

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *Understand a likeness: Genesis creation allusions in Musar leMevin (4Q415-418, 4Q423, and 1Q26)*

Wold, Benjamin G.

---

### How to cite:

Wold, Benjamin G. (2004) *Understand a likeness: Genesis creation allusions in Musar leMevin (4Q415-418, 4Q423, and 1Q26)*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/2837/>

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

# **Understand A Likeness: Genesis Creation Allusions in *Musar leMevin* (4Q415-418, 4Q423, and 1Q26)**

**A copyright of this thesis rests  
with the author. No quotation  
from it should be published  
without his prior written consent  
and information derived from it  
should be acknowledged.**

Benjamin G. Wold

Ph.D. Thesis Submitted to the University of Durham, Department of Theology

February, 2004



13 JUL 2004

## Abstract

*Musar leMevin* (4Q415-418; 423; 1Q26) is a sapiential document from the Qumran library. This previously unknown composition has become the focus of considerable scholarly attention in the last ten years. Among the many observations made on the document is its focus upon aspects of creation. Most notably, the otherwise rare phrase רז נהיה has been considered by some to allude to the order of creation. It has also been observed that a number of significant allusions to Genesis 1-3 occur in the document. For instance, 4Q416 2 iii-iv allude to Genesis 2.20-25 in a female leaving her mother and father. 4Q423 1, 2 i alludes to the Garden of Eden. 4Q416 1 is concerned with cosmology based upon creation. While these and other observations have been discussed to a limited degree, no sustained study has been conducted on allusions to Genesis creation traditions throughout *Musar leMevin*.

This thesis approaches the question of the use of Genesis creation traditions in the following manner. It is hypothesised that an examination of allusions to Genesis 1-3 may be valuable for interpreting the document. In chapter one, previous research on the document is reviewed and remaining unresolved issues suggested. Among the unresolved issues are a thorough understanding of anthropology and angelology in the document. In chapter two, a methodology is developed for identifying and adjudicating occurrences of allusions. Chapter three, on the basis of criteria set forth in chapter two, identifies nearly twenty allusions to Genesis 1-3 in *Musar leMevin*. Chapter four is dedicated to exploring anthropology and angelology on the basis of two significant allusions to Genesis 1.26-27 (4Q416 2 iii 15-18; 4Q417 1 i 15-18) and an exegetical tradition of angelic participation in creation. Chapter five is concerned with addresses about females and directed to a female based upon a cluster of allusions to creation traditions. In conclusion, creation traditions are seen to be formative for wisdom instruction in the document and elucidate (1) angelology and anthropology; and (2) how the phrase רז נהיה may be better understood.

Copyright © 2004 Benjamin G. Wold  
All rights reserved



## Table of Contents:

1) <i>Musar leMevin</i> : Review of Research and Remaining Issues.....	1
1.1) Introduction.....	1
1.2) General Information on the Document.....	2
1.3) History of Research.....	5
1.3.1) Issues Addressed in Recent Publications.....	8
1.3.2) Provenance of <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	8
1.3.3) <i>Musar leMevin</i> 's Relationship to the 'Sectarian Community' .....	9
1.3.4) The Meaning of the מדינה in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	20
1.3.5) Poverty Language in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	26
1.3.6) The Reconstruction of <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	36
1.3.7) Angelology in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	47
1.4) Issues Raised and Resolved.....	58
1.5) Suggestions for Remaining Tasks.....	59
2) Non-Explicit Use of Traditions: Methodology for Identification.....	62
2.1) Introduction.....	62
2.2) Non-Explicit Traditions in the New Testament.....	66
2.3) Devorah Dimant: Allusion in the Pseudepigrapha.....	81
2.4) Non-Explicit Traditions in <i>Hodayot</i> and DSS.....	85
2.5) George J. Brooke: Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Wisdom Texts...	93
2.6) Synthesis of Approaches and Criteria for <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	99
2.7) Conclusion.....	103
3) Identifying and Adjudicating Allusions to Genesis 1-3 Traditions.....	105
3.1) Introduction.....	105
3.2) Presentation of Fragments.....	106
3.2.1) 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii.....	106
3.2.2) 4Q415 2 ii.....	109
3.2.3) 4Q416 1.....	112
3.2.4) 4Q416 2 iii.....	114
3.2.5) 4Q416 2 iv.....	120
3.2.6) 4Q417 1 i.....	122
3.2.7) 4Q418 69 ii.....	129
3.2.8) 4Q418 77.....	131
3.2.9) 4Q418 81 + 81a.....	134
3.2.10) 4Q418 126 i-ii.....	136
3.2.11) 4Q418 177.....	137
3.2.12) 4Q418 178.....	139
3.2.13) 4Q418 206.....	140
3.2.14) 4Q418a 166 + 17.....	141
3.2.15) 4Q423 1, 2 i.....	141
3.2.16) 4Q423 5.....	149
3.3) Conclusions.....	151

4) Angelology and Anthropology in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	154
4.1) Introduction.....	154
4.2) 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18.....	154
4.2.1) Armin Lange.....	155
4.2.2) Torleif Elgvin.....	158
4.2.3) George J. Brooke.....	160
4.2.4) John J. Collins.....	161
4.2.5) Matthew J. Goff.....	168
4.2.6) Harrington and Strugnell.....	170
4.2.7) Summary and Translation of 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18.....	172
4.2.8) Philo and 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18.....	175
4.2.9) Targums and 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18.....	182
4.2.10) Rabbinic Literature and 4Q417 lines 15-18.....	183
4.2.11) Conclusions on 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18.....	184
4.3) Angelic References in 4Q416 2 iii.....	185
4.3.1) Translating the Term אַרְנַיִם.....	187
4.3.2) Interpreting the Term נְרִיִּים.....	192
4.4) Indefatigable Angelic Models.....	195
4.4.1) 4Q418 55.....	195
4.4.2) 4Q418 69.....	196
4.5) 4Q418 81 – Reconstruction and Identification.....	199
4.5.1) Armin Lange.....	201
4.5.2) Torleif Elgvin.....	204
4.5.3) Harrington and Strugnell.....	205
4.5.4) Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar.....	207
4.5.5) Crispin Fletcher-Louis.....	209
4.5.6) Loren T. Stuckenbruck: Angel Veneration in Early Judaism.....	213
4.5.7) Angel Veneration in 4Q418 81.....	219
4.6) Conclusions.....	220
5) Female Address and Instruction in Light of Creation Allusions.....	223
5.1) Introduction.....	223
5.2) Allusions to Genesis 1-3 and the Female.....	224
5.2.1) 4Q416 2 ii-iv.....	224
5.2.2) Meneham Kister on 4Q416 2 ii line 21.....	233
5.2.3) Elgvin on 4Q416 2 ii line 21.....	235
5.2.4) Harrington and Strugnell on 4Q416 2 ii line 21.....	236
5.2.5) 4Q417 1 i lines 8-12.....	240
5.2.6) 4Q415 2 ii.....	241
5.2.7) Synthesis of References to the Origin/Separation of the Female....	246
5.2.8) 4Q418 126 i-ii .....	247
5.2.9) Male Dominion Over the Female.....	249
5.2.10) 4Q423 1, 2 i.....	250
5.2.11) Summary.....	253
5.3) 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 and the Female.....	253
5.4) ‘Cover Your Shame’ .....	256

5.4.1) Occurrences of 'Shame' in Other Early Jewish Literature.....	257
5.4.2) Occurrences of 'Shame' in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	263
5.4.3) Conclusions Concerning 'Shame' in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	273
5.5) 4Q415 11 and the Female.....	275
5.6) 4Q415 9 and the Female.....	280
5.7) Conclusions on the Female in <i>Musar leMevin</i> .....	282
5.8) Observations on the New Testament.....	285
6) Conclusions.....	293
Bibliography.....	301

## **Acknowledgements**

This thesis was first conceived around the pool table on the top floor of the Petra Youth Hostel in the Old City of Jerusalem. Professor Loren Stuckenbruck, his son Hanno, and myself casually enjoyed the warm summer afternoon and discussed possible research topics. As we travelled the Land in August of 1999 our conversations facilitated the beginning of an outline for this work. Now, at the end of nearly four years of research and writing I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to Loren Stuckenbruck not only for his long hours of careful supervision, but for his friendship and collegiality as well. It has been an honour to work with him and the other staff at the historic University of Durham, England in the past years.

From the very beginning of my studies I have been supported financially by Tim and Kay Winn of the Lampstand Foundation. They have made it possible for me to study in four countries and obtain my B.S., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees. Their ongoing support, both in prayer and deed, has enabled me to fulfil my dreams, aspirations, and the work found in the following pages. I was a stranger and they took me in. It is to them that I dedicate this thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to several others. First, to R. Steven Notley, my M.A. supervisor at Jerusalem University College, who first introduced me to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins. Professor Notley has proven time and again to be not only a teacher, but mentor as well. During my year of research at Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Professor Hermann Lichtenberger warmly received me, provided opportunities to present my research, and co-supervised me during this year. I would like to thank the faculty and staff at the Theologicum in Tübingen for allowing me to research and write in a friendly and welcoming environment. Others that deserve special mention for their contribution to my pursuits in biblical studies are: Robert Hayward, Randal Buth, Hanan Eshel, and Hannah Safrai. Matthew Goff, Catherine Murphey, Benjamin Wright, John Collins, and George Brooke all shared unpublished works that contributed to this thesis, thank you.

My family and friends have been of special importance to me as I have undertaken this task. The love and support given to me by my parents and siblings has been invaluable. It is my hope that this thesis shall not only be a contribution to studies in Early Judaism, but an explanation of exactly what it is I have been doing in the last years.

Finally, I would especially like to thank two friends. Floyd Plemmons has been a generous and exceptional friend since we first met in a taxi at Ben-Gurion Airport in Tel Aviv. The experiences we have shared together: travels, tribulations and many an all night conversation have meant more to me than I can express here. Saya Nagafuji, whom I first met in the International Sprach Programm in Tübingen, has been a close companion and partner in the last years of my studies. If I speak German with a Japanese accent, she deserves the credit. I cherish our times together.

Tübingen, Theologicum  
January 23, 2004

BEN WOLD

When asked 'who is your neighbour'?

**Tim & Kay Winn**

Responded 'הגר אתכם - ואהבת לו כמוך' (Lev 19.34)

## List of Abbreviations

1 Cor	1 Corinthians
1 En	1 Enoch
1 Kgs	1 Kings
1QH	Hodayoth from Qumran Cave 1
1QM	Milhamah from Qumran Cave 1
1QS	Serek ha-Yahad from Qumran Cave 1
1 Pet	1 Peter
1 Sam	1 Samuel
1 Thess	1 Thessalonians
1 Tim	1 Timothy
2 Chr	2 Chronicles
2 Pet	2 Peter
2 Sam	2 Samuel
2 Thess	2 Thessalonians
2 Tim	2 Timothy
1Q, 2Q, 3Q, etc.	Qumran Cave Numbers followed by number, title or abbreviation of a manuscript/fragment
ANYAS	Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences
Apoc. Abr.	Apocalypse of Abraham
Apoc. Mos.	Apocalypse of Moses
Aet.	Philo, De aeternitate mundi
Aram	Aramaic
Ascen.Is.	Ascension of Isaiah
BA	Biblical Archaeologist
b. (before rabb. txt.)	Babylonian Talmud
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
Ber	Berakhot
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicum Lovaniensium
Bib	Biblica
BibOr	Biblica et orientalia
Bij	Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BS	Biblical Studies
BSac	Bibliotheca Sacra
BSJS	Brill's Series in Jewish Studies
BTB	Biblical Theology Bulletin
CBA	Catholic Biblical Association
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CD	Covenant of Damascus
Col	Colossians
Conf.	Philo, De confusione linguarum
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
Dan	Daniel
Deb.R.	Debarim Rabbah
Dec.	Philo, De decalogo
Deut	Deuteronomy
DJD (plus Arab. num.)	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series (plus vol. no.)
DJD (plus Rom. num.)	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (plus vol. no.)

DSD	Dead Sea Discoveries
DSSE	The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (ed. Geza Vermes)
DSSSE	The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (eds. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar)
EDSS	Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls (eds. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam)
EI	Eretz Israel
Eph	Ephesians
Eth	Ethiopic
EvQ	Evangelical Quarterly
Ex	Exodus
Ex R	Exodus Rabbah
Ez	Ezekiel
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
Fug.	Philo, De fuga et inventione
GAP	Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha
Gal	Galatians
Gen	Genesis
Gen R	Genesis Rabbah
Gig.	Philo, De gigantibus
Grk	Greek
Hag	Haggai
Heb	Hebrew
Hebr	Hebrews
Hekh.	Hekhalot
Hen	Henoch
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Series
HTR	Harvard Theological Review
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
Is	Isaiah
JANES	Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University
JBL	Journal of Biblical Studies
Jer	Jeremiah
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
Job	Job
Jos.Asen.	Joseph and Aseneth
JR	Journal of Religion
JSJ	Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT	Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSP	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement
JSS	Journal of Jewish Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies
JQR	Jewish Quarterly Review
Jub	Jubilees
Judaica	Judaica: Beiträge zum Verständnis
l. (ll.)	line(s)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
Leg.	Philo, Legum allegoriae
Lev	Leviticus
LTP	Laval Théologique et Philosophique
LXX	Septuagintal Tradition

m. (before rabb. txt.)	Mishnah
Mal	Malachi
Mid.	Middot
Midr.	Midrash
ms(s)	Manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic Text
Mut.	Philo, De mutatione nominum
Neof.	Targum Neofiti
NES	Near Eastern Studies
NovT	Novum Testamentum
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	Novum Testamentum
NTS	New Testament Studies
Num	Numbers
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
Onq.	Targum Onqelos
Opif.	Philo, De opificio mundi
OTP	The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (ed. J. H. Charlesworth)
p	Pesher
Phil	Philippians
Plato Tim.	Timaeus of Plato
PRS	Perspectives in Religious Studies
Prov	Proverbs
Ps(s)	Psalms(s)
Ps.-Jn.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Ps.-Philo	Pseudo-Philo
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece
PWCJS	Proceedings of the...World Congress of Jewish Studies
QL	Qumran Literature
Qoh	Qohelet or Ecclesiastes
QG	Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin
Rab.	Rabbah
rabb.	Rabbinic
RB	Revue Biblique
Rev	Revelation
RevEx	Review and Expositor
RevQ	Revue de Qumrân
RHPhR	Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses
San.	Sanhedrin
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature: Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSMS	Society of Biblical Literature: Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Paper
SDSSRL	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
ShirShabb	Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat
SHR	Studies in the History of Religions
Sib.Or.	Sibylline Oracles
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
ST	Studia theologica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judea
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha



t. (before rabb. text.)	Tosephta
T.Abr.	Testament of Abraham
Tarb	Tarbiz
T. Dan	Testament of Dan
Tg. Neof.	Targum Neofiti I
Tg. Onq.	Targum Onqelos
Tg. Ps.-J.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
TJ	Trinity Journal
T. Levi	Testament of Levi
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum
T.Sol.	Testament of Solomon
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TDOT	Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament
Tg.	Targum
Tob	Tobit
Vita	Vita Adae et Evae
Vita.Mos.	Philo, de vita Mosis
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTs	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
Wars	Josephus, Jewish Wars
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAH	Zeitschrift für Althebräistik
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

### **Notes on Transcription and Translation**

The transcription and translation of the Hebrew of *Musar leMevin*, due to the fragmentary nature of the text, presents several challenges. Unless otherwise indicated transcriptions of the document are taken from DJD 34 *without* diacritical markings. My own translations have been offered for most citations of DJD 34 with clear indication when this is not the case. Transcriptions of other Qumran texts are taken either from their respective DJD volume or from DSSSE.

## 1) *Musar leMevin*: Review of Research and Remaining Issues

### 1.1) Introduction

Among the documents discovered in the caves around Khirbet Qumran was a previously unknown sapiential composition. Since its discovery, this document has been discussed under a variety of titles or designations: מוסר למבין ('instruction for an understanding one'), Sapiential Work A, 4QInstruction, Instruction and 4Q415-ff. Since the publication of the document in the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (DJD 34) series in 1999 the work has been discussed simply as 4QInstruction with greater regularity.<sup>1</sup> This document survives, however, not only in materials from Cave 4 (4Q415-418, 423) but also from Cave 1 (1Q26); therefore, it would be accurate to refer to the composition as a whole without cave designation. The Hebrew title *Musar leMevin* will be the title used throughout the present study.<sup>2</sup>

This thesis will be focused upon issues of intertextuality with a particular emphasis on the influence of Genesis creation traditions in *Musar leMevin*. The significance of traditions related to Genesis 1-3, both explicit and non-explicit usages, will be identified and explored in relation to the document as a whole. Traditions stemming from the creation account in Genesis often appear to be the basis for framing both anthropologic and angelic conceptions in the document. In addition, other motifs (e.g. רז נהיה) in *Musar leMevin* may be better understood in light of an investigation of these traditions. Relations between the addressees and humankind, the addressees and

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Strugnell, D. J. Harrington, T. Elgvin (eds.), *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIV: Sapiential Texts Part 2, 4QInstruction (Mūsār l' Mēvîn): 4Q415ff. with a Re-edition of 1Q26 by John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, S. J., and an edition of 4Q423 by Torleif Elgvin, in Consultation with Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S. J.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).

<sup>2</sup> E. J. C. Tigchelaar and C. Murphy refer to the document primarily as 'Instruction'. 'Sapiential Work A' was a working title that was never intended to be a permanent designation. The frequent use of



angels, issues pertaining to the female and marriage in *Musar leMevin* are each significant themes that will be addressed.

The purpose of this chapter is first to introduce the document *Musar leMevin* and its characteristics, then to review the secondary literature and the issues and controversies it has raised about how this document is to be reconstructed and understood, and finally to consider some of the tasks that await research.

## 1.2) General Information on the Document

*Manuscripts.* An introduction to the document *Musar leMevin* that offers a number of generally agreed upon observations may be provided. Nevertheless, detailing any sort of broad picture will be impossible at this point. Regarding issues of palaeography, for instance, it may be uncomplicated to note that manuscripts evidence scribal hands that date to between the late 1<sup>st</sup> century BCE and early 1<sup>st</sup> century CE.<sup>3</sup> However, that six manuscripts of this document were found in Caves 1 and 4 is not a straightforward matter; it remains uncertain how many manuscripts are preserved among the fragments from Cave 4. In particular, the manuscript designated '4Q418' may actually consist of more than two manuscripts, and 4Q424 not usually counted among the six manuscripts may also be a copy of *Musar leMevin*. Thus it is more accurate to say, by way of introduction, that there were at least six manuscripts of *Musar leMevin* discovered in the two caves. Furthermore, the materials disclose that the document

---

'4QInstruction' elsewhere is not accurate in the context of speaking about a document as a whole but rather manuscripts.

<sup>3</sup> According to the editors of *DJD XXXIV* 4Q416 and 4Q418 are written in a hand that is transitional between Hasmonean and early Herodian. 4Q418a is early Herodian or perhaps even late Hasmonean. 4Q415 and 4Q417 display early Herodian script while 4Q423 represents a middle to late Herodian hand and 1Q26 is somewhere between early or middle Herodian. T. Elgvin argues that all copies are Herodian. 4Q416 is the youngest, written in an early Herodian hand, while 4Q423 and 1Q26 are the oldest, written in a middle Herodian hand. See T. Elgvin, 'Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A (\*),' in *RevQ* 16 (1995): 559-80.

originally consisted of between approximately 23 and 30 columns, making it one of the lengthier documents among the Dead Sea Scroll documents. The combination of these facts indicate the likelihood of the work's importance and popularity at least during the Herodian period: (1) fragments were found in Caves 1 and 4, and (2) a number of manuscripts, at least six in number, were discovered. With these considerations in mind, it can be further noted that *Musar leMevin* is a sapiential document written in Hebrew, extant in hands that date to about the turn of the Common Era, and was a significant and substantial document within the Qumran library.

*Extent of Fragments.* Observations made in relation to the material fragments, the largest and most significant as well as the vast number of smaller and more obscure fragments, serve to introduce *Musar leMevin* further. The largest single fragment is 4Q416 2 i-iv; even here, most of the lines of these columns are incomplete and less than half are preserved from margin to margin. Column iii is the best preserved with 20 lines extant in relatively good condition. The adjoining column ii is the next best preserved with 22 lines, all of which are incomplete. 13 lines of column iv are extant, but only from the left margin to the middle of the column. Only 7 lines of the bottom left corner of column i survive while the top 17 lines on the right of the column survive as a separate fragment. The 18-line fragment of 4Q416 i is particularly important as it has a wide margin on the right that appears to be the beginning of the scroll. Another of the larger fragments is 4Q417 1 i; it survives in 27 lines of which lines 7-18 are preserved from margin to margin. 4Q417 2 i is a large fragment as well with 28 extant lines. Other larger fragments are 4Q418 55 (12 lines), 4Q418 69 (15 lines), 4Q418 81 (20 lines), 4Q418 103 (9 lines), 4Q418 126 (17 lines), 4Q418 127 (7 lines), and 4Q423 1, 2 (9

lines). Not a single column of *Musar leMevin* survives in full, and the overwhelming majority of fragments do not even preserve a complete line. The smaller fragments number to over 400 and range in size from several incomplete lines down to single letter fragments. Just under 300 of these fragments have been assigned to '4Q418'.

*Addressee(s).* *Musar leMevin* is written primarily as a work addressed to a single individual (2<sup>nd</sup> person address); as the Hebrew title implies, it is directed at one who is told to understand (ואתה מבין), understands (מוסר למבין), and at times simply 'you' (ואתה see 4Q418 81). It does, however, contain a third person masculine address at one point (4Q416 1) and, surprisingly, at another point it has an address in the second person feminine (4Q415 ii 2). There are also a number of occurrences of second person masculine plural suffixes throughout the document (see for example ענייכמה or לבבכם in 4Q417 1 i 27).

The author(s) of the composition are concerned with financial transactions and family matters, but these concerns are placed within the framework of an eschatological and cosmological context. *Musar leMevin* has elements of an apocalyptic worldview that emphasises pursuit of the knowledge of good and evil, creation, angelology, a division of humanity and conceptions of future judgement and vindication for the righteous.<sup>4</sup> Especially important in the document is the frequent and variously termed command to pursue (פרש, לקח, הביט, דרש, בין, אחזן) the רז נהיה (approximately 28 occurrences), a phrase used to refer to an esoteric revelation that is the source of wisdom. One final note is the document's emphasis on the addressee's poverty. This alone is apparent from the

---

<sup>4</sup> Both J. J. Collins in *Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroads, 1984) and, more recently, M. J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003) pp. 80-115.

frequent use of the term מחסור 'lacking' or 'poverty' (approximately 26 occurrences) throughout *Musar leMevin*.

The various issues raised and scholarly contributions to reading and reconstructing *Musar leMevin* will be summarised below. A review of these topics will aid in setting the exploration of intertextual occurrences within the framework of present scholarship. Issues such as the provenance of *Musar leMevin*, its relationship to other Early Jewish literature, genre, and occurrences of unique motifs will precede the examination of the influence of creation traditions.

### 1.3) History of Research

The document *Musar leMevin* has only been the subject of study in any noticeable way since the mid-1990's. The first reasonably accessible transcription of the manuscripts became available to the academic community in Wacholder and Abegg's *Preliminary Edition* in 1992.<sup>5</sup> John Strugnell had originally been given the rights to publish the manuscripts. As was the case with a large number of documents the Wacholder editions were followed by the relatively rapid production of critical editions in the DJD series. The nine-line fragment of 1Q26 was first published in DJD I in 1955<sup>6</sup> and was re-edited in DJD 34. To date, there are a growing number of articles that give particular attention to *Musar leMevin*.<sup>7</sup> In addition, several monographs have devoted

---

<sup>5</sup> B. Z. Wacholder and M. G. Abegg (eds.), *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave 4* (Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-1992): 44-154.

<sup>6</sup> D. Barthélémy and J. T. Milik, *DJD I: Qumran Cave 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).

<sup>7</sup> J. K. Aitken, 'Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature,' in P. J. Harland and R. Hayward (eds.), *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millennium. Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (SVT 77; Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 181-93; J. J. Collins, 'In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran,' in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 609-18; 'Wisdom Reconsidered, in Light of the Scrolls,' in *DSD* 4 (1997): 265-81; T. Elgvin, 'Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4,' in J. J. Collins *et al.* (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and*

considerable attention to *Musar leMevin*<sup>8</sup> and a few monographs focus on the document exclusively. Eibert Tigchelaar's volume addresses, comprehensively, the reconstruction and sequencing of fragments of the document.<sup>9</sup> Another monograph, devoted exclusively to *Musar leMevin*, is to be published in the near future by Torlief Elgvin as a broadly reworked version of his Ph.D. dissertation.<sup>10</sup> Another noteworthy contribution to *Musar leMevin* is Armin Lange's work which devotes considerable time discussing, among

---

*Future Prospects* (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) pp. 179-96; 'Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation According to *Sapiential Work A*,' in D. W. Parry and S. D. Ricks (eds.), *Current Research and Technological Developments* (STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996) pp. 126-65; 'The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation,' in Th. L. Thompson, F. H. Cryer (eds.), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testament* (JSOTSupp 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) pp. 113-50; 'The Reconstruction of *Sapiential Work A*,' in *RevQ* 16 (1995): 559-80; 'Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,' in *SBLSP* 34 (1995): 444-63; 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE: the Evidence of 4QInstruction,' in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000) pp. 226-47; 'Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,' in D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 15-38; J. Frey, 'The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,' in D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 197-226; G. Ibba, 'Il "Libro dei Misteri" (1Q27, F. 1): Testo escatologico,' in *Henoch* 21 (1999): 73-84; D. J. Harrington, 'The *Rāz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415-418, 423),' in *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549-53; 'Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Wisdom Texts are Important,' in *DSD* 4 (1997): 245-54; 'Wisdom at Qumran,' in E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: the Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) pp. 137-52; 'Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran *Sapiential Work A*,' in *JSP* 16 (1997): 25-38; 'The Qumran *Sapiential* Texts in the Context of Biblical (OT and NT) and Second Temple Literature,' in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000) pp. 256-62; A. Lange, 'Wisdom and Predestination in the DSS,' in *DSD* 2 (1995): 340-54; E. Puech and A. Steudel, 'Un nouveau fragment de manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ7 = 4Q417 ou 418),' in *RevQ* 19 (2000): 623-27; M. Morgenstern, 'The Meaning of בית מלדיים in the Qumran Wisdom Texts,' in *JJS* 51 (2000): 141-44; J. Strugnell, 'The *Sapiential Work* 4Q415ff. and pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran: Lexigraphic Considerations,' in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 595-608; E. J. C. Tigchelaar, 'The Addressees of 4QInstruction,' in D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez and E. M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 62-78.

<sup>8</sup> J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997); D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (New York: Routledge, 1996); C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the DSS* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1995); C. M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (Leiden: Brill, 2001).



other texts, 4Q417 1 i. John Collins's and Daniel Harrington's books on sapiential literature are pedagogical and introductory in nature and are thus not devoted to an in-depth analysis of the document. Catherine Murphy dedicates a chapter of her book on poverty and wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls to *Musar leMevin*, a topic that is prominent in the document. Among Elgvin's publications is an article that addresses a reconstruction and sequencing of the fragments as well as several articles which address issues of the document's provenance. Several articles from the 1998 Tübingen Symposium are another recent contribution to studies on *Musar leMevin*.<sup>11</sup> The Orion Center of the Hebrew University held a symposium in 2001 where sapiential literature from the Dead Sea Scrolls was the focus of the call for papers. Among the papers presented were several works specifically about *Musar leMevin*, all of which will be published at a future date.<sup>12</sup> Even more recently a colloquium was held at the Catholic University of Leuven where a number of papers were presented on the document.<sup>13</sup> I am aware of at least two Ph.D. dissertations recently published on *Musar leMevin* as well.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

<sup>10</sup> T. Elgvin, *An Analysis of 4QInstruction* (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, 1997).

<sup>11</sup> C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002). Articles specifically written on *Musar leMevin* include: J. Dochhorn «Sie wird dir nicht ihre Kraft geben»: Adam, Kain und der Ackerbau in 4Q423 2 3 und Apc Mos 24; G. J. Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran'; L. T. Stuckenbruck, '4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: an Evaluation'; D. J. Harrington, 'Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom: Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A'; Tigchelaar, 'Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction: 4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels'; J. Frey, 'Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage'.

