

293 An ancient example of this is Philo of Alexandria, who employs a Greco-Roman distinction between various types of drunkenness to argue that righteous Noah was “drunk” (μεθη) in a positive, or “sober” (ψυχαλιός) way, befitting of those who are extremely wise. Interestingly, this type of drunkenness could lead to the ideal state in which to receive divine oracles; a topic deserving of further exploration in connection with Noah’s dream in Apocryphon. See Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis 1.68, 73 (Marcus; LCL); and On Planting 139-177 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL). On the Hellenistic theme of “sober drunkenness” in Philo and other sources cf. H. Lewy, Sōbria Ebrietās: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der antiken Mystik (Beihefte zur ZNW, 9; Giessen: Töpelmann 1929); and S. Brock, “Sōbria Ebrietās According to some Syriac Texts,” ARI 17 (2005) 181-95. For a modern, positive view of the story, see W. E. Brown, “Noah: Sot or Saint? Genesis 9:20-27,” The Way of Wisdom: Essays in Honor of Bruce K. Waltke (ed. J. I. Packer and S. K. Sonderland; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000) 36-60. Cassuto seems to view Noah’s act as neutral, placing the emphasis on Ham’s transgression and warning that “we must not read into the Pentateuchal narrative more than it actually states, taking the words at their face value.” U. Cassuto, A Commentary on the Book of Genesis: From Noah to Abraham, (Vol. 2; trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1964) 152.

294 Yet others hold an intermediate position, arguing that what Noah did was wrong, but that he was not culpable for his sin since he was the first to drink wine. See N. Koltun-Fromm, “Aphrahat and the Rabbis on Noah’s Righteousness in Light of the Jewish-Christian Polemic,” The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation (ed. J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay; Traditio Exegetica Graeca 5; Leuven: Peeters, 1997) 57-71. Koltun-Fromm compares this Christian view with the more negative rabbinic interpretation. The same apologetic is found Ephrem; see L. Van Rompay, “Antiochene Biblical Interpretation: Greek and Syriac,” The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation, 112-13. The view was defended by Saint John Chrysostom in his Homilies on Genesis, 18-45 (The Fathers of the Church, 82; Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1990) 202-205; and much more recently by G. A. F. Knight, Theology in Pictures: A Commentary on Genesis, Chapters One to Eleven (Edinburgh: The Handsel Press, 1981) 105; and N. Sarna, Genesis, 65.

295 E.g. Pseudo Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Bibliarum, Sefer ha-Yashar, and the Samaritan Asatir.

amidst a hopelessly wicked generation. While it appears that concentration on Noah eventually waned, possibly due to the growing attention received by Enoch, it is clear that both patriarchs were depicted as supreme paradigms of righteousness. Admirers of these men, so beloved by God, were apparently not interested in buoying their own faith by pondering the common depravity shared by these upright individuals. Rather, they were attracted to the idea of super-human heroes – peerless benchmarks against which the corruption of their own generation could be measured. The Genesis Apocryphon must be cited as the primary example for such an exalted view of Noah, and provides good grounds for its positive reading of Noah’s drunkenness. Yet the questions remain, “why place an apocalyptic vision here, and what does this move accomplish?”

3.4.3.1. יתנות. “And it was revealed”

To find the reason why Noah received a vision during his sleep one need look no further than the wording of Gen 9:21, which reads יתנות ו斝ו מים ויאמר יתנות יתנות באוהל אהל הרעה, “Having drunk of the wine he became inebriated, and was uncovered inside his tent.” Standard translations do not always reflect the ambiguity of the word יתנות, which in this context literally means “he/it was uncovered/revealed.” Almost all early interpretations and translations of this verse take יתנות to refer to Noah lying exposed – i.e. physically naked – within his tent. This understanding is supported by the next verse, which states that “Ham,

---


the father of Canaan, saw the nakedness of his father (הָאָבָן נַעֲרָה). The LXX uses a passive, aorist form of the verb γνωμένος (γνωμένος) to translate הָאָבָן נַעֲרָה, more strongly implying the idea of nudity. Targums Onqelos and Neofiti preserved the ambiguity of Genesis by translating יָדָד as נְאַתָּנֵל יָדָד. Yet others, such as Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, leave no room for doubt about Noah’s state, choosing the word אֲוָדַעַת (‘he stripped himself naked’) instead. Some English translations join Pseudo-Jonathan in making explicit what Genesis implies, writing that Noah “became drunk and lay naked inside his tent.”

Despite this typical, unflattering reception of Noah in Gen 9:21, it is important to note that the word יָדָד represents an anomalous morphology of the verb נַעֲרָה in the Hebrew Bible. It is the only instance of נַעֲרָה in the hitpa’el conjugation, save one, disputed occurrence in Proverbs 18:2. The latter verse has itself proven knotty for commentators, declaring that

299 For a survey of the traditional Jewish and Christian interpretations of these verses see Bergsma and Hahn, “Noah’s Nakedness and the Curse on Canaan (Genesis 9:20-27).” The authors point to the well documented biblical connection between the verbal root רעָה, יָדָד, and the noun נַעֲרָה, which together refer to an act (usually unauthorized) of sexual intercourse. It is apparently due to this combination that some Jewish and Christian commentators understood Ham’s transgression to entail a homosexual assault on his father. Also see M. Vervenne, “What Shall We Do with the Drunken Sailor? A Critical Reexamination of Genesis 9.20-27,” JSET 68 (1995) 33-55 [esp. 33-41].

300 The Vulgate makes Noah’s condition even less ambiguous, translating “bibensque vinum inebriatus est, et nudatus in tabernaculo suo.” See the remarks of Vervenne, “What Shall We Do with the Drunken Sailor?” 46.

301 So too the Peshitta, מְעַרְבָּה. The marginalia noted in Diez Macho’s edition of Neofiti are of interest here, making sure the reader is aware of the negative connotations of Noah’s actions. Drawing on the Yerushalmi, we first read אֲוָדַעַת בֵּית הָאָב וְשָׁבַעָה אֲוָדַעַת בֵּית אָבָנוֹ (‘And he stretched himself out inside the tents of the Syrians, and was despised inside the tents.’) After this there is an alternative reading for יָדָד – אֲוָדָד (“And he relaxed”) – which seems, in contrast, an attempt to downplay any possibility of nakedness or wrongdoing on Noah’s part. A. Diez Macho, Neophyti I: Targum Palestinense MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana: Tomo I Génesis (Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968) 51. Rashi, in his Metsudab on Genesis, questions the wisdom of Noah planting grapes as the first crop, foreshadowing his disapproval of the following actions of Gen 9:21-22.

302 Clarke, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch, 10.

303 New American Bible and New Living Translation (emphasis mine).
“the fool takes no delight in understanding, but rather in the הִנְבָּאָה of his heart.”

Whatever the exact meaning of הִנְבָּאָה, it is clear that it has nothing at all to do with physical nakedness, but rather with the act of revealing or uncovering one’s thoughts or intentions.

While the hitpa‘el of נָלַח in Gen 9:21 logically suggests a reflexive or passive meaning of “uncover” or “reveal,” rabbinic commentators took the unexpected morphology to intimate a connection to a second meaning of נָלַח, “to go into exile”:

רָבִּי יְהדָעָה רָבִּי סִימוֹן, וְרָב מָנוֹן, בְּעֵזֶרְךָ רָבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל הַבָּנוֹן, אֲחֵזָה נָלַח רָבִּי יִיתִחָק: "נָלַח הֵיהוּ רְבּוֹלֵךְ. נָלַח הֲוֶה, כִּפְרֵעַ שָׂאָלְךָ רָבִּי שְׁמוּאֵל לָבָּא וְלָבָּא אִלֵּךְ וְלָבָּא לְהוֹלֹךְ לָבָּא (נָלַח) לְךָ וּלָבָּא לְהוֹלֹךְ לְתַלָּאָתָךְ..." 306

Contrary to the interpretations surveyed above, the author of the Apocryphon appears to have neither taken Noah as the subject of נָלַח (going back to 9:20a), nor connected it with Noah’s nakedness in 9:22. Rather, he seemingly read נָלַח in reference to an unstated, but implied, subject – a revelatory vision received by Noah. A translation to accompany this understanding might be, “Having drunk of the wine he became inebriated, and it [i.e. a vision] was revealed inside of his tent.”


305 Some English translations for the second strophe of this verse have been, “but only that his heart may reveal itself.” (American Standard); “but only in revealing his own mind” (New American Standard); “but that his heart may discover itself.” (King James); “but rather in displaying what he thinks.” (New American Bible); “but delights in airing his own opinions.” (New International).

While such a reading may at first appear fanciful, there are numerous indicators that the root נלע in general, and the hitpa‘el conjugation more specifically, carried heavy connotations of divine communication and visionary experience. In the Hebrew Bible the common Hebrew idiom “to uncover the ears” (ונלע נלע) often refers to a matter revealed to humans by the Lord, and more generally entails the relation of privileged information between two parties. The use of this idiom in Job 33:16 is worthy of full citation:

In a dream, a vision of the night, when deep sleep falls upon people as they slumber in bed; then he [God] opens people’s ears.

In Amos 3:7 the Lord is depicted as revealing (ונלע) his plan, or secret ( novembre), to the prophets. Balaam experiences an “unveiling of the eyes” (ונלע וינים), allowing him to “see what the Almighty sees” (Num 24:4, 16; cf. Num 22:31), and a matter (ображен) is revealed (ונלע) to Daniel in Dan 10:1. Gen 35:7 recounts how God had revealed himself (ונלע אליהם) to Jacob at Luz. Isaiah used the verb in a similar way, choosing it to speak of the Lord revealing himself. Finally, the Psalmist entreats God to “open my eyes” (ונלע וינים), that he might see wonders (ेलא). Some of these uses of the root נלע, especially the opening of the ears or eyes to God’s hidden knowledge (נתורה) and mysteries

---

307 Cf. “ונלע” in A. Even-Shoshan, New Concordance to the Tanakh (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sepher, 1980). The Lord “opens the ears” in 1 Sam 9:15; 2 Sam 7:27; 1 Chr 17:25; and Job 36:10, 15 (also see 1 Sam 3:21). Sharing of information between human parties is found in 1 Sam 20:2, 12-13; 22:8, 17; and Ruth 4:4.

308 Humans who reveal secrets are censured in Proverbs using the same phraseology (11:13, 20:19, 25:9).

(ורים), are carried into the Hebrew sectarian writings from Qumran – most notably CD, 1QS, 1QH, and the instruction texts.\(^{310}\) In fact, it appears that these particular idioms became a dominant way of talking about the specially revealed knowledge granted to the sect.\(^{311}\)

Biblical Aramaic uses this meaning of הָנִּלָּה/נַלָּה), although not in the hitpe’al, solely to speak about revelation of the divine “mysteries” (יוֹרֵח), a “deep thing” (עמיְכָה), and a “hidden matter” (מעְטַרְתָּה).\(^{312}\) It is significant that these revealed subjects come to Daniel by way of a symbolic dream and a vision (רָפָא), similar in genre to that found in GenAp 13-15. Mysteries are also mentioned several times in connection with Noah’s various dream-visions in the Apocryphon (e.g. 5.21, 25; 6.12; and 14.9).

The most compelling evidence, however, comes from Qumran Aramaic, our nearest point of comparison for the Apocryphon. In the 4QEnoch fragments, a pa’el infinitive construct form of נַלָּה is found in the phrase כלָוָהוֹן שֶׁרִי נַלָּה רוֹזֶנֶהוֹת תַּלְשֵׁהוֹת, “all of them began to reveal mysteries to their wives” (= 1 En 8:3).\(^{313}\) Furthermore (and unlike Biblical or Qumran Hebrew), the Aramaic lexicon of the Dead Sea Scrolls preserves a number of instances of נַלָּה in the hitpe’al conjugation. For the group(s) writing this corpus of

---

\(^{310}\) For all instances of these idioms see M. G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: Volume One* (2 parts; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 1:178-79. Some of the more striking examples are: CD 2:14-15, 3:13, 15:13; 1QS 5:9, 8:16; 1QpHab 11:1; 1QH 9:21, 26:1; 2 ii 8; 1Q26 1:4; 4Q175 11; 4Q268 1:7; 4Q270 2 i 13; 4Q299 8:6; 4Q416 2 ii 18; 4Q418 123 ii 4, 184:2; 4Q427 7 i 19. The biblical idiom of “uncovering the nakedness” is not as prevalent in the non-biblical scrolls (CD 15:13; 4Q251 17:6; cf. 11Q19 66:12-13).

\(^{311}\) The hitpa’el of נַלָּה is not present in the Qumran Hebrew lexicon.

\(^{312}\) Dan 2:19, 22, 28, 29, 30, 47 bis. The pe’al form is used for both active and passive verbs. The haph’el conjugation is used to connote the alternative meaning “to exile.”

\(^{313}\) The phrase in its entirety must be reconstructed from two fragments belonging to different manuscripts of 4QEnoch, both of which recount the transgression of the Watchers (cf. 1 En 8). 4Q202 (4QEn’h ar) 1 iii 5 contains the initial words כלָוָהוֹן שֶׁרִי נַלָּה, while 4Q201 (4QEn’ ar) 1 iv 5 preserves the following נַלָּה רוֹזֶנֶהוֹת. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 189, n. i.
literature it is evident that this particular form was used in a passive, not reflexive, sense, specifically denoting divine revelation. In 4Q212 (4QEn⁰), אתנה is used in the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En 92:14) to describe the revelation of the “righteous law” to all the people of the earth.⁴¹⁴ Both אתנה and אתנה are found in 4Q536 (4QBirth of Noah⁰ ar) to speak of “luminaries” (נשמות הנдей) and “mysteries” (נודות) being revealed to the “Elect of God,” which may or may not refer to Noah.⁴¹⁵ Whoever the subject, the occurrence of the verbs in this text is significant, since its general topic is the relation of privileged, divine knowledge to an individual.⁴¹⁶ אתנה is found two more times in another copy of this text, 4Q534, although with very little surrounding context.⁴¹⁷ Again, however, it is clear that the general context of the scroll deals with divine revelation and instruction. The uncertain reading אתנה in 4Q546 (4QVisions of Amram⁴ ar) would also fit this trend, falling within a divine visitation granted to Amram.⁴¹⁸ Finally, the symbolic, visionary text 4Q541 (4QApocryphon of Levi⁵ (?) ar) may also employ two non-hitpe’al forms of אתנה in reference to divine secrets.⁴¹⁹ From the information presently available, therefore, it appears that the root אתנה in Qumran Aramaic was used exclusively to refer to divinely revealed wisdom and secrets.⁴²⁰

---

⁴¹⁴ Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 434, 437 n. 14a, 449-50. He suggests (450) that the righteous law is brought about by human agency, but this does not diminish the fact that proper understanding of the law was originally imparted from the divine realm.


⁴¹⁶ Cf. Chapter 1, 43-46.

⁴¹⁷ 4Q534 1 i 12, 3:1. Puech, DJD XXXI, 133, 143, and 149. The spellings of these two occurrences are less certain. They read אתנה and אתנה respectively.


⁴¹⁹ 4Q541 7:1, 24 ii 3. The readings are אתנה (if the transcription of Puech is accepted) and אתנה respectively. Puech, DJD XXXI, 239-40, 252-54.

⁴²⁰ An additional, corroborating occurrence is found in 11Q10 (11QTargum of Job) 27:3-4. This, however, is a reflection of the underlying Hebrew of Job 36:10.
Moreover, the *hitpe’al* form denoted such information *being* revealed to someone in the passive sense.

In light of the lexical usage of יִנָּה חֲלָשׁ לָכְךָ כְּפֹריָה sketched above, it is wholly plausible that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon understood יִנָּה in Gen 9:21 to entail divine revelation, thereby prompting him to insert Noah’s symbolic dream-vision at this point in his rewritten account. When this possibility is placed alongside our limited knowledge of the dream’s contents, the full import of this insertion can be tentatively appreciated. First, the dream acts to authorize the following division of the earth by Noah. By including within the dream a prescient account of the activity of Noah’s progeny in reference to their allotted geographic portions, the boundaries are implicated in the divine plan, or mystery. Hence, what Jubilees accomplishes with the heavenly “book” (Jub 8:11-12), the Genesis Apocryphon may achieve through a divinely inspired dream-vision – both being authoritative sources of heavenly wisdom, and stamps of divine authority. This difference in approach would not be surprising, since it reflects a broader discrepancy in attitude between Jubilees and the Apocryphon regarding dreams.

Second, the righteous image of Noah is upheld. By reading יִנָּה in reference to a vision any inference of wrongdoing on Noah’s part is neutralized, for it would be unthinkable that Noah both sinned and partook of the divine mysteries at the same time. In this way, any blame inherent in Gen 9 would be shifted to Ham.

Third, by placing a dream-vision here the author of the Apocryphon solves several notorious interpretative conundra related to Gen 9:20-27. Questions about how Noah “knew” (יָדַע) what his youngest son had done upon waking, why he spoke in terms of the

---

321 Ephrem dealt with this puzzling statement by proposing that “Noah had been both sleeping and awake. He was sleeping in that he had not perceived his nakedness, but awake in that he had been aware of
future during his curse and blessings, and why he cursed Canaan rather than Ham, could all be answered with the Apocryphon’s vision. Noah was able to curse and bless his sons in futuristic terms because he had just been told what was to happen in his dream.

Furthermore, it would be natural for Noah to curse Canaan rather than Ham upon waking, since he had just foreseen the grave transgression that this grandson would commit in the future by settling in a land rightfully apportioned to one of Shem’s offspring. This line of reasoning finds a partial parallel in some later Syrian Christian exegetes, who understood Noah’s statements to be prophetic of what would take place in the future.  

3.4.4. Summary

To summarize, it seems likely that the symbolic dream given to Noah in GenAp 13-15 was inserted by the author into the succinct plot of Gen 9:20-27 for a number of reasons. These include the authorization of Noah’s subsequent division of the earth, a defense of Noah’s righteous image, and an explanation of why Noah cursed Canaan rather than Ham after waking from his sleep. The contents of the dream included an apocalyptic recitation and foretelling of history, which focused at certain points on Noah and his sons as represented by trees, shoots, branches, etc. This aspect of the dream is paralleled in other sources containing The Dream of the Garden. One topic of the vision appears to be the usurpation of Arpachshad’s allotted portion by Canaan, which finds a thematic parallel in Jub 10:27-36. A key difference between these two texts, however, is their conflicting placement of this information. In the Apocryphon it is revealed to Noah (and the reader)


322 See, e.g., the commentary on Genesis, excerpting a number of early Syrian fathers, published by A. Levene, The Early Syrian Fathers on Genesis (London: Taylor's Foreign Press, 1951) 52, 198.
before his curse, thereby putting Canaan’s transgression and Noah’s curse in a causative and sequential relationship. In Jubilees, notification of Canaan’s disobedience occurs well after Noah’s curse and, therefore, the two are not related in quite the same way. While the dream may have served a number of helpful purposes for the author of the Apocryphon, it is likely that the most imminent reason for the vision’s placement at this point in the story may be found in the word בִּרְחָה of Gen 9:21. It is on this portentous note that we enter into the next major portion of the Apocryphon, and the most direct parallel with the Book of Jubilees – Noah’s division of the habitable earth.
CHAPTER 4
A COMPARATIVE COMMENTARY ON THE EARTH’S DIVISION IN
JUBILEES 8:11-9:15 AND GENESIS APOCRYPHON 16-17

The central chapter of this section is dedicated to a thorough comparison of the division of the earth into geographic districts for Noah’s sons and grandsons in the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees. These passages provide the most direct and extensive parallel between the two works, and may serve as an important case study against which to measure previous and subsequent comparisons. My most immediate goal in this chapter is to further our understanding, and perhaps dating, of the Genesis Apocryphon. However, in order to achieve this it has been necessary to spend significant time investigating both texts. This has resulted in a detailed commentary of the relevant section of Jubilees followed by a similar treatment of the Genesis Apocryphon.

The comparison has led to the conclusion that the two works differ in a number of significant details, while still bearing a remarkable affinity to one another in overall design and perspective – i.e. the way in which they rewrite the Table of Nations of Gen 10. This combination most plausibly suggests that the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees depended upon a common cartographic source, or less plausibly that one author used the other from memory or an intermediate written source. If one chooses to view their relationship as one of direct dependence, then it seems preferable to infer that Jubilees borrowed from the Genesis Apocryphon.
A detailed geographic discussion of lands and toponyms not naturally familiar to most readers easily lends itself to confusion and disinterest. For this reason, a hypothetical, reconstructed map, drawn with the present passages in mind, has been included near the beginning of this chapter.\(^{323}\) This is accompanied by other, previous attempts to graphically represent the map underlying Jubilees.

Map 3: Reconstruction of Jubilees’ World Map according to Gustav Hölscher\(^{324}\)

---

\(^{323}\) It must be kept in mind that any such map is a fixed piece of interpretation, as the following discussion should make clear. Many parts of my map, therefore, remain less certain than they may appear. It is important to view the map alongside the (often qualifying) arguments accompanying it in this chapter.

Map 4: Reconstruction of Jubilees’ World Map according to Michel Testuz\textsuperscript{325}

Map 5: One Reconstruction of Jubilees’ World Map according to Philip Alexander\textsuperscript{326}

Map 6: Another Reconstruction of Jubilees’ World Map according to Philip Alexander327

Map 7: Reconstruction of Jubilees’ World Map according to Francis Schmidt328

326 From Alexander, “Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish),” ABD 2.982.

4.1. Jubilees 8:11-9:15

The apportionment of the earth in Jubilees has been discussed often, but many nagging questions remain regarding the account’s overall structure and a number of its details. Before a proper comparison can be made with the Genesis Apocryphon, therefore, it is necessary to undertake a detailed analysis of this passage. The account may be divided into two segments: 1.) Noah’s division of the earth into three parts between his sons; 2.) the subsequent division of each son’s apportionment between his own sons (i.e. Noah’s grandsons). The inheritance of each son or grandson is comprised of a report of that apportionment’s borders or general placement in relation to those portions surrounding it, with some allotments garnering far more attention than others. In describing the allotments the author utilizes a limited set of geographic *topoi* as reference points.