<sup>12</sup> The Sixth International Symposium; *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May* (eds.), G. Sterling and J. J. Collins (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming); papers presented on *Musar leMevin*: J. J. Collins, 'The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls'; D. Dimant, 'Musar La-mevin (4QInstruction) – a Sectarian Wisdom'; T. Elgvin, 'Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction'; L. H. Schiffman, 'Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts'; B. G. Wright, 'The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature'.

<sup>13</sup> F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003); papers presented on *Musar leMevin*: J. J. Collins, 'The Mysteries of God: Creation and

### 1.3.1) Issues Addressed in Recent Publications

Most of the activity surrounding *Musar leMevin* has centred on a number of areas: (1) theological motifs; (2) similarities and differences with other sapiential literature; and (3) the relationship of this document to the other literature of early Judaism and, especially, the 'sectarian community'. The last mentioned has been one of the more controversial of these issues. In particular, discussion has been focused on the translation and interpretation of particular phrases and concepts within *Musar leMevin*. Less prominent, but of great significance, has been the endeavour to reconstruct the manuscripts and sequence columns. The following is a review of scholarship on these issues by topic. The purpose here will be to: (1) summarise conclusions which have been reached on basic issues; (2) highlight continuing issues of contention; and (3) identify previously unexamined areas for further study.

### 1.3.2) Provenance of *Musar leMevin*

*Musar leMevin*, as scholars have observed since the beginning of research on the document, contains practical wisdom instruction alongside eschatological and apocalyptic motifs. This combination receives considerable attention by Lange in his book *Weisheit und Prädestination* in which he attempts to relate *Musar leMevin* to other previously unknown documents from Qumran (1QS 3-4; 4Q299-300). Harrington has compared and contrasted the approaches to wisdom in *Musar leMevin* and Sirach<sup>15</sup> and

---

Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon'; J. Duhaime, 'Traditions Sapientiales et Apocalyptiques Dans L'Instruction sur les Deux Esprits (1QS III 13 – IV 26)'; F. García Martínez, 'Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?'; E. Puech, 'Apports des Textes Apocalyptiques et Sapientiels de Qumrân: À l'eschatologie du Judaïsme Ancien'; E. J. C. Tigchelaar, 'The Provenance of Mysteries or: Which Wisdom are We Talking About?'.  
<sup>14</sup> Goff, 'The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom'; D. J. Jefferies, 'Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction' (Gorgias Dissertations NES 3; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2002).

<sup>15</sup> Harrington, 'Two Early'.

provides a general introduction to the former in his book.<sup>16</sup> In his more recent articles Harrington places *Musar leMevin* in the context of biblical and Early Jewish literature.<sup>17</sup> Collins, in *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, introduces the document and its character briefly against the backdrop of almost every conceivable wisdom document known from early Judaism.<sup>18</sup> In a more recent article Collins addresses wisdom as a literary category and situates *Musar leMevin*, taking its unusual characteristics into account, within that literary form.<sup>19</sup> There, Collins challenges previously held notions of what characterises a wisdom composition and attempts to offer a developmental history of wisdom. The editors of DJD 34, Elgvin, Stuckenbruck and Tigchelaar all consider *Musar leMevin's* relationship to *1 Enoch*.<sup>20</sup> The esoteric and apocalyptic nature of wisdom in *Musar leMevin* is often contrasted with that of other more typical sapiential documents, most frequently Sirach. Elgvin views *Musar leMevin* as a conflation of two literary layers: (1) an older traditional sapiential work and (2) a later apocalyptic layer.<sup>21</sup> Elgvin's view dramatically alters *Musar leMevin's* place and provenance within Early Jewish wisdom compositions and will be discussed below.

### 1.3.3) *Musar leMevin's* Relationship to the 'Sectarian Community'

The issue of *Musar leMevin's* relationship to compositions of the Qumran group has been the focus of numerous discussions. Some scholars who have written about *Musar leMevin* have made their position known in this regard while others have spent

---

<sup>16</sup> Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*.

<sup>17</sup> Harrington, 'The Qumran'.

<sup>18</sup> Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*.

<sup>19</sup> Collins, 'Wisdom Reconsidered,' and, 'Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility,' in L. G. Perdue, B. B. Scott and W. J. Wiseman (eds.), *In Search of Wisdom. Essays in Memory of J. G. Gammie* (Louisville: Westminster, 1993): 165-85.

<sup>20</sup> DJD XXXIV, pp. 34-35; Elgvin, 'Analysis'; Stuckenbruck, '4QInstruction'; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*.

<sup>21</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism,' p. 226.

considerable time defending the nuances of their particular view. Relating *Musar leMevin* to the Qumran community and other documents in early Judaism has helped to narrow the milieu in which the document is interpreted. Several approaches have been employed to place this composition in both its social as well as literary context. The basic initial question has been whether or not *Musar leMevin* should be regarded as a sectarian document. A sub-question in this regard is the identity of the addressees and whether they have a priestly or non-priestly identity.<sup>22</sup>

Harrington addresses the location of *Musar leMevin* in relation to the Qumran community in several ways, though he places most emphasis on the particular topics addressed in the preserved portions of the document.<sup>23</sup> He notes that *Musar leMevin* devotes considerable attention to addressing commercial transactions (e.g. loans and deposits), social relations (e.g. superiors and inferiors), and family matters (e.g. wife, parents, in-laws). He argues that these subjects assume a setting in which the addressees are living outside of the community described by the *Community Rule* (1QS) or a monastic setting generally. It is thus not so simple, writes Harrington, to define the community behind *Musar leMevin* as narrowly or rigidly as the *Community Rule*'s descriptions. In general agreement, the documents of the Qumran group drawn upon for comparison are the *Serekh haYahad* (1QS), the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>), *Sefer Milhamah* (1QM), *Habakkuk Pesher* (1QpHab), *Messianic Rule* (1QSb) and *Damascus Document* (CD-A; CD-B; 4Q266-273). Among this short list of foundational documents is the *Damascus Document*, which shares some non-monastic elements with *Musar leMevin*. Harrington notes that there were different ways of being an Essene and there are different ways in

---

<sup>22</sup> I am persuaded by Tigchelaar's hypothesis 'that *Instruction* consists of different sections directed to varying addressees'; see *To Increase Learning*, p. 236 and 'The Addressees'.

which to reconcile the incongruities between the documents. Harrington first suggests, therefore, that *Musar leMevin* may reflect a pre-Qumranic phase in the community's history (2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE or earlier). He also raises the possibility that *Musar leMevin* could have been composed for a branch of the Essene or Qumran movement that was living outside of the monastic movement.<sup>24</sup> Though popular at Qumran, *Musar leMevin* may not have been directly related to the community (analogous to the Enochic traditions).

It is not, by Harrington's own admission, as simple as relating the topics addressed in *Musar leMevin* to what we know of the community from the sectarian corpus listed above. There are similarities between *Musar leMevin* and, especially, the *Serekh haYahad* and the *Hodayot* that align them rather closely. For instance, the unusual phrase רז נהיה appears almost nowhere outside of *Musar leMevin*, only in the *Book of Mysteries*<sup>a</sup> (1Q27 1 i line 4; 4Q299-300 lines 3-4 300; and similar expressions רז (רוזים, רוזי פשע, רוזי אור, כול רז) and the *Community Rule* (1QS 11.3-4). There are also verbatim overlaps between *Musar leMevin* and the *Hodayot* (cf. e.g. 4Q418 55 10; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10.27-28).<sup>25</sup> Beyond these and other linguistic similarities *Musar leMevin* and the Qumran group share ideas concerning eschatological judgement and some dualistic language.<sup>26</sup> The different social settings assumed in the documents, however, complicate these similarities. In the end, the theory that reconciles these incongruities for Harrington

<sup>23</sup> Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, pp. 41, 84-86; 'Two Early Jewish Approaches,' pp. 25, 37.

<sup>24</sup> In accord with the likely hypothesis, based upon Josephus description of the Essenes, of celibate and married sectaries.

<sup>25</sup> 4Q418 55 line 10 '[all their hidden mysteries. Ac]cording to their knowledge they (i.e. men) will receive honour, one man more than his neighbor (ולפי דעתם יכבדו איש מרעהו), And according to each one's understanding will his glory be increased'; and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10.27-28 (ולפי דעתם יכבדו איש מרעהו ('and according to their knowledge they will be honoured, one from his neighbour').

<sup>26</sup> See *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 28-29.

is that *Musar leMevin* represents the intellectual and religious heritage of a movement larger than the Essenes.<sup>27</sup>

Strugnell approaches the subject of *Musar leMevin's* provenance based upon lexicographical considerations. He did so first in an article and, a few years later, published selected portions in the introduction to DJD 34.<sup>28</sup> The following is a summary of both publications.<sup>29</sup> In his analysis Strugnell addresses the frequency and infrequency of sectarian vocabulary in *Musar leMevin* and, on most occasions, derives frequency through comparison to usage or non-usage in traditional Hebrew wisdom compositions. In his article Strugnell lists frequency of vocabulary in one of two ways: (1) infrequent vocabulary in *Musar leMevin* that is more common in 1Q-11Q; and (2) frequent vocabulary that is more sparsely applied in 1Q-11Q. This examination suggests that *Musar leMevin* differs markedly from traditionally understood sectarian works from the Qumran Caves in its relatively high number of foreign words and in its lack of terms and expressions characteristic of the Qumran corpus. In both presentations Strugnell has arranged the lexical frequency according to topic in order to make transparent the significance of the occurrences of vocabulary (purity and impurity, Torah, the community, doxological language, dualism, etc.). For the sake of brevity they have been listed below in alphabetical order<sup>30</sup>:

---

<sup>27</sup> Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, p. 85.

<sup>28</sup> Strugnell, 'The Sapiiential Work 4Q415ff. and pre-Qumranic Works,' and DJD XXXIV, pp. 22-30.

<sup>29</sup> At the time the article was written Strugnell did not have access to an 11Q concordance and thus his frequency statistics were of only 1-10Q. In DJD XXXIV the frequency numbers have been updated with 11Q included. Also, the article includes substantially more 'frequent vocabulary' than the DJD volume.

<sup>30</sup> The numbering system (00:00) places 1Q-11Q number of occurrences in digits to the right of the colon while the digits left of the colon represent the occurrences in *Musar leMevin*. So, for instance, '(0:140) תורה' means that the term Torah never occurs in *Musar leMevin* while it occurs 140 times in traditionally understood sectarian compositions considered by Strugnell.

### Infrequent Vocabulary in *Musar leMevin*:

ענו (0:11)	ישר-ישר (0:44)	אור (3:149)
ענוה (0:17)	ישראל (0:362)	אלוהים (1:341)
פלא (6:241)	מצוה (3:48)	גורל (2:91)
פשע (2:68)	מקדש (0:96)	חיחד (0:98)
צדקה-צדיק (3:136)	נדה (2:66)	הרבים (0:66)
קהל (0:43)	נפלא (1:43)	חושך (0:76)
קדש (13:306)	עדה (0:134)	חסד (3:109)
רע-רשע (3:118)	עליון (0:36)	טהרה (1:170)
תבונה (0:frequent)	עם (0:226)	טמאה (1:216)
חורה (0:140)	עני (0:19)	יהוה (0:174)

### Abnormally Frequent Vocabulary in *Musar leMevin*:

רז נהיה (32:1)	חכמה (10:37)	אביון (6:28)
רצון (17:97)	כבוד (18:296)	אמת (41:223)
רש (11:5)	מבונה (6:0)	בינה (15:63)
שזה (10:7)	מוסר (4:12)	גבורה (18:296)
שחר (11:20)	מחסור (28:2)	דל (1:6)
שכל (8:40)	משקל (7:12)	הבין (25:50)
שקד (10:3)	נחלה (35:47)	המשיל (18:7)
תמיד (11:34)	נשמר (7:13)	השכיל (10:71)
	פקודה (16:20)	התבונן (12:21)
	רז (30:81)	חיים (18:55)

Strugnell concludes that features traditionally viewed as marks of a sectarian work are conspicuously lacking in the vocabulary of *Musar leMevin*. However, the significant overlap between *Musar leMevin* and the sectarian Qumran corpus signifies a relationship between the two. Strugnell suggests three possible relationships for *Musar leMevin* and this corpus. First, *Musar leMevin* could be related in an ideological or chronological way to the sectarian corpus (e.g. 1QH<sup>a</sup>, 1QS, 1QM, 4QShirShabb). Given his preference for the other alternatives (below), Strugnell concludes otherwise. Second, *Musar leMevin* is a pre-Qumranic document that came from an earlier but related sect or group (e.g. 11QT, according to Schiffman *et al.*). Third, it may merely represent a general non-sectarian and post-exilic Jewish background (e.g. as CD 11-ff, 4QWords of

*the Luminaries*<sup>a-c</sup>, or 11QPsalms<sup>a</sup>). Based on these lexicographic considerations Strugnell argues that the third option is the most likely. No lexicographic evidence compels one to regard *Musar leMevin* as a sectarian composition.

More specifically in terms of the social provenance of *Musar leMevin*, Harrington and Strugnell raise various possibilities.<sup>31</sup> They list the following options: (1) the work does not need to be confined to or to originate from the Qumran group; (2) it represents a wider non-celibate branch of the Essene movement mentioned by Josephus; (3) it should be associated with the foundational pre-Qumranic phase of a Jewish movement; or (4) it is a general offshoot of Jewish wisdom groups. It is the fourth option that Strugnell and Harrington regard as the most plausible alternative.

Lange reaches not dissimilar, though more specific, conclusions. In his work *Weisheit und Prädestination* he views *Musar leMevin* as a 'non-Essene' document. Lange suggests a framework of compositions that evidence the idea of a pre-existent sapiential order. These compositions, in an ideological framework are *Musar leMevin*, *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27; 4Q299-301) and the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3.13-4.26).<sup>32</sup> These documents develop the idea of a pre-existent order of creation that regulate the world, history and the fate of human beings. This theology, concludes Lange, was later adopted by the *Yahad*, and can therefore be termed 'pre-Essene'. The Essene documents

---

<sup>31</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 21-22.

<sup>32</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 130 writes 'Aus diesen Parallelen darf geschlossen werden, daß die Zwei-Geister-Lehre aus den Kreisen stammt, die auch 4QSap A und Myst hervorgebracht haben. Jedoch stellt sie zumindest gegenüber 4QSap A eine Weiterentwicklung dar, die die schon in diesem Text angelegten dualistischen Tendenzen stärker betont und das eschatologische Moment von Myst ausbaut'. See also 'Wisdom and Predestination,' pp. 340-43.



that Lange identifies as having subsequently adopted the theology are 1QH<sup>a</sup> 1, CD 2.2-13, 4Q180 1 1-15, and 1QpHab 7.5-14.<sup>33</sup>

Like Strugnell and Harrington, Collins, in a review of wisdom literature found at Qumran, appears to be in favour of a more general origin for *Musar leMevin*.<sup>34</sup> Collins posits the existence of a number of groups who had varying notions of wisdom and drew upon different traditions. Though these groups would have invariably agreed and disagreed on issues, it is not apparent that the author(s) of *Musar leMevin* were segregated. Sectarian divisions, argues Collins, are not well attested before the first century BCE. Furthermore, wisdom cannot be identified with a single worldview, as not all groups agreed on the curriculum of wisdom; wisdom was a multivalent concept. Thus one should be cautious in attributing wisdom to one particular worldview or in using it as an antithesis for other viewpoints in Judaism. The apocalyptic perspective of wisdom compositions found at Qumran provide a foundation for *Musar leMevin* just as well as the this-worldly mindset of traditional biblical wisdom. It is not necessary to view apocalyptic wisdom as sectarian.<sup>35</sup>

Elgvin's approach to *Musar leMevin* is more controversial. He has often called *Musar leMevin* an 'early-Essene' document<sup>36</sup> and goes into most detail on its relationship to the sectarian community in two of his articles.<sup>37</sup> Elgvin's thesis is that *Musar leMevin* is a conflation of two literary stages that he conceives of as a 'proto-Essene' community

---

<sup>33</sup> Elsewhere Lange has argued that *Musar leMevin*, along with the *Book of Mysteries*, should be situated in the cultic environment of the Jerusalem Temple; A. Lange, 'In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,' in A. Schoors (ed.), *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998) pp. 113-160. See esp. pp. 126-28.

<sup>34</sup> Collins, 'Wisdom Reconsidered,' pp. 271-76, 280-81.

<sup>35</sup> See analogies in 1 Enoch 5, 10, 93.

<sup>36</sup> Elgvin writes this in the introduction of the document in 'Reconstruction' and again in 'Early Essene Eschatology,' 'Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing'.

<sup>37</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism,' and 'Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic'.

layer over an older wisdom composition. These conflated literary layers are: (1) the older layer of traditional sapiential admonitions; and (2) the younger apocalyptic portion. Elgvin sees a lack of literary unity in the composition between longer discourses containing apocalyptic thought and shorter admonitions that reflect traditional wisdom. These shorter portions of wisdom do not strictly correspond to sectarian or *Yahad* theology; rather, they promote knowledge based on reason (as in wisdom from the Hebrew Bible or in Sirach). The longer apocalyptic portions, by contrast, appeal to the 'mystery to come' (רז נהיה) and to divine mysteries revealed only to an elect community. The tension between traditional Near Eastern and biblical wisdom, on the one hand, and the eschatological and cosmological portions, on the other, leads Elgvin to conclude that they must be conflated layers. Elgvin associates one layer as reflecting a 'proto-Essene' composition. This original incompatibility between eschatological and cosmological motifs and sapiential instruction brings Elgvin to the conclusion that an earlier form of *Musar leMevin* was interpreted at a later stage.

In Elgvin's view *Musar leMevin*, in its interpolated form, is 'pre-Essene'. The bulk of his argument rests in ideas concerning a remnant community in *Musar leMevin* and the evolution of the concept in later Essene writings. *Musar leMevin* deals with ideas of the end-time community and the author is a participant in that community. The phrases associated with the community are: אנשי רצון ('men of good pleasure'), מטעת עולם ('eternal planting'), נחלי ארץ ('inheritance of the earth'), and פתח מקור ('open a fountain'); all of which are found in 4Q418 81. Elgvin suggests that *Musar leMevin* generated much of this terminology; for example, in the case of the

phrase <sup>38</sup>משעת עולם he is quite clear that the interpolator of *Musar leMevin* coined it. In turn, Elgvin argues that *Musar leMevin* provided the foundation for certain concepts and technical terms eventually borrowed by the Essenes or Qumran community (hence the designation of *Musar leMevin* as 'pre-Essene'). Elgvin argues that the metaphor <sup>39</sup>משעת עולם, used for the righteous community, later became essential to the self-understanding of the *Yahad*. Elgvin's analysis remains problematic. His location of *Musar leMevin* in relation to sectarian literature does not carefully define which compositions in early Judaism should be considered 'sectarian', especially which documents are to be assigned to the *Yahad*.

Elgvin concludes his discourse on conceptions of a righteous community in *Musar leMevin* by comparing them with similar conceptions in the works of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*.<sup>39</sup> While this is certainly appropriate for the subject of shared phraseology in the documents, it does not bring *Musar leMevin* any closer to the category of 'pre-Essene'. By associating *Musar leMevin* with *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, he does not clearly define the relationship between these three documents or their chronological progression.<sup>40</sup> No clear explanation is offered, for example, for the relationship of *1 Enoch* or *Jubilees* to the Essenes and how one should situate them in relation to a 'pre-Essene' group. It seems that shared self-conceptions central to *Musar leMevin* and later sectarian compositions are the foundation upon which Elgvin identifies the document.

Two problems are potentially resolved by Elgvin's hypotheses. First, if *Musar leMevin* presupposes a social context that is not monastic, assuming that the Qumran

<sup>38</sup> P. Tiller, 'The "Eternal Planting" in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *DSD* 4 (1997): 312-35; discusses the phrase in *Musar leMevin* along with its occurrence elsewhere in Early Jewish literature.

<sup>39</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom With and Without,' pp. 29-30.

community was monastic, Elgvin is able to assign those admonitions to an earlier traditional sapiential layer. Second, in regard to lexicographic considerations, the term *יָהָד* as a noun is absent from *Musar leMevin*. However, Elgvin attempts to construct essential community or *Yahad* conceptions that derive from *Musar leMevin* and therefore served as precursors to the *Yahad*. However, the weakness of Elgvin's theories consists in unsubstantiated claims. In particular, except for observations of eschatologised wisdom there is no compelling evidence for the existence of two layers of composition in *Musar leMevin*. Issues of redaction and source criticism, especially given the number of manuscripts available, will certainly be revisited by scholars of *Musar leMevin* for some time to come. Although Elgvin's forthcoming monograph may produce further evidence to substantiate his view of the provenance of *Musar leMevin*, the description of the document as 'pre-Essene' is at present not convincing to me.

A way forward is suggested by Tigchelaar in a brief article that attempts to place *Musar leMevin* on the 'social and religious map of the last centuries BCE'.<sup>41</sup> The purpose of his article is to explore to whom the composition was directed and the context in which it was written. Noting that an answer to this question will only, if ever, be available through a more thorough investigation of both *Musar leMevin* and documents from the period, Tigchelaar makes three observations. First, *Musar leMevin* is clearly distinct from works considered sectarian in its concern with family matters, financial affairs and a lack of any explicit reference to a particular community. Second, there are parallels between *Musar leMevin* and both sectarian and non-sectarian compositions. He cautions, however, that *Musar leMevin* may be a composite or, alternatively, a document

---

<sup>40</sup> For an evaluation of the relationship between *Musar leMevin* and *1 Enoch* both Stuckenbruck in '4QInstruction' and Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 212-216, question Elgvin's hypothesis.

that consists of layers of redacted material. Third, the work is addressed to 'one who understands'; this could refer to anyone in society, not only to a professional sage. The composition seems to admonish people from all levels of society. Thus Tigchelaar elsewhere concludes that, 'the lack of any reference to a sectarian group, community, or practice, suggests that the composition is not sectarian, but of a more general nature'.<sup>42</sup>

By contrast, Dimant, in her forthcoming article from the Orion Symposium, argues that *Musar leMevin* is a sectarian composition.<sup>43</sup> The sectarian character of the work, she argues, is indicated by the frequent terminological and ideological links with distinctive sectarian works such as the *Serekh haYahad* and the *Hodayot*. The paper presented by Dimant focuses on 4Q416 1 and emphasises parallels between this column and sectarian works. It is difficult from Dimant's work in its present form to ascertain the precise relationship that suggested parallels have between *Musar leMevin* and the sectarian compositions. Dimant's original argument for *Musar leMevin*'s origins will certainly be received with some scepticism.<sup>44</sup>

In summary, there are currently three views on the relationship of *Musar leMevin* and the sectarian compositions. (1) Strugnell and Harrington prefer to regard the document as a general offshoot of wisdom literature. Lange views *Musar leMevin* as a 'non-Essene' document that was formative for particular sapiential concepts that were adopted by later 'Essene' compositions. The views of Strugnell, Harrington, Lange, and Collins are quite similar in their conclusions, even if they do differ on how they arrived at their conclusion and certain nuances of their argumentation. (2) Elgvin argues that

---

<sup>41</sup> Tigchelaar, 'The Addressees,' pp. 74-75.

<sup>42</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 247-48.

<sup>43</sup> Dimant, '4QInstruction (mussar la-mevin) – A Sectarian Wisdom,' (unpublished, five page abstract).

*Musar leMevin* existed in two layers, an earlier portion and a later portion which is the product of 'pre-Essene' author(s). (3) Finally, Dimant has suggested that *Musar leMevin* as a whole is a sectarian wisdom composition, though her work has yet to be published in full.

The working presupposition of this thesis will be that *Musar leMevin* is a variation of 'traditional' sapiential literature, similar to the conclusion reached by Strugnell and Harrington. Conceptions of judgement, reward, angels, metaphorical language and particular expressions of hidden wisdom in the document are some such variations on 'traditional' sapiential compositions. *Musar leMevin*, then, represents a single genre that combines elements of wisdom with themes associated with apocalyptic literature. The unusual combination of apocalyptic and sapiential motifs in the document may also, at times, nuance a seemingly traditional wisdom motif. The absence of significant lexicographic similarities, the assumed social context, and the role of apocalyptic expressions in the literature of early Judaism are a few reasons *Musar leMevin* may be located in a broader Jewish milieu. While *Musar leMevin* divides humanity into two basic categories and uses language at times found in wide cross-sections of Early Jewish literature including documents from Qumran, such factors do not warrant the claim that the document has an Essene provenance or was later interpolated by an Essene group.

#### 1.3.4) The Meaning of רץ נהיה in *Musar leMevin*

The phrase רץ נהיה, which occurs about 30 times in *Musar leMevin*, is a prominent motif of the document. The addressee is told to give ear to (גלה אוזן), understand (בין),

---

<sup>44</sup> Jefferies, 'Wisdom at Qumran,' p. 59, considers the provenance of *Musar leMevin* to be from the Qumran Community.

seek (דרש), gaze (הביט), take (לקח), and distinguish (פרש) the נהיה רז. The expression נהיה רז, by contrast, occurs very rarely among the other Dead Sea Scrolls<sup>45</sup> while varying forms of רז, usually in a construct, occur with relatively greater frequency.<sup>46</sup> Several scholars have addressed the use of this phrase in *Musar leMevin*.<sup>47</sup>

In a short article Harrington explores the phrase נהיה רז exclusively.<sup>48</sup> He notes the unique use of the phrase in *Musar leMevin* and divides his discussion of the term נהיה רז into two basic issues: (1) the expression itself; and (2) its function in particular texts. Harrington first analyses the two words of the expression and their occurrences elsewhere. Important observations concerning the word רז are as follows: (1) It is a Persian loanword; (2) it appears in Daniel (2.18, 19, 27, 30, 47, 4.6) and elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls; and (3) the familiar translation 'mystery' is entirely adequate. With regard to the term נהיה, Harrington considers the following: (1) The expected vocalisation of נהיה with a masculine singular noun in construct is the masculine singular *niphal* participle to be vocalised as *nihyeh*. Moreover, (2) the word has the potential of either a future (so Milik, Harrington, Strugnell) or past sense (so Wacholder, Eisenman-Wise, Martínez). As a construct phrase there is no definite article, but the meaning always takes a definite sense.

<sup>45</sup> 1Q27 1 i 4 'ונפשמה לוא מלשו מרז נהיה'; 1QS 11.3-4 'הבישה עיני ואורה לבבי ברז נהיה'; 4Q300 lines 3-4 300; Elgvin argues for a reading of the phrase in 4Q413 (Composition Concerning Divine Providence) lines 4-5 in his article 'Mystery to Come'.

<sup>46</sup> 1QS 9.18 'וכן להשכילם ברז פלא'; 1QH 9.21 'כיא גליחה אוחי לזו פלא', 15.26 'השכלחני באמחכה ומיני פלאכה'; 4Q491 8-10 i 12 (4QM<sup>a</sup>) 'ורזי פל[א]ן[ת] כה'; 4Q299 3 ii 15 (Book of Mysteries) 'כול רז וחבלי'; 4Q300 1 ii 2 'חומכי רזים אן'; 4Q300 8 5 'וברזי עד'.

<sup>47</sup> See Aitken, 'Apocalyptic,' pp. 186-93 for a comparison of explicit and implicit divine revelation in *Musar leMevin* and Ben Sira/Sirach. Aitken observes that, 'for Ben Sira, as for the author of *Sapiential Work A* [i.e. *Musar leMevin*], creation and history are the sources for revelation and the understanding of God's plan'.

<sup>48</sup> Harrington, 'Rāz Nihyeh'.

The second part of Harrington's discussion centres on the occurrences of the phrase *רז נהיה* in *Musar leMevin* and elsewhere. In the majority of cases the expression is preceded by the preposition *ב-* but it is not clear whether it is used in a local sense ('in' or 'on') or an instrumental sense ('by'). On occasions the *רז נהיה* stands alone and once is preceded by the preposition *ב-*. Harrington considers the content of the *רז נהיה* by examining occurrences of its use in the document. The occurrences chosen are as follows:

- (1) Study the *rz nhyh* [מחשבותיך רז נהיה], and understand all the ways of truth, and all the roots of iniquity shalt thou contemplate (4Q416 2 iii 14).
- (2) Gaze in/by the *rz nhyh* [הבט ברו נהיה], and understand the birth-time of salvation, and know who is to inherit glory and iniquity (4Q417 1 i 10-11 [DJD 34 = 4Q417 2 i]).
- (3) Gaze in/by the *rz nhyh* [הבט ברו נהיה], and know the inheritance of everything that lives (4Q418 2 i 18 [DJD 34 = 4Q417 1 i]).
- (4) ... the *rz nhyh* [רז נהיה], and understand the generations of man (4Q418 77 2).
- (5) and understand in/by the *rz nhyh* [וקח ברו נהיה] the weight of the times and the measure (4Q418 7 4; translation uncertain).
- (6) Thou shalt not know what is allotted to it [i.e. *rz nhyh*], and in righteousness shalt thou walk [התהלך וברז נהיה דרוש מולדיו ואז תדע נחלתו ובצדק תתהלך] (4Q416 2 iii 9[-10]).
- (7) [the one who applies himself to studying the *rz nhyh*] shalt know to discern between good and evil (4Q417 2 i 7 [DJD 34 4Q417 1 i 7-8]).
- (8) meditate in/by the *rz nhyh* [הגה וברז נהיה] by night and investigate it continually (4Q417 2 i 6 [4Q417 1 i 6]).
- (9) as he (= they) uncovered thy ear by the *rz nhyh* [ברז נהיה], honour thou them [i.e. your parents] (4Q416 2 iii 18).<sup>49</sup>

Harrington concludes from these parallel phrases that *רז נהיה* carries associations with the knowledge of righteousness and iniquity and has an eschatological connotation. Further, the one who applies himself to the *רז נהיה* can expect certain rewards. It seems to be a body of teaching concerning behaviour and eschatology and is likely an 'extra-biblical compendium'. As such it is analogous to: (1) the *Maskil's* instruction in 1QS 3.13-4.26; (2) the *Book of Meditation* (1QSa 1.6-8); or (3) perhaps even the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27; 4Q299-301) with which it is already associated by the phrase *רז נהיה*.

<sup>49</sup> Harrington, 'Rāz Nihyeh,' p. 552; format altered from Harrington's original.



Lange takes a different view in the focus of his analysis of *רו נהיה* in *Musar leMevin* (primarily 4Q417 1 i). Lange translates the phrase as 'Geheimnis des Werdens' thus excluding an eschatological connotation.<sup>50</sup> Lange makes it clear elsewhere that this meaning is to be distinguished from 'the mystery of being' (i.e. the translation of R. Eisenman and M. O. Wise).<sup>51</sup> For him, the *רו נהיה* refers to the pre-existent order of creation without necessarily referring to history.<sup>52</sup>

Elgvin has also been a major contributor to the discussion concerning the meaning of *רו נהיה* in *Musar leMevin*. In one article published in 1994 Elgvin provides much of the preliminary background information that Harrington does, but includes Wernberg-Møller and Licht's discussions of the meaning and temporal aspects of *רו נהיה* in 1QS 11 in light of 1QS 3.15 and CD 2.10 (where the term *נהיה* occurs).<sup>53</sup> Both Wernberg-Møller and Licht understand the phrase *רו נהיה* and *והוא עולם* as parallel expressions. For Licht, therefore, it is the mystery of the universe, the provisional ruler of the universe and possibly the mystery of the future. Elgvin also reviews a proposal of Milik<sup>54</sup> who understands the *רו נהיה* as 'the mystery to come' or 'the mystery which is about to come into being'. Elgvin finds such a translation appealing; however, the difficulty in understanding the phrase *רו נהיה* as future when it is clearly used in a context referring to the past (4Q418 123 ii 3-4) discourages such a reading. Elgvin concludes, here, that the *רו נהיה* is the mystery of God, revealed to the men of the community; it is perhaps an

---

<sup>50</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, pp. 91-92.

<sup>51</sup> Lange, 'Wisdom,' p. 341. R. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Dorset: Element Books Ltd., 1992).

<sup>52</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 60, writes that the *רו נהיה* "bezeichnet somit ein Phänomen, das ethische, hitorische, nomistische, eschatologische und urzeitliche Komponenten sich vereinigt."

<sup>53</sup> Elgvin, 'Admonition Texts,' pp. 189-90.

<sup>54</sup> *DJD I*, pp. 101-2.

alternative expression for the knowledge of God and, as such, may be translated as 'the mystery of being'.

In a 1997 publication Elgvin goes into greater detail and retracts his earlier conclusion.<sup>55</sup> Elgvin now concludes that the *רו נהיה* is a comprehensive word for God's mysterious plan for creation as a whole, humanity and the redemption of the elect. He considers it best to understand the phrase as 'mystery to come' with an eschatological connotation, rather than as 'mystery of being'. Elgvin's resolution of the occurrence of *רו נהיה* in 4Q418 123 ii lines 2-8 is part of what makes his change of translation possible. More importantly, Elgvin notes passages where it is far more difficult to reconcile the translation 'mystery of being' with a given context. The clearest instances of an eschatological connotation are, in his opinion, in 4Q417 2 i lines 10-12 and 4Q417 1 i lines 1-14. Elgvin elaborates on the use of the *רו נהיה* in *Musar leMevin* by considering the remaining occurrences in the document. He states that it serves as the starting point for instructing the enlightened how they should walk in everyday life (e.g. 4Q416 2 iii lines 13-21 in the admonition to honour father and mother). So, for instance, the result of living one's life according to principles of *רו נהיה* will be the production of abundant crops (4Q423 3, par. 1Q26 2). Finally, Elgvin emphasises that *רו נהיה* is not to be identified with the Mosaic Torah. Though not strictly an apocalyptic work, *Musar leMevin* does contain in *רו נהיה* one apocalyptic element that connects the revelation of divine mysteries with salvation. *Musar leMevin*, Elgvin concludes, has integrated traditional wisdom into an apocalyptic framework. Thus Elgvin is able to maintain his two-stage theory.

---

<sup>55</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism,' pp. 232-36.

Collins dedicates a few pages not so much to how the phrase *רו נהיה* should be translated than to its function in *Musar leMevin*.<sup>56</sup> Collins cites the various ways the phrase has been translated ('the mystery that is to come'; 'the mystery of existence'; and 'the mystery that is to be') and chooses to give it a future sense in *Musar leMevin* as 'the mystery that is to be'. The content of 'the mystery that is to be' can only be gleaned from a few passages; especially important is 4Q417 1 i lines 10-12 ('gaze on the *רו נהיה* and understand the birth-time of salvation, and know who is to inherit glory and evil'). Collins infers from these lines that 'the mystery that is to be' is concerned with eschatological salvation and judgement. Even more important for the discussion is 4Q417 1 i lines 7-17,<sup>57</sup> where the *רו נהיה* (1) is associated with creation (ll. 8-9); (2) speaks of truth and iniquity as well as wisdom and foolishness with an obvious parallel to 1QS 3-4 (ll. 7-8); and (3) distinguishes between 'a people of spirit' and 'a people of flesh' (ll. 16-17). According to Collins' assessment, the *רו נהיה* seems to embrace the divine plan that spans from creation to the eschatological judgement. The eschatological connotation of the phrase should be understood as resulting from marvellous mysteries (presumably of creation) becoming clear in the end. If the addressee studies the mystery he can know God's glory and the mysteries of God's acts (4Q417 1 i 13). Further, the *רו נהיה* encompasses the coming and going of the periods (4Q418 123 ii 2-8) as well as anything that happens in life (e.g. a life of poverty or wealth). Collins, here, clearly limits the eschatological aspects of the *רו נהיה* within the framework of God's acts in creation.

<sup>56</sup> Collins, 'Wisdom Reconsidered,' pp. 272-74.

<sup>57</sup> Collins uses the earlier, pre-*DJD XXXIV*, designation for the fragment '4Q417 2 i', which was changed by the editors to '4Q417 1 i'.

Collins concludes his discussion with a note of caution regarding one of Harrington's suggestions. Harrington suggested that the mystery is an actual 'body of teaching' distinct from the Torah, as perhaps works such as *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3-4) or the *Book of Meditation* (the book of 'Hagu' or 'Hagi'). Collins thinks, however, that it may not be identified simply with the contents of a single writing, but with a subject matter to which each of the writings refers.

Speculation about a more precise understanding of רז נהיה in *Musar leMevin* remains. The theme of creation pervades most of the discussion surrounding its interpretation. While issues of possible translations of the phrase are limited, it may be possible to develop an approach to רז נהיה which considers more broadly the theme of creation throughout *Musar leMevin*.

### 1.3.5) Poverty Language in *Musar leMevin*

The insistence, assumption, or eventuality expressed by the author(s) of *Musar leMevin* regarding the addressee's (מבין) state of poverty or lacking (e.g. 4Q415 6 2, 4Q416 2 iii 12, 4Q418 177 5) has attracted considerable attention. *Musar leMevin* emphasises poverty far more than wealth and uses diverse vocabulary to do so (wealth: עשר, הון; poverty: אביון, דל, מחסור, עני, ריש). The most prominent term for 'poverty' in *Musar leMevin*, as mentioned previously, is מחסור. This term occurs approximately 26 times in the document.<sup>58</sup> Five publications to date focus on exploring this motif. Murphy has recently published a major monograph on the subject of wealth and poverty in the Dead Sea Scrolls and devotes a chapter to *Musar leMevin*.<sup>59</sup> Goff dedicates a chapter of

<sup>58</sup> In 4Q415 9 9; 4Q416 1 6; 2 ii 1; 2 ii 20; 2 iii 2; 4Q417 2 i 17; 2 i 19; 2 i 21; 2 i 24; 2 ii + 23 3; 2 ii + 23 25; 4Q418 7b 7; 14 1; 16 3; 81+ 81a 18; 87 6; 88 5; 97 2; 107 3; 122 i 7; 126 ii 13 (2x); 127 1; 159 ii 5; 240 3; 12 1.

<sup>59</sup> Murphy, *Wealth*, pp. 163-209.

his dissertation to 'poverty' in the document.<sup>60</sup> Wright has presented a paper at the Orion Conference concerned exclusively with categories of rich and poor in Qumran sapiential literature.<sup>61</sup> Tigchelaar, in his article on the addressees of *Musar leMevin*, surveys the characterisation of the addressee as poor as well.<sup>62</sup> Aitken is another who briefly touches upon the theme.<sup>63</sup> The views of these scholars are reviewed below.

Murphy concludes, after a careful and systematic examination of the document, that *Musar leMevin* is typical among sapiential treatments of wealth elsewhere (i.e. proper behaviour within the socio-economic hierarchy regardless of fluctuating position, standard advice on commercial transactions, and matters relating to agricultural production). She notes, however, these exceptions.<sup>64</sup> The first anomaly is the cosmological introduction of the work that sets otherwise typical wisdom sayings within an eschatological framework where God is presented as the ultimate benefactor whom humans serve. The cosmological preface to the agricultural section (4Q423) is slightly different in that it places the special status of the wise farmer within an exegesis of Genesis 1-3 that correlates special knowledge of the elect with the productive Garden of Genesis 2. The second anomaly is the integration of legal and eschatological material in a sapiential composition. Third, she observes that the coexistence in *Musar leMevin* of prosaic advice derived from universal human experience and appeals to special revelation (e.g. רז נהיה) as the ultimate tool for discernment is very rare in sapiential literature.

Murphy notes generally that there was in Judaism a struggle with the perception of inadequate divine provision for human needs. Poverty, in such instances, was not a

---

<sup>60</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, pp. 127-67.

<sup>61</sup> Wright, 'The Categories'.

<sup>62</sup> Tigchelaar, 'Addressees,' pp. 69-71.

<sup>63</sup> Aitken, 'Apocalyptic,' pp. 184-85.

condition to be revelled in as if this were the goal, since it is negative and alienates a person from others and God. By contrast, in *Musar leMevin* poverty has restorative and redemptive qualities. The virtuous person is advised to offer charity, not to shame the poor, and to avoid debt, while the slave is counselled on how to behave so that his status might become more like that of a son (4Q416 2 ii 7-15). Redemption is something occasionally realised through human channels, but the sages ultimately await divine judgement when God will redeem those whose worth is established.

Murphy observes that there is no specific condemnation of the rich in *Musar leMevin*, nor is there an expectation of their destruction. The emphasis throughout the document is rather on 'lacking' and 'poverty'. Hardly any sayings preserve admonitions to avoid the dangers of wealth or unjust gain. There are no critiques of sudden wealth, no instruction on the behaviour of a benefactor, no advice against covetousness, and no explicit advocacy of widows and orphans – all themes that might have been expected in a sapiential context. Wealth is respected in *Musar leMevin*, but it is no longer expected. The addressee is to pursue wisdom even in the circumstance of poverty and to understand that wealth is not gained by merit but by mysterious, divine dispensation.

The *Sitz im Leben* envisaged by Murphy is one where the addressees are employed in a variety of occupations, though farming would have been predominant. The document presumes an audience that struggles regularly with their own difficult financial circumstances that result in the pooling of resources, charity and when need be the taking of loans. The one resource that the recipients of *Musar leMevin* have that sets them apart from others is special divine revelation and the consolation of the רי נהיה.

---

<sup>64</sup> Murphy, *Wealth*, pp. 206-207.

Murphy devotes a portion of her work to the metaphorical use of some commercial terminology in *Musar leMevin*. It might be questioned if the implications of these metaphors on conceptions of poverty has more significance than Murphy has observed. She begins with the terms *'ephah* and *sheqel* which are frequently used terms in *Musar leMevin* and observes, along with Strugnell and Harrington, that the 'surrounding context suggest only a metaphorical use of this terminology' (e.g. 4Q418 126 ii 3-4).<sup>65</sup> Murphy comments on other 'language of commercial exchange' that is used metaphorically, such as פקודה which can mean 'punishment', 'visitation' or the economic meaning 'deposit'. 4Q418 126 ii line 6 reads 'to repay (להשיב) vengeance to the masters of iniquity, and punishment (פקודה) with re[compense...]' and Murphy suggests it could read as if 'God were returning the deposit of iniquity'. She further comments: 'the fact that the wicked are contrasted not to the righteous (the natural antonym) but to the poor may be governed by the dominant economic symbolism, but it is also possible that the dominant economic symbolism is governed by the nature of crimes being judged'.<sup>66</sup> A third option which she does not consider here is that poverty, which is by no means an ideal, is a metaphorical description that implies, at times, lacking in a manner unrelated to material need or debt. Murphy also discusses the term 'inheritance' (נחלה) as it is metaphorically employed in *Musar leMevin*. The term is used variously as (1) perhaps 'one's progeny or symbolically as one's portion in the present or eschatological Israel' (4Q415 2 i + 1 ii 5-6); (2) metaphorically for what God has given the sage in the present (4Q416 3 2); (3) abstract gifts of truth (4Q416 4 3); (4) holiness (4Q418 234 1); (5) the 'inheritance of Adam' (4Q418 251 1); or (6) even life itself

---

<sup>65</sup> Murphey, *Wealth*, pp. 171-72.

<sup>66</sup> Murphey, *Wealth*, p. 172.

(4Q418 88 8 cf. 4Q418 172 5-13).<sup>67</sup> Another possible term used metaphorically is 'storehouse' (אוצר) to describe either divine or human stores (4Q418 237 3).

Perhaps most important in Murphy's chapter on *Musar leMevin* are the conclusions she draws about the social context of the addressees and the Qumran community. The worldview expressed by the document allows one to infer a relatively open economic and social organisation that is at odds with the consensus view of the Qumran community. She suggests two options to reconcile the evidence. First, *Musar leMevin* could be ascribed to a pre-sectarian context. Second, *Musar leMevin* could lead one to think that the Qumran community should be reconceived as less centralised and somewhat more engaged in the surrounding world. She considers both these suggestions likely on grounds of the popularity of the work at Qumran and the absence of specifically sectarian vocabulary.<sup>68</sup>

Murphy briefly discusses the common construction in *Musar leMevin* אבין אחה 'you are poor' (4Q416 2 ii 20; 2 iii 2; 2 iii 8; 2 iii 12; 4Q418 9 13; 148 ii 4; 177 5; 249). She comments that this phrase is

...customarily followed by a reference to social superiors, such as kings (מלכים) or princes (נריכים). The consistent contrast in such passages to individuals with greater social capital suggests that a real economic statement is being made here about the maven's social location.<sup>69</sup>

In the instance of the addressee being called poor followed by a referent to kings, Murphy cites 4Q415 6 line 2: אבין א[ח]ה ומלכ[ים]. Taken literally and reading the *waw* as 'and', this could imply that the addressees are composed of two groups simultaneously: rich (kings) and poor. It might also be taken metaphorically and the *waw* taken as 'but'. Murphy does not fully detail, however, that the occurrence of statements of poverty

---

<sup>67</sup> Murphey, *Wealth*, pp. 173-74.

<sup>68</sup> Murphey, *Wealth*, p. 209.



followed by references to 'nobles' (נדיבים) is more frequent in *Musar leMevin*. 4Q416 2 iii, for instance, contains two such statements that the addressee is 'needy' (ll. 2, 8, 12) followed by a statement in line 11 that 'with the nobles (נדיבים) has He made thee to be seated, And over a glorious heritage'. In the following line, directly after this statement to the addressee that he is seated among the 'nobles', there occurs a reminder that he is needy (l. 12). Therefore, whatever being 'seated among the nobles' implies, it is not likely a reference to a monetary reality. The final instance of the poor being set in a context with social superiors is in 4Q418 177 line 5: אֶתְּהָה רֵשׁ וְנָדִיבִים. There is nothing convincing, in my opinion, that these references (4Q415 6; 4Q416 2 iii; 4Q418 177) strengthen the case that an economic statement is being made here. To the contrary, the suggestion that the addressee is both impoverished and/but a noble or seated among the nobles suggests another reading entirely. I would suggest that a case might be made for these occurrences being read metaphorically.

Wright analyses the occurrences of language of wealth and poverty in *Musar leMevin* and then compares the situation of the addressees with that of Ben Sira's students.<sup>70</sup> Wright's conclusion is that the addressees of *Musar leMevin* are in a dissimilar social setting than the students of Ben Sira. The addressees in *Musar leMevin* belong to a social stratum that can be essentially categorised as poor. The students of Ben Sira are being trained for official administrative capacities while the addressees of *Musar leMevin* are not being instructed for any official capacity. Whereas Ben Sira addresses issues of the wealthy class, *Musar leMevin* does not even mention a class of rich people. The lack of any reference to rich people in *Musar leMevin* begs the question

---

<sup>69</sup> Murphey, *Wealth*, p. 187.

<sup>70</sup> Wright, 'The Categories,' pp. 26-28.

whether the addressees are in some way isolated from them.<sup>71</sup> The addressees of *Musar leMevin* are constantly on the brink of falling into abject poverty or indentured servitude, which are concrete social realities. Wright notes that evidence indicates that the addressee is in a troublesome economic situation that is ongoing and precarious. Wright is also not inclined to view poverty in the document as an ideal value, though he does note the oddity of 4Q416 2 ii lines 20-21 ('Do not esteem yourself highly for your poverty when you are (anyway?) a pauper, lest you bring into contempt your (own) way of life').

Wright does not systematically address every occurrence of poverty in *Musar leMevin*. Nevertheless, the conclusions that he draws are valuable for understanding concepts of wealth and poverty in *Musar leMevin*, especially the comparisons drawn with Ben Sira. His discussion, however, is by no means a comprehensive treatment of the subject. Wright, for instance, does not comprehensively consider the apocalyptic and perhaps metaphorical nature of language in the document that might at times affect an interpretation of 'poverty' or 'lacking'. Nor does he resolve unusual references such as 'according to the poverty of their host' (4Q416 1) or 'so as to fill] up all the deficiencies of his secrets' (4Q416 2 ii 1).

Tigchelaar, in his treatment on the poverty of the addressee in *Musar leMevin*, is very brief.<sup>72</sup> While he raises several questions regarding the formula 'you are poor' in the document, the major contribution of his discussion is his suggestion that the formula could be read as conditional, 'if (when) you are poor'. Tigchelaar argues that phrases that explicitly describe the addressee as poor are limited and only envisage the possibility

---

<sup>71</sup> Wright does not consider the references to 'kings' and 'nobles' in this regard.

<sup>72</sup> Tigchelaar, 'The Addressees,' pp. 69-71.

that the addressee may become poor. Tigchelaar's suggestion is appealing and plausible; it would make some sense of 4Q416 2 iii where the addressee could presently be seated among the nobles and is simply being warned of the eventuality of poverty. However, if the author(s) warns against the possibility of impoverishment, why are exhortations regarding the dangers of wealth absent from the document? Also, if the addressee is presently seated with the 'nobles' then why is debt and credit a significant motif in *Musar leMevin*? Discussed above, poverty on a few occasions is found in conjunction with the terms 'nobles' and 'kings' (4Q415 6 2; 4Q418 177 5) and suggests that 4Q416 2 iii, a column with three statements that the addressee is poor, be read in some way as a present reality and not an eventuality.

Goff contributes a chapter of his monograph to the discussion of poverty in *Musar leMevin* as well. His conclusions are similar to Murphy's except she 'focuses more on the financial teachings of 4QInstruction than its depiction of poverty'.<sup>73</sup> Goff structures his presentation of poverty in the document in relation to the addressee's elect status. The addressee's poverty, on the one hand, appears to be contrary to his favoured status. On the other hand, poverty is used to teach them about their elect status.<sup>74</sup> Goff envisions poverty in the document as a component of the economic situation of the addressees. However, their elect status (e.g. 4Q416 2 iii 11-12) is used to assert a type of heavenly wealth (e.g. 'inheritance').<sup>75</sup> The emphasis in *Musar leMevin* on indebtedness 'is portrayed as a loss of one's spirit', which Goff associates with 'glory' and 'inheritance'.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Goff, *The Wordly*, p. 129.

<sup>74</sup> Goff, *The Wordly*, p. 127.

<sup>75</sup> Goff, *The Wordly*, p. 150.

<sup>76</sup> Goff, *The Wordly*, p. 164.

Economic poverty, argues Goff, is contrasted with two types of wealth: (1) a heavenly inheritance; and (2) a worldly indebtedness to a creditor. Goff recognises that the poverty of the addressee in the document is a hallmark of the composition, and the *Leitmotif* 'you are poor' (4Q415 6 2; 4Q416 2 ii 20; 4Q416 2 iii 2, 8, 12, 19) is without parallel in literature from the period. In addition, he advocates a reading of 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-12 and the term נדיבים ('nobles') as a reference to angelic beings and heavenly wealth.<sup>77</sup> He concludes that the addressee's 'poverty is clearly material'.<sup>78</sup> However, I would question his conclusion on the basis of the following observations. First, if wealth is portrayed as worldly and heavenly a case can be made that poverty is used with disparate connotations as well. Second, it is unknown who the readers or hearers of the document were and an insistence that they were all suffering from varying degrees of financial hardship and should be reminded of it is implausible in my opinion. Finally, 4Q416 2 iii is the column with the single most references to poverty and, as I will discuss in chapter four, contains several references to angelic beings providing a context for poverty that cannot be categorised straightforwardly as economic.

Aitken is alone in stating that the poverty motif in *Musar leMevin* 'seems to play an eschatological role'.<sup>79</sup> He notes the trend in the post-exilic period of emphasising the role of poverty in future speculation. Haggai 1.6 describes the impoverished situation of the post-exilic community saying 'those that earn wages. . .earn them to put into a bag with holes'. The Targum to Haggai translates צָרוֹר וְקִיב meaning 'bag with holes' with the Aramaic word מַאֲרִתָּא meaning 'curse' which elucidates the impoverished state of those who return. The Hebrew word מַאֲרָה develops the semantic range that includes

---

<sup>77</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 150.

<sup>78</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 167.

poverty (see Vulgate and LXX of Deut 28.20; Prov 28.27 and *Peshitta* on Deut 28.20).

In an explanation of this possible motif of poverty Aitken writes:

The Targum to the Minor Prophets, which is certainly post-70 C.E. in its final composition but probably contains earlier traditions, expresses an interest in the life that the righteous will enjoy in a new world (e.g. Targum to Hab. 3:2; Mic. 7:14) once the present order has been disbanded, and at Hag. 1:6 it may be attempting to underscore the former state from which the righteous will be delivered. In the book of Malachi a series of blessings and curses are uttered (3:6-12) before the writing down of those who fear the Lord (3:13-21) and before the prediction of the day of the Lord (3:22-24). God has already threatened to send a *מִאֲרָה* upon the priests (Mal. 2:2), and then He declares in 3:9 that the whole nation is cursed with a *מִאֲרָה* (Vulgate again translates as *penuria*) "because you are robbing me". There may be an irony implied in the prophet's words if God is going to deprive those who are depriving Him, but certainly throughout this section there is an alternation between deprivation and reward.<sup>80</sup>

Aitken points to the allusion to Malachi 3:16 in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-16 to the 'book of remembrance' and the apocalyptic overtones of this fragment. If the author of *Musar leMevin* was familiar with this use of *מִאֲרָה* and its emphasis on poverty as a 'prelude to the Lord's deliverance' then the motif of poverty might be better understood. Aitken cites 4Q416 2 iii lines 9-12 where God is said to lift the head of the addressee out of poverty and place him in a glorious inheritance. He also notes 4Q418 126 lines 1-10 which describes a future judgement by God where the good and wicked will be separated and the 'poor' will be vindicated while the 'lords of iniquity' will be punished.<sup>81</sup> Aitken refers also to the *Epistle of Enoch* where the 'poverty of the addressee is implied' within an apocalyptic context and is promised restitution in the life to come. Contra Tigchelaar, Aitken finds the impoverished state of the addressee emphasised throughout *Musar leMevin*: he is repeatedly reminded of his poverty.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>79</sup> Aitken, 'Apocalyptic,' p. 184.

<sup>80</sup> Aitken, 'Apocalyptic,' p. 185.

<sup>81</sup> Aitken, 'Apocalyptic,' p. 184.

<sup>82</sup> Aitken, 'Apocalyptic,' p. 184.

On the one hand, Murphy, Wright, Tigchelaar and Goff notice particular oddities of the theme of poverty in *Musar leMevin* and attempt to reconcile it to a more traditional sapiential use. Aitken, on the other hand, describes a possible alternative for reading some references in an esoteric eschatological manner. An exploration of this motif in conjunction with the use of other possible traditions at play in *Musar leMevin* is needed. The possibility that poverty in *Musar leMevin* is used with connotations that should be understood outside of a literal impoverished social condition have yet to be fully explored.

### **1.3.6) The Reconstruction of *Musar leMevin***

The task of reconstructing *Musar leMevin* began with the efforts of Strugnell and Milik in the 1950's. DJD 34 is the result of their combined efforts as well as Harrington and Elgvin who joined in more recent years.<sup>83</sup> The contribution of DJD 34 to a reconstruction of the document *Musar leMevin* will be reviewed below. Besides DJD 34, Tigchelaar, Elgvin as well as Steudel and Lucassen have proposed a sequencing of selected fragments. Tigchelaar's contribution to the reconstruction of 4QInstruction is the most substantial and in many ways serves as a supplement to DJD 34.

One of the primary tasks of reconstruction is assigning fragments to manuscripts. DJD 34 has divided the fragments under the manuscript designations 4Q415 (4QInstruction<sup>a</sup>), 4Q416 (4QInstruction<sup>b</sup>), 4Q417 (4QInstruction<sup>c</sup>), 4Q418 (4QInstruction<sup>d</sup>), 4Q418a (4QInstruction<sup>e</sup>), 4Q418c (4QInstruction<sup>f</sup>), 4Q423 (4QInstruction<sup>g</sup>), and 1Q26 (1QInstruction). Among the manuscript designations

---

<sup>83</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. xi.

4Q418a and 4Q418c<sup>84</sup> the number of manuscripts preserved by these two designations has been disputed. As Strugnell and Harrington write in the introduction to 4Q418a, 'the principal problem posed by 4Q418a is whether the fragments of 4Q415, 4Q418, and 4Q418a are to be divided among two manuscripts or three [i.e. 4Q418a may be simply 4Q418]'.<sup>85</sup> They add as well that Elgvin may be right in separating 4Q418 1, 2, 4, 286, 296 into a fourth manuscript. In the case of 4Q418c, Strugnell and Harrington argue on the basis of skin surface, column height and orthography that it represents a distinct manuscript of *Musar leMevin*. The total number of possible manuscripts suggested in DJD 34 could total up to nine, if Elgvin's suggestion is accepted.

Material reconstruction has been another important undertaking by Strugnell and Harrington in DJD 34 and more recently by Tigchelaar. Material reconstruction has taken the form of assigning smaller fragments to a larger fragment (i.e. unconnected fragments are associated with one another) which are then designated, for example, fragments 2, 2a, 2b, 2c. At times, material reconstruction is questionable and the designation appears, for example, as fragments 7b + 199 (?) + 64 (?) + 66 (?).