A perusal of previous attempts to grapple with Jubilees 8:11-9:15 reveals that some commentators have not adequately appreciated the broader horizon of the map on which the borders of each descendent must be placed. Thus, a site may be suggested for a toponym which simply does not cohere with a foundational observation: Shem receives Asia, Ham receives Libya, and Japheth receives Europe. Because of this, my own comments will incorporate two guiding principles: 1.) border descriptions and place identifications should make sense within the overall framework of the map and the author’s clear intention to place Noah’s descendants on specific continents; 2.) Jubilees situates the progeny of Noah

---


329 James Scott notes that the two stage format of Jubilees (as well as the Genesis Apocryphon) finds a partial parallel in the two-stage description from the *Περιήγησις τῆς οἰκουμένης* of Dionysius “Periegetes”. J. M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees* (SNTS Mon. Ser. 113; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002) 32.

330 Generally speaking, inordinate attention is given to Shem, and more specifically to his son Arpachshad, in the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees.
on a Hellenistic, Ionian world map, and this is the first context within which specific regions, borders, and toponyms should be considered (as opposed to identification with biblical toponyms).\textsuperscript{331} In the following treatment, sites in need of extended discussion concerning their identification or description will be included as excurses.

4.1.1. Noah’s Division Among his Sons: Jubilees 8:10-30

This section begins with the statement: “At the beginning of the thirty-third jubilee [1569-1617] they divided the earth into three parts – for Shem, Ham, and Japheth – each in his own inheritance.”\textsuperscript{332} The following report that one of the angels was present at this division gives it the stamp of divine authority, as does the later declaration that the allotments of each son emerged from “the book” (8:11) – a trope in Jubilees denoting divine mandate.\textsuperscript{333} This stands in contrast to the previous announcement that, during the days of Peleg, “[t]hey divided it in a bad way among themselves and told Noah” (8:9). Given the transparent desire of Jubilees to place Shem in Asia, Ham in Libya, and Japheth in Europe, it is quite possible that here the author is subtly attempting to supplant the account of Gen 10 with his own version of the Table of Nations, since Genesis unambiguously (and without

\textsuperscript{331} An excellent resource for toponyms in the ancient world (although not schematized according to the Ionian model) is the \textit{Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World} (ed. R. J. A. Talbert; Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000). For Jubilees’ dependence on the Ionian map see P. S. Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 197-213; and idem, “Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish),” 2.980-82. A partial critique of Alexander’s association of Jubilees with the Ionian map is given by J. M. Scott, \textit{Paul and the Nations} (WUNT 84; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995) 16-24. While Scott raises some credible correctives, he fails to deal with the substance of Alexander’s argument, which is that most of Jub 8:11-9:15 can be explained only in lieu of the Ionian map, and not biblical texts. In the end, much of his critique does not convince. For Alexander’s response see his article “Jerusalem as the \textit{Omphalos} of the World,” 106-109.

\textsuperscript{332} All English quotations of Jubilees are from the translation (Vol. 2) of J. C. VanderKam, \textit{The Book of Jubilees} (2 vols.; CSCO 510-511; Scriptores Aethiopici 87-88, Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

qualification) places Ham’s descendents in various parts of Asia.\textsuperscript{334} In this case, Gen 10 may represent the “bad division” undertaken by Noah’s sons of their own accord, while Jubilees 8-9 explains the proper division subsequently overseen by Noah and an angel, and derived from the heavenly book.

4.1.1.1. Shem’s Portion: 8:12-21

Shem inherits “the center of the earth” (8:12), by which the author means the continent of Asia as defined by rivers in the north and south, and seas to the east and west. The description of Shem’s allotment begins “from the middle of the mountain range of Rafa,\textsuperscript{335} from the source of the water of the Tina River” (8:12).\textsuperscript{336} The border progresses “toward the west through the middle of this river. One then goes until one reaches the water of the deeps from which this river emerges.”

Excursus 1: The Tina River

Philip Alexander puts forth two problematic suggestions in his brief description of the Tina. First, following Hölscher,\textsuperscript{337} he argues that the Tina has an east-west alignment.\textsuperscript{338} This is called into question, however, by the double mention of Japheth’s eastern border in 8:25 and 28, which follows the Tina. Here the boundary is described as traveling “northeast,” suggesting that the alignment may instead be northeast for the Tina and

\textsuperscript{334} Cf. Gen 10:8-20, where the Hamites are identified with the ancient cultural centers of Mesopotamia. At least one of Japheth’s sons (Madai/Media) is apparently identified with the Asian province of Media as well, an outlier accounted for in Jub 10:35-36.


\textsuperscript{336} The ancient Tanais (or Tanis) and present-day Don in western Russia.

\textsuperscript{337} Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 67.

\textsuperscript{338} P. S. Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 197-213 [207].
southeast for the Nile. In general, directions throughout Jubilees’ geographic description appear to be vague indicators, such that “north” may mean “in a more or less northerly direction” (e.g., in 8:26).

Second, Alexander proposes that the “water of the deeps” is simply another reference to the world-encompassing “Ocean in the east.” The placement of the water of the deeps is significant, since it also affects at which end the Tina River’s “mouth” (8:16, 25) should be placed. Alexander fixes the mouth at the meeting point of the Tina and the Ocean River, assuming that the latter flows into the former. It should be noted, however, that nowhere is the Tina said to adjoin this outer river, and other considerations suggest that this is not the case. According to 8:12, the “water of the deeps” is a point along the river between its “source” and “mouth,” implying that the deeps are some distance removed from the river’s source near the Rafa Mountains and outer Mauq Sea (i.e., this portion of the Ocean River). That the river “emerges” suggests that the author believed it to disappear and then reemerge at a source of underground water – i.e., the “water of the deeps.” Based on these factors, the most plausible assumption is that the deeps refer to an inland spring or lake rather than the outer river, and that the Tina and Mauq are not joined. Indeed, Herodotus states that the river “begins by flowing out of a great lake, and enters a yet greater lake called the Maeetian.” Strabo reports that the Orontes, Tigris, and Nile similarly disappear underground for a time before reemerging. Some of the earliest preserved maps agree with this. Hence, the mouth of the Tina is best taken as its exit into Me’at Sea, and not the Ocean in the east. Strabo suggests the same thing when he says that “the mouth of the

339 Translated “the Water(s) of the Abysses” by Charles and Alexander.
341 This also seems to be the opinion of Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 70), who wrote that the Tina “is said to spring from ‘the waters of the abysses.’”
342 The Me’at Sea of Jubilees. Herodotus 4.57 (Godley, LCL).
343 Strabo, Geography 6.2.9 (Jones, LCL).
344 Examples which show the river ending at a mountain range (!) near the outer Ocean, but not connected to it, are the Anglo-Saxon or Cotton world map (c. 1050), the late 13th century Hereford Mappa Mundi, and the 14th century Higden world map. The fine facsimile edition of a thirteenth-century copy of Claudius Ptolemy’s map in Claudii Ptolemaei Geographicæ: Codex Urbianus Graecus 82 (Leiden: Brill; Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1932), Tabula XVII. – VRB. GR. 82, ff 91 (90r) – 92 (91r); and the famous Peutinger map also have the river end at a mountain range without connecting to the outer waters, but these maps are based on an entirely different schema than the Ionian map. All of these maps portray the Tanais stopping short of the Ocean at a mountain range, which must also be what the mental map of Jubilees presumes.
Tanais (τὸ τοῦ Ταναίδος) is the most northerly point [of Lake Maeotis]. This identification of the Tina’s mouth also makes better sense in connection with 8:25, where Japheth’s allotment begins “toward the north of the mouth of its waters,” whence it travels northeast toward “Gog and all that is east of them.” Going northeast from the mouth would make little sense if the latter is placed at the extreme northeastern point of the Tina.

From here the Tina pours into the Me’at Sea, from which it extends “as far as the Great Sea.” Hölscher has plausibly proposed that this mention of the Great Sea should be understood in terms of its northernmost point, at the Pontus Euxinus.

Leaving the Tina, we enter among the most difficult segments of the earth’s division in Jubilees; Shem’s western border. Throughout the following discussion it should be borne in mind that we are making our way from the Tina River, which empties into the Black and then Aegean Seas, to the mouth of the Gihon River in the south. Accordingly, a boundary roughly following the western coast of Asia Minor and the Levant is to be expected. Many earlier attempts at identifying the sites named in following verses pay little attention to this fact, and suggest places that simply do not appear to belong in this description. As will be seen, where one puts any one site may greatly affect the region where surrounding sites are searched for, thereby limiting the scope of investigation.

Jubilees 8:13 continues, “[The border] goes until it reaches Karas. This is in the bosom of the branch that faces southward.”

---

345 Strabo, Geography 2.5.25. This phrase implies the word στόμα (mouth), which was used in the preceding sentence.

346 The ancient Maeotis and modern Sea of Azov, bordered on the north and east by Ukraine and Russia.

347 The modern Black Sea. See Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 62. He is followed by Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 207. This suggestion gains support from Strabo’s statement to the same effect in Geography 2.5.25.

348 The Nile, or “the River of Egypt” in the Genesis Apocryphon.
Excursus 2: Karas

Karas has previously been identified with two places, although both proposals have met with skepticism. Dillmann was the first to suggest that Karas is the region of Chersones (Χερσόνησος) in Thrace, just northwest of where the Hellespont empties into the Aegean Sea. He thereby implied that “the branch that faces southward” is the Aegean Sea. Charles disagreed with this placement based on his belief that “the branch that faces southward” should be identified with “the Branch of the Egyptian Sea” in 8:14. The latter he understood to be synonymous with the ancient Sinus Heroopoliticus, or modern Red Sea. Charles’ identification of the Branch of the Egyptian Sea was, in turn, founded on Isa 11:15, which mentions the same toponym: ולשון ים מצרים. Following this logic, Charles had to situate Karas somewhere near the Sinus Heroopoliticus, and for this reason viewed Karas as a truncated form of Rhinocurura (Ῥίνοκουρύρων), a region located somewhere south of the Mediterranean coast between Palestine and Egypt. In order for this identification to work, however, Charles had to posit a corruption in the text, since this site was clearly not “in the bosom” of the Red Sea.

Of these two identifications, Dillmann’s is preferable. It must be admitted that identifying “the branch which faces southward” of 8:13 with the Aegean makes far more sense in context than Charles’ proposal of the Red Sea, since the latter does not cohere with

---

349 Transcribed Kârâsô by Dillmann, Charles, and Hölscher.
351 So too Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 63, 67.
354 Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 70) gathers this from a pair of references in Epiphanius of Salamis (Ancorat, exii) and George Syncellus (Chronography §50), where the western border of Shem’s allotment is identified with “Rhinocorura of Egypt.” These sources do not, however, seem closely linked to the earth’s division in Jubilees (see the following chapter).
the ensuing statement in 8:14: “His share goes toward the Great Sea and goes straight until it reaches to the west of the branch that faces southward, for this is the sea whose name is the Branch of the Egyptian Sea.” Charles’ suggestion would entail reaching the Red Sea (or at least Rhinocurura) turning around and returning to the Mediterranean, then turning around yet again and going back to the west side of the Red Sea. This confusion stems from Charles’ misidentification of the Sea of Egypt, as will be demonstrated below.

Recently, Esther Eshel has proposed an alternate site to the two outlined above.\(^{355}\) Based on a tenuous connection between the phrase לֶחָזְק יִמְנָרִים (“the branch of the Egyptian Sea”) in Isa 11:15, the matching expression in Jub 8:14, and the words לֶחָזְק יִמְנָח (“the branch of the Reed Sea”) in GenAp 21:18, she assumes that each is speaking of the modern Red Sea (ancient Sinus Heroopoliticus).\(^{356}\) Despite the multiple problems with this assumption (cf. Excursus 3, below), she goes on to suggest that the identification of Isaiah’s “tongue” with the Sinus Heoopoliticus gains backing from the present mention of Karas, identifying the latter with “a small island named Icarus in the Persian Gulf, found on Greek and Roman maps.”\(^{357}\) While drawing conclusions about Isaiah based on Jubilees is questionable, there is indeed such an island, and the phonological resemblance to Karas is impressive. Still, it seems her assumption that Jubilees’ “tongue of the Egyptian Sea” is the modern Red Sea has caused her to overlook a major problem; while she rightly states that Karas is part of Shem’s lot, she fails to explain how a description of his western border could jump from the outlet of the Tina River all the way to the northern Persian Gulf, and then back to the “bosom of the branch which faces southward,” which is likely the Aegean Sea. Such a proposal makes little sense in its broader context, and if we are left only with the identifications of Dillmann, Charles, and Eshel, we would still be compelled to adopt that of

---


\(^{357}\) Ibid.
Dillmann. However, Eshel has pointed the way toward a fourth proposal that is preferable to any of these three.

An identification of Karas with the southeast Aegean island of Icarus (ικάριον), or its mainland counterpart Caria (Καρία or Καρίας), located on the southwestern corner of Asia Minor, has several advantages. Although small, the island enjoyed widespread fame because of its association with Icarus, the son of Daedalus, who according to Homer’s Iliad crashed into the Aegean at this spot after the wax which fastened his wings had been melted by the sun. Mainland Caria was closely linked to Icarus and the surrounding group of islands, and was even used in early times to denote all of Asia Minor. Herodotus hailed from one of the great Carian cities, Halicarnassus, and spoke of the region’s wide renown. In addition, the portion of the Aegean Sea surrounding the island, off of the Carian coast, was called the Icarian Sea (ικαρία Πέλαγος), and was famous for its formidable sailing waters. As Eshel has noted, Alexander the Great later named an island in the Persian Gulf after the original Icarus during his campaign in the east. In sum, the entire southeastern region of the Aegean at times bore the general identification Icarus, or Caria. This identification has the advantage of: 1.) being “in the bosom” of the Aegean; 2.) being situated approximately where we would expect Shem’s western border to fall; and 3.) allowing the subsequent verse to make sense. In addition, Icarus and Caria phonologically fit the toponym Karas better than Chersones or Rhinocurura.

358 Modern Ikaria.
359 The latter is a gentilic denoting region, and is used by Herodotus 7.97-98.
360 Strabo, Geography 14.1.19.
361 Strabo (Geography 14.2.28) goes on at length about the foreign and barbaric language used by the Carians (cf. Herodotus 1.142, 171). One wonders, therefore, if the name Icarus betrays a Semitic linguistic background, which in Hebrew might appear something like הֵרִיס אֶת (“Island of Caria”).
362 Strabo, Geography 2.5.21; 12.8.5.
363 Ibid, 1.4.7.
364 Herodotus 1.171.
365 Herodotus 6.95-96; Strabo, Geography 10.5.13; Arrian, Indica 7.20.5 (Brunt, LCL).
366 Arrian, Indica 7.20.3-6.
367 Yet another reason for considering this region as Karas is its close proximity to Ionia, where the map used by Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon was first developed.
From Karas and the Aegean Sea Shem’s share continues “straight until it reaches to the west of the branch that faces southward, for this is the sea whose name is the Branch of the Egyptian Sea” (8:14). If Karas is indeed Icarus/Caria (or even Dillmann’s Chersones) this must mean a southward extension to the main body of the Mediterranean, and then a straight extension to the west side of a “branch that faces southward.” Previous commentators have taken the two branches of 8:13-14 to be the same, but since the second is further qualified by the statement “for this is the sea whose name is the Branch of the Egyptian Sea” it is worth considering whether this is a previously unmentioned branch (i.e., another branch facing south), different than the branch in 8:13. Precisely which bay this could be has again been a source of confusion, and depends upon one’s location of the Sea of Egypt.

Excursus 3: The Branch of the Egyptian Sea

As mentioned above, many commentators assume that the Branch of the Egyptian Sea is the modern Red Sea (i.e. biblical ים סוף) based on a portion of Isa 11:15: “And the Lord will utterly destroy (לעשת ים מנרה) the branch of the Sea of Egypt (היווהים).” Hence, a parallel has often been drawn between our branch and the ים סוף of GenAp 21.18. However, such an identification makes little sense at this point in the description of Shem’s border, and a more plausible possibility exists.

Alexander has noted that the “Egyptian Sea” (Αἰγυπτίως πέλαγος) was not known by ancient Hellenistic geographers as an alternate name for the Sinus Heroopoliticus, but was rather the common designation for the eastern end of the Great Sea, stretching between Asia Minor and Egypt.369 The Great Sea was divided by ancient Hellenistic geographers into

---

368 This verse has troubles of its own, such as the meaning of the initial verb, which may alternatively be translated “he will split.” Some commentators have suggested that this word may have originally read והתייב “and he will dry up.” A treatment of the issues may be found in most commentaries; e.g., W. A. M. Beuken, Jesaja 1-12 (HTKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2003) 301-302.

regions – each bearing their own name – so that the Mediterranean could be spoken of as a whole (as in 8:12 and 8:14), or in terms of its smaller, constituent parts. Strabo mentions the Egyptian Sea numerous times, noting that it reaches from the shores of Alexandria in the south to Rhodes and the Icarian Sea in the north. He further describes it as skirting the southern edge of Cyprus, connecting to the Issican and Pamphyliai Gulfs (which lie along the southern shores of Asia Minor), then following the coastlines of Seleucia, Issus, Syria, Phonecia and Egypt back toward Alexandria. On the west, the Egyptian Sea borders the Libyan and Carpathian Seas. Agathemerus notes that the Icarian and Egyptian Seas lie near each other and Manilius declares that the shores of Cyprus are battered by “Egypt’s river” (Tonantem Aegyptique). Josephus knew of this part of the Great Sea as such, and it was still in coinage as late as Michael the Syrian (12th century CE). When forced to choose whether Jubilees is basing its identification of the Sea of Egypt on the possible Isaianic connection to the Red Sea, or unanimous Hellenistic usage of the term, there is no doubt that the latter makes far better sense at this point in the account.

If correct, “the branch that faces southward” of 8:14 must be sought in or along the Egyptian Sea as described above. The best candidates for such a branch are: 1.) The Aegean Sea; 2.) The Pamphyliai Sea, which is formed by a large bay situated along the southern coast of central Asia Minor; or 3.) the Issicus Sinus, or Myriandric Gulf, at the northeast corner of the Mediterranean, along the shores of Cilicia.

---

370 Strabo, Geography 17.1.7, 1.2.28.
371 Ibid, 2.5.24, 10.5.13.
373 Agathemerus, Geographiae informatio 3.9.
374 Manilius, Astronomica 4.634-5 (Goold, LCL).
375 Josephus, Jewish War 4.609 (Thackeray, LCL).
377 Alexander (“Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 205) presumes that the branch is the entire Egyptian sea, embracing everything between Asia Minor and Egypt. This, however, fails to adequately account for the fact that it “faces south,” and is considered only a “branch” of the Egyptian Sea, and not the entire Great Sea.
378 Based on his earlier identification of Karas, Charles guessed that this “tongue” was a promontory of land rather than a gulf, identifying it with the modern Sinai Peninsula. See his 1917 translation notes, The
seems the best candidate for several reasons: 1.) the border is said to extend “to the west” of this branch, and an extension to the west of the Aegean seems an ill fit for a description of Shem’s western border; 2.) an extension to the west of the Issicus would allow the boundary to nicely follow the Syrian and Phoenecian coasts southward, but would leave the island of Cyprus (likely Caphtor; see Excursus 7 below) outside of the allotment, thereby disagreeing with its inclusion in Shem’s lot in Jub 8:21; 3.) an identification with the Pamphylian Sea resolves both of these issues, and fits well the following description of the border’s extension southward. It is also possible that the Pamphylian and Issican Seas are being thought of as a single unit by our author.379

In Jub 8:15, we read that the boundary turns “southward toward the mouth of the Great Sea on the shore of the waters.”

**Excursus 4: The Mouth of the Great Sea**

Philip Alexander, relying on Pseudo-Aristotle, states that the “mouth” of the Great Sea “is, of course, [a reference] to the Straits of Gibraltar.”380 He was preceded by Hölscher, who noted that the phrase “on the shore of the waters” closely resembles “to the shore of the sea waters” in 8:23 (describing Ham’s portion), which may refer to the area near the Straits, where the Great Sea and Atel Sea meet.381 Despite these references to the Pillars forming a mouth, there are several factors which give one pause over this identification in Jubilees and are ignored by the above commentators: 1.) Most obviously, what do the Pillars of Heracles have to do with the western border of Shem’s allotment? While we might expect areas of the Great Sea to be included in geographic descriptions (as they no doubt are...
elsewhere in Jubilees), this seems a strange inclusion for Shem; the direction “southward” is certainly not what we would expect if the Straits of Gibraltar are meant—a problem equally incommodious for any of the Egyptian Sea possibilities discussed in the preceding excursus; 3.) the ensuing description is difficult to reconcile with this placement of the mouth, even if one does accept the doubtful identification of Afra with the Roman province of Africa in Jub 8:15; 4.) Pseudo-Aristotle, whom Alexander cited for support, did not associate the Pillars of Heracles with the mouth of the Great Sea, but rather with the outer, earth encompassing Ocean, or Atlantic. The same is true of Hippolytus of Rome, who is quoted by James Scott to support an identification of the mouth of the Great Sea with the Pillars of Heracles. Hippolytus, in fact, explicitly says that the Straits form the mouth of the Western Sea (i.e. the Atlantic, or Atel Sea in Jubilees), and not the Great Sea. Strabo discussed of the Straits as a “mouth” at some length, but did not specify to which sea it belongs.