The identification of parallels and overlaps between fragments is another valuable method for reconstructing a document. Strugnell and Harrington have identified a number of overlaps, which may be conveniently listed below:

---

<sup>84</sup> 4Q418b is not thought to be part of *Musar LeMevin*. It is distinguished with what is thought to be a quotation of Ps 107; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 497.

<sup>85</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 475.

<b>4Q415 11</b> 4Q418 167 4Q418a 15 (?)	<b>4Q418 1</b> 4Q416 1	<b>4Q418 81</b> 4Q423 8 1-4
<b>4Q416 1</b> 4Q418 1-2, 2a, b, and c	<b>4Q418 2</b> 4Q416 1	<b>4Q418 167</b> 4Q415 11
<b>4Q416 2 ii</b> 4Q417 2 ii 4Q418 8, 21, 22 4Q418a 19	<b>4Q418 7</b> 4Q417 2 i 4Q417 2 i	<b>4Q418 188</b> 4Q423 9 1-4 <b>4Q418a 11</b> 4Q417 1 i 21-24
<b>4Q416 2 iii</b> 4Q417 2 ii 26 4Q418 9-10	<b>4Q418 8</b> 4Q416 2 ii 2-13 4Q417 2 ii 3-17 4Q418a 19 1-4	<b>4Q418a 22</b> 4Q417 2 i 12-16 <b>4Q423 3</b> 1Q26 2 2-4
<b>4Q416 2 iv</b> 4Q418 10 5-10	<b>4Q418 9</b> 4Q416 2 iii 2-17	<b>4Q423 4</b> 1Q26 1
<b>4Q417 1 i</b> 4Q418 43, 44, 45 4Q418a 11	<b>4Q418 10</b> 4Q416 2 iii 17-2, iv 1 1-14	<b>4Q423 8</b> 4Q418 81 1-5
<b>4Q417 1 ii</b> 4Q418 123 I	<b>4Q418 43, 44, 45 i</b> 4Q417 1 i 2-22	<b>4Q423 9</b> 4Q418 188 1-8
<b>4Q417 2 i</b> 4Q416 2 i 4Q418 6(?), 7, 26, 27, 64(?), 66(?), 199(?) 4Q418a 22	<b>4Q418 69</b> 4Q417 5 1-5 <b>4Q418 77</b> 4Q416 7 1-3	<b>1Q26 1</b> 4Q423 4 <b>1Q26 2</b> 4Q423 3 2-4

The obvious contribution of these identifications is the creation of composite texts, which Strugnell and Harrington have constructed. Tigchelaar devotes half of his monograph to analysing overlaps and suggests several new additions and readings. Since *Musar leMevin* is in such a poor state of preservation with almost no full line entirely extant, such identifications of overlaps have made it possible to restore a number of lines fully (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii).

Elgvin has published a useful suggestion for sequencing fragments of *Musar leMevin*, which will be examined below.<sup>86</sup> Hartmut Stegemann's methods for material

<sup>86</sup> Elgvin, 'The Reconstruction,' pp. 579-580. The table below adapts Elgvin's section subtitled 'Survey of Contents'.



reconstruction are the basis of Elgvin's work.<sup>87</sup> Steudel and Lucassen, who also draw on Stegemann's methods, have proposed a sequencing of fragments as well, but have not published the results outside of the contribution of a table in DJD 34.<sup>88</sup> The table prepared below is a synopsis of the two sequences as found in Elgvin's article and Steudel and Lucassen's reconstruction found in DJD 34. Elgvin's summary of the contents of each column has been added to the Steudel and Lucassen reconstruction in an attempt to view the results of sequencing for understanding the document *Musar leMevin*.

<b>T. Elgvin (Putative column 4Q416)</b>	<b>A. Steudel &amp; B. Lucassen (Putative column 4Q418)</b>
<b>I)</b>	<b>I)</b> 4Q418 1, 2 (top); parallel 4Q416 1,2 – The elect and wise are not under God's wrath. God will judge all iniquity. It was the Creator who established the heavenly hosts and luminaries. 4Q418 213 (middle)
<b>II.17-21)</b> 4Q417 3, i 1-5 – Argument with a neighbor.	<b>II)</b> 4Q418 43 (top); parallel 4Q417 1 i – God's mysterious plan for creation and history, revealed to the community of the spirit through the book of Hagi. Walk in purity, resist temptations, praise God!
<b>III.1-20)</b> 4Q416 3 (4Q416 2, i) = 4Q417 6-27 – Relation of the elect of God and fellow man: needs, property, loans.	<b>III)</b>
<b>III.21-IV.3)</b> 4Q416 2, i 21-ii 3 – God provides sustenance for man and every living being.	<b>IV)</b>
<b>IV.3-18)</b> 4Q416 2, ii 3-18 – Business ethics: surety, relation to superiors and subordinates.	<b>V)</b>
<b>IV.18-V.3)</b> 4Q416 2, ii 3-18 – Live a	

<sup>87</sup> H. Stegemann, 'Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,' in L. H. Schiffman (ed.) *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) pp. 189-220.

<sup>88</sup> DJD XXXIV, pp. 18-19.

decent and humble life without luxury.

**V.3-6)** 4Q416 2, iii 3-6 – Restore a deposit in full.

**V.6-8)** 4Q416 2, iii 6-8 – The hope of the righteous through death.

**V.8-15)** 4Q416 2, iii 8-15 – Study God's mysteries and praise his name.

## **VI)**

**V.15-VI.13)** 4Q416 2, iii 15 – iv 13 – Family ethics; relation to parents, wife and children.

**VI.17-VIII 15)** Eschatological discourse.

**VI.17-20)** 4Q416 4 – The elect and wise are not under God's wrath.

**VII.2-7)** 4Q416 1 2-7 – God will judge all iniquity.

**VII.8-10)** 4Q416 1 8-10 – It was the Creator who established the heavenly hosts and luminaries.

**VII.11-16)** 4Q416 1 11-16 – This Lord of Heaven will carry through His judgment.

**VII.16-19)** 4Q416 1 16-19 – All flesh will see and acknowledge the acts of God.

**VIII.9-15)** 4Q416 3 – The lot of the elect and the ungodly under God's mercy and wrath.

**VII)** 4Q418 7 (bottom); parallels 4Q416 2 i and 4Q417 2 i – Relation of the elect of God and fellow man: needs, property, loans. God provides sustenance for man and every living being.

**VIII)** 4Q418 8 (top) parallels 4Q416 2 ii and 4Q417 2 ii – Business ethics: surety, relation to superiors and subordinates. Live a decent and humble life without luxury.

## **IX)**

**IX)** 4Q418 9 (bottom) 4Q416 2 iii – Restore a deposit in full. The hope of the righteous through death. Study God's mysteries and praise his name. Family ethics; relation to parents, wife and children.

**X)** 4Q417 9 – God’s mysterious plan for creation and history, revealed to the community of the spirit through the book of Hagi.

**XI)** 4Q417 10 – Walk in purity, resist temptations, praise God!

**XII)**

**XIII)**

**XIV)**

**XV)** 4Q418a 17, 4Q418 81 – The lot of the elect.

**XVI)**

**XVII)**

**XVIII)**

**XIX)**

**XX)** 4Q418a 23, 4Q418 55 – God has shared out to the elect their portions. They will be sensitive to His will. The ungodly did not seek the wisdom of God.

**XXI)**

**XXII)** 4Q423 1-2 – The conditions of the farmer in light of the Eden story.

**XXIII)** 4Q418 127 – A warning: if you are disobedient you will experience trouble and death. God gave everybody their portions, and will test them with scales of righteousness.

**X)** 4Q418 10 (top) parallel 4Q416 2 iv – Family ethics; relation to parents, wife and children.

**XI)** 4Q418 55 (bottom) – – God has shared out to the elect their portions. They will be sensitive to His will. The ungodly did not seek the wisdom of God.

**XII)** 4Q418 207 + 69

**XIII)** 4Q418 69 ii + 128 (bottom) parallel 4Q417 5 –

**XIV)** 4Q418 128 ii (bottom)

**XV)** 4Q418 81 + 103 (bottom) – The lot of the elect.

**XVI)** 4Q418 103 ii (bottom)

**XVII)** 4Q418 127 (top)

**XVIII)**

**XIX)**

**XX)**

**XXI)**

**XXII)**

**XXIII-XXX)**

The most noteworthy differences between the two reconstructions have to do with the estimated length of 4Q418. Elgvin has suggested that the manuscript 4Q418 originally consisted of twenty-three columns,<sup>89</sup> while Steudel and Lucassen estimate that there were at least thirty columns.<sup>90</sup> Another difference is Elgvin's placement of 4Q416 1 in column vii rather than at the beginning of the document as argued by Steudel – Lucassen and Strugnell – Harrington. The degree to which sequencing varies is apparent above.

Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar's contribution<sup>91</sup> is the most extensive work on the reconstruction of *Musar leMevin*, beside DJD 34, to date. Noting from the outset that J. Strugnell and D. J. Harrington characterised DJD 34 as 'minimalist' in approach, Tigchelaar proceeds to build upon their substantial commentary and reconstruction.<sup>92</sup>

Tigchelaar's monograph on *Musar leMevin* is organised in two parts. The first part is devoted primarily to the following tasks: (1) introducing the document *via* a history of its reconstruction, (2) offering reconstructions of individual manuscripts (he identifies eight: 4Q415, 416, 417, 418\*, 418, 418a, 423 and 1Q26) and (3) discussing a reconstruction and sequencing for the document *Musar leMevin*.

Tigchelaar's history of scholarship on *Musar leMevin* from the 1950's to the present is more extensive than DJD 34 and especially helpful in describing the role of the Preliminary Concordance in reconstructing the document.<sup>93</sup>

More important, however, is the delineation between fragments formerly designated 4Q418 and 4Q418a as representing three manuscripts rather than two and a repair sheet (consisting of three fragments: 1, 2, 2b). On the basis of paleographic,

---

<sup>89</sup> Elgvin, 'The Reconstruction,' p. 580.

<sup>90</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 19.

<sup>91</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*.

<sup>92</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 4.

physical, and textual evidence Tigchelaar concludes that the repair sheet must be interpreted as a separate manuscript which he designates 4Q418\*.<sup>94</sup> Reconstruction of manuscripts is provided from personal consultation of fragments and overlap of fragments. Particularly helpful are transcriptions of overlaps with indication of each fragment by way of font style. Tigchelaar's reconstructions offer a number of variant readings (i.e. omissions, additions, substitutions) from DJD 34, some of the more significant: 4Q415 11 line 8 [כ]שלן vs. DJD ]שלח[; 4Q416 2 ii line 4 ] אם בהון vs. DJD ]תשוקתה ו[; 4Q416 2 iv line 3 ] לבבו היא vs. DJD ]לנפש[כה vs. DJD [מא]דה 9 , בהון ישכה vs. DJD [ברעיכה לבלתי הריעכה ], line 24 מאור vs. DJD [לחי ] whereas DJD 4Q417 2 i line 7 omits לחי ; 4Q417 2 ii line 20 לא]ב vs. DJD לע[בר vs. DJD 4Q418 מאגר, line 25 מנושה vs. DJD מלגע; 4Q418 55 line 1 ונפשו vs. DJD (7b+199 (?)+64(?)+66(?)) מאגרכה; 4Q418 69 ii + 60 line 5 [מ] על מ vs. DJD [ל יום]מ vs. DJD 4Q418 81 line 4 פתח, line 13 omits [שיר vs. DJD פתח ] whereas DJD [מ]ל[אכיו] vs. DJD [א]ל[ים] , line 12 omits ] whereas DJD כול ק]צים vs. DJD כול ק]צים. The final chapter of part one is devoted to reconstructing the sequence of *Musar leMevin*.

Tigchelaar defines the aim of reconstructing a composition as, ‘an absolute or relative placement of preserved fragments in their respective manuscripts, or in relation to fragments of other manuscripts.’<sup>95</sup> Whereas Elgvin bases his reconstruction upon 4Q416 and Steudel and Lucassen upon 4Q418, Tigchelaar’s putative column is 4Q418a. The most likely relative order of the preserved fragments of 4Q418a is: [??] – 12 – 11 – 10 – 9 [??] – 22 – [?] – 19 – 18 – 17 – 16+14 – 15+13 – [??] – 8 – 7 – 6 – 5 – 4 – 3 – 2 – 1

<sup>93</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 7-10.

<sup>94</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 64.

<sup>95</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 155.

– [??] while 20+21 have not be placed.<sup>96</sup> Using overlaps with 4Q418a Tigchelaar is able to sequence a number of important fragments from other manuscripts. On this basis 4Q417 1 i is located in the first few columns of the document (overlaps 4Q418a 11) and is followed several columns later by 4Q417 2 i (overlaps 4Q418a 22) and the 4Q417 2 ii (overlaps 4Q418a 19). 4Q423 5 (overlaps 4Q418a 3) is situated among the final columns of *Musar leMevin*.

<u>Wad</u>	<u>Frgs.</u>	<u>Overlaps</u>	<u>overlaps</u>
	4Q418a [??]		
B 4	4Q418a 12		
B 3	4Q418a 11	=4Q417 1 i 21-24	=4Q418 43-45
B 2	4Q418a 10		
B 1	4Q418a 9 2		=4Q416 4 1 ?
	4Q418a [??]		
	4Q418a 22 1-5	=4Q417 2 ii 19-21	=4Q416 2 i 7-10]
	4Q418a [?]		
D 5	4Q418a 19 1-4	=4Q417 2 ii 19-21	=4Q416 2 ii 14-16
D 4	4Q418a 18 1-4		=4Q416 2 iv 3-7
D 3	4Q418a 17		
D 2	4Q418a 16		
D 1	4Q418a 15	=4Q415 11	=4Q418 167a + b
	4Q418a [??]		
A 8	4Q418a 8	=4Q415 6 ?	
A 7	4Q418a 7		
A 6	4Q418a 6		
A 5	4Q418a 5		
A 4	4Q418a 4		=4Q418 103 ii
A 3	4Q418a 3	=4Q423 5	

<sup>96</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p.157, explains that the, 'siglum [??] means that fragments of one or more revolutions of the scroll may be missing. . [?] means that one (but no more) fragment of one revolution of the scroll may be missing'.

A 2	4Q418a 2
A 1	4Q418a 1
	4Q418a [??] <sup>97</sup>

On the basis of the large right hand margin of 4Q416 1, rather than overlaps with 4Q418a, Tigchelaar agrees with all but Elgvin in locating 4Q416 1 as the first column of the document. In reconstructing and sequencing documents, Tigchelaar repeatedly emphasises that much of the task is uncertain and approximate.

The second part of the monograph focuses on several sections of *Musar leMevin* (4Q416 1; 4Q418 55 and 69 ii; 4Q415 1 ii-2 i; 4Q418 81) and considers terminology and themes of composite transcriptions. Corresponding themes and vocabulary between *Musar leMevin* and 1QS 3-4 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5 are discussed in the context of the relationship of its relation to other Early Jewish texts and the document's provenance.

Tigchelaar's composite text of 4Q416 1 contains a number of overlaps which are not present in DJD 34. In the cosmological portion (ll. 1-10), which describe the orderly course of creation, Tigchelaar provides two alternative readings not suggested elsewhere: line 2 חפצי as a plural noun in construct meaning 'affairs' or 'tasks' (cf. 1QS 3.17 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9.15) rather than 'pleasures'; line 6 the word מחסור is perhaps a scribal error and could be read as the Akkadian loan word מסחור meaning 'circuit'.<sup>98</sup> In the eschatological section (ll. 11-14), near to the end of line 11 Tigchelaar suggests the reconstruction ממקלומה (DJD 34 offers no reconstruction) and rejects Elgvin's proposed ממלכת רשעה.<sup>99</sup> The reconstruction and commentary provided on 4Q416 1 lead to a better and more comprehensive understanding of the column.

<sup>97</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 158.

<sup>98</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 177-79.

Two controversial suggestions regarding fragments 4Q418 55 and 69 ii are considered by Tigchelaar. The first is Elgvin's theory that *1 Enoch* 91-92 and 103 are closely related to, and probably inspired, these fragments.<sup>100</sup> Second, the possibility that these fragments are distinct and perhaps integrated compositions to *Musar leMevin* is evaluated. In regard to Elgvin's theories of correspondences between *Epistle of Enoch* and *Musar leMevin*, Tigchelaar notes important points of dissimilarity between them and suggests a possible reverse order of influence. In the case of the fragments within the document as a whole, while unique occurrences exist between the fragments (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> plural forms, הלל-questions, specific terms) and suggest a different origin, there are also occurrences of terms characteristic of *Musar leMevin* (נחל, פלג, הכין, אמת, אדעו, אל הדעו) that indicate a shared provenance.<sup>101</sup> Tigchelaar concludes, 'it is not impossible that these shared features should be attributed to slight editorial reworkings of a *Vorlage*'.<sup>102</sup> In his concluding remarks he is more definitive stating that the easiest explanation, 'is that the texts of these two fragments derive from an older source and have been incorporated into the composition'.<sup>103</sup>

Tigchelaar considers the possibility, among other considerations, that fragments 4Q415 1 ii-2 i and 4Q418 81 should be understood as directed towards a priestly addressee, distinct from other portions of *Musar leMevin*. One of his main points of contention is with Elgvin's reading these fragments as referring to a holy remnant community.<sup>104</sup> In general, Tigchelaar concludes that *Musar leMevin* reflects a number of addressees and while fragments 4Q415 1 ii-2 i and 4Q418 81 conceive of an addressee

---

<sup>99</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 185.

<sup>100</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 212-217.

<sup>101</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 221-224.

<sup>102</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 224.



with an intermediary role, the nature of the addressee here as priestly cannot be fully ascertained.<sup>105</sup>

A great deal of work towards a more complete reconstruction of *Musar leMevin* has been accomplished. While some new overlaps may be identified as the task of textual reconstruction of *Musar leMevin* continues, new theories regarding the sequencing of larger fragments may be possible.

### 1.3.7) Angelology in *Musar leMevin*

Crispin Fletcher-Louis has addressed extensively both issues of angelology and anthropology in the document *Musar leMevin* as well as the placement of such conceptions within the larger framework of Early Jewish compositions.<sup>106</sup> His work, at present, is alone in addressing angelology and anthropology in *Musar leMevin* and will serve to introduce significant columns and the interpretative questions they raise. Fletcher-Louis' monograph does not address *Musar leMevin* as a whole and should not be taken as a work devoted to exploring angelology in the document generally, rather, portions of *Musar leMevin* are touched upon as they relate to his overall thesis.

Fletcher-Louis conceives of a sweeping phenomenon in the literature of the period where righteous individuals are angelomorphic (i.e. they have rights, privileges, and status of angels). Certain individuals, such as Simon the High Priest, Moses, Enoch, and Noah are elevated to an even more exalted status where they are included 'within the grammar of God's own life, embodying *his* Glory and receiving the honour (and worship)

---

<sup>103</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 246.

<sup>104</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 234-35.

<sup>105</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 236.

<sup>106</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*.

otherwise reserved for him'.<sup>107</sup> While Fletcher-Louis could be taken to task for a number of bold assertions regarding theories of this pervasive 'angelomorphic' conception, an analysis of his reading of portions of *Musar leMevin* through this lens and general challenges to reading these texts are the task at hand.

Fletcher-Louis refers to Collins' reading of 4Q417 1 i lines 14-18 / 4Q418 43 lines 10-14 in regard to the word אָנוֹשׁ in line 17 as a reference to Adam/humankind.<sup>108</sup> For Fletcher-Louis the concept here of humanity being formed 'in the image of the holy ones' would be consistent with 'angelomorphic' conceptions attested elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Jewish literature. With Collins, the suggestion that an exegetical tradition of Genesis 1.26-27 is at play here, appeals to Fletcher-Louis. 'In our image and likeness. . . in the image of *elohim*' is to be read as humanity being created in the image of angels. The contrast in 4Q417 1 i 14-18 of the 'people of spirit' and the 'spirit of flesh' could be likened to the creation of two types of humanity; heavenly man (Gen 1) and earthly (Gen 2-3) similar to the tradition preserved by Philo. However, Fletcher-Louis suggests that even if אָנוֹשׁ were to be read as the antediluvian figure of 'Enosh' it may be for the purpose of legitimising a community 'as the recipients of revelation on the grounds that they belong to an angelomorphic genealogy stretching back to the patriarchs including Enosh and, perhaps, Seth'.<sup>109</sup> The vital observation for Fletcher-Louis is that whether one adopts Collins' reading or not, 'angelomorphic' conceptions are not jeopardised.

---

<sup>107</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 135.

<sup>108</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 115; Collins adopts this reading based upon the use of the word 'Enosh' in the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3.17).

<sup>109</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 116.

In support of the proposal that *Musar leMevin* conceives of humanity in terms of 'angelomorphism', Fletcher-Louis offers three observations. First, 4Q417 1 i as a whole is 'oriented to creation as it is originally intended.'<sup>110</sup> The column expresses interest in knowing the difference between good and evil (cf. Sirach 17.7) and positively views Adam and Eve in their partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, as the express purpose of wisdom in its role as a restorer of the primal order attested elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q300 3 2-3). For Fletcher-Louis, humanity's ability to distinguish between good and evil is a reflection on their 'angelomorphic' identity. Humanity was originally created angelomorphic and 4Q417 1 i is an expression that attempts to rediscover the 'pre-lapsarian order' of creation and is 'Essene realised *eschatology* as a the [sic] reflex of *protology*.'<sup>111</sup> A similar 'angelomorphic' tradition, so Fletcher-Louis, appears already in 2 Samuel 14.17 where the woman from Tekoa says to David, 'my lord the king is like the angel of God, discerning good and evil.' In my estimation, such a suggestion fails to understand the function of this simile in 2 Samuel's narrative. Second, the distinction of the two types of humanity (spirit/flesh) is consistent with a creation in the likeness of angels. In a previous chapter Fletcher-Louis establishes, questionably, that pre-Essene and Qumran documents use similar language to describe 'divine humanity which has somehow been removed from the realm of flesh (Sirach 45:4; *Jubilees* 31:14; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:19-20 [15:16-17]).'<sup>112</sup> 'Angelomorphic' traditions articulate human identity in terms of transcendence of spirit over flesh. Third, Fletcher-Louis appeals to 'several' other passages in *Musar leMevin* that conceive of a 'heavenly

---

<sup>110</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 116.

<sup>111</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 117.

<sup>112</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 117.

humanity which has overcome the normal limits of earthly existence.’<sup>113</sup> This final appeal references no specific passages in *Musar leMevin* but rather to the introduction of DJD 34 where the editors state, ‘There may be hints at the notion that an ‘elect’ group on earth now participates in the angelic community.’<sup>114</sup> The onus is upon Fletcher-Louis to establish that the addressees of *Musar leMevin* not only conceive of a present participation with the angelic realm but a realisation of angelic existence.

Fletcher-Louis’ treatment of 4Q418 69 follows on the heels of his discussion of 4Q417 1 i. Fletcher-Louis reflects on Harrington and Strugnell’s reading of 4Q418 69 and suggests that their view that, ‘it is the angels who are directly in view and the righteous only indirectly must be doubted.’<sup>115</sup> Line 7 of 4Q418 69 reads, ‘all those who will endure forever (נהיה עולם), those who investigate the truth (דורשי אמת),’ and is considered by the editors of DJD 34 as a reference to angels. Fletcher-Louis questions such a reading on the basis that this language is used elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls for the righteous alone. In lines 10-12 of this same column there is an exhortation to the addressee to pursue knowledge and is taken by the editors as an exhortation in which the angelic model is the inspiration for the righteous, a model that is indefatigable. The editors view the righteous as presently participating in some degree with the angelic.<sup>116</sup> Fletcher-Louis points to line 13 ‘whose inheritance is eternal life’ and asks where else in the literature of the period is there a tradition that conceives of angels as having an ‘inheritance’? For Fletcher-Louis this ‘is the privilege of the human elect, not angels.’ He also point to line 14 ‘do [t]he[y] not wal[k] in eternal light’ and asks where else

---

<sup>113</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 118.

<sup>114</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 33.

<sup>115</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 119.

<sup>116</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 119; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 284.

angels are represented as walking in eternal light? 4Q418 69 lines 13-15 should, then, be placed in the category of 'heavenly sonship' that the righteous belong to and includes both humans and angels in a heavenly mode.<sup>117</sup> Humanity in this column is already transformed, according to Fletcher-Louis, and is presently 'angelomorphic'. Nowhere does Fletcher-Louis consider that 4Q418 69 represents humanity as lowly and lacking – the very thing that led the editors to their conclusions. Furthermore, Fletcher-Louis does not adequately resolve the inconsistency of reading the addressee as both exalted and lowly.

4Q416 2 iii (= 4Q418 9), Fletcher-Louis argues, is similar to 4Q418 69 in that it makes a 'similar ethical use of the work's positive theological anthropology'.<sup>118</sup> Divine humanity has an exalted privilege that is characterised by an 'effortless pursuit of wisdom'.<sup>119</sup> The exhortation to walk righteously in line 10 of this column as well as lines 15-17, which restate the fifth command of the Decalogue, are evidence for Fletcher-Louis of this effortless pursuit. Most striking in lines 15-17 is the phrase, 'for as God is to a man, so is his father (כי כאל לאיש כן אביו)', This is compared by Fletcher-Louis with Aseneth's words about Jacob, Joseph's father in *Joseph and Aseneth* 22.3, 'your father Israel is as a father to me and (a) god.' The similarity is only vaguely recognisable and 4Q416 2 iii line 16 is entirely ignored by Fletcher-Louis where it continues, 'and as lords are to a man, so is his mother, for they are the womb that was pregnant with you'. The inclusion in humanity's fashioning of a likeness compared with both mother and father is significant, especially in light of the apparent interest in *Musar leMevin* on the female. It

<sup>117</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 120.

<sup>118</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 121.

<sup>119</sup> It seems rather that humanity in *Musar leMevin* is exhorted to seek wisdom and that the task is a difficult one. Note for instance 4Q418 55 11: '[As for *the holy angels*], are they like Man? (No,) for he

should also be noted that Fletcher-Louis is quick to move from simile to statements of ontology.

4Q418 81 is a lengthy and complex fragment that Fletcher-Louis understands as describing ‘a priest who is set apart from the laity, who are the ‘holy ones’, whom he is called to bless and glorify.’<sup>120</sup> Previous commentary<sup>121</sup> on the ‘holy ones’ of lines 1, 11 and 12 have understood them as angels and the addressee (ואתה)<sup>122</sup> is here instructed to bless and glorify the angels. Fletcher-Louis is doggedly opposed to evidence of angel veneration in Early Jewish literature and is reluctant to read 4Q418 81 in such a manner. The reading of the laity as the ‘holy ones’ here is an interpretation that Fletcher-Louis asserts is ‘forced upon us by the details of the immediate text’.

The addressee in 4Q418 81 is understood by Fletcher-Louis as distinct from the addressee elsewhere in *Musar leMevin*. Whereas the addressee is called upon in the vocative (ואתה מבין) throughout the rest of the document, here the simple address ואתה is used. Clearly, elsewhere the student whom the teaching is directed at is clearly lacking a priestly identity or credentials. Except for line 15 of 4Q418 81 the common language מבין, מבין, מבין, בן מבין, בן מבין, בן מבין does not occur while the simpler ואתה occurs six times. Though this simpler form of address is used elsewhere in *Musar leMevin*, the repeated use of it in this column suggests to Fletcher-Louis that the addressee is different than elsewhere in the document.<sup>123</sup> The document *Musar leMevin* as a whole is addressed to laity while 4Q418

---

(i.e. men) is sluggardly. And are they like a *son of man*? (No,) for he comes to an end’; translation from DJD XXXIV.

<sup>120</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 178.

<sup>121</sup> See for instance Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, p. 143; and DJD XXXIV, pp. 303-11.

<sup>122</sup> A collective use of the term throughout the column seems to be the most reasonable assumption.

<sup>123</sup> Tigchelaar, as discussed above, considers the multiple addressees of *Musar leMevin* and 4Q418 81 specifically in *To Increase Learning*, p. 236.

81 is addressed to a priest.<sup>124</sup> In reading 4Q418 81 as an address to an actual priest(s) and not laity (i.e. a *Maskil* instructing his students, the מבנים), a host of issues regarding the self-conceptions of the addressee are at stake.

The evidence, for Fletcher-Louis, that reveals the person's priesthood in 4Q418 81 is found in line 3 where Numbers 18.20 – 'then the LORD said to Aaron: you will have no allotment in their land, nor will you have any share among them; I am your portion and your inheritance among the Israelites (חלקך ונחלתך בחוך בני ישראל)' – is used. In line 3 of this column the allusion to Numbers is found in the words, '[fo]r he has made all, and caused each man to inherit his inheritance. And He is your portion and your inheritance among the sons of Adam (והוא חלקכם ונחלתכם בחוך בני אדם)'. It is by no means certain that the use of Numbers 18.20 in 4Q418 81 is indicative of the person being an actual priest and this allusion does not explicitly spell out or state this is the case.<sup>125</sup> This is not to say that an elevated priestly figure is not addressed here, but there is a limit to the extent that the context of Numbers 18.20 can be applied to the context of 4Q418 81 by way of an allusion. Fletcher-Louis agrees with Lange on finding evidence for the Aaronic priesthood in the column and notes several other details that substantiate his position. Fletcher-Louis points to the use of the verb נזר in line 2 and understands the word to have strong priestly connotations in post-exilic literature. Fletcher-Louis also finds in line 7 the Torah being interpreted – 'and you, seek His judgements from all your adversaries, in all love him' – presumably, with no further indication from Fletcher-

---

<sup>124</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 184.

<sup>125</sup> So Elgvin, 'The Mystery to Come,' p. 121; as well as Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD XXXIV*, p. 305. If 'Israel' is replaced by 'Adam' in 4Q418 81 and no substitute or mention is made of Aaron – it does not follow that this allusion automatically establishes the person's priesthood. Fletcher-Louis insists that line 3 'cite the privileges of the Aaronic priesthood,' p. 179.

Louis, the Torah is found in 'His judgements'?<sup>126</sup> The word 'Torah' does not appear in *Musar leMevin* and is not an overt or subtle theme in the document, rather it is the *רז נהיה* that is the focus of the addressee.

4Q418 81 line 4 has the odd construction לקדוש קדושים which is read unquestioningly by Fletcher-Louis as 'holy of holies'. Orthographically it is difficult to read לקדוש קדושים as 'holy of holies' when elsewhere it always appears as קדוש קדושים. Tigchelaar translates the phrase לקדוש קדושים as 'to be a most holy one' – a much more likely translation (cf. 4Q381 76-77 7).<sup>127</sup> Fletcher-Louis proceeds to conceive of the 'holy of holies' in line 4 as evoking, 'the way in which the priesthood within the Qumran community are set up as a holy of holies over against the laity who are the holy ones.'<sup>128</sup> Where Elgvin understands the allusion to Numbers 20.18 as universalising the priesthood, Fletcher-Louis disagrees on the basis of his reading of 'holy of holies *for all the earth*'. This phrase is an expression of 'cultic cosmology' and views the priest as set apart for the holy of holies 'which functions as a sacred centre of the whole cosmos instantiated in the cult where he and the rest of the people of God embody the true Adam'.<sup>129</sup> The community here and elsewhere reconstitute Adamic identity in a restored Eden surrounding a high priest who embodies God's glory (in keeping with Fletcher-Louis' reading of Sirach 50). Fletcher-Louis' reading of 'holy of holies' and subsequent interpretation of it as representing a high priest, conceived of as a sanctuary, is difficult at best.

---

<sup>126</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 178.

<sup>127</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 231.

<sup>128</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 179.

<sup>129</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 180.



Another phrase in which Fletcher-Louis finds a priestly function is in 4Q418 81 line 10 where, 'it is in your hand to turn away anger from the men of pleasure (להשיב אף מאנשי רצון)'. Strugnell and Harrington note the oddity of this phrase in the context of the teaching activity of a sage and cite biblical occurrences that are similar (Num 25.11; Ps 106.23, 29-30; Jer 18.20). These three parallels from the Hebrew Bible are to priests: Moses, Phinehas and Jeremiah. The priestly connotation of the phrase in line 10 would have been recognised as a role for a priestly figure, so Fletcher-Louis – priests turn away God's wrath. If Fletcher-Louis' hypothesis that it is a priest who is set apart from the laity and the laity are the 'holy ones' whom the priest is to bless and glorify – the identification of the phrase אנשי רצון is quite difficult.

It is likely, in my opinion, that a priestly figure maintains an elevated status in 4Q418 81 and that the laity are the אנשי רצון and not the 'holy ones'. The relationship between the elevated priestly figure of the column and the אנשי רצון is to 'turn away wrath' by way of an affiliation with angelic 'holy ones', consonant with the idea that angels in *Musar leMevin* are an indefatigable model to follow. Little sense can be made of the lowliness and yet apparent inclusion of the אנשי רצון if the 'holy ones' are the laity as Fletcher-Louis argues. The fact that 'all the evidence from contemporary Jewish tradition points to the turning back of God's wrath as a specifically priestly vocation' is a convincing point by Fletcher-Louis.<sup>130</sup> Less certain is Fletcher-Louis' portrayal of this priestly figure as 'distinctly angelic or divine'.

The route taken by Fletcher-Louis to arrive at the conclusion that the priestly figure in 4Q418 81 is 'angelomorphic' or divine begins with the assumption that when *Musar leMevin* was written it was 'preeminently the priest Phinehas (son of Eleazar, son

of Aaron) who turns back God's wrath from the righteous.'<sup>131</sup> 1 Maccabees 3.3-9 describes Judas Maccabeus as turning away wrath from Israel in emulation of Phinehas (1 Macc 2.26, 54; 3.8). Wisdom of Solomon 18.15-16 portrays Aaron standing in the breach between 'angelic death' and the righteous. In Wisdom of Solomon Aaron, then, is himself 'of cosmic, gigantic, proportion, bearing something of God's own majesty'.<sup>132</sup> Judas (1 Macc 3.3-9) and Aaron (Wis Sol 18.15-16) are likened by Fletcher-Louis to 'the angelomorphic Jacob in *Joseph and Aseneth* 22' – again.<sup>133</sup> The circuitous route taken by Fletcher-Louis to substantiate that the appearance of 'turn away wrath' in 4Q418 81 line 10 implies the 'angelomorphic' or divine status of a priest is not convincing. The probability that a priestly figure is envisaged in 4Q418 81 has merit and explains many of the complexities regarding the addressee of the column.

Fletcher-Louis notes that in line 9 of 4Q418 81 the addressee, a priest, is given authority over God's treasure. He dismisses the notion that this treasure is the 'insight' from the previous line, but rather a treasure that is of 'specifically divine privileges'. God's treasure given to the priest is broad in scope and includes wisdom, understanding, elemental forces (winds, waters, etc.), precious stones and metals.<sup>134</sup> Since the temple is here in mind, a microcosm of the universe, those who govern its workings, the priesthood, are those who have authority over its treasure. If the community that *Musar leMevin* is written for is estranged from the temple it stands to reason, so Fletcher-Louis, that the literal treasuries are given a metaphorical interpretation in 4Q418 81 line 9.<sup>135</sup> It

---

<sup>130</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 182.

<sup>131</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, pp. 180-81.

<sup>132</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, pp. 181-82.

<sup>133</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 182.

<sup>134</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 183.

<sup>135</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 183.

is noteworthy that there is no apparent reason for one to consider that *Musar leMevin* is composed by a community that has been estranged from the Jerusalem temple cult.

In conclusion, Fletcher-Louis states that, 'there is clearly an overwhelming case for treating 4Q418 81 1-14 as another witness to the theology of divine priesthood akin to that attested in *Jubilees* 31:14, 1QSb and 4Q511, and to the rhetoric of priesthood-laity relations in these and other texts (4QMMT, 1QS 8-9)'.<sup>136</sup> While the anthropological implications of 4Q417 1 i lines 14-18 certainly display a clear angel/human relationship there is little found in 4Q418 81 that demands that the addressee be viewed as 'angelomorphic' or divine in the sense spelled out by Fletcher-Louis. The elevated status of the addressee set against the אנשי רצון and the likelihood of this figure's identity as, or likened to, a priest is somewhat more convincing. In regard to the laity as the 'holy ones' Fletcher-Louis stresses that the opposing notion of 'holy ones' read as angelic beings is difficult to find elsewhere in the Judaisms of the period.<sup>137</sup>

Fletcher-Louis is at odds with a number of scholars who would have little difficulty pointing to a number of texts where a venerative attitude toward angelic beings occurs. The concept found in 4Q418 81 line 11 that exhorts the addressee to 'glorify holy ones' is further evidence for Fletcher-Louis that angelic beings are not in mind, as there is no corroborative evidence elsewhere for such language of veneration. However, evidence for a priest glorifying his people has a parallel, he writes, in 1 Maccabees 3.3 where Judas Maccabee 'enlarged the glory' of his people.<sup>138</sup> Fletcher-Louis' appeal to 1 Maccabees 3.3 on this point does little to elucidate 4Q418 81 line 11 – it is difficult to understand what exactly the parallel is between *Musar leMevin* and 1 Maccabees

---

<sup>136</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 185.

<sup>137</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 186.

(enlarging glory for a nation and the act of glorifying an angelic figure is not analogous). Fletcher-Louis closes his discussion on 4Q418 81 in the statement that this column 'preserves another important witness to the belief at Qumran that the peculiar vocation of the priesthood entailed an embodying, or making manifest, of divine Glory.'<sup>139</sup> Not only is the rather loose use of the phrase 'at Qumran' difficult, as it presumes a provenance of the document, but the conclusion on the nature of the priesthood and its appearance in *Musar leMevin* by Fletcher-Louis is as well.

Fletcher-Louis discusses a number of texts that raise issues of angelology in *Musar leMevin*. A review of his research serves to introduce a few of the contentious issues that surround columns with possible references to angelic beings. While Fletcher-Louis' conclusion is that the document is one among many that preserve an 'angelmorphic' theology, a more extensive analysis of angelology in the document is needed. Genesis creation traditions may serve as a point of departure for a re-evaluation of angelology in *Musar leMevin*. It may be seen that creation in the document touches upon issues that are fundamental for the addressees' conception of angelology and anthropology.

#### **1.4) Issues Raised and Resolved**

A review of the above literature demonstrates both the exceptional progress of scholars for an understanding of *Musar leMevin* as well as evidence of the disunity among them on how to interpret the document. The basic questions that have been raised are as follows. First, while *Musar leMevin* clearly conceives of wisdom in language and conceptions similar to other wisdom literature (e.g. Ben Sira), much can be learned from

---

<sup>138</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 186.

<sup>139</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 187.

points of dissimilarity between *Musar leMevin* and other such documents. Second, the dissimilarities in *Musar leMevin* from biblical and non-biblical wisdom literature, its unique use of vocabulary, and its possible popularity in the library at Qumran raise questions regarding its relationship to other literature, traditions, and the community of Qumran. Third, phrases such as רז נהיה as well as the abundant terminology and references to the poor have attracted much attention and have been the focus of debate as to how they both should be interpreted in relation to the theology of the document. Fourth, the task of reconstructing this poorly preserved document has been and remains a foundational endeavour. The large majority of fragments have been assigned, without objection, to their manuscripts. Also, a large number of overlaps have been identified and valuable composite texts constructed. Several sequences for the fragments of *Musar leMevin* have been proposed with significant variants between them. Finally, Fletcher-Louis has addressed issues of angelology and anthropology and has raised a number of important issues in this regard. Fletcher-Louis' work demonstrates, among other things, that a variety of interpretative issues must be resolved in order to begin forming conclusions on angelology and anthropology in *Musar leMevin*. His work also points towards the significance such interpretations have on the document as a whole.

### **1.5) Suggestions for Remaining Tasks**

The reconstruction of the document *Musar leMevin* is one of the most crucial tasks that remains. The two methods used at present to reconstruct the document are: (1) material reconstruction (the so called 'morpho-phthiseo-critical' analysis), and (2) textual reconstruction. Another (possible) method for reconstructing the document may be an analysis of intertextual occurrences in the document. Identifying the use of other

traditions the reconstruction of certain lines and phrases may be reproduced with greater certainty. In addition, it is generally assumed at present that *Musar leMevin* is a loosely structured composition, similar to other wisdom literature, and does not necessarily preserve a logical progression or presentation of ideas. This assumption can be questioned. It may be possible to identify a coherent structure, perhaps limited, to the document's presentation of concepts that will aid in the sequencing of some fragments.

The identification of biblical and non-biblical traditions, explicit and non-explicit, in *Musar leMevin* will hopefully yield insights to topics previously addressed. A systematic analysis of the use of Genesis creation traditions may result in a clarification, for instance, of the terms *מחסור* or *נדיבים*, *רז נהיה*. In the case of language that refers to poor and needy the identification of such traditions will elucidate some of the more unusual occurrences of the concept in *Musar leMevin*. The contributions at present are valuable, but a broader attempt that employs a new methodology may prove beneficial.

Theological motifs in *Musar leMevin* that need to be addressed to a greater extent are anthropology, angelology and cosmology. 4Q416 1, likely the first column of the manuscript, provides a cosmological introduction. The influence of cosmological motifs throughout the document need further exploration, for instance in way the pursuit of special revelation is related to cosmology. The author(s) may also conceive of a portion of humanity having a relationship to angelic beings. It is worth inquiring whether conceptions of poverty and revelation are related to anthropology generally, or perhaps even angelology. *Musar leMevin* is concerned on a number of occasions with the female and even addresses a female in one instance (4Q415 2 ii). No comprehensive treatment of the female in *Musar leMevin* has yet been produced. A point of departure for

exploring these themes is the identification of allusions to Genesis creation traditions, which, I propose, are foundational for many such conceptions in the document.

In conclusion, the task of identifying the use of biblical and non-biblical traditions in *Musar leMevin* may well be significant for reconstructing the document, clarifying debated concepts and phrases, and ultimately situating more precisely *Musar leMevin* among the literature of the library from Qumran and Early Jewish literature generally. Two initial tasks first present themselves: (1) a methodology for identifying allusions should be formulated; and (2) possible allusions to Genesis 1-3 traditions should be identified and adjudicated.

## 2) Non-Explicit Use of Traditions: Methodology for Identification

### 2.1) Introduction

Discussions of non-explicit use of biblical traditions in the documents from Qumran are, at present, few in number. In the use of the phrase 'non-explicit' such terms as 'allusion' and 'echo' spring to mind. These terms are loosely used in scholarship and frequently misused when applied in exegesis. It is with good reason that the present discussion on the non-explicit use of traditions is relatively undeveloped as it is often rather problematic even to define the terms 'allusion' or 'echo'. Once defined, it is with even greater difficulty that a series of criteria or tests are developed for adjudicating the likelihood of an occurrence. Most often, the tendency of scholars is to make unsupported claims that one text is alluding to another without the degree of caution here desired. Thus, it is important to attempt to broaden the present discussion of the non-explicit use of biblical traditions. The document *Musar leMevin* uses, it appears, a great number of biblical traditions non-explicitly and a formulated approach for identifying these uses is necessary if one is to ascertain the role of Genesis 1-3 in the document.

The term 'allusion', unlike 'quotation', is subject to a lack of precision. It is not surprising, therefore, if biblical scholars have used the word loosely, perhaps even as a 'default' that denotes everything that does not come under the category of quotation. The present task, therefore, is to ask what basis there may be for making the claim that one text is alluding to another. Answering such a question is not a straightforward matter; there are only a handful of scholars who, in referring to an 'allusion', attempt at the same time to offer criteria underlying their choice of the term. This allowance for vagueness does not result in precision when describing a



wide variety of intertextual<sup>1</sup> resonances, sometimes inconsistent in nature, to one and the same expression.<sup>2</sup> Is it possible to attain a more technical understanding of 'allusion', or is one to accept that confusion or amorphous generalisation is inherent to the term? For example, on the one hand, there can be cases in which an 'allusion' is indisputable as such, while, on the other hand, non-explicit references to other documents or sources seem little more than conjecture. For the sake of clarity in this thesis, it is thus necessary to formulate a definition that emerges from an analysis of problems encountered in *Musar leMevin* than to abandon the expression altogether or to use it without sufficient transparency. Therefore, the ensuing discussion, with reference to the contiguous areas of study (New Testament, Early Jewish sources, and other Dead Sea documents), will attempt to delineate 'allusions' within the wider context of intertextuality and Early Jewish exegesis.<sup>3</sup>

Scholarship on the use biblical traditions at Qumran has focused mainly on categories of explicit citation<sup>4</sup>, introductory formula<sup>5</sup>, 'pesher'<sup>6</sup>, anthology<sup>7</sup>, and

---

<sup>1</sup> James A. Sanders, 'Intertextuality and Canon,' in S. L. Cook and S. C. Winter (eds.), *On the Way to Nineveh* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) p. 316; states that the term 'intertextuality' is used with three basic senses: (1) interrelation of blocks of text in close proximity; (2) the function of older literature cited or in some way alluded to in later literature; and (3) the interrelation of text and reader. Steve Moyise, 'Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament,' in S. Moyise (ed.), *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North* (JSNTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) pp. 14-41, offers three influences between 'text and subtext': (1) Intertextual Echo, the influence of the old upon the new; (2) Dialogical Intertextuality, the influence of the old and the new upon each other; and (3) Postmodern Intertextuality, the influence of all other texts, especially those known to the reader.

The term 'intertextual' will be used in this thesis to denote the occurrence of earlier literary traditions upon later writings; see Sanders' point (2) and Moyise's point (1).

<sup>2</sup> So, for instance, in the case of *Musar leMevin* there is little consensus for the identification of the allusion to either Seth/Sheth in 4Q417 1 i 15-17.

<sup>3</sup> Perhaps the term 'exegesis', or even 'hermeneutic', avoids the complications that are inherent in the term 'intertextuality', however the use of both words is necessary in discussing allusions, which was one of the exegetical practices of early Judaism. See Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988) for a general introduction to practices of Jewish exegesis.

<sup>4</sup> For a general introduction to the use of 'Scripture' in writings from Qumran, see G. Vermes: 'The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting,' in Vermes, *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975) pp. 37-49.

<sup>5</sup> D. I. Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992); W. H. Brownlee, 'Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *BA* 14 (1951): 54-76; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (London: Tynedale Press, 1959); M.

rewritten Bible.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, in New Testament scholarship the vast number of works that study intertextuality are concerned primarily with the explicit use of the Hebrew Bible and Septuagint.<sup>9</sup> Discussions of allusions within biblical, Early Jewish, and New Testament studies are much fewer in number and among them only some develop a clear methodology for approaching the issue. In the case of the Apocalypse of John, non-explicit biblical traditions are used quite densely and yet discussions

---

Fishbane, 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,' in M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. II. 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) pp. 339-77; J. A. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,' in *NTS* 7 (1960-1): 297-33; M. H. Gottstein, 'Bible Quotations in the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *VT* 3 (1953): 79-82; F. L. Horton, 'Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature,' in *RevQ* 7 (1969-71): 505-14; J. L. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999); M. R. Lehmann, 'Midrashic Parallels to Selected Qumran Texts,' in *RevQ* 3 (1961-62): 545-51; B. M. Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah,' in *JBL* 70 (1951): 297-307; B. J. Roberts, 'Bible Exegesis and Fulfillment in Qumran,' in P. R. Ackroyd & B. Lindars (eds.), *Words and Meaning: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: University Press, 1968) pp. 195-207; E. Slomovic, 'Towards an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *RevQ* 7 (1969-71): 3-15; J. C. Trever, 'The Qumran Covenanters and Their Use of Scripture,' in *Per* 39 (1958): 127-38; S. Weitzman, 'Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit,' in *JBL* 115 (1996): 49-61; P. Wernberg-Møller, 'Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline,' in *ST* 9 (1955): 40-66.

<sup>6</sup> G. J. Brooke, 'Qumran Peshier: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre,' in *RevQ* 10 (1979-81): 483-503; A. Finkel, 'The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures,' in *RevQ* 4 (1963-4): 357-70; M. Fishbane, 'The Qumran Peshier and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics,' in *PWJCS* 6 (1977) I: 97-114; L. I. Rabinowitz, 'Peshier/Pittaron: Its Biblical Meaning and Significance in the Qumran Literature,' in *RevQ* 8 (1972-75): 219-32; J. A. Sanders, 'Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul and the Old Testament,' in *JR* 39 (1959): 232-44.

<sup>7</sup> G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985).

<sup>8</sup> J. H. Charlesworth, 'The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Exegesis,' in C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) pp. 139-52; B. N. Fisk, *Do You Not Remember: Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

<sup>9</sup> See for example H. Anderson, 'The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel,' in J. M. Efrid (ed.), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of W. F. Stinespring* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972) pp. 280-306; J. C. Becker, 'Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology,' in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) pp. 64-9; M. Black, 'The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament by the New Testament,' in *SJT* 39 (1986): 1-17; R. L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995); C. A. Evans, 'Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture,' in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup, 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) pp. 47-51; M. P. Miller, 'Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,' in *JSJ* 2 (1971): 29-82; C. D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

regarding approach and methodology for identifying such usages are almost non-existent.<sup>10</sup> Study of the use of non-explicit traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls has centred almost exclusively on the *Hodayot* while there is almost complete silence with respect to the other documents. Due to the paucity of contributions that concern themselves with understanding anything less than formal citations of traditions, any scholarship that seeks to develop an approach to identifying non-explicit traditions should be considered.

The word 'allusion' alone suggests an ambiguity that renders the discussion of allusions difficult to pursue along lines of categorical paradigms. Therefore, a large extent of scholarship that attempts to define and describe occurrences of allusions has resorted to analogies in order to further the discussion. As an attempt is made in this thesis to clarify the nature and function of non-explicit intertextual occurrences in *Musar leMevin*, it will become apparent that analogy is often one of the few ways by which to communicate or illustrate usage. So, for instance, many elements of the genre of *Hodayot* are not shared by *Musar leMevin*; one important similarity does exist however: both documents formulate theological conceptions largely on the basis of non-explicit occurrences of a tradition.

The few works within New Testament studies that address non-explicit traditions will also be explored below in search of a viable methodology. It should be noted that there is an all too frequent tendency within New Testament scholarship to

---

<sup>10</sup> R. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) pp. 12, 57 writes in his introduction that the authors of the NT used 'biblical materials' in an 'allusive' manner and later adds that 'the distinction between a direct quotation and an allusion is of course notoriously difficult' and can be 'somewhat arbitrary'. However, outside of these brief comments no discussion on 'allusion' is forthcoming. The NT composition with arguably the most allusions to biblical traditions, is the Johanne Apocalypse. However, S. Moyise, in his study of *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), never develops the conversation any further than identifying and arguing for specific occurrences in the apocalypse. A recent contribution within NT scholarship that addresses a methodology for identifying non-explicit uses of biblical traditions comes from Shiu-Lun Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,

make facile claims about the occurrence of an allusion.<sup>11</sup> Another shortcoming of some New Testament scholarship is to conceive of intertextuality as occurring between a first century document and the 'Old Testament'. There is often a failure to recognise the literary life of a tradition outside of the canon of 'Scripture' that may have circulated for hundreds of years. The form of a tradition as it appears in a later text may be an allusion to several layers of a tradition which, though ultimately derived from a 'Scriptural' source, have acquired an independent life of their own. Identifying the strands of independent growth and variation are indispensable if one wishes to determine more precisely the nature of an intertextual occurrence. Therefore, rather than conceiving of the task as identifying strictly non-explicit usages of a biblical text (Hebrew Bible or LXX), the task should involve the identification of sources that preserve a biblical tradition in expanded or altered forms. In other words, *Musar leMevin* may know a tradition that adapts, re-writes, or interprets a biblical source and formulates various theological constructions on a document that is several steps removed from the biblical text *per se*. The document *Musar leMevin* will be studied from a history of traditions approach that should not be conceived of as the use of 'Scripture'.

## **2.2) Non-Explicit Traditions in the New Testament**

Since its publication, Richard Hays' book *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* has been frequently cited in discussions concerned with the use of biblical

---

2002) pp. 5-11; Shum interacts with Richard Hays' (see below) criteria of identification but does not develop a methodology beyond these.

<sup>11</sup> See for instance C. A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) pp. 47-48, who comments on allusions in Luke: '...the works that list OT citations and allusions in the NT do not agree completely on definitions or on the identification of such references in Luke and the NT. Even the editions of the two standard Greek texts do not agree. The UBS3 text lists 24 Lukan references as OT quotations and does not deal with allusions. The NA26 text italicizes 31 references as quotations and lists 525 allusions (inclusive of the 31 quotations).'

traditions in the New Testament.<sup>12</sup> Hays is one of the first to apply scholarship on intertextuality in English literature to the realm of the New Testament's use of non-explicit citations of biblical sources. Thus, an analysis of Hays' proposed methodology and a critical examination of the approach he applies to identifying and discussing non-explicit uses of biblical sources will serve as a point of departure for identifying similar occurrences in *Musar leMevin*.

An analysis of Hays' discourse on intertextuality as developed for application in English poetry as analogous and helpful for understanding literature of Early Judaism is significant. Hays recognises that research on literary allusion and echo is far more developed and widespread in the academia of English poetry than that in biblical scholarship. He attempts to adopt research into the theory behind intertextual studies in English literature in order to understand and illuminate the nature of Paul's use of non-explicit biblical sources. Hays' work is important because it seeks to develop and refine approaches to non-explicit citations to a greater degree than scholars have previously attempted. The benefits of his approach will be evaluated below and at the end of this chapter similarities between the use of biblical traditions in English literature with that of Early Jewish literature will be presented.

Hays opens his discussion by briefly rejecting the category of 'midrash', which he regards as neither helpful nor pertinent.<sup>13</sup> Part of his criticism is due to the generic meaning of the word 'midrash' and the accuracy of applying it to almost any exegetical activity in either Jewish or Christian compositions. Hays further criticises notions that suggest rabbinic midrashic compositions as the background for understanding Pauline thought. It should be, he argues, that Paul is more accurately

---

<sup>12</sup> R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

<sup>13</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, pp. 10-14.

seen as the background for midrash and not *vice versa*.<sup>14</sup> While such criticisms should serve as words of caution, they forget the aim any approach should seek: a wider conversation and subsequent methodology that can further elucidate our discourse on intertextuality in early Judaism. The dismissal, or minimising, of nearly contemporary relatives of the New Testament canon is puzzling in my opinion especially when it stands juxtaposed to suggested conversation partners like Alexander Pope, Yeats, or Milton. The term 'midrash' certainly can be used to cover over a 'multitude of exegetical sins,' but it can be used responsibly and cautiously as one of the closest relatives to Early Jewish compositions. Hays's answer is fairly rigid when he states that 'the label midrash brings the interpretative process to a halt'. The abuse of the word 'midrash' is similar to the abuse of the word 'allusion' and 'echo'. It is not, however, only the 'label' that Hays struggles with, but the inclusion of rabbinic citations, allusions, and echoes in midrashic compositions as part of his treatment on intertextual occurrences outside of a few fleeting references to Michael Fishbane. The category of midrash is fraught by vagueness, but the conversation constructed by Hays may end up 'throwing the baby out with the bath water'.

Hays' aim is to apply intertextual approaches that have developed within literary criticism on English poetry to the letters of Paul in hopes of illuminating scriptural allusions and citations therein.<sup>15</sup> Whereas for Paul Hays states that the canon of 'Scripture' is the Law, Prophets and Writings, elsewhere the body of traditions, or canon, for intertextual reflection include Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Stevens and so forth. Hays begins this exploration by citing the works

---

<sup>14</sup> Whether midrash is the background for Paul or Paul for midrash is not necessarily relevant. The well-known occurrence in 1 Corinthians 10.4 'for they drank from the supernatural Rock *which followed them*, and the Rock was Christ' is a non-biblical tradition preserved also by midrashic sources and serves to elucidate Paul's use of a tradition. See *Midrash Sifra Numbers* 11.21; B. Talmud *Shabbath* 35a, *Avoth* 5.6, *Sukka* 3a-3b; *Midrash Numbers Rabbah* 19:25-26; *T. Sukka* 3.11; and *T. Onqelos Numbers* 21.17.

of Julia Kristeva and Roland Barthes who define intertextuality as 'the study of the semiotic matrix within which a text's acts of signification occur'. This definition of intertextuality shapes Hays' approach to Paul and he deduces his intent to go beyond the historical-critical approach, which seeks genetic and causal explanations in order to focus rather on describing the 'system of codes or conventions that the texts manifest'.<sup>16</sup> The semiotic matrix for Paul, continues Hays, is clearly Israel's 'Scripture'. The scriptures are a source of symbols and metaphors that are deeply imbedded in Paul's mind and 'condition his perception of the world'. For Hays, Paul's use of scripture is viewed progressively less as an exegetical or expository occurrence and more of a poetical usage.<sup>17</sup> That aside, the difference between an authoritative source, such as biblical texts, and an influential literary milieu, are distinctions that are never quite spelled out by Hays. The definition and use of the term 'Scripture' in greater detail is of fundamental importance as a number of sources were available at the period which were brimming with biblical codes and conventions themselves as well as with the language of similar communities. Paul knows not only 'Scripture' but also exegetical traditions that are preserved in the literature of the period.