An identification of the “mouth” with the Nile Delta would make much better sense in every respect, although I have been unable to find direct reference to the Delta as the mouth of the Great Sea in the ancient sources. One piece of indirect evidence may be the reference to the Delta region of the Nile as a “source,” or “head” in GenAp 19.12. In Jub 8 the Tina River’s “source” and “mouth” are on opposite ends, with the former on its northern end and the latter in the south. Perhaps the Apocryphon’s location of the Gihon’s

---

382 Admittedly, “Ocean” (יאמ), which likely refers to the conjunction of the surrounding body of water with the Mediterranean Sea at the Straits of Gibraltar/Gadera, is spoken of as part of Shem’s western border in the later rabbinic treatments of Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Num 34:6 and Rav Judah ben-Ila’s boundary description in j. Hall. 60a. These are built on Num 34:6, which simply lists the “Great Sea” as the western border of the Land of Israel. In Jubilees, however, it appears that Japheth, father of the Sea Peoples, receives a large portion of the Great Sea (see below). This seems to argue against Shem’s reception of the entire Mediterranean in his apportionment. For more on the targumic and rabbinic sources cf. P. S. Alexander, “Geography and the Bible (Early Jewish),” ABD, 2.986-87.


384 Scott, “The Division of the Earth,” 311.

385 Hippolytus, Chronicon 156. One finds the same statement in parallel portions of the Chronicon Paschale and the Chronographia of George Syncellus, both of which draw on Hippolytus.

386 Strabo, Geography 3.5.6.

387 The Delta is called a mouth repeatedly in the ancient sources, but this is typically in reference to the Nile River, and not the Great Sea. Thus, we are left with ancient references to two different mouths (the Ocean and the Nile), neither referring to the Great Sea.
source at its northern end points toward its mouth being in the south. If this is the case, then the Delta as the Great Sea’s mouth makes good sense. While the evidence is not overwhelming, I haltingly take the meeting place of the Nile and Great Sea to be the mouth mentioned here because of its alleviation of the problems listed above. However, I remain open to other alternatives, including the standard Pillars of Heracles interpretation.

Wherever one locates the “mouth of the Great Sea,” the border moves next “toward the west of Afra…until it reaches the water of the Gihon River” (8:15).

**Excursus 5: Afra/Fara**

Most commentators have placed Afra together with two toponyms mentioned later in relation to Japheth’s allotment – Fara and Aferag (8:27) – identifying all three sites as the Libyan province of Africa. Aferag, it appears, can be dissociated from the others, and will be dealt with below. Afra and Fara, however, stand a better chance of referring to one and the same site, and will thus be treated together here. If the two sites are the same, then we should keep in mind that it is a common meeting point between the allotments of Shem and Japheth.

The term Libya, not Africa, was used by Hellenistic geographers to denote the southern continent as a whole, and the region stretching along the Mediterranean coast west of Egypt more specifically. Indeed, one looks in vain for the term “Africa,” in any of its forms, in Herodotus, Strabo, and even later geographers such as Agathemerus (3rd cent. C.E.), giving an impression that the term was unknown to many Greek and Roman geographers. Charles suggested that Afra and Fara “[seem] to be Africa in its early limited sense,” apparently referring to the Roman province. It is true that for Josephus (drawing on Alexander Polyhistor) and Claudius Ptolemy it occasionally is used to refer to a small, middle portion of the northern Libyan coast, roughly equivalent to modern Tunisia. Yet even this area seems to first accrue the name Africa only after the Punic wars (c. 146 B.C.E.), under Roman

---


The term did not gain more widespread use until its later role as a Roman proconsul, sometime between the reigns of Augustus and Claudius (c. 27 B.C.E. – 54 C.E.). Simply put, the suggestion of Africa for the terms Afra, Fara, and Aferag in Jubilees is anachronistic if the traditional date of composition is accepted.

Concerning the present mention of Afra in the description of Shem’s allotment, the same question could be asked here as that regarding the “mouth of the Great Sea” above: What would Africa, especially if located on the central Libyan coast, have to do with Shem’s western border? The problem is equally difficult for Fara in the account of Japheth’s portion. There the boundary runs from Gadir “until it reaches the west of Fara. Then it goes back toward Aferag and goes eastward toward the water of the Me’at Sea” (8:27). We would not expect Libya to figure so significantly into the apportionment of Japheth, since it is clear from the text as a whole that this is Ham’s domain and that Japheth is restricted to Europe. This is especially true of the Roman province of Africa, which does not seem to hold special significance for any of the sons’ allotments.

An attractive possibility for the site of Afra/Fara is Pharos, the small island associated with the city of Alexandria, at the west edge of the Nile Delta. This island was world-renowned since the time of Homer, and would eventually house the famous lighthouse that was listed as one of the world’s seven wonders. It was also noted by ancient historians and geographers as the only serviceable harbor for a great distance in either direction, from Libya to Joppa, and was a landmark closely associated with the Delta region. A late reference in Michael the Syrian, bishop of Antioch, mentions that the island was also known as “Isis Pharia” at an earlier time. Aside from the island’s popularity as a geographic reference and seafaring point, its situation at the western edge of the Nile Delta fits well with the common Ionian use of the Nile as a dividing point between the continents of Libya and Asia, in addition to the westernmost point of the Egyptian Sea. This site’s employment in a

---


393 See Chabot, Chronique de Michel le Syrien 1.37 [Latin trans.]; 4.21 [line 30 of right col.; Syriac]. Michael presents this as an alternate appellation for Pharos (p. 236).
description of Japheth’s borders is not as odd as it may first seem (certainly no more odd than Africa), but actually helps make sense of Jub 8:27, since the boundary would then transect the Great Sea diagonally, from Gadir to Pharos, thereby including the four islands that are said to belong to Japheth’s son Tiras in Jub 9:13. If Afra/Fara is identified with Pharos, the result would be a common meeting point of the boundaries of Japheth, Shem, and Ham at the westernmost point of the Nile Delta, a solution which works quite nicely when placed on the ancient map.

The linchpin of this argument may, in fact, be found in the latter columns of the Genesis Apocryphon. In GenAp 19.13 we read of Abram and Sarai crossing the seven branches of the Nile Delta. Immediately after crossing the last tributary Abram exclaims, “Now we have left our land and entered the land of the sons of Ham, the land of Egypt.” Assuming that the Apocryphon and Jubilees have a similar understanding of each son’s allotment, this story shows that Abram reached the end of “our land” – i.e. Shem’s (or, more specifically, Arpachshad’s) inheritance – after crossing the Nile’s seventh tributary. This is precisely the vicinity of Alexandria, and Pharos.

Once at the Gihon (Nile) River, matters once again become clear. The boundary moves along the southern bank of the Gihon until it reaches its end, presumably at the edge of the terrestrial disk where it meets the encircling body of water (here the Atel Sea; cf. 8:22). From here “it goes eastward until it reaches the Garden of Eden, toward the south side of it” (8:16), the Garden of Eden being the easternmost (and uppermost) point on the map. It continues circling around the eastern edge of the earth until it again reaches the Rafa Mountains, turning there to rejoin the Tina River at its mouth. This final mention of the Tina’s mouth suggests that the description overlaps for a portion of the border, between the Rafa Mountains and the Me’at Sea. Put another way, the stretch dividing Asia from Europe is described at both the beginning and end of the account of Shem’s allotment.

Shem’s border is explained in a counter-clockwise direction, beginning at the Rafa Mountains and ending at the mouth of the Tina River. From the Tina, it runs along the eastern edge of the Aegean Sea, across the Egyptian Sea (probably including Cyprus within
its bounds), and to the western edge of the Nile Delta, whence it skirts the Gihon and the eastern limits of the world before once again meeting the Tina.

Jubilees 8:17-21 presents a recapitulation of Shem’s allotment, which explains the importance of his land in theological terms. We read in 8:19 that “[Noah] knew that the Garden of Eden is the holy of holies and is the residence of the Lord; (that) Mt. Sinai is in the middle of the desert; and (that) Mt. Zion is in the middle of the navel of the earth. The three of them – the one facing the other – were created as holy (places).” Furthermore, it is a “blessed and excellent share” (8:21). The sites listed in these verses deserve further study, but are all within the border described above, and as such will be elaborated upon below only as needed.

4.1.1.2. Ham’s Portion: 8:22-24

Ham’s account is far shorter and simpler than those of Shem and Japheth, and presents fewer difficulties concerning identification. The boundary begins on the Egyptian side of the Gihon River, on the right (i.e. south) side of “the garden.” This refers to the Garden of Eden, as the end of 8:23 makes clear, and is envisioned at the eastern extremity of

---

394 We hear nothing of this sort for the allotments of Shem’s brothers, alerting the listener that there is something very special about both Shem and the land he is to occupy: “[Noah] recalled everything that he had said in prophecy with his mouth, for he had said: ‘May the Lord, the God of Shem, be blessed, and may the Lord live in the places where Shem resides (8:18).’” By allotting Asia to Shem and quoting this altered form of Gen 9:26-27, the author of Jubilees draws together the biblical themes of the election of Shem and the sanctity of the Levant and related places in Asia. 8:21 begins the list of the sites encompassed by Shem’s border.

395 The sites are: Eden, the land of the Erythrean Sea, the land of the east, India, Erythrea and its mountains (cf. 9:2), Bashan, Lebanon, the islands of Caphtor, the Sanir and Amana mountain ranges, the Asshur mountain range, Elam, Asshur, Babylon, Susan, Madai, the Ararat Mountains, and an area lying across a northern (likely Caspian) sea.
the earth by Jubilees, 1 Enoch, and the Genesis Apocryphon. From here the description moves “southward and goes to all the fiery mountains,” which are unidentified and probably owe to mythical ideas concerning the far southern portion of the earth. Since one goal of the Ionian map appears to have been symmetry, this range was probably meant to balance the more well-known Mountains of Qelt in the north (Jub 8:26).

Turning westward, the boundary goes “toward the Atel Sea; it goes westward until it reaches the Mauq Sea, everything that descends into which is destroyed” (8:22). The Atel Sea has been unanimously understood as an abbreviated reference to the ancient Atlantic Sea (‘Ατλαντικὴ θάλασσα), while the Mauq has fostered more discussion.

**Excursus 6: The Mauq Sea**

There has been no shortage of propositions regarding the etymology of this name. Charles was the first to question whether the word Mauq might be a distorted form of

---

396 Jub 8:16; 1 En 32:2-3, 60:8, 70:1-3; GenAp 2.23. The Genesis Apocryphon does not actually mention the Garden of Eden, but it is very likely considered the dwelling place of Enoch in the scroll. See P. Grelot, “Parwaïm de Chroniques,” 30-38. All of these references are ultimately based on Gen 2:8 “And the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, in the east.” The Gihon is also related to the garden in Gen 2:13, where it is one of the four rivers of Paradise.

397 The southernmost area of the earth was the least well-known by ancient geographers, and included a healthy dose of speculation. Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 73) and Hölscher (Drei Erdkarten, 60) mention the fiery mountains of 1 Enoch 18:6-9 and 24:1-3 along with this verse, but the connection with Jubilees does not seem a direct one. The mountains’ name may have something to do with the southern region being the warmest of the inhabited earth (cf. Jub 8:30), but more likely it is based on the biblical notion that the Lord will come from a mountain in the south, in a fiery state, to judge the earth (cf. Chapter 3, n. 55; also 1 En 18:8-11; GenAp 15.10-11). Interestingly, the late 13th century Hereford Mappa Mundi, which bears a number of striking affinities to the presumed world map of Jubilees, has the mons ardens (“burning mountain”) in this area (cf. also the Anglo-Saxon or Cotton world map in the British Library manuscript Cotton MS Tiberius B.V.1 [c. 1050], and most other medieval mappae mundi). It seems quite certain that these are an echo of the tradition found much earlier in Jubilees, and (with Alexander) I would argue that Jubilees’ map bore the same basic features as these much later models.


399 There are textual problems with this verse, which have been sufficiently dealt with by VanderKam. See VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, 2.54-5.
"Ωκεανός, “the Great Ocean Stream.” Tisserant went a step further, proposing that it is a shortened and corrupted form of the Hebrew [תֵּבְנֵי] (“waters of the Ocean”). He has been followed by Alexander, Schmidt, and Werman. Hölscher offered an entirely different explanation, relating Mauq to the word דְּבָר (“circle”), which stood for the “Horizontkreises” of the earth. Winternute, in turn, considered it to be a mem-preformative noun from the Hebrew root חֹקֶק, with the meaning “place of the boundary [of waters].” All of these explanations have shortcomings, not entirely accounting for the phonetic values or spelling of the name Mauq.

Given the etiological explanation following the sea’s mention in Jub 8:22, the likely form of the name in the Genesis Apocryphon (16.9; קָהָן), and the later witness of the Syriac Chronicle to the Year 1234 (כַּלְכַּל), VanderKam’s suggestion that the name is based on the verb “destroy” (מָצַח), and could be translated by something like “Sea of Destruction” appears to be correct.

Based on the description of the two seas here and elsewhere in Jubilees, it seems plausible that the Atel Sea occupies the southern half of the surrounding body of water, while the Mauq Sea constitutes the northern half.
Reaching the Mauq Sea, we read, “It comes to the north to the boundary of Gadir and comes to the shore of the sea waters, to the waters of the Great Sea, until it reaches the Gihon River (8:23).” Gadir (Γάδηρα, next to the Straits of Gibraltar) is the point at which the boundary turns east again, following the northern Libyan coast until it reaches the waters of the Gihon at the Nile Delta. The course of the Gihon is then traced back to the right side of the Garden of Eden, whence the account began.

The description of Ham’s allotment runs in a clockwise direction, encompassing the entirety of Libya. It is clear from the sources that pre-Roman geographic knowledge of this continent was restricted primarily to its northern parts.

4.1.1.3. Japheth’s Portion: 8:25-30

The third share of the earth falls to Japheth, beginning “on the other side of the Tina River toward the north of the mouth of its waters” – i.e. on the northwestern side of the Tanais, near the Me’at Sea. From this point the territory runs “toward the northeast, (toward) the whole area of Gog and all that is east of them.” Here one apparently skirts the Tina, moving toward the Rafa Mountains in the northeast. Gog has typically been understood as a region somewhere in the northern parts of Asia, in either Lydian Asia Minor or in the general vicinity of Scythia, which is itself a somewhat amorphous territory. If such is the case here, the author is defining Japheth’s portion by what is on the other side of the river, rather than describing part of the allotment itself. Hölscher, however, took Gog to be the land belonging to Magog (9:8) – i.e., the land northwest (to the left) of the Tina, and

407 For the former see “Gog,” ABD, 2.1056. A good list of sources for the land of Scythia is provided by Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 70).
therefore within Japheth’s boundaries. Either interpretation is possible, although that of Hölscher seems more likely here based on the clear, frequent employment of the Tina as a border between the lands of Shem and Japheth.

8:26 continues, “It goes due north and goes toward the mountains of Qelt, to the north and toward the Mauq Sea. It comes to the east of Gadir as far as the edge of the sea waters.” Although this verse continually mentions the direction “north” in its description, it is clear that this means a westerly moving tour along the northern circuit of the earth, and not a strict following of the cardinal direction. This includes drawing near to the Qelt Mountains, the Mauq Sea, and then the Straits of Gibraltar.

From Gadir the border begins to move back toward the east, to the Tina River. It first “goes until it reaches the west of Fara” (8:27) – i.e. the Alexandrian island of Pharos. It then “goes back toward Aferag and goes eastward toward the water of the Me’at Sea.”

**Excursus 7: Aferag**

As noted in the discussion of Afra/Fara above, Aferag has often been taken as yet another form of the name “Africa.” In addition to the earlier arguments against the identification of any of these sites with Africa, two further complications are noteworthy regarding Aferag: 1) it would be odd for two terms referring to the same place and differing significantly in spelling to occur so close together, in the way they do here; 2) what would it mean to go “until it reaches the west of Fara (i.e. Africa)” only to then go “back toward Aferag (i.e. Africa)”?

This hardly makes sense.

---

408 Hölscher, *Drei Erdkarten*, 71.

409 The modern Pyrenees or Alps [or a conflation of the two], in the region of ancient Celt – i.e. northern Spain and southern Gaul. Hölscher (*Drei Erdkarten*, 71) places the Qelt range in the northwest of the “Erdkreises”.

410 See Excursus 5, above.

411 See note 59, above.
Charles’ suggestion that Aferag may refer to the province of Phrygia, in Asia Minor, is far more plausible.\textsuperscript{412} This would more sensibly bring the border back into the general region of the northeast Aegean, whence one could travel “eastward toward the water of the Meat Sea,” as described in 8:27. Indeed, it is clear from several ancient sources that Phrygia Hellespontica (also Phrygia Epictitus, or Phrygia Minor) stretched to the northeast corner of the Aegean Coast, where the Hellespont issues from the Pontus Euxinus.\textsuperscript{413} This possibility is bolstered considerably by the fact that Phrygia and Africa were spelled the same in later targumic, rabinic, and Samaritan sources.\textsuperscript{414}

From here the border again reaches familiar territory, going “to the edge of the Tina River toward the northeast until it reaches the banks of its waters toward the mountain range of Rafa. It goes around the north” (8:28). The next verse adds that Japheth’s eternal inheritance includes “five large islands and a large land in the north.” Four great islands in the Great Sea are also mentioned as part of Japheth’s son Tir’as’ allotment in Jub 9:13. Since Shem has already been allotted the “islands of Kaftur” (probably Cyprus; see Excursus 8, below), we may deduce that these four are likely Crete, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica. Based on a reference to “the islands and the shores of the islands” in the description of Madai’s portion (9:9), Hölscher and Alexander have suggested that the fifth great island of 8:28 is

\textsuperscript{412} Charles, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 74.

\textsuperscript{413} See, e.g., Strabo, \textit{Geography} 12.4.1, 3, 10. Here the region is given several names: Ἡ Ἑπίκτητος καλομένη Ἔφρυγία, Ἐλλησποντιακή Ἔφρυγία, and μικρὸν Ἐφρυγίαν. Cf. Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World, map 52.

\textsuperscript{414} Phrygia is frequently spelled with an initial aleph in Semitic languages, and closely resembles the form used in Jubilees. In fact, in later sources it is spelled exactly like Africa: הָפִּירִים. See Arukh ha-Shalem [Hebrew] (9 vols.; ed. A. Kohut; New York: Pardes Publishing House, 1955) 1.243-44. Also P. S. Alexander’s unpublished doctoral dissertation, \textit{The Toponymy of the Targumim} (Oxford, 1974) 303 [Table 1]; 309 [Table 16]. Michael the Syrian (Chabot, \textit{Chronique de Michel le Syrien}, 4.9 [line 8]) uses the form הָפִּירִים, and the Samaritan \textit{Asatir הָפִּירִים}. M. Gaster, \textit{The Asatir}, 18/ת [Hebrew text section].
Britain, or the British Isles more generally. These islands were indeed known to the Ionians, making this identification plausible.

Japheth’s allotment, like Shem’s, is described running counterclockwise. It begins at the Tina’s mouth and encircles the entire continent of Europe, including a large portion of the Great Sea, until it returns to its source-waters near the Rafa mountains. As with Shem’s allotment, the beginning and end of the description overlap for the length of the Tina River. The final verse of Japheth’s description states that his land “is cold while the land of Ham is hot. Now Shem’s land is neither hot nor cold but it is a mixture of cold and heat” (8:30). Apart from reflecting a general climatic reality, the division of the oikumene into three climata was a trope of Hellenistic geography.

4.1.2. The Subdivision among Noah’s Grandsons: Jub 9:1-15

Following the tripartite division of the earth by Noah, his sons proceed to subdivide the three continents among their own progeny. This typically consists of listing various places within each allotment, defining where each of Noah’s grandsons is to dwell and providing a more detailed picture of the world map employed by the author of Jubilees.

415 Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 72; Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 207.

416 Herodotus (3.115) knew of them only vaguely, but by the time of Strabo (Geography 1.4.3) they are described in detail.

417 Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 75) also noted the reference to islands in 1 Enoch 77:8. Although there are some textual issues with this passage, it says, “I saw seven large islands in the sea and on the land – two on the land and five in the Great Sea.” G. W. E. Nickelsburg and J. C. VanderKam, 1 Enoch: A New Translation (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004) 107.

418 This is not surprising in light of the connection of Japheth’s descendents with the “maritime nations” (מִצְדָּרַע) in Gen 10:4-5.

4.1.2.1. Ham’s Sons: 9:1

The allotments of Ham’s sons are described very briefly and simply, consisting of little more than a list of their names: “There emerged a first share for Cush to the east; to the west of him (one) for Egypt; to the west of him (one) for Put; to the west of him (one) for Canaan; and to the west of him was the sea.” The order employed is that of the Gen 10:6, and no geographic indicators are used to demarcate the boundaries between the sons, save the outer sea bordering the westernmost point of the continent. This may be due in part to the logical inference of geographic location based on most of the inheritors’ names. In biblical and subsequent Jewish tradition Cush was identified with Nubia and Ethiopia, Egypt (مصر) with the land of the same name, and Put with modern Libya, west of Egypt along the ancient Libyan coast. Although in the Bible Canaan is typically associated with the region bearing that name in the Levant, here he is obviously placed in the region of modern Algeria and Morocco (ancient Mauretania). Thus, the Jubilees account begins in the east and ends in the west, moving neatly from top to bottom on the east-oriented map. This is notable, since the same cannot be said for the biblical account, which situates Canaan northeast of the first three sons.