Another influential factor in Hays' approach is John Hollander who has written on echoes of biblical traditions in Milton's *Paradise Lost*. Hollander, as cited by Hays, seeks to 'consider a way of alluding that is inherently poetic rather than expository, and makes a new metaphor rather than learned gestures'.<sup>18</sup> Hollander also uses the terms 'revisionary power,' 'allusive echo,' and 'new figuration' when

---

<sup>15</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 15.

<sup>16</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 15.

<sup>17</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 24, summarises Paul's use of scripture in the statement: 'Paul's citations of Scripture often function not as proofs but as tropes: they generate new meanings by linking the earlier text (Scripture) to the later (Paul's discourses) in such a way as to produce unexpected correspondences, correspondences that suggest more than they assert'.

describing the natural distortion that occurs in intertextual echo. It is the task of those who study literary echo first to identify an echo and, second, to give account of the 'new figurations' generated by them. Hays appeals to an example provided by Robert Alter to illustrate this task. In the example below are Yeats' quatrain, 'The Nineteenth Century and After' in parallel with Matthew Arnold's 'Dover Beach.' These texts are used to illustrate an 'allusive echo':

Yeats

Though the great song return no more  
There's keen delight in what we have:  
The rattle of pebbles on the shore  
Under the receding wave.

Matthew Arnold

The Sea of Faith  
Was once, too, all the full, and round earth's shore  
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furled.  
But now I only hear  
Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,  
Retreating. . .

Hays, as both Hollander and Alter, uses this illustration as an instance where Arnold's work is described as 'recollection' and not 'citation'. There is no case for 'quotation' or 'allusion' here, but 'echo'. One of the properties of echo in this illustration is that 'allusive echo' at times may operate as a 'diachronic trope'. Diachronic trope is a term substituted with 'transumption' and 'metalepsis' by Hollander. These three terms are used to describe an instance when a 'literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts'.<sup>19</sup> Allusive echo, continues Hays, is the instance of an interplay between two texts when text B is best understood with a knowledge of text A. This allusive echo, or metalepsis, 'places the reader within a field of whispered or unstated correspondences'. Finally, Hays borrows from Hollander the term 'resonance' and speaks with the phrases 'internal resonances' or 'cave of resonant signification'. Here Hays replaces Kristeva and Barthes' 'semiotic matrix' with Hollander's 'cave of resonant signification' to

---

<sup>18</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 19.



emphasise once again that it is to 'Scripture' that one must turn in order to understand the literary influence on Paul. I would raise a cautionary note at this point, not in disagreement that 'Scripture' was influential on Paul, but that a 'recollection' of Paul or a 'diachronic trope' between his writing and biblical texts is better understood if Paul is placed within a world where he is knowledgeable of a great many possible sources, all of which have grown within the same 'semiotic matrix'.

Hays uses Philippians 1.19 as a point of departure to illustrate how echoes of biblical sources function in Paul's epistles. In this discussion the distinction between echo and allusion is placed on a scale with quotation on one end, progressing to allusion and then echo. The difference between the terms is the 'semantic distance between the source and the reflecting surface'.<sup>20</sup> The greatest difficulty is when an echo nears 'vanishing point', that is when the reader is no longer able to determine whether there is an echo or not. Hays offers criteria for identifying echoes, a term here identified with 'intertextual fusion that generates new meaning', which he entitles *The Locus of Echo: Five Options*. These five options are composed to answer questions regarding claims of intertextual meaning. The purpose of listing these is to highlight the importance of distinguishing the fine line between the tasks of identifying a non-explicit occurrence and understanding the role a 'hermeneutical event' plays in deciphering the occurrence.

- (1) The hermeneutical event occurs in Paul's mind. Claims about intertextual meaning effects are valid where it can credibly be demonstrated that Paul intended such effects.
- (2) The hermeneutical events occur in the original readers of the letter. Claims about intertextual meaning effects are valid where it can credibly be demonstrated that the Philippians would likely have perceived such effects.
- (3) The intertextual fusion occurs in the text itself. (In this case, we cannot properly speak of a hermeneutical event.) We have not access to the author or

---

<sup>19</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 20.

<sup>20</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 23. While Hays definitions of the terms 'quotation', 'allusion' and 'echo' are clear, it may not be entirely useful to adopt both terms 'allusion' and 'echo' when discussing non-explicit citations in *Musar leMevin*.

to the original readers; we have only the text. Consequently, assertions about Paul's intention are intelligible only as statements about the implied author, and assertions about 'the Philippians' are intelligible only as statements about the implied reader. Implied author and implied reader are epiphenomena of the text's rhetoric. Consequently, claims about intertextual meaning effects are valid where it can credibly be demonstrated that they are in some sense properties of the text's own rhetorical or literary structure.

- (4) The hermeneutical event occurs in my act of reading. Claims about intertextual meaning effects are valid if I say so. In other words, the perception of intertextual effects has emerged from my own reading experience, and no further validation is necessary.
- (5) The hermeneutical event occurs in a community of interpretation. Claims about intertextual meaning effects are valid where it can credibly be demonstrated that they conform to the hermeneutical conventions of a particular community of readers. (Such communities can, of course, be variously composed and disposed: the church, the guild of biblical scholars, the guild of literary critics, the readers of this book – and each of these communities is, of course, fractured into various schismatic schools and subcommunities).<sup>21</sup>

Hays follows this list by stating his intention not to follow any single one of these principles, but to 'hold them all together in creative tension'. In the process of developing an approach to identifying and discussing intertextual occurrences, the suggestion that one balance the elements of the 'hermeneutical event' to some extent nullifies these options and makes them less useful for deciphering the likelihood of a citation. In embracing these five options Hays acknowledges one 'key hermeneutical axiom': there is an 'authentic analogy...between what the text meant and what it means'.<sup>22</sup> Hays, as the reader, may detect the echoes similarly to the first century audience, being informed and moulded by 'Scripture' himself. For Hays, hermeneutics plays a significant role in his approach to Paul and the identification of allusions and echoes. As a methodology is developed for identifying non-explicit uses of traditions in *Musar leMevin*, less emphasis will be placed on questions of hermeneutics and the role it plays in identifying and discussing intertextual occurrences. Asking questions regarding where the 'hermeneutical event' takes place complicates the subject beyond what is manageable or necessary for the task at hand.

---

<sup>21</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, pp. 26-27.

<sup>22</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 27.

Hays provides a list of criteria that he uses when identifying the presence and meaning of scriptural echoes in Pauline epistles. The seven tests are summarised below.<sup>23</sup>

- (1) *Availability*. Was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or original readers?
- (2) *Volume*. The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may also be relevant: how distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within Scripture, and how much rhetorical stress does the echo receive in Paul's discourse?
- (3) *Recurrence*. How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scriptural passage?
- (4) *Thematic Coherence*. How well does the alleged echo fit into the line of argument that Paul is developing? Is its meaning effect consonant with other quotations in the same letter or elsewhere in the Pauline corpus? Do the images and ideas of the proposed precursor text illuminate Paul's argument?
- (5) *Historical Plausibility*. Could Paul have intended the alleged meaning effect? Could his readers have understood it?
- (6) *History of Interpretation*. Have other readers, both critical and pre-critical, heard the same echoes? The readings of our predecessors can both check and stimulate our perception of scriptural echoes in Paul.
- (7) *Satisfaction*. With or without clear confirmation from the other criteria listed here, does the proposed reading make sense? Does it illuminate the surrounding discourse? Does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation?<sup>24</sup>

Hays suggests these guidelines for detecting intertextual occurrences without intending that they serve as strict principles for identifying allusions or echoes. Hays speaks of the 'spontaneous power' of 'intertextual conjunctions' that throw 'sparks' and 'fragments of flame on their rising heat'. Hays concludes that any identification and interpretation of scriptural echoes which seeks to understand Paul's intention is a matter of historical speculation. 'Scriptural' echoes are acts of figuration, and the figures used may be read and understood differently by later recipients of Paul's letters. For Paul, 'Scripture' is the source from which his wordplays are derived and from which he might use familiar lines with new life in a different situation.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> For the sake of brevity, Hays explanatory comments that follow each category have been edited here.

<sup>24</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, pp. 29-31.

<sup>25</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 33.

The vast majority of Hays' work is dedicated to the discussion of intertextual echoes in Pauline epistles on a passage-by-passage basis. While undertaking a review of Hays' subsequent application of his methodology would further elucidate the value of his approach, that task is beyond what is manageable for the present chapter. It is sufficient to note that Hays does not systematically adjudicate Paul's allusions and echoes with the criteria presented above. The question at hand is to evaluate Hays' contribution to the study of intertextuality in relation to the broader framework of Early Jewish literature.

From the outset, Hays writes admiringly of the extensive work that has been accomplished in intertextual studies in English literature. A poetic composition's echo of its 'semiotic matrix' may indeed be a new way of speaking about the influence of biblical documents on Paul's compositions, but Hays suggestion of its value for the study of intertextuality in Early Jewish literature should be questioned. What is the real contribution of turning to English poetry as the beginning point for laying a foundation upon which to build an approach to intertextuality in early Judaism? One of the major points that Hays returns to repeatedly is the influence of 'Scripture' on Paul. It is precisely on this point that the proximity of the analogy between Paul and English poetry must be challenged. There is no doubt that an analogy can be drawn between Arnold's use of Yeats and Paul's use of Deuteronomy, but they are significantly distant relatives. The discussions underway in the field of English literature may be relevant for interpreting Paul and asking general hermeneutical questions, but the degree of their relevance is limited. Hays's approach is rather lop-sided in that it begins and ends with a small number of conversation partners (Hollander, Kristeva, Barthes) who bring to the conversation descriptive terms but not a great deal of substance. Intertextuality in English

literature is certainly germane in a discussion of the use of traditions in early Judaism, but the contribution may not be as significant as Hays indicates. Further, the use and reuse of similar traditions derived from the same source ('Scripture') and the adoption of a second or third stage (etc.) adaptation by a later author must be considered. Hays, in seeking analogies by which to communicate, evaluates Paul simplistically as relying on 'Scripture' and thus his analogies reflect a lesser degree of similarity than may possibly be found elsewhere.

The fact that biblical traditions were highly influential on such a large number of Early Jewish as well as early Christian compositions, is an issue that Hays hardly addresses. Hays does mention the similarities between Paul and the *Hodayot*<sup>26</sup> and dissimilarities with Philo<sup>27</sup>, but these are no more than passing references. The use, reuse, rewriting, citation, interpretation, paraphrasing and allegorisation of biblical traditions in such a wide variety of documents from the period provide evidence for an intertextual phenomenon that may have certain analogies in Arnold or Milton, but arguably have distinct dissimilarities as well. This is not to say that discussing allusions is not helpfully described with terms such as 'diachronic trope'; rather it is essential that a diachronic trope in Paul be understood as echoing from more than a 'cave of resonant signification' that equals 'Scripture' flatly. It is a tradition with a complexity created by biblical documents that influence and pervade the literary milieu of the period to an enormous extent.

Hays' work has been well received by the world of New Testament scholarship as a significant contribution in hermeneutics and Pauline exegesis.<sup>28</sup> But

---

<sup>26</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 174.

<sup>27</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 160.

<sup>28</sup> R. E. Ciampa, *The Presence and Function of Scripture in Galatians 1 and 2* (WUNT 2, 102; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998) pp. 24-25; K. H. Jobes, 'Jerusalem, our Mother: Metalepsis and Intertextuality in Gal. 4:21-31,' in *WTJ* 55 (1993): 299-320. See also reviews by C.A. Evans in *CBQ* 53 (1991): 496-98 and C.L. Stockhausen in *JBL* 52 (1992): 155-157. B. D. Sommer, 'Exegesis, Allusion

to what extent can Hays' work be said to provide the basis for a methodology and approach to the larger task of interpreting Early Jewish literature, specifically *Musar leMevin*? Hays' application of his own guidelines is not to be questioned nor is the value of the conclusions drawn from his careful reading of selected Pauline passages. Indeed, for the present study, Hays' seven tests of non-explicit use of a tradition offer a point of departure for developing an approach to *Musar leMevin*. Moreover, the contribution of English literature for expressing a hermeneutical event in an intertextual occurrence appears to be significant. In the process of formulating a history of traditions approach it may be questioned whether there is anything more in English literature besides an eloquent vocabulary for the formation of the current discussion.

Dale Allison, in his work on Matthew's typology of Moses, has a helpful discussion on the non-explicit use of tradition.<sup>29</sup> Allison also seeks to develop a set of criteria that may be compared and contrasted with Hays. Unlike Hays, Allison forgoes a lengthy discussion on trends in English Literary scholarship. In seeking to identify allusions Allison presents two sets of guidelines that serve to narrow the probability of an intertextual occurrence. The first list provided addresses the issue regarding the various ways one text can be linked to another. Allison's six suggestions are summarised here:

- 1) Explicit statement. An author can circumvent ambiguity by straightforward comparison.
- 2) Inexplicit citation or borrowing. Texts can be dug up and transplanted without acknowledgment.
- 3) Similar circumstances. An event may be intended to recall another circumstantially like it.
- 4) Key words or phrases. One may dress up a story with the words of another that is like it and well known.

---

and Intertextuality in the Hebrew Bible: A Response to Lyle Eslinger,' in VT 46 (1996), p. 484, n. 9, criticises the usefulness of some of Hays' seven criteria.

<sup>29</sup> D. C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993).

- 5) Similar narrative structure. The structure of a text can itself be allusive. [For example:]
 

1 Kings 19 Elijah appears Elisha is at work The call to discipleship Elisha follows Elijah	Mark 1 Jesus appears The disciples are at work The call to discipleship The disciples follow Jesus
--	--
- 6) Word order, syllabic sequence, poetic resonance. The rhythm or meter of sentences as well as the patterns of words and syllables can be imitative in order to allude.<sup>30</sup>

While points (1) and (2) are easily recognised and identified, points (3) – (6) are not. The second list that Allison provides (see below) sets forth six ways that non-explicit usages or allusions may be identified. Allison rightly cautions that diligent searching can always uncover resemblances between two texts, but he struggles with how to determine which are meaningful. A controlling method for identifying allusions, explains Allison, is not altogether possible as there is always an element of intuition and sense perception that play a role in the task. The guidelines Allison provides are given with the intention of being broad in approach. A summary is again provided below:

- 1) Chronological Relationship. One text can only allude to or intentionally recall another prior to it in time.
- 2) Significance. Probability will be enhanced if it can be shown (on other grounds) that a passage's proposed subtext belongs to a book or tradition which held some significance for its author.
- 3) Similar Circumstance. In the absence of explicit citation or clear unacknowledged borrowing, a typology [allusion] will not be credible without some combination of devices (3) – (6); see above.
- 4) Prominence. A type should be prominent. A proposed typology [allusion] based on Moses and the exodus owns an initial plausibility, whereas one requiring knowledge of Ittai, the Philistine commander (2 Samuel 15), does not.
- 5) Precedence. An alleged typology [allusion] has a better chance of gaining our confidence if its constituent elements have been used for typological construction in more than one writing.... Precedence enhances probability.
- 6) Unusual imagery and uncommon motifs. Two texts are more plausibly related if what they share is out of the ordinary.<sup>31</sup>

These criteria recall Hays's seven criteria listed above. While the nuances of several of Allison's criteria are different than those of Hays, the two lists are remarkably

---

<sup>30</sup> Allison, *The New Moses*, pp. 19-20.

similar. Hays' seventh criterion, that of 'satisfaction', is noticeably lacking in Allison's list. The criterion of 'satisfaction' is considered by Hays to be the most important test of an allusion or echo. This test answers questions such as: 'does the proposed reading make sense?' or 'does it produce for the reader a satisfying account of the effect of the intertextual relation?'.<sup>32</sup> Hays' seventh test is difficult because it raises issues surrounding the intent of intertextuality, a topic that Allison addresses in the conclusion of his work. For Hays, it seems that perceptions of what a text meant and what it means form his view of 'satisfaction'.

In his treatment on typology in Matthew Allison states that the gospel writer did not 'trumpet all his intentions' nor did he 'instruct us about his literary methods'.<sup>33</sup> Matthew is not a self-contained entity, but rather a piece of a larger work that demands to be read in the context of other texts. The reader must be actively engaged in the act of understanding what the gospel presupposes from the Jewish Bible. The density of the allusions in the gospel cannot be reduced to being verbal inflations; rather they are highly significant utterances. Like 11QMelchizedek, an eschatological midrash, the author uses single words or sentences that purposefully lead the reader into the possibility of multiple interpretations. Further, the audience that Matthew had in mind when writing were equipped far better than modern readers to understand these occurrences. Allison draws on the analogy of the famous hymn by Augustus Montague Toplady 'Rock of Ages':

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,  
Let me hide myself in Thee!  
Let the water and the blood,  
From Thy riven side which flowed,  
Be of sin the double cure,  
Cleanse me from its guilt and power...

---

<sup>31</sup> The presentation of these six points has been slightly modified from Allison's presentation for the sake of brevity. Ibid, pp. 21-22.

<sup>32</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, p. 31.

<sup>33</sup> Allison, *New Moses*, p. 284.



The complexity of this analogy displays the clever interplay of multiple allusions in one text.<sup>34</sup> This 'catena of allusions' draws upon John 19.34 for the image of water and blood flowing from the side of Jesus, the 'Rock' as Jesus is an equation spelled out in 1 Corinthians 10.4, while the idea of being hidden in the cleft of a rock is from Exodus 33.22, and finally the possibility of water flowing from a rock could be from Exodus 17 and Numbers 20. It is not to be assumed that the intended audience would have recognised and understood every allusion, but the compactness of the allusions serves to encourage and increase the knowledge of the audience. In the case of Matthew, 'the focus upon moral instruction, the habit of topical presentation, and the ubiquity of mnemonic devices... when taken together, strongly suggest [catechetical intent]'.<sup>35</sup> The use of Jewish scripture in Matthew, then, has a parallel with the use of tradition in the hymn 'Rock of Ages'. The ultimate goal in mind of both compositions is to stimulate interest in the Bible with carefully planted allusions that would be recognised by the audience.

Svend Holm-Nielsen, in his work on *Hodayot* discussed below, raises a relevant issue that should be noted in connection to what Allison proposes here. It is important to distinguish between the extraction of texts from a biblical source and a simple application of terminology that was current in the community and drawn in the distant past from the Bible.<sup>36</sup> The work of a composer embodies and reflects a creative process that synthesises information with a complexity that at times may

---

<sup>34</sup> Allison, *The New Moses*, p. 7, states in the introduction of the book: '...there are at least three types of intertextuality: borrowing which alludes to no subtext, borrowing which alludes to a series of subtexts, and borrowing which alludes to or cites a specific subtext'.

<sup>35</sup> Allison, *The New Moses*, pp. 285-87.

<sup>36</sup> Another underlying issue related to this question is whether an allusion or citation is intended to remind the readers or hearers of the context of the earlier text. The answer to this question for Hays would appear to be that it is generally not intended to do so.

deliberately include allusions while, at other times a natural linguistic and cultural heritage with no thought of another text or tradition.

Whether the conclusion suggested by Allison that ‘stimulating interest in the Bible’ was one of the primary intents of Matthew’s allusions, it nonetheless calls into question Hays’ seventh test of ‘satisfaction’. Since the intention of an author using biblical traditions could be manifold, it might be fair to say that the author was seeking to dissatisfy his audience. The point is that it is not necessarily possible to recognise when satisfaction in reading has been attained. Perhaps it might also be reasonable to consider that a test of satisfaction may easily be passed when in fact the allusion was actually haphazard, containing no clear referent. Hays formulates the test of satisfaction further in asking whether ‘the proposed reading offers a good account of the experience of a contemporary community of competent readers’.<sup>37</sup> In the case of a didactic work rich in allusions, it is unknown whether or not a proposed allusion was designed to compel the reader to learn, explain what they presently read, or form an authoritative voice that might compel the addressee to believe. In the case of establishing an allusion that may in fact be misidentified, it is easy to conceive that a ‘satisfactory’ explanation be provided for an allusion that is otherwise unsupportable. Questions of satisfaction and dissatisfaction may be worthy of dialogue but at present will not serve as a criterion for identifying an occurrence.

Hays and Allison both contribute significant and cogent discussions that touch directly upon identifying the non-explicit use of traditions in the New Testament. Both lists of criteria developed for determining the likelihood of an allusion will be adapted for use in *Musar leMevin* in section 2.6 below.

---

<sup>37</sup> Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, pp. 31-32.

### 2.3) Devorah Dimant: Allusions in the Pseudepigrapha

Devorah Dimant offers a valuable contribution to the discussion of allusions to biblical traditions that occur in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.<sup>38</sup> Her work on allusions and intertextual occurrences has been carried out in relation to non-biblical and Early Jewish literature. Dimant defines an allusion as: *a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts, using a special signal referring to the independent external text. These signals may consist of isolated terms, patterns and motifs taken from the independent text alluded to.*<sup>39</sup> The two types of allusions in the 'Apocrypha' and 'Pseudepigrapha' are allusions to either isolated verses or to a running biblical text. Dimant's discussion is broken into these two categories and several examples are provided.

Dimant uses *Wisdom of Solomon* as a source for her examples of isolated allusions. The opening verses of 1.1-15 and 6.1-21 are two passages in *Wisdom of Solomon* that are 'linked' by style, words and subject, forming a concentric chiasmus. These passages are further linked by biblical allusions and include words from Psalm 2.10 (LXX). Dimant suggests that Psalm 2 is selected by the author because it urges kings and judges to exercise wisdom, an indirect polemic against Hellenistic theories of kingship. The example of Psalm 2.10 is presented solidly as an allusion on the basis of linguistic and conceptual overlap between the two works. A more discrete example of an allusion is to Proverbs 8.15 and is identified on the basis of similar ideas, style and general tenor. Proverbs 8.15 asserts that through wisdom the kings of the earth rule and judges judge. This concept forms a large part of the discourse of the first nine chapters of Proverbs and converges thematically and stylistically in

---

<sup>38</sup> D. Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha', in M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, II 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988): 379-419.

*Wisdom of Solomon* 1-6. These two examples (Psalms and Proverbs) illustrate two procedures of biblical allusion. First, one employs a specific and characteristic word or phrase from the original to the 'affinity of context'. Second, a method is used that plays on accumulating less defined elements that are reminiscent of the original.<sup>40</sup> Criteria set forth may be summarised as follows: (1) shared linguistic elements; (2) shared concepts or themes; and (3) and shared style.

One other device used when one text alludes to an earlier that Dimant discusses, which incidentally occurs quite seldom in *Wisdom of Solomon*, is the patterning of the new text on the syntactical structure of the old. *Wisdom of Solomon's* allusions (chs. 1-6) are usually taken from different contexts and coalesced into a new unity. Within different contexts a distinction should be made of the actual function there and the literary setting, since the same allusion can be used in different places for different purposes.<sup>41</sup>

The second type of allusion discussed by Dimant is one that occurs in relation to a running text. Such occurrences are an act of modelling the new text from the biblical text. This modelling is identified by the new text adopting the original motif, terms, and small phrases from the biblical source. Allusions of this kind often provide explicit reference to their source somewhere in the new context.<sup>42</sup> There is a wider literary purpose in the case of allusions to a running biblical text. For instance, a 'pseudonymic attribution' is established when a systematic attribution of a biblical account occurs. Also, a system of allusions is frequently used to create a stylistic analogy with a biblical motif or text. Dimant notes the importance of recognising that imitating biblical style is done for literary or exegetical purposes. In purely stylistic

---

<sup>39</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 410.

<sup>40</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 412.

<sup>41</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 415.

<sup>42</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 415-16.

usages biblical elements usually retain only general characteristics and do not point to one specific context whereas elements used for exegetical purposes are always rooted in a specific context.<sup>43</sup>

Pseudepigraphy is, then, a type of allusion in itself. Such an allusion draws mainly from one or two texts and uses them to create new biblical forms or genres. This is the case in Early Judaism with prayers that know psalms or testaments using Genesis 49 and Deuteronomy 31-34. Similarly, in narrative compositions that are either ‘rewritten Bible’ or ‘free narrative,’ various biblical stories function as a model. In the examples that Dimant provides, the concern is with occurrences of motifs used both with and without characteristic phraseology. When phrases are used it enhances the referential value of a motif. Less clear when one reads Dimant’s work is whether it is possible to establish an allusion when phraseology does not occur in a new context.<sup>44</sup> The notion of pseudepigraphy as allusion is essential for the identification of non-explicit uses of traditions in *Musar leMevin*. As traditions develop from Bible to rewritten Bible, compositions that know both may be using a more explicit use of a tradition rather than a non-explicit use of a biblical text.

Dimant uses the book of Tobit as an example of an allusion based upon the reworking of biblical models and motifs. Tobit, some have observed, evokes motifs from Genesis and Job. A similarity of main motifs attached to the characters Tobit and Job as well as the character Tobit following a sequence of motifs from the book of Job, indicates that Job serves as a model throughout the book. Dimant outlines the following:

Motifs	Job	Tobit
The hero is pious and righteous	1:1, 8	1:6-12, 16-17
He is prosperous	2:3	2:2-5
He is deprived of his possessions	1:2-3	1:13
He is crippled by illness	1:14-19	1:15-20

<sup>43</sup> Dimant, ‘Use and Interpretation,’ p. 416.

<sup>44</sup> Dimant, ‘Use and Interpretation,’ p. 417.

His wife works for others	2:7-8	2:9-10
He is provoked by his wife	31:10	2:11-14
	2:9 (LXX)	
He prays and wishes to die	3 <i>et passim</i>	2:1-6
His final vindication and restitution of health and wealth	42:11-15	14:2-3
He dies in his old age, blessed with offspring and wealth	42:16-17	14:11-12 <sup>45</sup>

These affinities of Tobit with Job are important because they are non-explicit. The narrative is not taken over or reworked by Tobit and is independent of Job. This use by Tobit of biblical motifs is different from rewritten Bible or pseudepigraphy. Thus, this is an example of 'free narrative' where a Job-like plot has been re-created. The referential value occurs in the coincidence of motifs and a few terms and leads to a comparison of the two narratives.<sup>46</sup>

In conclusion, Dimant contrasts the purpose of explicit and implicit uses of biblical sources:

[Explicit usage is:] employed in rhetorical contexts, namely in various types of discourse, and for various rhetorical purposes. The uses in compositional functions occur in all types of contexts and genres. In explicit rhetorical uses the biblical elements stand for the divine authority and are presented as such. In implicit compositional uses biblical elements are part of the materials forming the texture of the composition. Authors employing biblical elements in this way aim at re-creating the biblical models and atmosphere, and identify themselves with the biblical authors.<sup>47</sup>

In terms of genre, *Musar leMevin* is dissimilar from both Tobit and *Wisdom of Solomon* in several respects. Tobit for the most part is a narrative interspersed with prayers and thanksgiving hymns. The *Wisdom of Solomon* may fit under the general category of sapiential literature but it is somewhat proverbial and uses a type of metre as well. The analogy between these works and *Musar leMevin* is helpful but they are not *verbatim* examples that illustrate what may occur here. The contribution of Dimant in discussing the non-explicit use of tradition for *Musar leMevin*, therefore, is the general observation that a system of allusions is used frequently to create an

<sup>45</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 418.

<sup>46</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 419.

<sup>47</sup> Dimant, 'Use and Interpretation,' p. 419.

analogy with a biblical motif or narrative(s). In the case of *Musar leMevin*, the use of Genesis 1-3 appears to be analogous at times to such a system of allusion.