4.1.2.2. Shem’s Sons: 9:2-6

Jubilees’ treatment of Shem’s sons is much more detailed than that of the sons of Ham. Elam and his children are the first to receive their allotment, “to the east of the Tigris River until it reaches the east of the entire land of India, in Erythrea on its border, the waters of Dedan, all the mountains of Mebri and Ela, all the land of Susan, and everything on the

---

420 Gen 2:13 places the Land of Cush alongside the Gihon. Also see 2 Kgs 19:19, Jer 46:9, and “Cush,” ABD 1.1219.
border of Farnak as far as the Erythrean Sea and the Tina River” (9:2). In general, this
describes everything east of the Tigris, from the Erythrean Sea in the south to the Tina River
in the far north. This includes the ancient Near Eastern region of Elamtu, the city of Susan
(Susa), and the Zagros and interior Iranian mountain ranges, to which the “Mebri” and
“Ela” mountains of Jubilees must belong. Hölscher appears to have rightly identified
Farnak as the ancient region of the Pharmacotis River in ancient Margiane, known to Pliny
the Elder and Claudius Ptolemy and situated directly east of the Caspian Sea, in modern
southeast Turkmenistan. Although the region of biblical Dedan is traditionally understood
to be in western Arabia, the identification of “the waters of Dedan” with this site would be
an extreme outlier compared with the other sites mentioned. One can, therefore, appreciate
Alexander’s statement that “it is hard to say what precisely these are.” Yet Hölscher’s
suggestion of Dodone/Sidodone, along the southern Persian coast in ancient Carmania,
should be duly considered. This site is mentioned by Arrian, in his account of Nearchus’
voyage along the Erythrean coast, as “a desolate little region, with nothing but water and

421 The standard Mesopotamian sites may be found in most Bible atlases, but the maps in the The
Helsinki Atlas of the Near East in the Neo-Assyrian Period (ed. S. Parpola and M. Porter; Finland: Casco Bay
Assyriological Institute, 2001) are particularly excellent. For more on the Mebri and Ela mountains cf.
Werman, “פִּיפֶר הַוַּולְמִים,” 279, n. 32.

422 Or Merv; modern Mary.

423 Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 69, n. 8. Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 75) must be credited for first putting
this identification forward, albeit tenuously. Hölscher cited a passage in which Assarhadon states that he
subdued the land of Parnaki. This identification is followed by Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 74; and Schmidt
“Jewish Representations,” 125.


426 Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 69. The manuscript evidence disagrees over the spelling of the name. The
known forms are Σίδωδωνή, Σιδωδώνη, Σιδωνή, Σιδωδώνη, and Δωδώνη.

427 A helpful map is found in the back of Vol. II of E. Iliff Robson’s edition, in the Loeb Classical
fish,” at which Nearchus temporarily anchored.\textsuperscript{428} This certainly fits well within the context of Jubilees, and is preferable to the biblical site. If Hölscher’s identifications of Farnak and the waters of Dedan are correct, the author of Jubilees must have had access to sources of considerable detail regarding the eastern territories of Persia.

Asshur is listed next, inheriting “the whole land of Asshur, Nineveh, Shinar, and Sak as far as the vicinity of India, (where) the Wadafa River rises” (9.3). Assyria (i.e. Assyria), Nineveh, and Shinar (i.e. Babylonia) are well-known sites referring to the central regions of Mesopotamia.\textsuperscript{429} Sak, which VanderKam has noted refers to Scythia,\textsuperscript{430} would be somewhere to the northeast of these regions, in the vicinity of the Caspian Sea. That the allotment goes “as far as” the region of India suggests that it moves eastward, up to India’s border, presumably protruding into part of Elam’s share. The Wadafa River might be a reference to this border, although its identification has eluded commentators.\textsuperscript{431} The Hydaspes (\textgreek{Υδασπης}) River\textsuperscript{432} is one candidate, having several of the phonological elements present in Wadafa and being situated in the northwestern region of India. This river was famous during the Hellenistic and Roman periods as the site of a battle between Alexander the Great and an Indian army during his eastern campaign.\textsuperscript{433} Judging by the ensuing descriptions,


\textsuperscript{429} Cf. Jub 10:26; Gen 10:10-12.

\textsuperscript{430} VanderKam, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 2.56.

\textsuperscript{431} For a survey of views and an argument for this reading see VanderKam, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 2.56-7.

\textsuperscript{432} The modern Jhelum.

\textsuperscript{433} See Arrian, \textit{Anabasis} 5.9-18 (Brunt, LCL).
Asshur’s allotment must cover the lower-central and eastern parts of Mesopotamia, stretching from there northeast to the south of the Caspian Sea and up to northern India.

Arpachshad receives “all the land of the Chaldean region to the east of the Euphrates which is close to the Erythrean Sea; all the waters of the desert as far as the vicinity of the branch of the sea which faces Egypt; the entire land of Lebanon, Sanir, and Amana as far as the vicinity of the Euphrates” (9:4). This is the first allotment of a grandson in which the description moves in a definite direction – clockwise. The district of Chaldea equates to the lower portion of Mesopotamia (i.e., below Babylon), dovetailing with Asshur’s portion to the north and Elam’s to the east. In the Bible it is typically associated with the city of Ur (Gen 11:28, 31; 15:7). As described in Jubilees this region borders the Erythrean Sea on the south. “All the waters of the desert” may refer either to oases, as Hölscher and Alexander assumed, or to the water surrounding the land on its coastal borders. In both cases, “the desert” must be a reference to the Syrian Desert, stretching between Mesopotamia and the Levant, in addition to the entire Arabian Peninsula to the south.

The “branch of the sea which faces Egypt” is the most difficult designation in Arpachshad’s territory, causing Charles to confess “I don’t know what is meant here.” There are two possibilities: 1.) The ancient Sinus Heroopolitanus (modern Red Sea); or 2.)

434 “Chaldea,” ABD, 1.886.


436 At least this would be a logical deduction if Hölscher’s suggestion for “the waters if Dedan” is correct.

437 So Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 70.

438 Charles, The Book of Jubilees, 76.
the eastern region of the Great Sea, called by ancient geographers the Sea of Egypt.\textsuperscript{439}
Alexander asserted that the first interpretation is confirmed by GenAp 21.17-19, where Abram states that he hiked along the Euphrates River and Erythrean Sea, until he reached “the branch of the Red Sea” (ם סוק).\textsuperscript{440} It is true that Abram is retracing Arpachshad’s (and thereby his own) borders, but Alexander must assume that the Red Sea (ם סוק) and the Egyptian Sea (ם מערת) are one and the same – something that is not explicit in the text.

Given the popular association of the Sea of Egypt with the Great Sea (an association argued forcefully by Alexander himself), it is easy to see why Hölscher adopted the second option.\textsuperscript{441}

While I agree with Hölscher, the two seas essentially demarcate the same general area – the northern Sinai.

From here the border moves north and then east, from Lebanon\textsuperscript{442} to Sanir\textsuperscript{443} and Amana,\textsuperscript{444} and finally back to the Euphrates.

The fourth portion falls to Aram, who receives the areas north of Asshur and Arpachshad, “the entire land of Mesopotamia between the Tigris and the Euphrates to the north of the Chaldeans as far as the vicinity of the mountain range of Asshur and the land of Arara” (9:5). That is, those portions of Mesopotamia not already allotted to Arpachshad

\textsuperscript{439} See Excursus 3, above.

\textsuperscript{440} Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 205-6.

\textsuperscript{441} Hölscher, \textit{Drei Erdkarten}, 70. He suggests that this “auch einschließlich der Sinaihalbinsel,” which makes good sense given the earlier descriptions of Shem and Ham.

\textsuperscript{442} Here perhaps meaning all of Palestine (cf. Jub 10:29).

\textsuperscript{443} Biblical Senir and modern Mt. Hermon (cf. Deut 3:8-9).

\textsuperscript{444} The vicinity of Mt. Amanos, in northern Syria (see below). All three mountains are also mentioned together in Cant 4:8. Amana has alternately been identified with the anti-Lebanon range (cf. Charles, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 72).
(Chaldea) and Asshur (Asshur, Nineveh, and Shinar), as well as the regions north of this. The “mountain range of Asshur” may form a boundary between the allotments of Aram and Lud (9:6; see below).

Excursus 8: The Mountains of Asshur

There has been a longstanding hypothesis that the Mountains of Asshur in Jub 8:21 and 9:5-6 and Mount Taurus (מֵרָת הַוְי) of GenAp 17.10 and 21.16 refer to the same geographic feature. Avigad and Yadin were the first to propose that, since both are located in the same general vicinity by Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon, and since both fall within the sub-allotment of Shem’s son Aram in the two works, it may be that Jubilees misread the name in its “Aramaic and Hebrew” sources. This might have happened, argued Avigad and Yadin, if the author of Jubilees mistakenly read the Aramaic מֵרָת הַוְי (or מְרָת הַוְי) as מְרָת הַוְי, or the Hebrew מִרְתָּ הָשָׁו (or מִרְתָּ הָשָׁו) as מִרְתָּ הָשָׁו. F. García Martínez adopted a firm stance on this issue, declaring that “the mountains of Asshur can only be Mount Taurus: מֵרָת הַוְי of 1QapGn XVII, 10.” In his opinion, the confusion of the author of Jubilees could have derived only from Aramaic, and this provides evidence for his belief that Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon depend on a common, Aramaic exemplar (i.e. the Book of Noah) at this point. This is a debatable claim, since one could argue that the Hebrew מִרְתָּ הָשָׁו would be more easily mistaken as Mountains of Asshur than any of the other options presented by Avigad and Yadin, including the Aramaic מֵרָת הַוְי and the Hebrew מִרְתָּ הָשָׁו. E. Eshel has recently advocated this possibility, arguing that the Mountains of Asshur in Jubilees (Hebrew מִרְתָּ הָשָׁו) is a scribal error for the Taurus Mountains (גבעה הָשָׁו) due to a simple mix-up between הָשָׁו and האלף.

---

445 Literally, “Mountain of the Bull.”

446 Based on my reading at the end of GenAp 17.9 it may be seen that the overlap actually occurs in the description of Lud’s portion.

447 Avigad and Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon, 30. It is now standard to assume that Jubilees depends only on a Hebrew Urtext, and not an Aramaic one. See VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, 2.VI-VII.

448 F. Garcia Martínez, Qumran and Apocalyptic, 40.

449 Assuming Jubilees to otherwise depend on a Hebrew source.

450 Eshel has related this idea to me in personal communication, but has also indicated that she intends to publish it in an article in the forthcoming Festschrift for Betsy Halpern-Amaru, Heavenly Tablets.
A number of factors are left unaccounted for in the above proposals, and warrant some caution over their acceptance: 1.) Jubilees mentions “mountains” (in the plural), while the Taurus of the Genesis Apocryphon is a single peak; 2.) the description in GenAp 21.16 makes clear that Mount Taurus is to be equated with the mount elsewhere called Amanus (or “Taurus Amanus”)

off the northern end of the Mediterranean coast of Syria (near the Issican Gulf) and still used in rabbinic literature to mark the northern border of Israel;

3.) Jubilees already has an Amana mountain (8:21, 9:4), distinct from the Mountains of Asshur, which appears to be a better candidate to parallel the Apocryphon’s Mount Taurus based on the locations described for each; 4.) the references to the Mountains of Asshur in Jubilees seem to indicate a region further north and east than the description of Mount Taurus in GenAp 21.16, the former being mentioned primarily alongside Mesopotamian sites; 5.) the upper Zagros, or eastern Taurus range, which constitute the Median highlands, are in the area where Jubilees seems to place the Mountains of Asshur. These mountains do, in fact, border the northeast edge of Assyria, and are nearby the Mountains of Ararat (cf. Jub 8:21). Hence, the name “Mountains of Asshur” is not incoherent with its context in Jubilees – a fact that weakens considerably the allegation of scribal confusion.

While it remains possible that some form of the scribal confusion hypothesis of Avigad and Yadin, García Martínez, and (most plausibly) Eshel is correct, the above factors make it entirely reasonable that the term Mountains of Asshur in Jubilees is not a mistake, but simply represents another range of mountains further north and east of the Mount Taurus of the Genesis Apocryphon (= Mount Amana in Jubilees). With Alexander, therefore, I identify the Mountains of Asshur with the eastern Taurus and northwestern Zagros Mountains (surrounding Lake Van), which are an extension of the former range into central, modern Kurdistan.

Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism (ed. L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber; SJSJ 119; Leiden: Brill, due out June 2007).

451 See Tg. Ps.-J. 34:7-8 (תוגר אמאניים); and y. Hallah 4:8. Amanus is also mentioned by Josephus, Jewish Antiquities 1.130.

452 Avigad and Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon, 30.

453 Zeitlin (“The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 255-56) took this position, but based it on the faulty claim that “[t]he Book of Jubilees was written in the pre-Hellenistic period.”

The region of Arara\textsuperscript{455} abuts these mountains, being situated around Lake Van between Kurdistan and Armenia. Aram’s share is described from south to north.

The final son is Lud, who acquires “the mountain range of Asshur and all that belongs to it until it reaches the Great Sea and reaches to the east of his brother Asshur” (9:6). In Jub 9:5 we read that Aram’s portion reaches “\textit{as far as the vicinity of the mountain range of Asshur},” but not that it includes these mountains. Thus, it seems that the southern feet of these form the boundary between the two shares. Since Lud’s allotment stretches from the Great Sea to the east of Asshur’s land, it must run along the northern borders of the shares of Arpachshad, Aram, and Asshur to the south. The areas covered by Lud’s portion are Asia Minor and some of the northerly regions of Asia to the east of it, perhaps ending around the Caspian Sea.

Jubilees’ ordering of the sons of Shem largely follows the biblical listing (Gen 10:21-31; 1 Chr 1:17). The only difference is an inversion of the last two sons, Jubilees having Lud in the last, rather than penultimate, position. There are no known biblical variants agreeing with Jubilees’ order, but the same scheme is found in Josephus’ \textit{Jewish Antiquities} 1.143-44.

4.1.2.3. \textit{Japheth’s Sons: 9:7-13}

The final son of Noah to subdivide his inherited land is Japheth\textsuperscript{456}. The first share falls to Gomer, “eastward from the north side as far as the Tina River” (9:7). This description is extremely ambiguous, but from the surrounding allotments we may gather that it stretches westward from the Tina, with Magog to the northwest, and Javan and Tubal to

\textsuperscript{455} Biblical Ararat; ancient Urartu.

\textsuperscript{456} A broader treatment of the geographic territory occupied by Japheth and his sons in a number of Jewish texts (including Jubilees) has been given by J. Maier, “Zu ethnographisch-geographisch Überlieferungen über Japhetiten (Gen 10, 2-4) in frühen Judentum,” \textit{Henoch} 13 (1991), 157-194.
the southwest (likely separated from Gomer by the lower part of Magog’s portion). This would roughly equate to modern Russia.

Magog comes next, receiving the land “north of him [i.e. Gomer]…all the central parts of the north until it reaches the Me’at Sea” (9:8). This too is a rather vague report, although mention of the Me’at Sea suggests that Magog’s portion skirts to the south of Gomer, in addition to being north (and presumably west) of it. A modern equivalency of Ukraine, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Poland (i.e. the central and northern parts of Eastern Europe) must be rough modern parallels, granting, of course, the considerable differences between ancient and modern maps.

Madai occupies the land “west of his brothers [i.e. Gomer and Magog] as far as the islands and the shores of the islands” (9:9). The designation “west of his brothers” suggests the general region of northwestern Europe, roughly equating to the modern countries of Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands and northern France. Charles first suggested that the islands mentioned in this verse are the British Isles. Given that Madai’s portion does not appear to occupy any part of the southern European coast, this proposal is quite plausible. Although brief, the description moves from east to west.

The fourth share is apportioned to Javan, who receives “every island and the islands that are in the direction of Lud’s border” (9:10). The words “every island” cannot literally mean every island in existence, since we know from elsewhere that islands are apportioned

---

457 Charles, The Book of Jubilees, 76. He is followed by Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 72; Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 207; and Werman, “ספר העולם,” 280, n. 35.

458 As an addendum to this verse Jub 10:35-36 amusingly recounts that when Madai “saw the land near the sea…it did not please him.” Instead, he pleaded for a land grant from Elam, Asshur, and Arpachshad (his wife’s brother), thereby living “in the land of Mediqin near his wife’s brother until the present.” This story creatively reconciles Jubilees’ world map with the clear etymological relationship of Madai to the Near Eastern land of Media.
to Shem, Tiras, and apparently Madai. Rather, this must mean every island within certain geographic parameters. The most logical conclusion is that “every island” means every island in the Aegean Sea. A further qualification is then added by stating that these include the islands hugging the coast of Asia Minor, which belongs to Lud. It is striking, and perhaps significant, that Javan (i.e. Greece) is not only denied territory in Asia, but also relegated to small islands only – a point that will be revisited below.

Tubal receives “the middle of the branch which reaches the border of Lud’s share as far as the second branch, and the other side of the second branch into the third branch” (9:11). Commentators have been divided as to the meaning of “branch” (or “tongue”; הַשְּׁן) in this verse. It must either refer to a peninsula of land, or a gulf of water. The latter is preferable, since the term clearly refers to gulfs elsewhere in the narrative. The first branch (i.e. the branch which reaches the border of Lud’s share) is then the Aegean Sea, the second branch the Adriatic Sea, and the third branch the Tyrrhenian Sea. If this is correct, Tubal is allotted the mainland peninsulas of Greece and Italy, and presumably the lands connecting them to their north.

Next, Meshech is apportioned “all the (region on the) other side of the third branch until it reaches to the east of Gadir” (9:12). That is, southern France, Spain, and Portugal.

---

459 Charles (The Book of Jubilees, 77) entertains the possibility that the first mention of islands in this verse actually refers to “coastlands,” and not islands.

460 So Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 72; and Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 207.


463 E.g, modern Albania, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Slovenia.
The shares of Javan, Tubal, and Meshech are described from east to west, corresponding to the east to west description of Gomer, Magog and Madai’s portions in the north.

The last son to whom Japheth allots land is Tiras. His inheritance amounts to “the four large islands within the sea which reach Ham’s share” (9:13). Precisely which islands constitute “the four large islands” has been a matter of some debate. All agree that they must include Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily, but the fourth has been variously taken as Cyprus, Malta, and Crete.

The confusion here is doubtless connected to the following aside in the last bit of Tiras’ description, “The islands of Kamaturi emerged by lot for Arpachshad’s children as an inheritance.” Charles put this sentence in brackets, believing it to be an interpolation. Whether he is correct or not, it is understandable why the original author, or a later redactor, wanted to clarify this issue in light of the earlier statement that Shem received “the islands of Caphtor” (8:21) as part of his allotment.

Excursus 9: The Islands of Caphtor/Kamaturi

Two key issues must be resolved to reach a decision on the identity of these islands: 1.) to which islands do “the islands of Caphtor” in 8:21 refer; and 2.) are “the islands of Caphtor” and “the islands of Kamaturi” synonymous? Beginning with Charles the second question has been unanimously answered affirmatively, so that the identification of Caphtor may also be applied to Kamaturi with some confidence (and vice versa). Unfortunately, the geographic identification of Caphtor/Kamaturi is not entirely clear. Charles notes that

---


465 Hölscher, Drei Erdkarten, 72.


Caphtor is linked to Cappadocia, north of Syria in Asia Minor, by several of the Targums and the Peshitta.\textsuperscript{469} This is easily ruled out, since here we find Caphtor/Kamaturi referring to an island, or a group of islands, as in Jer 47:4.\textsuperscript{470} Charles opts for the island of Crete, although he admits that modern commentators have linked Caphtor to a number of sites, including Cilicia, Cyprus Crete, or Coptos (a city in the upper Thebaid).\textsuperscript{471} Hölscher, Berger and Wintermute agree that the island is Crete,\textsuperscript{472} but Alexander is certain that “Cyprus must be one of these.”\textsuperscript{473} Schmidt withholds judgment, merely listing Crete and Cyprus as possibilities, while Caquot makes the unlikely suggestion that the islands of Kamaturi refer to the Aegean islands along the coast of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{474} It seems most logical to understand Caphtor/Kamaturi as a reference to Cyprus, since it is the nearest to Shem’s allotment. However, the possibilities that both Cyprus and Crete, or Crete alone, are meant cannot be absolutely excluded. While I find Cyprus’ location a strong argument for its identification with Caphtor/Kamaturi in Jubilees, the matter must remain unresolved in the absence of further evidence. Of course, the fourth great island of Tiras must remain equally ambiguous. If Caphtor/Kamaturi refers to Crete, it must be Crete. If Shem receives Crete instead, then Cyprus must belong to Tiras. If, however, both Crete and Cyprus are meant, then Hölscher’s proposal of Malta may be possible (although I find this a far less likely option).

4.1.3. Summary: Jubilees’ Division of the Earth

When read in tandem with chapter 10:27-35, Jub 8-9 reveals a creative marriage of the Table of Nations from Gen 10, the Ionian world map, and Jubilees’ apologetic desire to provide the Israelites (i.e. the descendents of Arpachshad) a legitimate claim to the biblical

\textsuperscript{469} Charles, \textit{The Book of Jubilees}, 72.

\textsuperscript{470} The Jeremiah passage reads יִתְנַה בְּמִי. It is possible that in Jubilees the phrase was originally intended to be singular (i.e. “the island of Caphtor”) as in Jeremiah. If the original Hebrew of Jubilees was written בְּמִי, as Charles assumes, the first word could have then been translated as either singular or plural.

\textsuperscript{471} Cf. “Caphtor,” \textit{ABD} 1.869-70.


\textsuperscript{473} Alexander, “Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 206.

\textsuperscript{474} Schmidt, “Jewish Representations,” 124; Caquot, \textit{Annuaire du Collège de France} (1980-81), 508-9. These Aegean islands are clearly given to Javan earlier.
“land of Canaan” – i.e. the eventual land of Israel. Schmidt suggests that this cocktail emerged as the result of an inter-Israelite conflict regarding the growing trend of Jewish openness toward Hellenization, with Jubilees advocating a conservative, anti-Hellenizing stance. While this may partially account for Jubilees’ concern, it seems likely that Jubilees is also making a claim on the land vis-à-vis foreign occupation. The laughably small allotment of Javan (i.e. Greece) in particular suggests that the Greeks may be the targets of such a claim. This would fit well with the standard opinion that Jubilees was written in the midst of the Maccabean revolt against the Seleucids. Thus, not only is Jubilees taking a stand against pro-Hellenistic Israelites, but also against those modern Canaanites, the Greeks, who have dared usurp a land not their own. This apologetic could easily be appropriated by others, such as the Essenes or later Christian groups, who viewed themselves as the true remnant of Israel – i.e. the rightful heirs of the Promised Land.

Jubilees’ heavy dependence on the Ionian world map is obvious through its division of the world into three parts by way of the Tina and Gihon rivers, as well as many of the other sites employed. If the identifications of Karas with Icarus/Caria, Afra/Fara with Pharos, and the Egyptian Sea with the eastern Mediterranean are correct, then this dependence on Hellenistic geography is even further underscored. Jubilees’ strict focus on geographic regions (and not on ethnic or linguistic developments), as well as its division schema (first among Noah’s sons and then among his grandsons) are additional factors setting this account apart from its biblical exemplar.

---


476 On the date of Jubilees see the excursus in Chapter 1, 38-40.

4.2. *Genesis Apocryphon 16-17*

Noah’s division of the earth in the Genesis Apocryphon is woefully fragmentary, and as a result many issues are less clear than in Jubilees. Perhaps it is for this reason that some scholars dealing with the division of the earth in early Judaism merely gesture toward these columns as an obvious parallel to Jubilees, presumably with little of interest to offer on its own.\(^{478}\) Despite the scroll’s incomplete nature, this is certainly not the case. It is true that GenAp 16-17 follow the same general structure as Jubilees, Noah first dividing the world into three sections among his sons, who in turn distribute their respective shares among their own sons. This remains one of the most striking parallels between the two accounts. In addition, there is significant overlap in the major landmarks used to delineate territories from one another, attesting to a common dependence on the tripartite Ionian world map.

In the following comments I will make frequent reference back to Jubilees and summarize some of the more interesting points of comparison and contrast at the end of the chapter. For more detailed explanations of individual readings the textual notes may be consulted.

4.2.1. *Noah’s Division among his Sons: Genesis Apocryphon 16*

4.2.1.1. *Japheth’s Portion: 16.8-12*

The first glimpses of Noah’s distribution are picked up already in progress, and we are immediately faced with difficulty reading the text and contextualizing the places

\(^{478}\) A representative example may be found in J. M. Scott, *Geography in Early Judaism*, 28, 36. Of course, this is understandable given the relatively recent publication of these columns.
mentioned. It is clear, however, that the account begins midway through a description of Japheth’s allotment. Line 9 begins, “of the sea that is between them, source of (the) Mahaq, up to the Tina River. It then passes by line of sight the length of the whole land of the north, in its entirety, until it reaches the source of…”

Several words in this line have fostered debate and confusion. The first word of the line has been read by some as “branch” (לְשׁוֹנָה) or “branches” (לְשׁוֹנָי), which is a geographic term used elsewhere in both Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon, although it does not occur in Jubilees’ description of Japheth’s share. The other word that has drawn attention is what most read as בֵּין, which has been understood by some to occur once in the center of line 9 (my נַחֲלָה) and once toward its end (my בֵּין). There are good paleographic reasons to believe that neither of these readings is correct, but taken together they have generated some theories that must be addressed briefly.

Esther Eshel has recently argued that the term בֵּין in the Genesis Apocryphon is an alternate name for the Euphrates River, which is elsewhere called by the expected פורט (GenAp 16.16; 17.12, 14[?]; 21.12, 17 bis, 28).479 Eshel based her argument in part on an enigmatic geographic reference to a certain בֵּין in Isa 11:15 – a term that has frustrated exegetes for centuries. Paired with her transcription of “branches” or “bays” at the beginning of the line, she proposed that, in contrast to Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon allots Japheth the majority of Asia Minor, up to the בֵּין (her Euphrates River) and then back to the Tina River. Hence, the division of the earth in the Genesis Apocryphon stands closer at this point to its “parallel” account in Josephus than to Jubilees.

A serious difficulty with this interpretation is its ill fit with the rest of the GenAp 16-17, in which it is relatively clear that 1.) Japheth receives only the land north of the Tina River (17.16); 2.) Shem is granted the “waters of the Tina River (16.15)”; and 3.) Lud is apportioned Asia Minor, as in Jubilees (17.9-10). Another problem is a comparison with Josephus’ account, which clearly has different motives. Of course, most decisive are the paleographic problems mentioned above, which Eshel fails to address despite disagreement over the first instance of יבב in the editions.

As the passage is transcribed here, several terms present in Jubilees’ description of Japheth’s portion are also discernible in the Genesis Apocryphon. While the “sea that is between them” is difficult to pinpoint, it is apparently linked to the “source of the Mahaq,” which is equivalent to the outer Mauq Sea in Jubilees. From here the border reaches “up to the Tina River,” indicating that the border is progressing in a clockwise direction – the opposite of Jubilees. “[T]he whole land of the north, in its entirety” may then refer to the land bordering the Tina, on its northern bank – i.e. the lands of Gomer and Magog. Indeed, 17.16 later records that Gomer’s portion lies “in the north, until it reaches the Tina River.” The word יבב preceding this phrase makes the best sense as a geographic adverb, based on either the meaning “sight” or “spring” for the word יבב.

480 Cf. the following chapter.

481 The first letter is transcribed as a mem by Garcia-Martinez and Tigchellar and Beyer.

482 See the textual note. My reading יבב is similar to that found in a Syriac Chronicle loosely quoting Jubilees text at this point ( membrum, cf. VanderKam, The Book of Jubilees, 2.53-54, n. to 8:21).

483 Alternatively, it may refer to the general situation of Japheth’s portion in its entirety. This seems less likely, however, based on this line’s placement in the description.

484 See the textual notes.
In 16.11 the description of Japheth’s share concludes, stating that “this boundary crosses the waters of the Great Sea until it reaches to Gā[de]ra…” Here again we see a significant difference in comparison with Jubilees, which ends at the northeastern end of the Tina River. Like Jubilees, however, this description does traverse the Great Sea, apparently including a large portion of it within Japheth’s lot.

Though many questions must remain unanswered regarding Japheth’s share in the Genesis Apocryphon, it is clear that, as in Jubilees, his portion includes the land of the north and employs the Tina River as a major border. Unlike Jubilees, the portion is described in a clockwise direction, and uses Gadera as its point of origin and termination. The description ends by stating that “…Noah divided by lot for Japheth and his sons to inherit as an eternal inheritance (16.12).”

4.2.1.2. Shem’s Portion: 16.14-25

Although the parchment comprising the middle of col. 16 is relatively well preserved, the script itself is badly deteriorated and fragmentary due to the corrosive traits of the ink. Thankfully, however, a number of toponyms are still legible and give some idea of how these lines compare to the description of Jubilees. GenAp 16.14 begins, “To Shem fell the second lot, for him and his sons to inherit…” That Shem receives the second share indicates that Japheth’s lot comes first in the earth’s division, and that Ham is the last to receive his share. This order (Japheth-Shem-Ham) stands in stark contrast to the more expected order found in Jubilees (Shem-Ham-Japheth).

The first extant geographic detail of the section is the mention of “the waters of this Tina River” (16.15), which emerge and then progress to a now lost destination. Jub 8:12 also includes the Tina very near the beginning of its description, although only after naming the
Rafa Mountains and “the source of the water” of this river. It is unclear whether the Apocryphon listed these features, but it is probable that some description of the upper Tina and its source preceded the present mention of the river, since the phrase “this Tina River” seems to assume a directly antecedent reference.\footnote{This may, in fact, be one argument against the reconstruction of Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan (and followed by Fitzmyer) at the end of 16.14, which I have followed for the time being.}

Following a half line of illegible text is a second reference to the Tina River, and then, after another short break, to “the Maeota Sea (Ἁμαρτία τῆς Μαiegής),”\footnote{The ancient Maeotis (Gk. Μαιωτίς); equivalent to Jubilees’ Me’at Sea.} which reaches…the gulf of the Great Salt Sea. This boundary goes by line of sight to the waters of this gulf, which…” (16.16-17). Again, Jubilees provides a similar description, moving from the outer edges of the earth to the Me’at Sea and then into “the bosom of the branch that faces southward” (Jub 8:12-13) by way of the Tina River. It is clear that both texts use the Tina to describe the border between Shem and Japheth, and that the descriptions run the same direction and employ like landmarks. The similarities, however, break down somewhat in the details. Beyond probably not mentioning the Rafa Mountains,\footnote{Based on available space at the end of GenAp 16.14.} the Genesis Apocryphon uses a form for the Maeotian Sea that is morphologically closer to its Greek exemplar Μαιωτίς than the Me’at of Jubilees. Additionally, the Apocryphon names the Great Salt Sea,\footnote{This is apparently another way to refer to the Great Sea, or Mediterranean, based on the later appellation “this Great Sea of salt” (אַלְמָה יָם דָּם מַלֵּל) in GenAp 21.16, which is clearly speaks of the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is simply called the Great Sea (יָם רַבָּה) in 21.11-16. Cf. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 172.} rather than the more typical Great Sea of Jub 8:12. The mention of the
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\footnote{This may, in fact, be one argument against the reconstruction of Morgenstern, Qimron, and Sivan (and followed by Fitzmyer) at the end of 16.14, which I have followed for the time being.}

\footnote{The ancient Maeotis (Gk. Μαιωτίς); equivalent to Jubilees’ Me’at Sea.}

\footnote{Based on available space at the end of GenAp 16.14.}

\footnote{This is apparently another way to refer to the Great Sea, or Mediterranean, based on the later appellation “this Great Sea of salt” (אַלְמָה יָם דָּם מַלֵּל) in GenAp 21.16, which is clearly speaks of the Mediterranean. The Mediterranean is simply called the Great Sea (יָם רַבָּה) in 21.11-16. Cf. Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 172.}
gulf of this sea directly after the Maeotis in the Apocryphon shows that the author considered the Great Sea to extend through the Pontus Euxinus, as in Strabo and Jubilees.\footnote{See note 20, above.}

The next recognizable landmark is “the gulf of the sea that faces toward Eg[yp]t” in GenAp 16.18. Lack of context precludes certainty, but this gulf probably refers either to the entire eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea (i.e. the Egyptian Sea of Hellenistic geographers), or to a smaller gulf comprising only part of the Mediterranean (e.g. the Aegean, Pamphylian, or Issican/Myriandric gulfs). In my opinion, the second option is more likely, in which case this gulf equates to Jubilees’ “Branch of the Egyptian Sea” (8:14).\footnote{Cf. Excursus 3, above.} If this is the case, the two accounts describe the same feature in a slightly different manner.

Unfortunately, this is the last reference of any substance in Shem’s portion. The remaining seven lines are too disintegrated to read with any certainty, but reveal that at line 18 the account is less than half finished, being roughly eleven and a half lines long.\footnote{The lines in this column are irregularly short for the scroll due to its placement at the end of a sheet of parchment (so too col. 22). In a typical column the section would be closer to nine or ten lines long.} It is apparent that, like Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon’s border description moves counterclockwise. A number of the same landmarks are also employed, despite the regular inconsistency in details between the two accounts.

4.2.1.3. Ham’s Portion: 16.26ff.

There are several indicators that a description of Ham’s portion begins at line 26: 1.) mention of Shem receiving the “second lot” in GenAp 16.14, which is preceded by Japheth’s
allotted lands; 2.) the presence of a large *vacat* midway through 16.25; and 3.) convincing remains of the word מָרָא, “And to Ham,” at the beginning of 16.26. Unfortunately, there is almost nothing legible remaining of this section, save a clear gimel in line 27, which may well belong to the name Gihon. Based on the preceding descriptions, we would not expect this description to be longer than ten to twelve lines (and probably shorter, given the typical disinterest in the Hamites and their allotments), putting us near the end of the column.

4.2.2. *The Subdivision among Noah’s Grandsons: Genesis Apocryphon 17*

4.2.2.1. *Ham’s Sons?*

While the first five lines of col. 17 are completely missing, there are a number of reasons to believe that they once contained a description of Ham’s allocation of his share among his sons: 1.) as suggested above, the account of Ham’s portion likely ended around the end of col. 16; 2.) the division of Shem’s lot among his sons begins in 17.7, and is preceded by a half-line *vacat*, leaving at least six lines of text unaccounted for at the top of the column; 3.) a review of the allotments of Japheth, Shem, and Ham, while plausible, would likely not have taken up six lines; 4.) Japheth’s distribution among his sons in 17.16-19 takes up less than four full lines; 5.) placing Ham first would create a chiastic structure with the preceding list of Japheth-Shem-Ham. It is also worth recalling that Jubilees’ description of Ham’s sons is very brief. Considering that Ham has three less sons than Japheth, it is quite likely that the last lines of col. 16 and the beginning lined of col. 17 contained both a review of the land distributed to Noah’s three sons, and the subdivision of Ham’s share.
4.2.2.2. Shem’s Sons: 17.7-15

The subdivision of Shem’s lot among his sons is relatively well preserved. The list begins much like Jubilees, stating that “Shem divided his [share] between his sons” (17.7).492 The first son to receive his share is Elam, “in the north, next to the waters of the Tigris River, until it reaches the Erythrean Sea, to its source which is in the north” (17.7-8). While both the Tigris and Erythrean Sea are cited in Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon’s account is much shorter and less precise, never mentioning such exotic sites as India, the mountains of Mebri and Ela, or Farnak. We also read nothing of the Tina River for the allotment’s northern border, as in Jub 9:2. To be sure, we gain a far less exact picture of Elam’s lot from the Genesis Apocryphon than from Jubilees. Nevertheless, the same basic area seems to be in view, generally comprised of everything east of the Tigris River, from the Erythrean Sea in the south to the Tina in the north. Both accounts jump from place to place, but appear do so in a somewhat similar pattern, moving from the Tigris down to the Erythrean Sea, and then back up toward the north.

The portion of Asshur follows in GenAp 17.8, “And after him, (the region) to the west (fell) to Asshur, until it reaches to the Tigris…”493 No more than a few words can follow this mention of the Tigris, showing again that this description is much shorter and far more schematic than that of Jubilees. All that we can gather in the Apocryphon is that Asshur’s share is west of Elam, and that it involves the Tigris River. This, of course, lines up well geographically with the description in Jubilees 9:3, although there we hear nothing about being “to the west” of Elam, or the Tigris River.

492 Jubilees 9:2 reads, “Shem, too, divided (his share) among his sons.”

493 In col. 17 of the Genesis Apocryphon the word חותרה “and after him” commonly (but not always) signals the next apportionment to be listed. For this reason, the inclusion of this part of line 8 within Elam’s portion is to be rejected (cf. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon*, 96-7, 173-4).
The third distribution falls “to Aram, the land that is between the two rivers until it reaches the summit of Mt. Ararat, in that region” (17.9). When paired with the following allotment of Arpachshad, it is clear that this refers to the middle and upper regions of Mesopotamia, and north into modern Kurdistan and Armenia. Jub 9:5 is again longer than the Apocryphon, and differs in the sites chosen to describe the allotment. While it lists “the mountain range of Asshur” in the north, here we apparently have Mt. Ararat instead. In addition, Jubilees employs the Tigris, Euphrates, and land of Chaldea to demarcate the specific area of Mesopotamia being referred to. Despite these differences, the geographic area described by both texts is once again the same, with both narratives moving from south to north.

Next, to Lud “falls this Mt. Taurus, and this portion passes to the west until it reaches to Magog; everything next to the branch… that is in the Eastern Sea, in the north, which embraces this branch – that which is on top of the three portions to south of this one” (17.10-11). Here we surprisingly find a significantly longer and dissimilar description than that provided by the author of Jubilees. Mt. Taurus (or Taurus Amanus) is situated near the border between northern Syria and Cilicia in southern Asia Minor, and constitutes a standard landmark used to distinguish the regions to its north and south. The “Eastern Sea, in the north,” must refer to the Caspian Sea, which would be expected near Lud’s eastern frontier. This is confirmed by the mention of Magog, who receives a portion that would border this area in Jub 9:8 (the Genesis Apocryphon is too vague to be sure where

494 Although by less of a margin than with most other portions.

495 Some have read my Mt. Ararat as the mountains of Asshur based upon Jubilees, but this is doubtful. See the textual notes.

496 Cf. Excursus 8, above.
Magog’s portion lies). That a “branch” is referred to may hint that the author of the Genesis Apocryphon understood the Caspian to be an inlet of the outer Ocean River, but this is not certain. The final statement that Lud’s share sits “on top of the three portions to the south,” indicates that his portion runs along the tops of three allotments to its south. These must be Asshur, Aram, and Arpachshad. As in Jubilees, Lud receives Asia Minor and the land northeast of it, but in the Genesis Apocryphon this area is explained in an entirely different way. Interestingly, despite their differences both accounts appear to begin with a point somewhere in the middle of the allotment and then move first to the west, and then toward the east.

The final description is that of Arpachshad, which stands apart from the others because of its added length. His section begins, “until it reaches to… which turns to the south, the entire land irrigated by the Euphrates, and all…” (17.11-12). The “land irrigated by the Euphrates” is a technical reference to southern Mesopotamia, approximately from Hit southward, and is equivalent to Jubilees’ “Chaldean region to the east of the Euphrates.”

497 Alexander (“Notes on the ‘Imago Mundi,’” 206) argues that in Jubilees the Eastern Sea cannot be connected to the outer waters because of the east-west orientation if the Tina River (but cf. Excursus 1, above). This is questionable, but would line up with the descriptions of some Hellenistic geographers (e.g. Hecataeus and Eratosthenes). The seemingly more common view among Ionian-dependant geographers (e.g. Strabo, Arrian, and Pseudo-Aristotle) was that the Caspian was open on its northeastern end to the outer sea, thereby forming a large gulf. This is still seen on the famous late 13th century Hereford Mappa Mundi, or the late 14th century Higden world map. If, indeed, Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon disagreed on this point (which I find doubtful) it would be of no mean importance. However, any such difference is impossible to demonstrate at present.

498 Alternatively, the branch may be the Aegean Sea, but this would require a significant leap in the description, from the Aegean to the Caspian within one or two words. This seems a less likely option.

499 See the article by W. S. LaSor, “Euphrates,” in the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia (4 vols.; ed. G. W. Bromiley et. al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 2.202-204. Mesopotamia is roughly divisible into three regions – upper, middle, and lower. The lower region was distinguished in antiquity by an impressive network of irrigation ditches ciphering water away from the Euphrates and enabling a productive environment for agriculture; hence, the “land irrigated by the Euphrates.” This region was also regularly inundated by flooding from the Euphrates during the rainy season, which may also be partially responsible for the designation here.
(9:4). The following line continues, “…al[l] of the valleys and plains which are between them and the coastlands that are in the bosom of this gulf, every… until it reaches…” Where precisely the “valleys and plains” are located is unsure, though an identification somewhere within the Levant is expected. The “coastlands” (מַיִם) that lay in the bosom of this gulf are likely the Sinai, Israeli, Lebanese, and Syrian seacoasts, but may alternatively refer to an “island” lying at the east edge of the “gulf” of the Mediterranean (i.e. the Egyptian Sea). The first option is considerably strengthened by the fact that a different, more technical word for “island” (איָלָה) is used later in this column (17.17).

The last extant segment of Arpachshad’s share reads, “to Amana, which adjoins Mt. Ararat, and (from) Amana until it reaches the Euphrates…” (17.14). Amana is also mentioned (along with Lebanon and Senir) toward the end of Jubilees’ account of Arpachshad’s land. This region could be linked either to Mt. (Taurus) Amanus, in northern Syria next to the Issican Gulf, or with the biblical district in the vicinity of the Amana River (modern Nahr Barada), which runs from the Anti-Lebanon mountain range through Damascus. The following reference to Mt. Ararat, as well as the placements of Mt. Taurus and Amans in the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees, argues strongly for adopting the former option. This also advocates for a southerly location for Mt. Ararat, in modern Kurdistan. As in Jubilees, the Euphrates is among the last toponyms mentioned.

Arpachshad’s portion is among the most similar in comparison with Jubilees. Both accounts are roughly the same length, follow a clockwise direction, and list a number of the same sites. Despite this general resemblance, however, there remain stark differences in
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500 If an island is meant (which I find unlikely), then Cyprus is certainly the best candidate. This would shed some new light on questions about the islands of Caphtor/Kamaturi in Jubilees (cf. Excursus 9, above).
wording and description, such as their entirely unrelated manners of depicting the region of southern Mesopotamia.

4.2.2.3. Japheth’s Sons: 17.16-19

The entire subdivision of Japheth’s portion between his sons is, not surprisingly, more succinct than the version in Jubilees. To Gomer, the first to receive his share, fell “(that) in the north until it reaches to the Tina River” (17.16). This is strikingly similar to Jub 9:8, which adds only that Gomer received what is “eastward” in the north.

The next two sons are simply listed without further elaboration: “And after him [i.e. Gomer] to Magog, and after him to Madai” (17.16-17). Since we find that Gomer is placed next to the Tina, we may assume that, like Jubilees, the author of the Genesis Apocryphon understands these allotments to be moving consecutively toward the west. Jubilees, however, expands considerably upon both shares.