#### **2.4) Non-Explicit Tradition in the *Hodayot* and DSS**

In his monograph on the *Hodayot*, Holm-Nielsen dedicates a considerable discussion to identifying the use of biblical traditions within the document.<sup>48</sup> While Bonnie Kittel has subsequently criticised Holm-Nielsen for his description and, often, identification of the *Hodayot*'s use of biblical traditions (to be examined below), his work and discussion remain valuable. Research into the non-explicit usage of biblical traditions in the *Hodayot* serves as an excellent point of departure for discussing similar occurrences in *Musar leMevin*. This is due to two basic similarities: (1) the discussion on the subject of 'allusions' in the *Hodayot* has been addressed whereas for other documents from the Qumran library this is not the case; and (2) the *Hodayot* is undoubtedly using a great deal of biblical tradition in an almost exclusively non-explicit way.

A number of difficulties exist in identifying and discussing the *Hodayot*'s use of biblical traditions. First, Holm-Nielsen considers the struggle of identification in terms of the *Hodayot*'s 'paraphrased use of an Old Testament text'.<sup>49</sup> For example, the New Testament, unlike the *Hodayot*, often draws attention to another source with an introductory phrase or statement. In the cases when the New Testament author does not draw attention to the use of a biblical source, most often the citation is of a known biblical tradition. However, in the *Hodayot*, even when two sentences are 'quoted' from the Hebrew Bible, they are not word for word. Second, there are a vast number of cases in which it is obvious or highly probable that the author had more than one biblical passage in mind. In such cases it is difficult to determine whether

---

<sup>48</sup> S. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960).

the author was aware of quoting or citing these sources. If the context from which it is presumed a quotation derived is examined, it becomes clear that the author paid little or no attention to the context of the biblical source.<sup>50</sup> The similarity between the two texts often lies in the single expression or word alone. The usage of an 'Old Testament' expression is often so circumstantial and has so little bearing on the new context that it can hardly be reckoned among the cases of an 'actual use of Scripture' and has 'no theological content'.<sup>51</sup> Third, even when there is an agreement of terms and phrases between the *Hodayot* and a biblical source, it cannot be presumed that a quotation can be identified. Rather, it may be that certain vocabulary and language are permanent phrases, stereotyped expressions, or customary terminology that originated from the Hebrew Bible but existed in the everyday language of the time and therefore not an intertextual occurrence. Holm-Nielsen observes that within a religious sphere, where special terminology is used, this could easily be the case. It is not uncommon to find the same expression in a number of contexts in the *Hodayot* as well as elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is no way to know, definitively, whether the author is extracting texts from a biblical source or simply applying a terminology that was current in the community which derived from biblical sources at some previous point.<sup>52</sup>

Holm-Nielsen characterises the application of biblical traditions in the *Hodayot* as an attempt to form an original poetic composition by the knitting together of borrowed material. He defines the application as follows:

'the authors did not have as their object the authorisation of their work as canonical writing by the use of the Old Testament [as compared with the New Testament], but rather the creation of original poetry in an Old Testament style and, by means of the

---

<sup>49</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 302.

<sup>50</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 302.

<sup>51</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, pp. 303-4.

<sup>52</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 303.



use of the Old Testament in this poetry, the expression of the relationship between God and the community, and between God and the community's individual member.'<sup>53</sup>

The use of a biblical source here is dissimilar to, say, a *pesher* or midrash in that the authors had no intention of selecting from the biblical source, but of making use of it. The *Hodayot* is not attempting to authorise a definitive interpretation of a biblical passage; rather, it takes the biblical source for granted and 'cultivates a theology' on that basis.

Holm-Nielsen observes the *Hodayot's* use of biblical sources and questions the significance of such usages. He raises the matter of whether the biblical documents, which the authors of the *Hodayot* used in their compositions, possess a significance at all in themselves or whether the significance derives from when texts were first placed in a definite historical context. Stated another way, Holm-Nielsen asks if the expressions were simply suitable for giving the mood of the poem as the intention of the present author. While these questions are, to a large extent, rhetorical, they provide the opportunity for Holm-Nielsen to differentiate further between the use of a biblical document in *pesharim*, where the use is there conditioned by history, and the *Hodayot* where theology is in mind.<sup>54</sup> The expressions and words of psalm literature should be taken first as abstract rather than concrete, as illustrations and symbols rather than portrayals of historical occurrences.

From a 'technical viewpoint' Holm-Nielsen notes that among the books of the 'Old Testament', the *Hodayot* uses some books more than others. The biblical psalms are clearly the most often used tradition in the *Hodayot*, but their use there is not always transparent. It is not always possible to determine which text the author is referring to and some usages may be indirect. The author could be unconsciously quoting or using a biblical source, a phenomenon noted previously. Holm-Nielsen

---

<sup>53</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 305.

identifies Psalm 104 as a particularly important Psalm that is used with a frequency that is indicative of its popularity. Other Psalms that have portrayals of misery are also quite popular (e.g. Ps 22, 31, 42).<sup>55</sup> Outside of the Psalms, prophetic books, mainly Isaiah, rank second in importance. Outside of a few rare examples, the hymns do not use biblical narratives. This is due to the nature of the composition, its purpose clearly is not to admonish or indoctrinate but form poetic expressions of thanksgiving and lament in regard to those who keep the Law and those who do not.<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, Genesis 1-3 stands out as important in the *Hodayot* for use of portraying humanity as corrupt in the present world. The community, in its use of Genesis 1-3, understands itself as existing as a 'reincarnation of the paradise of old'.<sup>57</sup>

Holm-Nielsen describes two types of hymns that use biblical sources differently. First, there are hymns that have close contact with the community in a 'technical' way. The use of biblical sources by these hymns is more sporadic and haphazard. The second type is those psalms which concern themselves with the experience of the individual within the community. In the first category it is possible to speak of 'standard quotations' (e.g. Ps 2, Is 28.11, Hos 14.14). In the second category the use of biblical sources is less consistent between the hymns and they have less in common.<sup>58</sup>

In his concluding remarks on the *Hodayot's* use of biblical sources Holm-Nielsen states that the authors were quite free in their use of the sources. It is clear that terminology that had an origin in biblical sources was being used in the daily life of the community. Holm-Nielsen is not convinced, however, that there is evidence that the authors availed themselves of anthologies or testimonies due to the widely

---

<sup>54</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 306.

<sup>55</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 309.

<sup>56</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 311.

<sup>57</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 312.

divergent nature of 'Old Testament' usage. If anthologies had been employed it would be expected that some combinations of biblical sources would reoccur. The *Hodayot*, then, should be considered an independent working of the Old Testament by authors who had good knowledge of it.<sup>59</sup>

Holm-Nielsen does not formulate guidelines by which the use of biblical traditions can be identified, but clearly articulates important questions to ask of a document that employs non-explicit biblical sources. For instance, are suspect non-explicit citations in *Musar leMevin* dependant on more than one biblical passage? To what extent does the author of *Musar leMevin* pay to the context of the biblical source? Is the author of *Musar leMevin* extracting texts from a biblical source or simply applying a terminology that was current in the community and drawn in the distant past from the Bible? Similarities and issues raised by the *Hodayot* serve to place *Musar leMevin*'s use of biblical sources in parallel with a relative document.

In the process of seeking to define terminology that is both accurate and descriptive of an author's use of biblical traditions, Bonnie Kittel's excursus on this topic is well-worth examining.<sup>60</sup> In her evaluation of Holm-Nielsen's work, Kittel criticises Holm-Nielsen's use of inaccurate terminology in referring to biblical citations. When identifying a 'quotation' it is imperative to define what, exactly, constitutes a 'quotation' of a biblical tradition in Early Jewish literature. In the case of Holm-Nielsen's terminology the phrases 'allusion to,' 'derived from,' and 'inspired by' are intermingled in his observations of biblical traditions and the composition of the *Hodayot*. Whereas Holm-Nielsen, according to Kittel, views the psalms of the *Hodayot* as 'mosaics of Old Testament quotations', she rightly views the psalms as original compositions which imitated biblical style and idiom.

---

<sup>58</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, pp. 313-14.

This conflict between the technique of the author(s) of the *Hodayot* in using biblical traditions provides the impetus for an examination by Kittel of Holm-Nielsen and Carmignac's terminology and use of the word 'quotation'. In the first of four observations she states that most 'quotations' consist of only one or two words and often the words quoted in the *Hodayot* appear in different parts of the verse cited. Second, both Holm-Nielsen and Carmignac admit frequently that among these one and two word quotations the context and meaning of the words often change considerably. Third, it is often the case that a 'quotation' is actually a reoccurring biblical idiom that cannot be identified with any one particular chapter and verse. Finally, the 'quotations' conjugate the verb 'quoted' differently in the *Hodayot* than biblical tradition and form varying syntactical relationships as well. Kittel concludes these four observations by disqualifying Holm-Nielsen and Carmignac's identifications of 'quotations' as inaccurate since a 'quotation' is generally understood to be the repetition of a passage verbatim.

These criticisms of the identification of 'quotations' by Kittel produce a need to define more clearly not only the term 'quotation,' but also the use of Hebrew Bible in the *Hodayot* in ways other than might be termed 'quotation'. More generally, Kittel's discussion of 'quotations' and 'allusions' is relevant not only for the document the *Hodayot* but also, more generally, for Early Jewish literature. The following observations will help delineate between 'quotations' and 'allusions' in *Musar leMevin*. Kittel analyses biblical idioms in the *Hodayot* (2.20-30) and differentiates between four usages of borrowing from the biblical sources. First, a 'quotation' or 'allusion' is used to recall a particular passage to the addressee(s). Second, literary forms from the Hebrew Bible are imitated by the use of standardised

---

<sup>59</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, p. 315.

phrases in the appropriate places. Third, within certain genres or theological motifs characteristic imagery and metaphor can be identified. Finally, it is often the case that thoughts are expressed in a manner consistent with biblical language and terminology.

Kittel states that it is not possible to assign every phrase of a psalm into one of the above four categories. However, these categories serve to differentiate between the classifications 'quotation' and 'original material'. While she elaborates on issues specific to the language of the *Hodayot*, she also addresses the identification of 'allusions' in the paragraphs that follow. 'Quotations,' by definition, must consist of several words and appear with little variation from the original, but 'allusions' are a much broader category. The term 'allusion' may be used to refer to a 'loose quotation' or to a 'veiled hint'. An 'allusion,' states Kittel, must refer to a single passage and the context and meaning should, within her study of the *Hodayot*, 'converge on a single text' or must have 'incomplete convergence reinforced by surrounding references to the same passage'.

Kittel provides two examples of allusions to illustrate her principles. The first allusion she identifies as וַחֲשֹׁךְ בַּעֲדַי which is an expression that occurs in the *Hodayot* (2.21) and Job 1.10 (שָׂכַח בַּעֲדַי). The identification of this first allusion is made using the criteria that Kittel describes as an usage that 'converges on a single text'. The idiom occurs three times elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, once in the root סָךְ, meaning 'to hedge up' or more generally indicates the obstructing of something. Only in Job 1.10 is שָׂךְ used in the sense of protecting something (i.e. God has 'hedged up' Job from evil) and is therefore a unique use of the idiom in the Hebrew Bible. In the *Hodayot* (2.21) the author thanks God for protecting or 'hedging me up' from death, thus employing the idiom with the same distinct meaning as Job 1.10. Though

---

<sup>60</sup> B. P. Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran* (SBLDS 50; Scholars Press, 1981) pp. 48-52.

different pronominal suffixes are used and שׁוֹךְ is conjugated differently, Kittel argues that this is an allusion to the Job passage since the idiom is used with the same distinct meaning and similar context. The second illustration of an allusion identified by Kittel occurs in the *Hodayot* (7.6-25). The identification of this second allusion is made using the criterion that Kittel described as ‘incomplete convergence reinforced by surrounding references to the same passage’. Several expressions in the hymn seem to indicate a use of Zechariah 3 where Joshua the High Priest is the subject. There is, states Kittel, an ‘incomplete convergence’ (i.e. it does not fit the criteria of the former allusion): some idioms are changed slightly and some use different meanings than those found in Zechariah 3. The proposed allusions in the hymn are scattered throughout and leave some doubts as to the veracity of the identification. However, she argues, the number of references and sufficient contextual indications show that Zechariah 3 is ‘certainly’ in the background of the author’s thought.

Thus Kittel provides two ways of identifying allusions. The first type of allusion is one that converges on a single text but does not conjugate words identically, however, it does use a *similar distinct meaning* and *similar context*. The second type of allusion is one that does not converge on a single text, but *surrounding references to the same passage reinforce it*. Further, the number of suspect allusions and contextual indications within the document verify the certainty of an allusion.

Kittel’s definition and identification of an allusion is strict and precise. However, while her caution is warranted and criteria helpful, much more can be said about the probability of an occurrence of a non-explicit use of a tradition. The two types of allusions delineated here are measured by standards that mark allusions of greater certainty, but the application of a broader number of guidelines may allow a measure of greater probability and sustainable speculation.

## 2.5) George J. Brooke: Biblical Interpretation in Qumran Wisdom Texts

George Brooke has recently published a cogent article on 'Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran'.<sup>61</sup> Since in his article an attempt is made at developing accurate and descriptive terminology, Brooke's identification of particular uses of 'Scripture' in sapiential documents is helpful. While Brooke does not address terminology specifically, he does discuss genres and methodologies of various sapiential works represented among the Dead Sea documents. Brooke's aim is not so much to develop a precise terminology or criteria by which to discuss or identify allusions as it is to speak of the use of biblical sources generally. In his discussion, identification of allusions are taken somewhat for granted. Nonetheless, for reasons that become clear below Brooke's work provides an appropriate beginning for the discussion of the use of biblical sources in *Musar leMevin*.

Brooke singles out five ways in which scriptural traditions are used in the relation to various genres and they are as follows: (1) wisdom as biblical poetry, (2) wisdom as halakhah, (3) wisdom as parenesis, (4) wisdom as narrative exegesis, and (5) wisdom as *peshet*. At points in his presentation the term 'allusory' is used in regard to the use of biblical sources, but Brooke does not address issues of defining or adjudicating the likelihood of an 'allusion'. In his discussion of these different usages Brooke cites examples that are nearly explicit citations (e.g. 'honour your father and mother' in 4Q416 2 ii 21) as well as non-explicit uses of scripture (e.g. 'Enosh/enosh' and 'Seth/Sheth' in 4Q417 2 i 16). In the cases of discussions regarding the non-explicit, Brooke does not have a developed methodology for locating the referent or significance of an allusion.

---

<sup>61</sup> G. J. Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' pp. 201-20.

In Brooke's first category, *wisdom as biblical poetry*, he addresses the 'atomistic' character of poetical presentations of wisdom in sapiential documents from Qumran. In the case of these compositions there is rarely an 'overall grand narrative' or 'systematic ethic'. Within this genre, writes Brooke, the primary use of biblical sources is in the form of 'allusory anthologisation' of biblical traditions. The author may select from a number of sources, at times unaware of the source, and create a new arrangement. This particular explanation by Brooke is reminiscent of Holm-Nielsen's description of the psalms of the *Hodayot* noted above. According to Brooke, the hearers or readers were not required to be able to identify the sources of each phrase, but some would certainly have discerned what was taking place. What takes place, generally, is that new compositions have been formed from 'old favourites'. Brooke's description of such compositions is presumably similar to the view that Kittel criticises when she speaks of scholars who have a 'low view of the creativity and originality of the poet [of the *Hodayot*] who modelled his work so clearly after biblical compositions'.<sup>62</sup> Whatever the case may be, it is the category of non-explicit tradition within the category of poetry that is the most difficult to identify and substantiate.

Brooke cites as an example of the above 'allusory anthologisation' in the use of Qohelet in the *Book of Mysteries* (4Q299-301). Armin Lange is here credited for observing this use of Qohelet within *Mysteries* where phrases of Qohelet are 'alluded to' or where phrases are 'reused' in *Mysteries* as a 'citation' while passages are 'not repeated verbatim'.<sup>63</sup> The terms 'alluded,' 'reused,' and 'citation' in this context are used loosely by Brooke. The term 'citation' is generally understood to mean explicit usage and verbatim presentation of a portion of a biblical tradition. The term 'reused'

---

<sup>62</sup> Kittel, *Hymns*, p. 48.



may mean that a tradition is presented verbatim in a new context or could perhaps mean a narrative or concept is rewritten. Brooke concludes from this example of Qohelet's use in *Mysteries* that 'the language of the scriptural source is reworked into the new composition in an appropriate way'. Brooke then cites Lange's example of such a usage in Qohelet 6.8-11 in 1Q27 1 ii line 3 and Qohelet 5.5 in 1Q27 6, lines 2-3.

In Brooke's second category, *wisdom as halakhah*, the use of some biblical traditions in contexts where life instruction occurs can be regarded as halakhic exegesis. Halakhic wisdom is described as taking two forms. The first form is described as an imitation of biblical models that applies various principles from Torah, or scripture generally, and not specific and individual rulings or statutes. The second form of halakhic wisdom takes individual rulings from the Torah and interprets it. Brooke provides three examples of the second category all of which are important to discuss as they are taken from *Musar leMevin*.

The first example of a halakhic use of scripture is from 4Q416 2 ii line 21 where it reads 'and also do not curse the vessel of your bosom'.<sup>64</sup> Following Strugnell, Brooke seeks to view this passage as extending the positive commandment of the Decalogue, 'honour your father and mother,' to include one's wife. Brooke notes that most legal interpretations of this type are formed with two passages juxtaposed and asks the question whether this is so in *Musar leMevin*. Brooke proposes the possibility that the occurrence of the phrase 'wife of your bosom' in a context where one's wife is listed with a number of relations (excluding parents) who could lead the addressee into idolatry. The phrase 'wife of your bosom' occurs in Deuteronomy 13.7 and 28.54 in a context where a disobedient man denies food to his

---

<sup>63</sup> Lange, 'In Diskussion,' pp. 125-26.

brother, wife and children. Brooke notices that the only relative in this context that is not a blood relation is the wife and that *Musar leMevin* (4Q416 2 ii 21) contains a legal interpretation that rules one should honour his wife similarly among these relations.<sup>65</sup>

The second example of a halakhic use of a biblical source is in 4Q418 103 ii lines 7-9 where it reads 'Lest it form something of mixed kinds like a mule, And (lest) thou become as one who we[ars *sha'atnez*], made of wool and flax, And (lest) thy toil be like (that of) one who plo[ughs] with ox and a[s]s [to]geth[er], And (lest) moreover thy crops b[e for thee like] (those of) one who sows diverse kinds, and of one who takes the seed and the full *growth* and the yi[eld of] the [vineyard *together*], to be set apa[rt (for the sanctuary)]'.<sup>66</sup> Brooke views this passage as the juxtaposition of two biblical verses to form a legal understanding of different kinds of mixtures. The first scriptural passage that 4Q418 103 ii lines 7-9 use is Leviticus 19.19 which reads, 'You will not let your animals breed with a different kind; you will not sow your field with two kinds of seed; nor will you put on a garment made of two different materials'. The second passage that Brooke envisages as juxtaposed to Leviticus is Deuteronomy 22.9, 'You will not sow your vineyard with a second kind of seed, or the whole yield will have to be forfeited, both the crop that you have sown and the yield of the vineyard itself'.

Brooke's third example of a halakhic use of 'Scripture' is from 4Q416 2 iv lines 6-9 where it is read, 'Over her spirit he has set you in authority so that she should walk in your good pleasure, and let her not make numerous vows and votive offerings; turn her spirit to your good pleasure. And every oath-binding on her, to vow a vow, annul it according to a (mere) utterance of your mouth; and at your good

---

<sup>64</sup> See Brooke's fourth category below (§4.2).

pleasure restrain her from performing [...].<sup>67</sup> This passage from *Musar leMevin* is understood by Brooke to be a simplification and clarification of a more extensive one on vows from Numbers 30.6-15. In *Damascus Document* 16.10-12 a passage very similar to 4Q416 2 iv lines 6-9 occurs and uses Numbers similarly. Brooke identifies the referent of *Musar leMevin* and Damascus Document in the statement, 'In general the biblical basis for this advice to the husband... is to be found in Num 30.6-15'. While this is true, it is limited in its scope of defining and locating a possible history of traditions for a non-explicit usage such as this. Further work of identifying biblical traditions in *Musar leMevin* is needed.

Brooke's third category, *wisdom as parenesis*, is a category that uses historical circumstances recorded in 'Scripture' for the purpose of exhortation. Brooke describes two ways such references are usually made: (1) as markers that give the reader a sense of identity (e.g. 4Q185 i 13-15 'remember the miracles he performed in Egypt') and (2) as primary examples used to encourage a particular way of behavior in the audience.

Brooke's fourth category, *wisdom as narrative exegesis*, is the most relevant category for the present discussion as we seek to develop language to address *Musar leMevin's* use of traditions. Brooke defines this use of Scripture as one that, 'is not explicit, but depends upon the hearer's or reader's assumed ability to locate the resonances of the instruction as based in the authoritative traditions known elsewhere'.<sup>68</sup> The following discussion is important not only because it addresses the issue of the non-explicit use of traditions, but also echoes specifically of Genesis 2-3.

Brooke provides three examples of Genesis echoes in *Musar leMevin*. The first is

---

<sup>65</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' pp. 209-10.

<sup>66</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 210.

<sup>67</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 211.

<sup>68</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 212.

found in 4Q416 2 iii 20-iv line 5 where phrases such as ‘helpmeet of your flesh,’ ‘from her mother He has separated her,’ ‘she will become for you one flesh,’ and ‘she is the flesh of your nakedness’ appear.<sup>69</sup> Brooke does not elaborate upon a standard used for determining the clear allusions to Genesis 2.24 and 3.16 in the above lines (certainly it would be difficult to disagree with the identification) which is, as he says, ‘readily apparent’. However, this passage illustrates the difficulty in identifying less apparent allusions and their referents. In Brooke’s second category, wisdom as halakhah, the following phrase is identified with Deuteronomy 13.7 and 28.54 (discussed also above), ‘...do not curse the vessel of your bosom,’ (4Q416 2 ii 21). In light of the phrase ‘wife of your bosom’ here in 4Q416 iv line 5, it seems likely that ‘vessel of your bosom’ in 4Q416 2 ii line 21 could be alluding to a Genesis tradition rather than a Deuteronomy tradition. The purpose of this observation is to highlight the importance of adjudicating the likelihood of an allusion and the possibility of alluding to multiple traditions in one complex.

Brooke’s second example of wisdom as narrative exegesis is from 4Q417 2 i line 16 which contains significant phrases such as ‘children of Seth/Sheth,’ ‘Vision of Hagu,’ and ‘inheritance to Enosh/enosh’.<sup>70</sup> Brooke justifies a reading of ‘Enosh’ in these lines as the antediluvian figure of Enosh as opposed to ‘mankind’ in stating, ‘Enosh was son of Seth’.<sup>71</sup> The identification of the allusion in 4Q417 2 i may be correct, and will be considered extensively in a later chapter, but this reading is far from certain. The third example provided by Brooke is from these same lines and is the identification of the ‘Book of Memorial’ with Malachi 3.16-18 where a book of remembrance is mentioned in an eschatological context.

---

<sup>69</sup> Brooke, ‘Biblical Interpretation,’ p. 212.

<sup>70</sup> Brooke, ‘Biblical Interpretation,’ p. 212-13.

<sup>71</sup> Brooke, ‘Biblical Interpretation,’ p. 212-13.

The fifth category, *wisdom as pesher*, is almost a non-category for wisdom documents, as no biblical source is ever explicitly cited and then interpreted in a *pesher* style in a known composition.<sup>72</sup> However, Brooke does suggest that the *רו נהיה* that occurs in *Musar leMevin* and the *Book of Mysteries* is similar or suggestive of a *pesher* interpretation. While the *רו נהיה* almost certainly does not refer to scripture, it is a tradition like the Torah that is available to all and is used similarly to Torah in some instances. Whether or not this view of the *רו נהיה* has validity will be addressed at a later point.

These categorisations by Brooke highlight more specifically the four ways that biblical sources are being used in *Musar leMevin*. Three of the categories (narrative, halakhah, and parenesis) represent a usage that is at times explicit or at least more clearly allusions than the category of wisdom as biblical poetry. The relevance of developing criteria for adjudication is most clearly seen when attempting to locate non-explicit use of tradition in the category of poetry.

## 2.6) Synthesis of Approaches and Criteria for *Musar leMevin*

Several basic observations emerge from the preceding analysis of the study of non-explicit citations. Especially useful is Dimant's use of the expression 'free narrative'. Using the book of Tobit as an example of this type of allusion, she has demonstrated an independent reworking of a tradition which employs a sequence of motifs that suggest Job was used as a model throughout the book. The 'referential value' occurs in the number of coincidental motifs and terms between two texts. Dimant's category of 'free narrative' is helpful for considering *Musar leMevin's* non-explicit use of traditions, especially Genesis 1-3. When one conceives of the possibility of a 'free narrative' use of Genesis 1-3 in *Musar leMevin*, criteria that

---

<sup>72</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 9.

focus, for instance, on lexical and syntactical overlaps are placed within a broader category. If a running allusion to Genesis 1-3 can be established in *Musar leMevin*, then the likelihood of suspected non-explicit citations may be argued with greater certainty.<sup>73</sup>

The contributions by Hays, Allison, Dimant, Holm-Nielsen and Kittel for developing a method and criteria for identifying the occurrence of non-explicit traditions all overlap to some extent. The following is a compiled adaptation of these criteria that are applicable to the document *Musar leMevin*, with certain nuances changed where appropriate. Suggested criteria that are difficult to apply for the identification of non-explicit traditions in *Musar leMevin* are discussed following these categories.

#### *Categories For Identification:*

- 1) Accessibility. The author(s) had access to the source both in terms of the practical and chronological. Understanding the significance of other sources and *Musar leMevin's* knowledge and relation to those sources has at present only begun.
- 2) Vocabulary and Syntax. The suspect non-explicit tradition shares specific and significant vocabulary or syntactical patterns with the proposed referent.
- 3) Imagery and Motifs. The more distinctive the imagery/motif of a suspect non-explicit tradition, when similar but not precise vocabulary or syntax occur, and similarly unique imagery/motif occurs in a biblical source the likelihood increases.
- 4) Literary Context. Proven significance of a tradition established elsewhere in a document lends credibility to less pronounced occurrences that may be employing imagery without specific vocabulary shared with the referent. This is both a criterion of recurrence and volume.
- 5) Similar Tradition(s). The occurrence of similar but more conclusive occurrence(s) in (an)other document(s) establishes a greater likelihood of the occurrence of a non-explicit tradition. Precedence elsewhere enhances probability here.

As these criteria show, not all the points made by Hays may be deemed equally relevant.<sup>74</sup> Several of Hays' criteria proposed present difficulties when

---

<sup>73</sup> In commenting upon Hays' criterion of 'Recurrence' for the identification of allusions/echoes Shum writes: 'the more specific a quotation from an earlier source-writing, the more significant the evidence that it provides in determining whether the document's author consciously had knowledge of that source-writing when composing her/his work'; in Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah*, p. 8.

<sup>74</sup> Shum, *Paul's Use of Isaiah*, p. 10, concludes that he can only accept three of Hays' criteria: volume, recurrence, and thematic coherence. He writes that 'availability and ... historical plausibility, though useful, are not always workable, and that both involve a high degree of conjecture... As for the criteria of the history of interpretation and satisfaction, our verdict is this: they are much less useful than

applied to *Musar leMevin*. First is his category of 'thematic coherence' which, though not to be rejected altogether, should be used with caution. Under this heading Hays poses questions such as: (1) does the alleged echo fit into the developing argument; (2) is the meaning consonant with other quotations in the same letter and other letters of the author; and (3) do the images and ideas proposed by the precursor text illuminate the argument? This criterion does not fit with the composition *Musar leMevin* for two basic reasons: (1) the document even after reconstruction is far too fragmentary and incomplete and the general 'argument' is unknown; and (2) we do not have other documents known to have been written by this author.<sup>75</sup> The third question asked may be applicable but should be applied with caution. Perhaps 'thematic coherence', as suggested by Hays, has merit but will be a far less useful criterion here due to the poor state of preservation of *Musar leMevin* as well as the document's relative obscurity.

Hays also considers the category of 'historical plausibility' asking the questions: (1) could the author have alleged the meaning effect, (2) and could the reader have understood it? Again, knowledge of the author(s) of *Musar leMevin* is provided only by what may be deduced from the document itself. While the implied author's plausible intent can be explored, one should bear in mind the limitations and conflicting historical contexts in which various scholars place *Musar leMevin* (e.g. is the author estranged from the temple? What is the relationship between *I Enoch* and *Musar leMevin*?). While a number of general things may be assumed about the intended reader(s) of *Musar leMevin* (i.e. a relative placement within Judaism), the

---

expected, and cannot be taken as appropriate testing for the examination of alleged allusions or echoes'.