Javan comes next, receiving “every island that is alongside Lud, and (that) between the gulf th[at] is n[ea]r Lud and the [s]econd gulf.” The words “every island” mirror exactly the phrase in Jubilees, but in this portion is also found one of the most intriguing differences between Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon. While the former allots Javan only the Aegean Islands, it is clear that the Apocryphon assigns him the mainland of Greece as well – i.e. the land lying between “the gulf that is near Lud” (the Aegean Sea) and “the second gulf” (the Adriatic Sea). Fitzmyer, basing himself on Jubilees, has understood “the second gulf” to go along with the following word חלב “to Tubal,” thereby leaving Lud with only islands as in Jub 9:10. However, we have no other instance in cols. 16-17 where a site related to one of Noah’s sons or grandsons is listed before he is named. Considering a probable second mention of “the second gulf” at the beginning of 17.18, it is quite certain that everything
preceding לֹאֵל belongs within the portion of Javan. As in Jubilees, the reference to Lud’s share in describing the Aegean Islands demonstrates that Lud (and, therefore, Shem) has already received all of Asia Minor.\textsuperscript{501}

Tubal’s abrupt description consists of three Aramaic words: “that which is on the other side of the second gulf” (17:17-18). Here too there is a discrepancy with Jubilees, linked to the difference regarding Javan. While in Jubilees’ lengthier account Tubal is apportioned both mainland Greece and Italy, here he receives Italy alone – i.e. that lying to the west of the Adriatic. While disagreeing with the overall scope of Tubal’s share, Jub 9:11 contains a phrase remarkably similar to that of the Genesis Apocryphon’s report, “…and the other side of the second branch into the third branch.”

Of the last two sons, very little readable text remains. It is clear that Meshech is listed after Tubal, although only his name is preserved. His description was quite short – probably four to seven words – and likely mentioned “the third gulf” (the Tyrrhenian Sea) and Gadir, as in Jub 9.12.

Not even the name of Tiras is extant, although he is undoubtedly the last son to be listed both by default (his is the only share not yet described) and based on the traditional order employed by Genesis and Jubilees. His account may include reference to the four islands mentioned in Jub 9:13, since his description appears to end by referring to “the portion of the sons of Ham,” as in Jubilees. It is worth noting that there does not seem to be room in the Genesis Apocryphon for Jubilees’ additional reminder that the “islands of Kamaturi” emerged as the inheritance of Arpachshad.

A basic parallel in structure may be observed between the subdivisions among Japheth’s sons in the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees. Beyond using the same order of names, both texts describe the allotments in two stages: first, from east to west in the north of Europe, and then once again from east to west in southern Europe.

By all appearances the listing of the shares of Japheth’s sons ends the body of the earth’s division in the Genesis Apocryphon, although this would likely have been followed by a summary section reviewing the actions taken and solemnizing the occasion with the taking of oaths (cf. Jub 9:14-15). This possibility is strengthened by the little text which survives in the following lines, and by a vacat four and a half lines after the end of Japheth’s subdivision. Unfortunately, from 17.25 until the text becomes readable again in col. 19, the manuscript is completely illegible. If extant, we would likely have read of the dispersion of peoples at the Tower of Babel and the transgression of Canaan settling in the land apportioned to Arpachshad (Jub 10:18-34). Perhaps it even included the resettlement of Madai in the region of Mesopotamia, as in Jub 10:35-36.

4.2.3. Summary: The Genesis Apocryphon’s Division of the Earth and Its Relationship to Jubilees

Having examined the parallel accounts of the earth’s apportionment in Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon, we are now in a position to make some comparative observations. To begin with, the similarities between the two texts are striking, and compellingly demonstrate that they are based on nearly identical exegetical approaches to Gen 10. These similarities only add weight to the widely held notion that these works are related to each other in some way – an idea advocated even before Avigad and Yadin by Albright and Trever. Some of the most obvious examples of their connection are:
i. The basic, two-fold literary structure of an initial division by Noah and a secondary division by his three sons

ii. Shared geographic terminology based on the Ionian world map and not present in Gen 10, such as “gulf/branch,”\textsuperscript{502} the Tina River, the Gihon River, the Maeota/Me’at Sea, the Eastern Sea, the Mahaq/Mauq Sea, etc.

iii. Use of the Tina and Gihon rivers as borders between the continents

iv. Similar formulae at the beginning and end of each section within the initial division among Noah’s sons

v. The basic similarity of the geographic territories received by each son and grandson

vi. The common apologetic background of both works, which promotes the pre-Canaanite possession of the Levant by the Israelites’ ancestors

These strong family resemblances make it simply untenable to assert that the Apocryphon and Jubilees represent completely independent exegetical traditions.

Alongside these general likenesses, however, a host of noteworthy differences have also emerged. Perhaps most striking is the divergence of the order in which some of Noah’s sons and grandsons are presented. These are laid out in the following chart:

\textsuperscript{502} Cf. especially the two works’ common use of the terms first gulf, second gulf, and third gulf to speak of the Aegean, Adriatic, and Tyrhenian Seas to distinguish between the allotments of Japheth’s sons Javan, Tubal, and Meshech.
### TABLE 3:

**THE ORDER OF THE EARTH’S DIVISION IN THE GENESIS APOCRYPHON AND JUBILEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis Apocryphon 16-17</th>
<th>Jubilees 8:8-9:15</th>
<th>Genesis 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noah’s Sons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noah’s Sons</strong></td>
<td><strong>Noah’s Sons</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japheth (7-16.12)</td>
<td>Shem (8:11-21)</td>
<td>Japheth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ham (16.26-?)</td>
<td>Japheth (8:25-29)</td>
<td>Shem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[Ham’s Sons?]**
- [Cush]
- [Egypt]
- [Put]
- [Canaan]

**Shem’s Sons**
- Elam (17.7-8)
- Asshur (17.8)
- Aram (17.9)
- Lud (17.9-11)
- Arpachshad (17.11-14)

**Japheth’s Sons**
- Gomer (17.16)
- Magog (17.16)
- Madai (17.17)
- Javan (17.17)
- Tubal (17.17-18)
- Meshech (17.18)
- [Tiras] (17.18-19)

**Shem’s Sons**
- Cush (9:1)
- Egypt (9:1)
- Put (9:1)
- Canaan (9:1)

**Japheth’s Sons**
- Elam (9:2)
- Asshur (9:3)
- Arpachshad (9:4)
- Aram (9:5)
- Lud (9:6)

**Japheth’s Sons**
- Gomer (9:8)
- Magog (9:8)
- Madai (9:9)
- Javan (9:10)
- Tubal (9:11)
- Meshech (9:12)
- Tiras (9:13)

**Shem’s Sons**
- Elam
- Asshur
- Arpachshad
- Lud
- Aram

**Japheth’s Sons**
- Gomer
- Magog
- Madai
- Javan
- Tubal
- Meshech
- Tiras
When placed beside each other in this way two major discrepancies in sequence are evident between the Apocryphon and Jubilees. The first occurs in the initial section dealing with Noah’s sons, where the Apocryphon, Jubilees, and Genesis each have a different order. The second is in the succession Asshur-Aram-Lud-Arpachshad in the subdivision of Shem’s sons, again with three different arrangements represented. The question to be asked is whether these differences are of any real significance, or are simply arbitrary. In this case it is quite plain that both the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees are organized according to a central guiding principle, and that these principles are not the same.

In the Genesis Apocryphon Noah’s progeny are consistently listed directionally, following their placement on the Ionian map. During the initial division Noah’s sons are listed from north to south (or left to right on the ancient map, which is quite literally “oriented,” with east at the top): Japheth, Shem, and Ham. For the secondary division among the grandsons this order is likely reversed, now moving in a chiasmic manner from south to north: Ham, Shem, and Japheth. All of the grandsons, with a few necessary exceptions, are listed from east to west (or top to bottom). The placement of Lud in the list is somewhat flexible since the author makes clear that his allotment runs along the north edge of three portions belonging to his brothers. The author of the Apocryphon has chosen to put him in the penultimate position, between Aram and Arpachshad. Japheth’s sons must be listed in a two-tier structure, with a northern and a southern group, since their allotments do not fit as neatly into a successive east-west alignment as the allotments of the

503 In the lower section of the table I have not listed the Noah’s sons according to their actual order for Gen 10 (i.e. Japheth-Shem-Ham, shown in the upper part of the table), but have adapted them to the sequence employed by the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees (Ham-Shem-Japheth) for comparative purposes. From this point, whenever referring to the biblical order of names, I am basing myself on the genealogy of Gen 10 (//1 Chr 1:1-17). Cf. VanderKam, “Putting Them in their Place,” 48-53.
sons of Shem and Ham. Finally, Tiras almost certainly received only islands, as in Jubilees, and is accordingly put at the end of Japheth’s sons.

In Jubilees the picture is quite different. Here it is obvious that, in general, the author utilized the standard order of names found in Gen 10, regardless of their placement on the map.\(^504\) One exception is Jubilees’ order of Aram and Lud, which has been reversed from the biblical succession of Lud and Aram in Gen 10:22 (//1 Chr 1:17). While the biblical versions unanimously place Lud before Aram, Josephus also lists the sons as Jubilees does,\(^505\) suggesting that Aram-Lud may once have been an alternate order in one of the Greek recensions. For the initial division among Noah’s sons the author chose to follow the more common biblical sequence of Shem, Ham, and Japheth, instead of the unique order of Japheth, Ham, and Shem used in the body of Gen 10. The secondary division lists all of the grandsons in their biblical succession (save Aram and Lud), but the larger structure of the section deviates from this trend by presenting the groups in the sequence Ham, Shem, and Japheth (or south to north), as appears to be the case in the Genesis Apocryphon. While these exceptions produce some incoherence, it remains clear that Jub 8:11-9:15 is based largely on the biblical taxonomy of Noah’s descendents.

As mentioned above, this disagreement in organizing strategies is most clearly seen in the initial lists of Noah’s sons, and the secondary register of Shem’s sons. Most notable in the latter group is Arpachshad, who is moved from the middle to the end of the list in the Apocryphon. We find full agreement between the texts for the sons of Japheth and Ham,

\(^{504}\) Cf. Gen 6:10, 9:18, 10:1; and 1 Chr 1:4 for Noah’s sons, and Gen 10 and 1 Chr 1 for his grandsons.

\(^{505}\) Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 1.143-45.
since here the two strategies of the Apocryphon and Jubilees overlap – they are listed both according to the biblical arrangement and from east to west.

A second important difference is the brevity of the Genesis Apocryphon when compared to Jubilees. With the exception of Lud, Arpachshad, and Javan, the extant parts of the Apocryphon regularly contain shorter and simpler descriptions of each allotment. Good examples of this are the shares of Elam and Asshur, which include a number of sites not found in the Genesis Apocryphon, such as the waters of Dedan, the Mebri and Ela mountains, and the Wadafa River. As Werman has argued, this seems to reveal a more comprehensive knowledge of geography on the part of Jubilees, especially of those lands in the eastern regions of middle Asia (from the Tigris into India). This disparity cuts against the grain of the standard view, espoused by Avigad and Yadin, Fitzmyer, and others, that the Apocryphon is regularly more expansive than the shorter accounts of Jubilees and 1 Enoch. It also adds another important example to Nickelsburg’s earlier caution that such expansion is not always the case.

Finally, there are numerous other differences between Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon regarding geographic details, toponyms, and formulaic language. Taken individually most of these discrepancies are not of great significance. However, when viewed together they become quite impressive, and demonstrate a sustained divergence in how the allotments are portrayed. Some of the most important examples of this are:

i. Japheth’s portion being described in opposite directions, and with different points of orientation (Gadera vs. the northeast end of the Tina River)

---

Werman, “וָרֶם,” 281.
ii. The direction “west” and the Tigris River being mentioned only in the Genesis Apocryphon’s description of Asshur’s allotment

iii. The Genesis Apocryphon including Mt. Ararat and not mentioning the Tigris or Euphrates in Aram’s portion

iv. The Apocryphon’s reference to the Eastern Sea and “three portions to the south” in its description of Lud’s share

v. Jubilees’ absence of “valleys and plains,” coastlands, or Mt. Ararat in Arpachshad’s allotment

vi. Javan’s reception of mainland Greece in the Genesis Apocryphon

vii. The variation in geographic terms, such as the Apocryphon’s independent use of the Great Salt Sea, the Reed Sea (תנור), “the land irrigated by the Euphrates,” and probably Mt. Taurus; or Jubilees’ exclusive use of Farnak, Sak, Babel, Shinar, and several other toponyms

viii. Formulaic use of the phrase “and after him” (והקב) in the Apocryphon to introduce most grandsons

Based on the above observations, what are we to make of the relationship between these passages? If one were to presume a direct literary connection between the two texts (i.e. one had direct access to a copy of the other and borrowed from it for its own composition) the balance must tip in favor of the Genesis Apocryphon being the earlier work. There are at least four factors that argue for this position:

1. Regarding the differences in order, it seems more likely that the later, dependent text would correct toward the order of sons and grandsons found in Gen 10, rather than
away from it. Thus, it easier to envision Jubilees taking the directional account of the
Apocryphon and re-presenting it according to the biblical arrangement than vice
versa.

ii. The fact that the Genesis Apocryphon is typically shorter than Jubilees may be seen
as an argument for its priority. As noted in the first chapter, however, respected
scholars have used the relative length of a text to argue both sides of this issue –
both that the shorter text is earlier (del Medico, Fitzmyer) and that it is later (Avigad
and Yadin, Vermes). This should stand as a warning to exercise caution in placing
too much emphasis on the relative length of an account.\footnote{One wonders if perhaps the text-critical maxim *lectio brevior lectio potior* has had too much influence on some in this debate.} It seems that in each case
a most important factor to consider is the broader setting and goals of each text
under discussion. It is not entirely surprising, for example, that Jubilees condenses
the Enochic story of the Watchers, since this is not a major focus or concern of his
work. One would be hard pressed to find a commentator who argues that because
Jubilees is shorter in this case, it is also earlier than the Book of Watchers. In the
present case, however, we would be surprised if a work like the Genesis Apocryphon
(so obviously focused on the topic of geography and Noah’s role as divider of the
earth throughout the scroll) would pass over the additional geographic and
theological material of Jubilees.

iii. A related matter is the greater simplicity of the descriptions in the Apocryphon,
which regularly exhibits less geographic specificity and elaboration than Jubilees. A
logical inference from this phenomenon, especially given the scroll’s geographic
bent, is that its author was working with more rudimentary geographic knowledge than the author of Jubilees.

iv. A relatively unexplored aspect of Jub 8:11-9:15 is its inclusion of what may be called theological and geographic “add-ons.” The prime example of this is Jub 8:17-21, which is appended to the geographic description of Shem’s allotment and recasts it in hyperbolic, theological terms. While a study of this passage is beyond our purview, this passage has the feel of an authorial observation interpolated into the otherwise orderly structure of Noah’s distribution – an added commentary of sorts on the blessedness and excellence of Shem’s portion. The aside about Shem’s inheritance of the islands of Kamaturi in Jub 9:13 may be another such addition, as Charles assumed. A less certain example is the brief statement about the climate of each son’s region in Jub 8:30. It is relatively clear that the Genesis Apocryphon has neither the first or second of these passages, again attesting to the shorter, simpler quality of its account. That Jubilees added some additional comments to the less cluttered Apocryphon seems the more plausible scenario.

Of course, it would be preferable to base an argument for the priority of the Genesis Apocryphon on a firmer foundation, since none of these points can be judged conclusive evidence. Added to this is the perennial caveat concerning the fragmentary state of the

---

508 This passage should be read alongside Jub 4:26, which lists “four places on earth that belong to the Lord;” the Garden of the Eden, the mountain of the east, Mt. Sinai, and Mt. Zion.


510 I am not suggesting that these passages are interpolations placed into a simpler form of Jubilees at some secondary stage of the book, but that the original author may have included these comments as further explanation of an earlier, less adorned version of the earth’s division, such as that in the Genesis Apocryphon.
Still, when viewed together these four factors place the onus on anyone who would argue that Jubilees contains the earlier account. For this to be the case, the author of the Genesis Apocryphon must have had sufficient motive to change the biblically-based order of Jubilees, shorten and simplify the descriptions of most allotments, and pass over Jubilees’ theological observations, which would have suited his overall program quite nicely. The latter points may be countered by a supposed desire on the author’s part to preserve parchment, but this is a somewhat unsatisfactory argument and does nothing to address the question of order.

But should we assume that the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees are directly related? The numerous discrepancies in order, direction, length, geographic terminology, and other details point away from this theory. A more plausible and satisfying conclusion is that both works depend on a common source or tradition, and that each drew from it in their own unique way. The evidence strongly suggests that this source was cartographic, and not textual, as Alexander and others have already supposed. If both authors obtained their information from a similar (or the same) map, it would have been perfectly natural for each to list the sons and grandsons according to different principles, or to describe allotments in different directions, with different starting points, and in slightly different ways. This explanation would also lead us to expect the large extent of agreement exhibited between the Apocryphon and Jubilees.

One discrepancy that remains unaccounted for under the common map theory is the variation and independence in geographic terminology. Perhaps each author had access to a

---

different map (but drafted according to the same basic scheme), each of which used slightly alternate terms for certain features. Most disagreements, however, can be explained by the supposition that Jubilees either supplemented the map’s sites based on a more extensive knowledge of (primarily eastern) geography, or simply included more of the map’s information in his account. The Apocryphon’s distinctive terms (with the exception of Mt. Taurus) can be explained as originating from elsewhere in the Bible (e.g. כָּרָת נוֹב), or by common reasoning (e.g. “the land irrigated by the Euphrates”). In any case, there is no doubt that theorizing a common map, or map tradition, behind both of our texts best accounts for the odd pastiche of similarities and differences laid out above.

If one accepts that an actual map lay behind both the Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees, it is worth asking what this map may have looked like. As in the reconstructed map provided earlier in this chapter and the earlier reconstructions of Hölscher, Alexander, and Schmidt, it seems safe to assume that the earth was depicted as a circle (or, less likely, an oval) surrounded by an encompassing body of water. That is to say, the basic design of the map was Ionian. The terrestrial disk would have been penetrated in its center by the Great Sea, from which branched the Tina and Gihon rivers to the northeast and southeast respectively, dividing the circle into three roughly equal portions. Onto this basic layout the sons and grandsons of Noah from Gen 10 were likely inscribed, each in the general geographic region corresponding to his (re-)assigned allotment. It is clear that a number of major landmarks must have been indicated by an illustration and an accompanying written legend. These would have included features such as the Maeota Sea, Mt. Taurus, Mt. Ararat, Karas, the Erythrean Sea, and others. These points of orientation were then used by our

512 All three may be found in either Schmidt, “Jewish Representation,” 122-23; or VanderKam, “Putting Them in Their Place,” 64-65.
two authors to convert the map into a written account by way of an organized description of each heir’s allotted territory. As Alexander has noted, there were plenty of discrepancies between this map and Gen 10, and the former must be understood as a remarkable example of theologically and politically motivated biblical exegesis rather than an attempt to accurately portray the biblical Table of nations (for which one should look to Josephus or the Targums). Ironically, this was achieved with the extensive aid of Hellenistic geographic science. The influx of Greek knowledge, influence, and domination following the campaign of Alexander the Great in 333 B.C.E. must have laid the groundwork for this creative fusion of the Ionian conception of the earth, Judean politico-religious ideology, and the esteemed book of Genesis. With the Greeks must have come their maps, and it was only a matter of time before some disgruntled groups in Judea utilized these toward their own ends by producing a cleverly revised adaptation.

With the common map theory in mind we may readdress the question of which text might be earlier. Of the four factors leading to the above suggestion that the Genesis Apocryphon should be considered earlier if a direct relationship is assumed, at least two still apply here. The fact that the Genesis Apocryphon is shorter and simpler continues to bear some weight, especially considering the scroll’s interest in geographical matters (at least as they relate to the Israelites). Connected to this are the additional, and rather exotic, toponyms included by Jubilees that are not present in the Apocryphon. As suggested by Werman, these seem to reflect a more developed geographic lexicon on behalf of Jubilees. Of course, it is entirely possible that two contemporaneous authors in slightly different situations had varied levels of geographic knowledge, or even that the author of the

---

Apocryphon wrote after Jubilees but was simply less educated in distant eastern topography. Yet the fact that both authors wrote exegetical treatments of Genesis in Judea and harbored some of the same concerns lessens this possibility appreciably. At present it seems best to assign this part of the Apocryphon chronological priority.

A concluding point worthy of brief comment is the divergent portrayal of the portion of Javan in each work. Is it of any significance that the Apocryphon apportions Javan mainland Greece while Jubilees does not? This certainly appears to mark Jubilees (or, perhaps, its source) with a greater disdain for the Greeks – an unsurprising deportment if its author was writing in the wake of the recent Antiochean persecutions and during the ongoing upheaval of the Hasmonean revolt and expansion efforts. Should the fact that the Apocryphon’s author does not deprive Javan of the Greek Peninsula cause us to place him in a different social or historical situation? The very premise of earth’s division and its presupposed map belies a concern over Israelite rights to the Levant, and foreign domination would naturally lead to this position. But foreign domination was not an infrequent occurrence in Judea. A date in the Roman period (after 63 B.C.E.) is quite unlikely for a number of reasons, which will be enumerated in the concluding chapter. A date preceding Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the Hasmoneans is more tenable, but the question persists whether this would provide a setting more amicable toward the Greeks. Ultimately, a date either before the Antiochean persecutions (perhaps the post-Ptolemaic feudal wars between the *diadochoi* [c. 223-187 B.C.E.], during which the Judeans must have felt entirely helpless?) or after their memory had faded somewhat under Hasmonean rule seems slightly preferable, but must remain little more than an educated guess at present.

As a final caveat, it should be stated that an earlier date for the Genesis Apocryphon’s division of the earth section does not necessarily imply that the work as a
whole is earlier than Jubilees. Flusser has argued that the authors of works like these drew freely from a variety of traditions, adding or subtracting from each as their purposes and preferences dictated, and this seems a valid enough statement. Hence, the author of the Apocryphon may easily have adopted an early version of the earth’s division and left it relatively unchanged. Yet until proven otherwise, and in lieu of other case studies of the sort undertaken here, the nature of the parallel passages treated in this chapter point toward the Apocryphon as the earlier of our two works.

514 Flusser, Kirjath Sepher (קירת ספר) 32, 382-83.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS

In light of the preceding chapters, we may now close with a reappraisal of some of the issues surveyed in Chapter 1. The topics to be covered in this chapter are: 1.) the exegetical nature of the Genesis Apocryphon, and 2.) its provenance and date of composition. An ancillary goal is to provide an apt summary of the main points that have emerged in earlier chapters.

5.1. The Exegetical Nature of the Genesis Apocryphon

The author of the Genesis Apocryphon rewrote at least parts of the book of Genesis, in Aramaic, guided by a demonstrable modus operandi and influenced by several distinctive topics of interest. While some portions of his rewriting overlap with elements of the Enochic corpus (e.g. 1 En 106-107 and the Book of Giants) and the Book of Jubilees (e.g. the chronology of Abram and Sarai in Egypt and the division of the earth), the fruit of our author’s labor is unique, and almost never matches these other works precisely.

5.1.1. Relationship to Genesis

Much of the scroll reflects a very loose take on what would much later be called the ‘canonical’ Genesis. Some may contend that such exegetical flexibility calls into question the shape and authoritative status of Genesis in the few centuries preceding the Common Era, but this notion does not appear to gain support from the Genesis Apocryphon. As argued
in Chapters 3 and 4, both Noah’s dream and the earth’s division among his children are best understood as interpretive reworkings, intended to alleviate difficulties in Genesis. That is, the Genesis Apocryphon is *biblical interpretation*. This is most evident in the way that the above two episodes “straighten out” perceived difficulties with Canaan (not Ham) being cursed in Gen 9:25, Shem apparently not receiving the Levant in Gen 10, and the nominally justified obliteration of the Canaanites exhorted in the books of Deuteronomy and Joshua. All of these factors impacted the Apocryphon’s exegetical deportment, and were woven together with its strong conviction about the Israelites’ exclusive right to the Land of Israel. All of this presupposes a form of Genesis at least akin to our major versions (LXX, MT, SP), which was venerated enough to warrant an interpretative rewriting. In addition to these larger interpretive issues, the scroll appears to make exegetical adjustments at a more detailed level, such as its explanatory substitution of נֵבָלִים for נֵבָל in GenAp 21.32 (Gen 14:9).515

5.1.2. Exegetical Unevenness: Noah and Abram

There is wide variation in the extent to which the Apocryphon treats the different parts of Genesis. This is most evident in its dissimilar handling of the Noah and Abram narratives. In fact, were these two parts of the scroll preserved on different manuscripts, and in two different scribal hands, it is conceivable that they would be considered two different works.

The Noah section is supplemented with an astounding amount of extra-biblical material, to the point that the narrative as we know it from Genesis nearly disappears (although the fragmentary state of the scroll may contribute to this perception). The Abram

columns, however, contain much less expansion, intimating that traditions attached to this patriarch were less developed at the time when the scroll was written, at least within the particular circles in which the Apocryphon was produced. Whatever the situation, the scroll’s author pays far more attention to Noah. Significantly, almost all of the extra-biblical information pertaining to Abram is unique, and did not find its way into later traditions. The same cannot be said for the Noah section.

The question of different sources for the two sections is one deserving of further study. Significant differences beyond the extent of exegetical expansion appear to exist, such as variation in Aramaic syntax and the use of divine epithets. There are, however, numerous connections as well, such as the employment of symbolic dreams and the shared geographic concern discussed in the preceding chapters. If different written sources do underlie the text (which would be unsurprising), they have been carefully woven together by our author.

5.1.3. The Exalted Status of Noah (and Abram)

Noah’s immensely righteous status is a striking feature of the Genesis Apocryphon. His exaltation is, in fact, unrivaled by any other work from the Second-Temple or rabbinic periods of Judaism. The one event that is either omitted, neutralized, or understood negatively by nearly every other ancient exegete (Noah’s drunken episode) is creatively


517 The latter point has been raised by Moshe Bernstein in personal communication, and is indeed striking. I look forward to his upcoming publication on this topic.

turned into a positive by the Apocryphon by converting the story into a locus of the divine revelation of heavenly mysteries. Even Enoch’s presence in the scroll seems to be supportive of Noah, pointing forward to the “righteous planting” to come (cf. GenAp 6.1-2). It is clear that messianic expectations and an Urzeit-Endzeit typology are at play in Noah’s depiction, with his setting in history and divinely mandated role constituting a foreshadowing of things to come again in the future.\(^{519}\)

While Noah’s premier status is among the most distinctive aspects of the scroll, he is not the only patriarch to receive a makeover. Abram is also the beneficiary of a very positive image, a fact evident in his reception of a symbolic dream on the cusp of entering Egypt. The dream is quite plainly intended to clear Abram of all selfish or malicious intent in asking Sarai to act as his sister during their stay by attributing the impetus for this move to the Lord himself. One might justifiably ask the author if the decision reflects any better on the Lord than it does Abram, but at least all culpability is removed from the latter (and we may safely assume that such a divine mandate was considered well beyond questioning). In general, then, the author of the Genesis Apocryphon was interested in presenting all of the patriarchs, and especially Noah, in a most blameless light.

5.1.4. Apocalypticism and Heavenly Wisdom

The messianic and Urzeit-Endzeit themes inherent in Enoch’s prophetic portrayal of Noah have already been noted. These and other factors indicate that the author and authorizing community of the Genesis Apocryphon embraced an apocalyptic worldview.\(^{520}\)

\(^{519}\) For similar motifs in Jubilees see Scott, Geography in Early Judaism, 35 (esp. n. 53).

\(^{520}\) So Lignée, Les Textes de Qumran, 2.211-12.
This is perhaps seen most clearly in Noah’s dream-visions in cols. 6-7 and 13-15, both of which may properly be termed “apocalypses.” The outlook was one that viewed history as moving imminently toward a (second) cataclysmic judgment and placed a premium on the divine “mysteries” (מִשְׁפָּטִים), which were revealed to a succession of righteous individuals through angelically mediated visions. Significant in these dream-visions was a cache of heavenly wisdom, identified by the author with true righteousness in the eyes of the Lord.

In a number of Second-Temple period Jewish works this wisdom was viewed to have passed through an impeccably pedigreed chain of individuals, within which Enoch, Noah, Shem, and Abram figured as important links. In GenAp 19.24-29 Abram is depicted as a purveyor of this divine wisdom to Pharaoh’s courtiers, which may have been an etiological attempt to explain any useful wisdom found in Egyptian circles at the time of the scroll’s formulation.

This reserve of knowledge was apparently broad, notably including calendrical, sacrificial, and medical (apotropaic) teachings.

5.1.5. Dreams

Dream-visions are the preferred mode of divine revelation in the scroll. They are often, but not always, symbolic. Both Noah and Abram experience such dreams, although Abram’s pair is of a slightly different type. In the first dream (GenAp 19:14-21) he does not receive an angelic interpretation, as in both of Noah’s visions, but rather deciphers its meaning himself. His second vision is not symbolic, relating directly the dimensions of the Promised Land without the mediation of symbolism, or its related angelic interpretation.


Indeed, Abram’s dreams do not deal with the transcendental divine mysteries, as Noah’s do, but rather see to the more pressing exigencies of his physical wellbeing in Egypt, and the allotted borders of his land (cf. the connection to Noah in GenAp 11.15-20). The absence of all of these dreams in Jubilees constitutes a considerable departure from the Apocryphon, and attests to Jubilees’ reticence to embrace this mode of revelation.

5.1.6. Rights to the Land of Israel

The right of Israelites to inhabit and rule over the Land of Israel – i.e. the region allotted to Arpachshad during the earth’s division —was of extreme importance to our author. Chapter 3 outlined the breadth of this motif in the Genesis Apocryphon, and its far more truncated presence in Jubilees. Indeed, the Apocryphon is peerless in its emphasis on Noah’s authorized position as the apportioner of the habitable earth. The stress placed on original rights to the land seems most plausibly to reflect a social situation where the authorizing community felt either threatened by foreign domination and/or criticism, in which case it fills a retaliatory and paraenetic function, or a need to justify and propagandize its own right to rule. Of course, these two options are not mutually exclusive, and could have operated at the same time.

5.1.7. Hellenistic Influence

Like Jubilees, the Genesis Apocryphon displays a considerable amount of Greek influence. Most significant in both works are their heavy indebtedness to the Ionian world map – a dependence explored at length in Chapter 4. Other possible examples occur during Abram’s exploits in Egypt and Canaan, such as the use of the name Hyrcanus (הרכנוס) for
one of Pharaoh’s nobles, the description of Sarai’s beauty in GenAp 20.2-8, and the association of King Arioch with Cappadocia in Asia Minor (21.23). These factors speak to an interaction with Hellenistic science and culture, and, together with the preceding points, reveal a composition far from the unbiased, fresh, and simplistic work described by Vermes and others. The presence of these Greek elements provides a very early terminus post quem for the scroll of approximately the early 3rd cent. B.C.E. Presumably, this is the earliest we could expect the penetration of Hellenistic geographic science into Judea (probably via one of the outlying Greek cultural centers, such as Samaria, Gaza, or Alexandria).

5.1.8. Purpose

Why was the Genesis Apocryphon written? As mentioned earlier, one might ask whether works now dubbed rewritten Bible, or parabiblical, were originally intended to

523 GenAp 20.8. See the important discussion of Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 197-99. J. H. A. Hart (in The Encyclopaedia Britannica, 11th ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1910, 14:210) suggests that Hyrcanus is “a Greek surname, of unknown origin, borne by several Jews of the Maccabean period.” That the name is of Greek origin uncertain, especially since the lexeme ‘buri’ (בורי) is not typical at the beginning of Greek names. Contra Hart, Hyrcanus seems to be a primary or alternate/secondary name rather than a surname. In Josephus there are three individuals bearing the name: 1.) Joseph the Tobiad’s son, simply named Hyrcanus (c. 200 B.C.E.; born, interestingly enough, out of an Alexandrian affair; Antiquities 12.186 [Marcus, LCL]); 2.) the Jewish high priest John, son of Simon, who was “also called Hyrcanus” (high priest c. 135-104; now often refers to as Hyrcanus I; War 1.54 [Thack.ay, LCL]); 3.) Hyrcanus, son of Alexander Janneus and Alexandra (high priest c. 79-40 B.C.E.; now typically called Hyrcanus II; War 1.109). Fitzmyer and others favor John Hyrcanus II as the most likely historical allusion in the Genesis Apocryphon, but there is really almost no good reason for this. All of the individuals listed above had connections to the Ptolemies of Egypt, causing one to wonder if the name is actually Egyptian in origin, rather than Greek. The entire topic is deserving of further study.


525 See section 1.2.2.1. in Chapter 1.
supplant, or at least be on equal footing with, their eventually victorious canonical
counterparts. If so, books like Jubilees and 1 Enoch might be considered “canonically
challenged,” failing to ultimately succeed in their allotted task (at least over the long run). Of
course, it is now virtually impossible to affirm or deny such a question, but we might ask in
response, “What did biblical interpretation look like before the method so familiar to us now
– i.e. a lemmatized scripture passage followed by a discrete segment of commentary, or
‘midrash’ in the rabbinic sense?” The first sure instances of this type of exegesis are the
Qumran Pesharim, which appear to be later than most examples of rewritten Bible.

The historical first of the Pesharim, with their distinctive lemmatized structure,
present us with at least three alternatives: 1.) lemmatized commentaries existed before the
Pesharim, but we simply lack any surviving examples of the genre; 2.) everything preceding
the Pesharim was not considered a commentary on the authoritative text of Genesis,
Leviticus, or the like, but was intended as a new and equally authoritative version of it; or 3.)
the so-called rewritten Bible genre actually was how biblical interpretation looked before
lemmatized commentaries existed, and audiences simply knew the difference between the
authoritative text (e.g. Genesis) and the text interpreting it (e.g. the Genesis Apocryphon). I
tend to view the Genesis Apocryphon, and the rewritten Bible genre more generally, as a
combination of points 2 and 3. The Pesharim, and even more so the rabbinic midrahim,
attest to the concretization of what may be termed Scripture, or Bible – a text which claims
ultimate authority over all others (or under which all others are subsumed). Here the
distinction between Scripture and interpretation was sharp, and little ambiguity existed. The
line was much fuzzier with works like the Genesis Apocryphon, Jubilees, and Pseudo-Philo’s

527 Cf. the discussion in section 1.2.1. of Chapter 1.
Biblical Antiquities, but this does not mean there was no line at all. Rewritten Bible seems to be an interpretive genre standing between the halcyon days of “interbiblical exegesis,” when the scriptures were still relatively open to change, and the dawn of lemmatized commentary with pesharim-type texts.

The Genesis Apocryphon is an exegetical work based on the book of Genesis. Standing at a crossroads in scriptural interpretation, it was meant to be read alongside the authoritative text, and not instead of it. It filled perceived gaps in information, addressed interpretative perplexities, and drew (or manufactured) explicit connections between varied events or persons in the narrative. Based on its particular theological and ideological concerns, it also emphasized certain themes, characters, or events, and even revised certain stories. In short, the scroll provided its constituency the proper lens through which to read Genesis. While the nature and purpose of the Apocryphon greatly resemble the Book of Jubilees, the preceding chapters have shown that its characteristic methods and concerns share less commonality.

5.2. Provenance and Date

A number of factors have exerted considerable influence on the now standard dating of the Genesis Apocryphon to the 1st century B.C.E. Several of these now appear to be founded on false or outdated assumptions, and so the time is ripe to readdress the topic in light of our findings.

5.2.1. The Judean Sitz im Leben

The Genesis Apocryphon has commonly been considered a product of Judea. For some this was rooted in an assumption that the scroll was written by the Essenes at Qumran,
but this has rightly been questioned (see below). A more solid reason for locating the scroll's composition in Judea is the geographic knowledge that it reflects. Noteworthy in this regard is the double mention of Ramat-Hazor in GenAp 21:8-9, which Bardtke justifiably labeled “palästinisches Lokalkolorit.” Other toponyms suggest an intimate familiarity with the geography of this part of the Levant, such as the unique use of “the Great Valley” (הָרְבִּחה) to refer to the Jordan Valley in GenAp 22.4, the mention of an unknown people group (the Zumzam) in Ammon in GenAp 21:29, and the qualification that “the Valley of Shaveh, which is the Valley of the King” in Gen 14:17 also goes by the name “the Valley of Bet-Hakerem.” That the author knew the hitherto unattested name of the easternmost branch of the Nile Delta (the Carmon [הָרְמָו]) in GenAp 19.11 is also striking, and together with the possibly Egyptian origin of the name Hyrcanus may suggest some familiarity with Lower Egypt as well. One might also call attention to the observation of Kutscher and Fitzmyer that the Aramaic employed by the scroll shows affinity with other Western dialects, or the many connections with other Jewish works widely regarded to be of Judean origin (e.g. Jubilees and the Enochic literature). When we add that the scroll was discovered

528 H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*, 150.
530 Ibid, 236. This name is used instead of the biblical Zuzim (妧ַזָּמ; Gen 14:5).
in the Judean Desert there is every reason to believe that the scroll was composed in Judea, and none to contradict it. There is no cause to doubt a Judean *Sitz im Leben*.

### 5.2.2. A non-Qumran (but Qumran-friendly) Work

The Judean origins of the scroll make it theoretically possible that it was composed by the faction of Essenes still considered by most scholars to have resided at Khirbet Qumran. As seen in Chapter 1, a number of early commentators took this stance, but it has subsequently been almost totally abandoned. There are at least two sound reasons for this retreat. First, as Fitzmyer has argued at some length, “there is nothing in this text that clearly links it with any of the known beliefs or customs of the Qumran sect.” One might add that a work not originating with the group responsible for the Qumran sectarian literature does not necessarily mean that it is not Essene, since the Essenes appear to have

---

533 I continue to stand in the camp of F. M. Cross, J. C. VanderKam, E. C. Ulrich, D. Dimant, E. Tov, and many others, who consider the so-called “sectarian scrolls” to have been produced by a faction of Essenes (either celibate or married, it is difficult to tell) living at Qumran. This hypothesis, however, has been repeatedly questioned, most recently (and most competently) by Yizhak Magen. See Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, “Back to Qumran: Ten Years of Excavations and Research, 1993-2004,” *Qumran, the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates: Proceedings of a Conference Held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (ed. K. Galor, J.- B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg; Leiden: Brill, 2006) 55-113. Cf. H. Shanks, “Qumran – the Pottery Factory,” *BAR* 32:5 (2006). The debate is somewhat tertiary to the present discussion, since the real question is not whether the Genesis Apocryphon was composed by monk-like Essenes along the shore of the Dead Sea, but whether it was written by those who produced the sectarian literature (e.g. the Community Rule texts, the War Scroll, the Cave 4 instruction texts, etc.).

534 See the discussion of the scroll’s literary genre in Chapter 1. This opinion also appears to be presupposed by F. Garcia Martinez (*Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 140-41), when he says the mention of Mt. Lobar “here [4QpsDan] and in the narrative of the deluge in 1QapGn XII, 10-13, gives the impression that it constitutes a Qumranic tradition.


been a rather large parent group of those who cordoned themselves off at Qumran. Still, Jubilees and the Enochic literature were found at Qumran and are not considered sectarian, and Fitzmyer is justified in placing the Apocryphon alongside these as an imported work.

A second reason to doubt a Qumran origin is the scroll’s language of composition. The Aramaic literature from the Qumran caves simply does not seem to share the same theological outlook as the Hebrew sectarian literature. This has already been argued by Segert and Lamadrid, and was later supported by Fitzmyer, Dimant, and others. We could add to these points Dimant’s observation that the sectarian literature lacks any apocalyptic visions of the type found in the Apocryphon, or that the scroll does not exhibit the traits argued by Tov to constitute a Qumran scribal school.

Although the Genesis Apocryphon was not composed by the Essenes of Qumran, it was certainly read and used there. When considering the theological and ideological tenets underlying the scroll it becomes clear why this was the case. The Apocryphon’s apocalyptic perspective, emphasis on exclusive Israeliite rights to the Land of Israel, concern with the esoteric divine mysteries, interest in calendrical issues (evident in the scant remnants of col. 8), exaltation of the patriarchs, and perhaps even its penchant for dreams and their interpretations, line up with interests present either in the sectarian literature or outside

---


541 Ibid.

542 E. Tov, “Further Evidence for the Existence of a Qumran Scribal School,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery*, 199-216. In further support of the Genesis Apocryphon’s difference regarding scribal practices is its unique practice of placing successive letters in the upper, right-hand corner of each parchment sheet.
descriptions of the Essenes (e.g. in Josephus or Pliny the Elder). Hence, there are plenty of elements in the scroll that could have been embraced by the sect, even if all of its details may not have suited their needs or tastes.

5.2.3. Is 1Q20 the Autograph of the Genesis Apocryphon?

Some scholars have speculated that the single manuscript on which the Genesis Apocryphon is preserved (1Q20) may, in fact, be the composition’s autograph. This notion was first proposed by Fitzmyer, and received guarded votes of confidence from Moraldi and Kaufman. If this were the case, dating the scroll would become much easier, since we could then depend directly on the relatively reliable tools of paleography and Carbon-14 or Accelerator Mass Spectroscopy dating.

There are, however, multiple reasons to reject this claim. Armin Lange suggested that the Apocryphon could not be an autograph based on what he considered a gloss in the description of Sarai’s beauty in GenAp 20.6, but his case was somewhat deficient. More convincing are the comments of Hammershaimb and Wise, both of whom give


549 M. O. Wise, *Thunder in Gemini*, 121, n. 58.
numerous reasons to doubt that any of the scrolls from the Qumran caves (and, in Wise’s case, especially 1Q20) are autographs. Based on their argumentation, the numerous supralinear additions, scribal corrections, and particularly fine manuscript execution of 1Q20 show beyond doubt that it is not an autograph.\(^{550}\) Especially determinative is Wise’s recourse to known autographs from the Cairo Geniza, which exhibit very different characteristics than any of the scrolls from the Qumran. To this could be added that those documents from the Judean Desert that are undoubtedly original compositions are written in cursive, not formal, square scripts. This suggests that composition was typically done in cursive and then converted by a professionally trained scribe (in a formal hand) into a scribal copy. Considering these points, it seems safe to assume that 1Q20 is a copy of an earlier work. Of course, the distance between the composition and its copy is another matter.

5.2.4. Date of the Present Manuscript (1Q20)

Fitzmyer has already gathered most of the relevant information for dating 1Q20 by paleographic and other technological means.\(^{551}\) The various opinions regarding the date of the Apocryphon’s script specifically, or the Herodian scripts more generally, are:

---

\(^{550}\) A pertinent example is the supralinear, exclamatory particle קני in GenAp 13.14, which is inserted after the similar particle/conjunction יני and appears to be in the same hand as the main text. There is no grammatically compelling reason for this doubling of exclamations, for the phrase makes perfect sense without the קני, and יני is not followed by this word elsewhere in the scroll. The most likely explanation for this unnecessary word is that it is a correction, based either on an exemplar or the identical phrase in the preceding line.

Cross has never dated the Genesis Apocryphon specifically, but assigned the War Scroll (1QM) to the early Herodian period (ca. 30-1 B.C.E.). 561 As noted by Avigad, the

---

552 Avigad and Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon, 15, 38 [27, 2].


554 J. T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery, 135. Milik does not specify the Genesis Apocryphon as exhibiting the Herodian script, but clearly places it alongside other manuscripts from this period elsewhere.


560 Beyer, Die aramäischen Texte, 165.

script of the Apocryphon closely resembles that of 1QM, and therefore it is likely that Cross
would date both manuscripts to the late 1st cent. B.C.E. The tendency to date scripts with
such precision has been criticized by Gregory Doudna, who laid out some of the
shortcomings of this method while affirming its basic usefulness. More broadly, Doudna
has led a charge to shift the dating of the scrolls earlier by approximately a century, but his
views have gained little adherence to date.

The initial radiocarbon date of the Genesis Apocryphon was 2013 ± 32 years (= 73
B.C.E.-14 C.E.). A robust debate has ensued among specialists in the field over the
technical veracity of the initial findings, with a handful of scientists arguing for a slightly later
date than first proposed. These critiques have been responded to in kind, with the above
date still being favored by the majority of researchers. The median date suggested by all of
the studies does not deviate far from the turn of the era. When combined with the


paleographic dates assigned to the scroll, a date around the late 1\textsuperscript{st} cent. B.C.E. for this copy emerges as most tenable.\textsuperscript{567}

5.2.5. Language

The final and most decisive recourse for dating the Apocryphon (i.e. its composition, and not the present copy) has typically been to the philological study of its Aramaic language.\textsuperscript{568} The early and insightful work of Kutscher has been exceedingly influential in this regard,\textsuperscript{569} impacting the proposed date of Avigad and Yadin even before his study had been published.\textsuperscript{570} Kutscher did not enjoy the benefit of working with the entire Aramaic corpus from the Judean Desert, and was thus forced to use Biblical Aramaic (BA; especially Daniel) and the Western Aramaic (WA) targum and dialect traditions (especially Targum Onqelos [TO] and Palestinian Christian Aramaic [CA]) as his main points of orientation. Curiously, he does not settle on a basic date for any of these, save CA (ca. 500 C.E.). He supplemented the two ends of his spectrum with other, admittedly distant, reference points, such as Nabataean and Palmyrene. In the end, the best Kutscher could do with such a limited body of comparative material was say that the Aramaic of the Apocryphon fell somewhere between BA and the later TO and CA. Thus, he settled on a date in the 1\textsuperscript{st} cent.

\textsuperscript{567} This date has also been independently suggested, in personal communication, by a Polish epigrapher of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Dr. Przemysław Dec (Department of Jewish Studies, Jagiellonian University, Krakow). He believes the script to fall toward the earlier end of Avigad’s proposed spectrum.

\textsuperscript{568} See, e.g., the statement of Fitzmyer (The Genesis Apocryphon, 27-28), “When all these reasons are considered, they are not very convincing, except for the philological argument of Kutscher. The rest, for what they are worth, serve merely to confirm his dating…”

\textsuperscript{569} Kutscher, “The Language of the ‘Genesis Apocryphon.’”

\textsuperscript{570} Avigad and Yadin, A Genesis Apocryphon, 38 [לְאָשֶׁר].
B.C.E. (– 1st cent. C.E.). While judicious and well wrought, the study leaves one wishing for a more secure mooring by which to date the scroll. Especially helpful would be a proposed relative date for BA.

A more detailed, comprehensive comparison with Daniel was performed by Rowley several years after Kutscher’s article. Although overlooked by some subsequent commentators, he credibly demonstrated that, “[w]hile most of the points that have been examined could singly sustain no firm argument, their cumulative weight makes it clear that the language of the scroll is very close to that of the Aramaic parts of the book of Daniel, though slightly later.” He concluded that, “[o]n linguistic grounds there is nothing to preclude a date in the second century B.C., since there is nothing that would require any long interval between the date of the Aramaic of Daniel and the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon.*” Similar sentiments were expressed by Black and Fitzmyer. Fitzmyer added his own linguistic treatment of the scroll’s language in his commentary, and ended in agreement with the conclusions of Kutscher, “the Aramaic of this scroll is a representative of Middle Aramaic and forms a transition between Daniel and later Western Aramaic.”

---


573 Ibid. It should be borne in mind that elsewhere Rowley has argued for a relatively late, 2nd cent. B.C.E. date for the Aramaic of Daniel, which undoubtedly affects how early he is willing to date the Apocryphon’s language. H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1929).

574 M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, 197-98; Fitzmyer (*The Genesis Apocryphon*, 35) proclaimed, “it can be seen that the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon* is not far removed from that of Daniel. When one allows for Hebraisms in the latter and its fairly clear Masoretic encrustations, the language is otherwise closely related.”

Later studies sought to refine Kutscher’s verdict as more of the Aramaic texts from the Judean Desert were published, a task only recently completed.\footnote{A desideratum in Qumran Aramaic has recently been filled with the grammar of U. Schattner-Rieser, \textit{L’araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte: 1. Grammaire} (Instruments pour l’étude des Langues de l’Orient Ancien 5; Prahis: Éditions du Zèbre, 2004).} Out of this corpus a third major point of reference was introduced with the publication of the Job Targum from Cave 11 (11QtgJob). The original editors sought to fit this scroll into the serological typology laid out by Kutscher, though they admitted that “Il est plus difficile de déterminer la date, ou la période de l’origine du texte.”\footnote{Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrán (ed. J. P. M. van der Ploeg, A. S. van der Woude, and B. Jongeling; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 3.} They judged, however, that “notre targum de Job soit plus ancient [than the Apocryphon] et que sa garammaire soit plus proche de l’araméen de Daniel que du \textit{Genesis Apocryphon} (1QGenAp).”\footnote{Ibid, 4.} Hence, the Aramaic of the Job Targum was placed between that of Daniel and the Genesis Apocryphon, resulting in a suggested date to the second half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} cent. B.C.E. Rather meager comparative evidence was provided to support this claim, but the shortage was remedied by the later studies of Kaufman\footnote{Kaufman, “The Job Targum from Qumran.”} and Sokoloff.\footnote{M. Sokoloff, \textit{The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI} (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan, 1974) 9-26.} Kaufman offered some astute comments, such as his suggestion that 1QapGen and 11QtgJob represent two different literary Aramaic traditions:\footnote{Kaufman, “The Job Targum from Qumran,” 326.}

The first, represented by the Job Targum, is chronologically closer to Official Aramaic but less imitative of it. The second, as in the Genesis Apocryphon, is more distant but more imitative, at least as regards certain specific features. The
relationship between these two traditions remains unclear, but it does not appear to be merely a matter of straight-line development.

Kaufman ultimately shifted the date of the Job Targum’s Aramaic to the 1st cent. B.C.E., and that of the Apocryphon to the 1st cent. C.E. This modification, however, was based firmly on a supposition that the Aramaic of Daniel must be fixed around the middle of the 2nd cent. B.C.E. Sokoloff, marshalling a good deal of linguistic data, essentially agrees with the earlier dates of Kutscher and the Targum’s original editors.582

From the above studies a standard litany of linguistic traits has emerged, which has been used to determine the relative age of the Aramaic of our scroll. These include characteristics which argue both for “later” and “earlier” dates, with the usual orientation points being the book of Daniel and the Job Targum. Those in the “earlier” camp are generally considered on par with Daniel and earlier than 11QtgJob, while the “later” group is thought to postdate both texts. Some common examples are listed below:

Traits suggesting that the Genesis Apocryphon is later than 11QtgJob and Daniel

1. The Apocryphon’s occasional use of the relative pronoun –ת instead of -ת (roughly 6% of the time). Only the latter is used in BA and 11QtgJob, while –ת predominates in later dialects.583 The late date of –ת is now seriously questioned by its presence in other manuscripts of early works (e.g. 4Q196 [Tobit], 4Q213a [Aramaic Levi Document], and 4Q201 [Book of Watchers]), and should not be considered decisive.

582 Sokoloff, The Targum to Job, 9.

2. The Apocryphon frequently (but not always) employs the demonstrative pronoun הָא rather than the form (נָא) normally found in BA. The only occurrence of this word in 11QtgJob is the later form הָא. Again, the early use of הָא is now attested in 4Q209 [Astronomical Enoch] and other 3rd-2nd cent. B.C.E. works.

3. The Genesis Apocryphon employs either א or ה in a number of situations where BA and 11QtgJob have only ה, an example being the scroll’s mixed use of א and ה ("if, whether"). In general, the Apocryphon is not uniform in its use of these two letters. The form א is now attested in 4Q438-39 [Testaments of Judah and Joseph] as well.

4. The Apocryphon consistently uses a preformative א in the causative conjugations (גָּפֶ'ה), rather than the much more dominant ה of BA and 11Qtg Job (בָּפֶ'ה). Kutscher and Sokoloff misleadingly imply that the same phenomenon in the reflexive/passive הָפֶ'ל/בָּפֶ'ל stem gives further testimony of the Apocryphon’s later character. Cook, however, has shown that this example proves quite the opposite, and would favor an earlier date for the Apocryphon. As it turns out, the גָּפֶ'ה dominates in Qumran Aramaic more generally, even in the earliest texts (e.g.


The haph’el seems to be preserved only as a historical relic.\(^{588}\)

5. The Genesis Apocryphon employs the later form מָלַח (“there”) rather than the earlier מַלָח, found in both BA and 11QtgJob.\(^{589}\) As with the above examples, the “later” form has now been found in a number of early works from Qumran.

Traits suggesting that the Genesis Apocryphon is earlier than 11QtgJob

1. 11QtgJob employs the nota accusativi מָלַח (in מַלָח) at least once, in addition to one instance in Daniel 4:22, while the Apocryphon always has the allegedly earlier direct object marker מְלָא.\(^{590}\) מָלַח is also found in the New Jerusalem texts (4Q554\(^{4}\) and 5Q15) and the Wadi Muraba’at and Hever contracts, but is otherwise missing from Qumran Aramaic.\(^{591}\)

2. The Genesis Apocryphon assimilates the letter מ significantly less than 11QtgJob, and even BA. It also dissimilates the geminate root and exhibits nasalization (insertion of the letter מ) more often.\(^{592}\) These have generally been understood as


earlier traits, but Fitzmyer has questioned their relevance. They are now recognized to represent a wider trend in the Aramaic manuscripts from Qumran.

These few examples readily demonstrate that the publication and scrutiny of the Aramaic corpus from the Judean Desert has cast the most compelling factors for a “later” date of the Genesis Apocryphon into grave doubt. The orthography of the scroll has occasionally been discussed as an indicator for relative dating as well, but this too has been seriously questioned by Cook and Fitzmyer.

Although it is frequently left unsettled in the above studies, the date assigned to Daniel’s Aramaic plays a critical role in any relative dating of the Genesis Apocryphon or the Job Targum. While some parts of Daniel were almost certainly penned around the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (ca. 174-164 B.C.E), it is widely acknowledged that the majority of its Aramaic chapters are earlier than this. Albright, basing himself on the more exhaustive work of Wilson, argued that the majority of the Aramaic portions of Daniel originated in the 3rd cent. B.C.E., and that Ezra must have preceded this by around a century.

---

593 Fitzmyer, The Genesis Apocryphon, 36, n. 112.


596 See the helpful sketch of J. J. Collins, Daniel (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 38. Also see his overview of the Aramaic dating, 13-20.

597 R. D. Wilson, “The Aramaic of Daniel,” in Biblical and Theological Studies by the Members of the Faculty of the Princeton Theological Seminary Published in Commemoration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Seminary (New York: Scribner’s, 1912) 261-306.

598 W. F. Albright, “The Date and Personality of the Chronicler,” JBL 40 (1921) 115-117.
Allowances for similar or significantly earlier dates were made by Driver, Rosenthal, and Kitchen. Most recently, Collins appears to have settled somewhere in the early 3rd century with his judgment that “the balance of probability… favors a date in the early Hellenistic period for the Aramaic portions of Daniel.” If one sides with the majority in assigning the brunt of Daniel’s Aramaic to the early 3rd cent. B.C.E. (and Ezra’s to at least the 4th), then what compelling evidence is there to date the Genesis Apocryphon, which appears to be only slightly later than Daniel on linguistic grounds, to the 1st cent. B.C.E.? Even allowing for a full century of development the scroll could date to the early 2nd cent. B.C.E., and there is nothing in the scroll’s content to preclude such a date. When one digs deeper, however, it becomes clear that the 1st cent. B.C.E. date is based largely on the assumption by some (e.g. most scholars working on Qumran Aramaic) that the “Aramaic of Daniel” must date to around 165 B.C.E., when the book came to a close. Most Daniel scholars would reject this oversimplistic, late dating.

Alongside these considerations one should factor the following points: 1.) Kutscher’s conviction that BA originated from eastern Aramaic (in contrast to the Apocryphon); 2.) the almost timeless quality of the so-called ‘Reichsaramäische’ used by Daniel, which

---

603 See the similar perplexity at this late date expressed by Cook, “Remarks on the Testament of Kohath,” 205-219 [217].
changed very little over a several-century stretch (beginning as early as the 6th cent. B.C.E.); and 3. the opinions of several scholars who have voiced legitimate concerns over dating texts from varied, unknown locales and social circles within a typological series, as Kutscher, Sokoloff, Kaufman, Fitzmyer, and others have done. This point is especially poignant in light of solid evidence that several distinct orthographies operated in Qumran Aramaic around the same time, probably due to slightly different authorial settings or individual scribal penchants.

Together, the above points make clear that a relative date of the Genesis Apocryphon’s Aramaic to the 1st cent. B.C.E. on linguistic grounds breaks down under scrutiny. If one were to take seriously the typological placement of the scroll in relation to BA (and it is not clear that this is the way to proceed), then the date widely agreed upon by Daniel experts should be used as an orientation point – i.e. the early 3rd cent. B.C.E. Theoretically, this would allow for a date as early as the late 3rd or early 2nd cent. B.C.E., even when taking into account the Job Targum. However, the most compelling support for a significantly earlier date comes from other Aramaic texts from Qumran. A number of these date to the 2nd cent. B.C.E. based on paleography and radiocarbon measurement, or are datable to this period on other grounds, and yet are written in an Aramaic that does not differ substantially from that of the Apocryphon. Given the culmination of evidence, it


608 E.g. 4Q201-203 (Book of Watchers, Animal Apocalypse, Book of Giants); 4Q208-209 (Astronomical Enoch); 4Q213-14 (Aramaic Levi); 4Q542 (Testament of Qahat); 4Q543-549 (Visions of Amram); to name only the earliest manuscripts.
seems time to adjust the linguistic *terminus post quem* of the Genesis Apocryphon from the 1st cent. B.C.E. to at least the early 2nd cent. B.C.E.

5.2.6. Relationship to Jubilees, 1 Enoch, and Other Works

Fitzmyer has meticulously argued that every attempt to find concrete historical allusions in the Apocryphon so far has failed to pass muster. Fitzgerald Lacking such data, the best prospects for assigning the scroll a general date remain comparative analyses with other early Jewish works. This and other studies have stressed the Genesis Apocryphon’s affinity with texts like 1 Enoch (including the Book of Giants), Jubilees, the testamentary literature (especially Levi and Qahat), and even Daniel – all works dating from the 3rd to 2nd cents. B.C.E. in their original forms. This affinity is evinced in the scroll’s literary genre, basic (apocalyptic) worldview, specific theological concerns, stance on divine revelation, and even language of composition (with the exception of Jubilees). Put simply, the Genesis Apocryphon “belongs” with these texts. To this group might be added many of the remaining Aramaic texts from Qumran, such as the Amram and Pseudo-Daniel fragments.

The Genesis Apocryphon’s relationship to Jubilees is mixed. On first inspection there are a number of striking similarities between the two, as in the case of the earth’s division, some chronological details, or the basic literary genre employed. These parallels certainly speak to some sort of association. Yet, when the related motifs are scrutinized it becomes clear that they are used in different ways, and to different extents. Along with this go more basic differences, such as a dissimilar attitude toward apocalyptic visions, disparate portrayals of Noah, and even different languages of composition. At present, the best

---

explanation for this mixture is that both works originated in Judea around same period of
time and drew from a common reserve of exegetical traditions surrounding Genesis. As
argued in Chapter 4, one of the shared sources accessible to both authors seems to have
been a map re-visioning the Table of nations from Gen 10 according to an Ionian scheme
and in concert with a robust apologetic stance on the Land of Israel. However, the
Genesis Apocryphon and Jubilees do not appear dependently related in the sense that one
drew directly from the other, and this should encourage the utmost care in using their
parallel passages for relative dating.

A similar picture emerges with regard to the Enochic literature. Again there are
some striking similarities, most noticeably the birth of Noah parallel (GenAp 2-5 and 1 En
106-107). But there are also marked differences in details of the stories and their handling.
In 1 Enoch, the purpose of chapters 106-107 is somewhat ambiguous, although it seems to
be primarily paraenetic, warning its hearers of acting in a way akin to the Watchers and tying
into the surrounding Epistle of Enoch. In the Apocryphon the story functions very
differently, being largely directed toward the exaltation of Noah and his unique, salvific role
in human history. The connection of the Book of Giants to 1 Enoch remains uncertain,
but here too we have seen similarities with the Genesis Apocryphon. Although the
relationship between the Enochic corpus and the Apocryphon has not been a focus of the
present study, it is an area highly deserving of further study.

The publication of all of the Genesis Apocryphon’s extant columns has finally made
it possible to place each of its fragmentary portions within a broader (albeit still patchy)

610 If one were to subscribe to a “Book of Noah,” it is certain that this tradition was part of it. Cf.
note 82.

611 See Nickelsburg 1 Enoch 1, 8, 11, 172-73.
narrative framework. This has revealed what may be the most striking and important
difference between the scroll and the two works with which it is so often compared: the two
most significant parallels (GenAp 16-17/Jub 8:11-9:15 and GenAp 2-5/1 En 106-107) are
much more at home in the Genesis Apocryphon than they are in the other books. We have
seen that the division of the earth in the Apocryphon is the culmination of a process that
begins at Noah’s birth, and is stressed multiple times throughout the scroll. Moreover, the
theme continues on with Abram, who is unambiguously cast as Arpachshad’s geographic
successor. The same cannot be said for Jubilees, where the theme pops onto the
narratological scene for a brief time, and then disappears again. The story of Noah’s birth is
even starker. In 1 Enoch these chapters have every indication of being an add-on,
completely unmoored from their surroundings. In contrast, the tale plays several
important roles in the larger narrative structure of the Apocryphon, not least of which is a
heightening of Noah’s status and an adumbration of his future roles. If Milik and
Nickelsburg are correct in supposing that 1 En 106-107 uses older Noachic tradition, then it
is likely that GenAp 2-5 looks very much like what was used. In the Genesis Apocryphon
both stories are parts of an organic whole. This is not the case in Jubilees and 1 Enoch.

It is not entirely certain what to make of this phenomenon, but the most logical
conclusion seems to be that the Genesis Apocryphon preserves the stories in their original
setting, while Jubilees and 1 Enoch do not. If this is judged to be the case, we have perhaps
the strongest argument yet for the preliminary suggestion of Avigad and Yadin that the
Apocryphon is an earlier witness to these accounts than other known works.

612 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 539-42.
5.2.7. *Summary: A Second Century B.C.E. Companion to Genesis*

After surveying the evidence, there are a number of factors recommending an early to mid 2nd cent. B.C.E. date for the Genesis Apocryphon, rather than the standard 1st cent. B.C.E. hypothesis:

i. Its fondness of apocalyptic, symbolic dream-visions

ii. The literary genre it employs (rewritten Bible)

iii. The unique portrayal of Noah, which seems to predate the now suppressed Noah sections of 1 Enoch

iv. The name Hyrcanus (הירקנוס), which probably does not refer to one of the historical figures mentioned by Josephus, but is only known as a name from the late 3rd cent. B.C.E. (Hyrcanus the Tobiad) to early 1st cent. B.C.E. (the Jewish high priest Hyrcanus II) – i.e. the pre-Hasomonean and Hasmonean periods

v. The brevity and simplicity of its account of the earth’s division in relative to Jubilees

vi. The fact that the parallels with Jubilees and 1 Enoch are more integrated into the narrative of the Apocryphon

vii. The scroll’s apologetic tenor regarding the exclusive Israelite right to inhabit the Land of Israel, which seems most at home in a pre-Hasmonean or Hasmonean setting.

None of these points is very convincing on its own, but their cumulative weight is more significant. In general, the above features demonstrate that the Genesis Apocryphon is allied most closely with other literature from the 3rd-2nd cents. B.C.E. – it is in this period that the scroll finds its literary home. Additionally, we have seen that the Aramaic of the Apocryphon does not stand in the way of a 2nd century date. In fact, it may now be possible to list the scroll’s language as one of the factors arguing for this period. I favor a date close
to that of Jubilees; perhaps slightly earlier based on points i, v, and vi, as well as its employment of Aramaic as the language of composition. A safe range would be 200-150 B.C.E, although an earlier date should not be ruled out absolutely.

The Genesis Apocryphon is a remarkably creative and rare example of Second Temple period Jewish exegesis from the Hellenistic era. At one and the same time it embraced a Hellenistic understanding of the earth, and used that understanding to advocate a radical adherence to the “Most High God” and an exclusive Israelite right to inhabit the Levant. Along with Jubilees and some other Jewish Hellenistic works it demonstrates how biblical exegesis transitioned between so-called inter-biblical exegesis and later, lemmatized commentaries such as the Pesharim (although it was no doubt synonymous with both of these for a period). Behind our scroll was a community aware of the culture around it, but eminently concerned to uphold its own traditions and system of beliefs. One can only hope that with future discoveries in the partially unpublished Aramaic and Syriac corpora we might find further attestation of some of the Genesis Apocryphon’s missing pieces, and gain a yet better understanding of this fascinating text.
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