<sup>75</sup> Also to be noted is that *Musar leMevin* is thought to have existed in more than one form with some columns extant in one manuscript while not in another (e.g. 4Q417 1 i and 4Q416 1 i). Questions regarding authorship of some or all of *Musar leMevin* remain.



location of the addressee in a specific theological environment is not as specific as one would desire when applying this criterion.

The 'history of interpretation' is another criterion employed by Hays. The question asked under this heading is: have other readers (either critical or pre-critical) attested to a similar interpretation? In the case of *Musar leMevin*, a previously unknown document, it could only be asked whether there is any consensus among a small handful of scholars who agree with the identification of a particular reading. In general, there is no significant history of interpretation behind *Musar leMevin*.

Although previously discussed, Hays' appeal to 'satisfaction' remains difficult, but not so difficult that it should be disregarded. Hays asks the following questions: (1) does the reading make sense; (2) does the reading illuminate the surrounding discourse; and (3) does the reading produce a satisfying account for the reader? At risk of being pedantic, this begs the question of the intent of the author's use of a suspected non-explicit occurrence; therefore, such a criterion hardly seems a category for adjudicating the likelihood of an occurrence. Also, proposed variant readings (e.g. 4Q417 1 i and the interpretation of 'Sheth' and 'Enosh') may convince different scholars to a greater and lesser extent. While 'satisfaction' should be entertained and considered when attempting to locate the referent of a non-explicit citation it can hardly be used to determine the referent. Perhaps it should fairly be stated that when a reading openly conflicts with the surrounding context, and creates dissatisfaction, a particular reading can be dismissed.

The discussion surrounding intertextual occurrences in the documents of early Judaism and nascent Christianity is most often in reference to the explicit use of biblical sources. It is helpful to distinguish between the terms 'quotation' and 'allusion' and attempt to be as specific as possible in using each of these terms. The



contributions of some of the above scholars in defining 'allusion' has led to a greater precision for determining intertextual resonances. A critical evaluation and adoption of these various methodologies will be valuable when applied to the document *Musar leMevin*. Dimant's definition of the term 'allusion' (see §2.3 above) is appropriate for application in the proceeding address of non-explicit citations in *Musar leMevin*. Less helpful may be an attempt to delineate between the terms 'allusion' and 'echo'. As previously mentioned, Hays explains the use of these terms as representing intertextual occurrences that range from explicit ('quotation') to less/non-explicit ('allusion' and 'echo').<sup>76</sup> The term 'echo' implies a two-way resonance of an intertextual occurrence while 'allusion' only a one-way. Such a delineation in the case of *Musar leMevin* is irrelevant and in the discussions that follow non-explicit citations will simply be referred to by the term 'allusion'.

## 2.7) Conclusion

The relevance of the study of Genesis 1-3 creation traditions in *Musar leMevin* will quickly become apparent. Manuscripts 4Q416 1 and 4Q417 1 i have each been assigned to the beginning of 4QInstruction, given the different content of these fragments, it is thought that they represent divergent recensions of the same document. In the case of 4Q417 1 i such a hypothesis may never be substantiated. However, 4Q416 1 - 2 almost certainly represent the opening columns of 4Q416.<sup>77</sup> In the case of 4Q417 1 i and 4Q416 1 - 2 there are a number of explicit and possible non-explicit usages of Genesis 1-3 creation traditions. Also notable is 4Q423 which explicitly and possibly non-explicitly uses Genesis 1-3 traditions and likely stands

---

<sup>76</sup> For Hays, the term 'allusion' is used of obvious intertextual references and 'echo' of subtler references; however, it should be questioned whether this delineation serves to clarify occurrences or further obfuscate the identification of non-explicit uses of traditions.

<sup>77</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 73; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 191-93.

near the end of the document.<sup>78</sup> Elsewhere in the document, as noted above, other identifiable uses of Genesis 1-3 occur. The importance of Genesis for *Musar leMevin* is thus not questioned, rather the extent to which the tradition was used and the degree of its influence on the document has yet to be explored fully. The probability that the document began with creation motifs and then continued this theme through to the latter portion of the composition should raise questions regarding the role of the theme elsewhere in the document.

The purpose of establishing preliminary guidelines for approaching and discussing the occurrence of non-explicit traditions elsewhere has been to establish a framework within which to determine the use of Genesis 1-3 traditions throughout *Musar leMevin*. The identification and adjudication of a non-explicit use of a Genesis tradition may hold insights into how sapiential themes were formulated throughout the document. It is already understood that cosmological and anthropological concepts owe dependence, to varying degrees, to a tradition that extends back to Genesis. By exploring some of these more certain themes and identifying suspect allusions to Genesis 1-3 it is hoped a fuller picture of the theology of *Musar leMevin* will be understood.

---

<sup>78</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 505; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 169.

### **3) Identifying and Adjudicating Allusions to Genesis 1-3 Traditions**

#### **3.1) Introduction**

This chapter explores a number of fragments of *Musar leMevin* which may or may not contain an allusion to traditions related to Genesis 1-3. Once identified some might be grouped according to similar themes and motifs and expanded upon in the chapters to follow. Others might simply be noted as containing an allusion, thereby substantiating the significance of creation traditions in the document, with little more comment outside of their identification and adjudication here. In general, if it can be displayed that *Musar leMevin* contains a type of running allusion to Genesis creation traditions, or at least repeatedly turns in allusion to traditions stemming from Genesis, the overall likelihood of more contestable allusions might be made more certain.

The preceding chapter on methodology attempted to develop the conversation surrounding the identification of non-explicit uses of literary traditions for the chapters to follow. This was done in order to be transparent in the difficulties posed in arguing for an allusion as well as to suggest criteria that might aid in adjudicating the likelihood of an allusion. In this chapter the criteria adopted and developed there will be used, however, not in a formulaic manner. In other words, some language and assumptions will be evident based upon chapter two, but the process of arguing for an allusion will not conclude with a list of criteria that match the allusion to a given passage. It will be evident, for instance, that the criterion of shared vocabulary and syntax or literary context is being used without having to note it explicitly. Finally, the chapters that follow this chapter will attempt to organise allusions in a more thematic manner, which will further serve to demonstrate allusions (chapters 4 and 5). While this chapter simply identifies

allusions based upon the general criteria adopted in chapter two, chapters four and five will examine how these allusion relate to one another and their influence on various theological themes. The issues raised in chapter one (רִיכוּת, the language of 'rich' and 'poor', angelology, and anthropology) may be elucidated by conceptions of creation and serve as a way forward in resolving unanswered questions.

A brief physical description of the fragments is provided as well as a transcription of relevant lines.<sup>1</sup> If the use of Genesis traditions in *Musar leMevin* proves to provide any structure for the document this physical description will lay the groundwork for possible location of fragments. Placement of fragments in the reconstructions of Elgvin, Steudel and Lucassen (S/L), and Tigchelaar are provided in the introduction of each fragment. However, detailed explications of selected lines and their relationship to the document as a whole will be reserved for the following chapters.

The organisation of the discussion in this chapter follows the numerical designation and sequencing of the fragments as found in DJD 34. The reasons for this ordering are: (1) it facilitates a more objective approach that allows allusions to emerge from the fragments; and (2) serves as a resource that might be easily referred to in following chapters as opposed to a thematic grouping.

### **3.2) Presentation of Fragments**

#### **3.2.1) 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii**

Fragments 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii consist of nine lines that are preserved with the centre of the column destroyed. The margins on both the left (2 i) and right (1 ii) are preserved

---

<sup>1</sup> Transcriptions of *Musar leMevin* in chapter three are taken from DJD XXXIV unless otherwise indicated. Translations are mine.

but neither the top nor bottom remain. These fragments are unaccounted for in the reconstructions of Elgvin, S/L and Tigchelaar.

Fragment 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii preserves several words that seem to reflect an agricultural sense<sup>2</sup> that may stem from a paraphrase of the Garden of Eden account in Genesis 1-3. Lines 5-6 are written in the second and third person and appear to be exhortations or warnings. Lines 8-9 describe the rebirth or regularity of the seasonal cycle. Thus the fragments maintain in content a use of imagery from nature throughout.

ב עולם /זרע	יכה ]	4) ב [ ]
כ]יא לוא ימוש זרעכה		5) קודשכה לוא]
א וחשיש פרי		6) מנחלת]
נדיבים [		7) [ ]
לכו]ל קצים יפרח		8) [ ]
ם והתחדש		9) [ ]

- 4) in [ ] your [ ] . . . eternity, seed of  
 5) your holiness not[ ] or your seed will not be removed  
 6) from the inheritance of [ ] . . . And rejoice in the fruit  
 7) [ ] . . . nobles  
 8) [ at al] times it will blossom  
 9) [ ] and be renewed

The agricultural terms זרע and פרי appear within close proximity in Genesis 1.11, 1.12 and 1.29 and only appear together again in Leviticus 27.30. The suggestion that this fragment reflects the use of the Genesis creation narrative may be made not only on the basis of vocabulary from Genesis 1-3 but also on the basis of forms in other fragments of the document that preserve more certain allusions. Most importantly, 4Q423 1, 2 i clearly paraphrases the Garden of Eden account and may suggest that some agricultural imagery in *Musar leMevin* is used in a metaphorical sense (see §3.2.15 below).

One might also note similarities that occur between 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii and the *Book of Watchers* 5.1-4 where it reads:

Observe how the verdant trees are covered with leaves and they bear fruit. Pay attention concerning all things and know in what manner he fashioned them. All of them belong to him who lives forever. His work proceeds and progresses from year to year. And all his work prospers and obeys him, and it does not change; but everything functions in the way in which God has ordered it.<sup>3</sup>

Like *Book of Watchers* 5.1ff. 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii appears to conceive of the regularity of nature and seasons: (1) in line 5 we read that seed will not be removed; (2) in line 8 that something (seed or fruit?) will sprout in every period or season; and (3) in line 9 that it will be 'renewed'. The opening column of *Musar leMevin*, 4Q416 1 discussed below, also reflects this theme.

Other possible hints of creation traditions in this fragment: (1) line 6 contains the words וְחִשֵּׁשׁ פְּרִי ('rejoice in the fruit'). Negative connotations associated with eating from the tree of knowledge are not necessarily envisaged in *Musar leMevin*, but rather the ability to differentiate between good and evil appears to have positive connotations (cf. 4Q423 1, 2 i 7). The idea that one rejoices in the fruit could be identified with a positive conception of gaining knowledge after eating the fruit.<sup>4</sup> (2) The occurrence of the term 'eternal' followed immediately by 'seed' (l. 4) might be associated with the phrase 'eternal planting' (4Q418 81 + 81a 13) a term which could itself allude to Genesis 1-3. (3) The terms 'inheritance', 'eternal' and 'nobles' in this fragment each suggest the possibility that more than straightforward agricultural matters (alone?) are being discussed. The term 'inheritance', as Murphy discusses, is used metaphorically within

---

<sup>2</sup> One might consider reading 'your seed' in the sense of 'your offspring' ('children'), however, the surviving context would indicate an agricultural usage of the term 'seed'.

<sup>3</sup> Translation by E. Isaac in J. H. Charlesworth (eds.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1 (New York: Doubleday, 1983) pp. 14-15. See also critical additions by M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970) pp. 20-21; and M. A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) pp. 8-10.

<sup>4</sup> It is evident on the basis of 4Q423 1, 2 and Sirach 17.7 that a sapiential tradition existed that conceived of the eating of the tree of knowledge as entirely positive.

the document.<sup>5</sup> As briefly discussed in chapter one, and to be discussed in greater detail in chapter 4, the term 'noble' may be a term that is not used simply for a class of the wealthy.<sup>6</sup>

On account of the degree to which 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii is fragmentary, it is impossible to draw any certain correlation between it and the Genesis creation narrative. Both words זרע and פרי are extremely common,<sup>7</sup> both in the Hebrew Bible and other Early Jewish literature, though they occur rarely in such close proximity.<sup>8</sup> If a compelling case can be made for a running allusion to a Genesis 1-3 tradition in *Musar leMevin* the likelihood of this fragment resonating such a tradition increases.

### 3.2.2) 4Q415 2 ii

Fragment 4Q415 2 ii is the second column of fragment 4Q415 2, and thus follows the fragmentary text just discussed. This column survives in nine lines with only the right margin intact and neither top nor bottom remaining. The text and the material it preserves are unaccounted for in the reconstructions of Elgvin, S/L and Tigchelaar.

The column below is addressed to one who is identified in the second person feminine singular. This unusual occurrence of a female addressee is highly significant and will be discussed in detail in chapter 5. Line one exhorts a woman to honour someone like a father. In lines 2 and 4 the woman addressed is exhorted not to 'remove' or 'reject' a covenant. Line 8 could be read as a good wife being praised by men. Lines

<sup>5</sup> Murphy, *Wealth*, pp. 173-74.

<sup>6</sup> It is likely that the addressee is called a נדיב and 'poor' (4Q418 177); elsewhere he is seated among the נדיבים (4Q416 2 iii 11). This term may be used at times to correlate the addressee with the angels, a relationship that it can be argued is derived from an allusion to Gen 1.26 in 4Q417 1 i 15-18. Therefore, the occurrence of the term 'noble' (5x in *Musar leMevin*) in this column could relate indirectly to creation.

<sup>7</sup> In the Hebrew Bible פרי occurs 197x and זרע 403x.

<sup>8</sup> The terms פרי and זרע occur in the same context 3x in Gen 1; elsewhere 1x in Lev 27.30; 2 Kgs 19.29; Is 37.30; Zech 8.12; Ps 21.11; and 107.37. In the DSS they do not occur together and in other Early Jewish literature see 4 Ezra 4.29-30; and 8.5.

7 and 9 address the origin, presumably, of the female addressee although nothing indicates this syntactically in line 9.

- (1) כאב כבדי ]
- (2) אל תמישי בלבבך וע]
- (3) כול היום ובחיקו בר]
- (4) פן תפרעי ברית קודש]
- (5) ואויבת לנפשך וב]
- (6) א[שה עד לש]
- (7) בבית מכו[רוחך] ובבריתך ת]
- (8) תהלה [ ] י כל אנשים ]
- (9) [ ] ל[ ] מבית מולדים ]

- 1) Like a father honour [
- 2) do not return/remove your heart [
- 3) all the day/continually, and in his bosom [
- 4) lest you ignore a holy covenant [
- 5) and one hated by your soul [
- 6) [ ] a w[i]fe<sup>9</sup> (?) until [
- 7) in the house of yo[ur origins] and in your covenant[
- 8) a praise [ ] all men[
- 9) from the time of birth<sup>10</sup> [

The vocabulary in this column does not suggest a use of Genesis 1-3 but two things suggest a basis in such a tradition. First, lines 7 and 9 use language that might be related to origins in the phrases *בית מולדים* and *בית מכו[רוחך]*, likely the woman's origin is conceived in these lines. Second, in line 3 the 3<sup>rd</sup> masculine pronominal suffix occurs with the noun 'bosom' (*חיקו*), which is a term that occurs elsewhere in the document in the construct 'wife of your bosom' (*אשת חיקכה*; 4Q416 2 iv 5, 13). 4Q416 2 iv is a column with a number of clear allusions to Genesis 1-3 and apart from 4Q416 2 iv and the column here, the term *חיק* does not occur in *Musar leMevin*.

<sup>9</sup> I would suggest the possible reconstruction א[שה].

<sup>10</sup> The editors provide the second person singular 'thou' in their translation: 'from the house where thou wert born'; 4Q299 1 4, 3a ii-b 13, and 5 5 in *DJD XX* is always translated 'times of birth'. This phrase also occurs in 4Q415 2 ii 9, which will be discussed in chapter 5. See also Morgenstern, 'The Meaning of *בית מולדים*,' pp. 141-144.



*Lines 7-9.* Strugnell and Harrington reconstruct the word מכון[רוח] ('your origins') in line 7. The two obvious reconstructions of 'מכון' that they consider are מכון and מכון. The editors comment that a suffixed form of מכון might be suggested, but dismiss the idea citing the term's usual occurrence elsewhere in a context associated with God and temple. To support a reconstruction of 'origins' in line 7 they note the occasion in Ezekiel 16.3 where מלדחך occurs alongside מלדחך (cf. מולד in l. 9).<sup>11</sup> In addition, in line 9 the term בית precedes the occurrence of the word 'origin' and likewise in line 7 the word בית occurs before the fragmentary word 'מכון', a similarity that further support the reconstruction מכור. The addition of the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular feminine pronominal suffix -ך to מכור is based upon the number of spaces available for reconstruction and the same suffix in the following word בריחך.

4Q415 2 ii is apparently concerned with how the female addressee ought to relate to a man, who is probably her husband. In addition, her origin is referred to twice, if the reconstruction of the final word of line 7 proposed in DJD 34 is correct. The final lines of 4Q416 2 iii and the following column 4Q416 2 iv make use of portions of Genesis 2.20-25 and, I will argue below, allude several times to that passage as well. In these two columns the addressee is instructed in various ways how he should relate to his wife. 4Q416 2 iii line 20 exhorts the addressee to consider origins (קח מולד[ן])<sup>12</sup> when one has taken a wife. In the lines that follow (2 iii 21-2 iv) frequent explicit and non-explicit uses of Genesis 2 occur, including the phrase אשת חיקכה in 4Q416 2 iv lines 5 and 13. Three

<sup>11</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 49. The word מולד is a significant term in *Musar leMevin*, occurring seven times, and is apparently something that should be considered as a point of meditation or consideration in a way similar to the נהיה. Not only does it occur alongside the נהיה (4Q416 2 iii line 9 (רו נהיה דרוש מולדיו) (רו נהיה), but identical exhortations occur on every occasion except in 4Q415 2 ii that one should 'seek' it (דרוש; 4Q418 9, 9a-c line 8) or 'take' it (קח; 4Q415 11 line 11; 4Q416 2 iii line 20; 4Q417 2 i line 11; 4Q418 202 line 1).

<sup>12</sup> A 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular pronominal suffix might be reconstructed here: מולדינה.

similarities emerge from a comparison between 4Q415 2 ii and 4Q416 2 iii-iv: (1) interest in the origins of the female; (2) the term חַיָּק used in a context somehow related to a female; and (3) a general concern with how a female should relate to males or males to females. Though much more could be said regarding both columns and their use of a Genesis tradition, it may be concluded for now that an allusion to Genesis in 4Q415 2 ii is very likely.

### 3.2.3) 4Q416 1

Tigchelaar provides a composite text of 4Q416 1 (overlaps 4Q418\* 1, 2, 2b; 4Q418 229; and a conglomerate of small 4Q418 fragments)<sup>13</sup> that is significantly more extensive than DJD 34's transcription of 4Q416 1. The reconstruction below is Tigchelaar's. Elgvin locates 4Q416 1 in column 7 while S/L, Tigchelaar and the editors of DJD 34 agree in locating 4Q416 1 in the first column of *Musar leMevin*. The location of 4Q416 1 in the first column is based upon the width of the right margin of the fragment.

The selected lines below primarily reflect cosmological concerns regarding the order of creation. The text as a whole is concerned with cosmology in relation to judgement and anthropology.

- |                                      |    |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| כל רוח]                              | (1 |
| ולחכן חפצין]                         | (2 |
| מועד במועד ו]                        | (3 |
| לפי צבאם למ] שור במשורה ול           | (4 |
| וממלכה למד] ינה ומדינה לאיש ואיש     | (5 |
| לפי מחסור צבאם ] ומשפט כולם לו       | (6 |
| וצבא השמים הכין ע] ל                 | (7 |
| למופתיהמה ואתות מו] עדיהמה           | (8 |
| זה לזה וכל פקודהמה י' שלימו ו] ספרו] | (9 |

<sup>13</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 175-76.

(15) להכון צדק בין טוב לרע ל] [ר כל משפ[ט  
 (16) [י]צר בשר הוא ומביני]  
 (17) בראתיו כי ה ]

- 1) every spirit [ stars of light]  
 2) and to determine the matters of [ they run from eternal times]  
 3) season upon season, and [ without standing still. Properly they go,]  
 4) according to their host, to ke[ep in its keeping, and to for kingdom]  
 5) and kingdom, for jurisdi[ction and jurisdiction, for each and every  
 6) according to the poverty<sup>14</sup> of their host. [And statute of them all to him/it  
 7) And the host of heaven He has established ov[er and luminaries]  
 8) for their omens and the signs of [their] se[asons  
 9) one to another. And all their appointments [they] will [complete, and they will] number [  
 15) to let the righteous distinguish between good and evil, to [ ] every stat[ute  
 16) [incl]ination of the flesh is he/it. And understand[  
 17) His creatures for [

A number of lexical similarities can be observed between 4Q416 1 and Genesis 1-2. This cluster of terms serves to strengthen the allusion to Genesis: רוח (Gen 1.2; 416 1 1), אור (Gen 1.3, 14-16; 416 1 1), מועד (Gen 1.14; 416 1 3), אהת (Gen 1.14; 416 1 8), ככב (Gen 1.15; 416 1 1), שמים (Gen 1.14-20; 416 1 7). In line 15 the phrase 'to let the righteous understand between good and evil' (להכון צדק בין טוב לרע) may be a reflection of the statement 'to distinguish between the light and the darkness' (ולהבדיל בין האור ובין החושך) in Genesis 1.18 (cf. *Instruction on the Two Spirits*). The phrase יצר בשר in line 16 might be related to the creation of man in Genesis 2.19-20. Lastly, in line 17 the term בראתיו occurs (cf. Gen 1.1) which very concretely introduces this theme in the document.

The ordered course of the heavenly bodies is described in the first nine lines of 4Q416 1 and serves as the backdrop for the motif of judgement in the following six lines. Thus *Musar leMevin* commences with a statement about cosmology based upon the

<sup>14</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 179, discusses the possibility that מחסור 'going around' should be read rather than מחסור 'poverty' on the grounds of scribal error. While this would make line 6 much more comprehensible, the frequency of the word מחסור throughout *Musar leMevin* in unusual contexts would suggest against such a reading.

orderly creation of heaven and earth followed by motifs of judgement and then exhortations for the righteous addressee to distinguish between good and evil. The luminaries' regulation or rule (משל) of the cosmos is widespread in Early Jewish literature (e.g. 1QS 10.1ff.; 1QM 11.8ff.; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9.25-26; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20.7ff.; *1 Enoch* 2-5; 81-83). The origin of luminaries as governing times and seasons can be traced back to the first verses of Genesis 1. Harrington comments upon this aspect of 4Q416 1:

It would appear that the wisdom instructions that follow in the main part were intended to help the one who is being instructed both to align himself with the correct order of the cosmos (as discerned from Genesis 1 and probably on the basis of a solar calendar) and to prepare for the divine judgment when the righteous will be vindicated and wickedness will be destroyed forever. If fragment 1 of 4Q416 is indeed the beginning of the great sapiential instruction, then it must have provided the theological perspective in which the sage's advice on various issues was to be interpreted. And that perspective was cosmic and eschatological.<sup>15</sup>

4Q416 1 establishes sapiential instruction with an appeal to the created order and emphasises the importance of discerning the created order for purposes of behaviour and justice. In terms of the significance of this opening column of the document, it suggests the importance of creation in the document as the basis for the instruction to follow.

### 3.2.4) 4Q416 2 iii

Column 4Q416 2 iii consists of 21 lines (4Q416 2 i; 2 ii are 22 line columns) which are preserved in a four column fragment (4Q416 2 i, ii, iii, iv). The bottom of 4Q416 2 iii has damage points that correspond to those of 4Q416 2 i, ii while 4Q416 2 iv only preserves the text from the first 13 lines. Whereas Elgvin locates 4Q416 2 iii in columns four and five of the document (i.e. before 4Q416 1), S/L place it in column nine while Tigchelaar locates 4Q416 2 i, ii, and iv but not 4Q416 2 iii in his reconstruction table.

---

<sup>15</sup> Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, p. 41.

In column 4Q416 2 iii (cf. par. 4Q418a 16b + 17) as well as the following column 4Q416 2 iv, a number of allusions to Genesis 2.20-25 occur. While the allusions are more straightforward in the last lines of 4Q416 2 iii and first lines of 4Q416 2 iv, an argument can be made for 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 having a conceptual basis in Genesis 1-3 as well. Lines 15-18 discuss the nature and likeness of man's creation. Lines 19-21 allude to Genesis 2.2-25 in order to instruct the addressee on how to relate to his wife. These lines read as follows:

15) חביט ואז תדע מה מר לאיש ומה מתוק לגבר כבוד אביכה ברישכה  
 16) ואמכה במצעדיכה כי כאב<sup>16</sup> לאיש כן אביהו וכאדנים לגבר כן אמו כי  
 17) המה כור הוריקה וכאשר המשילמה בכח ויצר על הרוח כן עובדם וכאשר  
 18) גלה אונגכה ברז נהיה כבדם למען כבודכה וב[ ] הדר פניהמה  
 19) למען חייכה וארוך ימיכה vacat ואם רש אתה כשה[  
 20) בלוא חוק vacat אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדין  
 21) מרז נהיה בהתחברכה יחד התהלך עם עזר בשרכה]

15) you will gaze. Then you will know what is bitter for a man and what is sweet for a man. Honour your father in your poverty,  
 16) and your mother in your low estate. For as God is to a man so is his own father and as אדנים are to a man so is his mother, for  
 17) they are the oven of your origin. As He set them in authority over you and fashioned by the spirit, so serve them. As  
 18) He uncovered your ear to the נהיה רז, honour them for the sake of your honour, and with [ ] venerate their presence,  
 19) For the sake of your life and of length of your days. vacat. If you are poor as[  
 20) without statute/bosom (?) vacat, you took a wife in your poverty, understand [her<sup>17</sup>] origins[  
 21) from the נהיה רז, in your uniting together (with her). Walk together with the helper of your flesh  
 2 iv 1) his father and mother [

Before an examination of possible allusions to Genesis 1-3 in 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-21 the preceding context of the column will be summarised. Discussed briefly in chapter one was 4Q416 2 iii lines 2-14 which contain a number of statements about poverty. Most discussed was the phrase 'you are poor' (אתה אביון/ראש/רש) which occurs four times (ll. 2, 8, 12, 19) in the column. In lines 5-6 the addressee is exhorted not to

<sup>16</sup> This composite transcription has an important variant between manuscripts 4Q416 2 iii and 4Q418 9 17. 4Q418 reads, כאל rather than כאב.

take wealth (אל תקח הון) from someone unknown lest it adds to one's poverty, leads to death and corrupts the spirit. When one avoids taking wealth in Line 7 a positive consequence occurs, the addressee's remembrance is said to 'flower forever' and an inheritance of joy is then left to their progeny. The seeking of something outside one's inheritance, described in the lines that follow (ll. 8-9), results in confusion and the displacing of one's boundary. The focus of the addressee's pursuit should be the רז נהיה. The רז נהיה in 4Q416 2 iii line 9 is the source by which one studies (his/its?) origins (מולדיו) and knows allotments. Line 11 states that God has lifted the addressee's head out of poverty (כי מראש הרים ראשכה) and made him to dwell among נדיבים ('nobles') and to rule over a glorious inheritance. However, in the lines that follow (ll 12-13) the addressee is reminded that he is needy and should not use poverty as an excuse for not studying and seeking knowledge. Line 14 again exhorts the addressee to study the רז נהיה in order to understand the ways of truth and roots of iniquity.

Tigheelaar suggests that the phrase אביון אחזה, and similar phrases, should be read as conditionals ('if you are poor'). Indeed, in 4Q416 2 iii line 19 there is a clear occurrence of such a phrase (ואם רש אחזה). Several observations might suggest that poverty and lacking in this column are conceived of as metaphorical at times, particularly the notion of being seated among the nobles but being poor as well as the metaphorical use of 'inheritance'. While this is not the focus of the present discussion, it should be noted that references to poverty in lines 15-21 (e.g. l. 15 'honour thy father in thy poverty'; l. 20 'thou hast taken a wife in thy poverty') are interwoven with an exhortation to study the רז נהיה and one's origins (l. 9). This is especially important in light of lines

---

<sup>17</sup> Reading my own reconstruction מולדינה.

16-18, which address the origin of the addressee (i.e. the offspring of his parents) in a context related to poverty.

*Lines 15-18.* Line 15 begins with an exhortation to pursue and gain knowledge, comparing the understanding of good and evil to sweet and bitter. In the following lines 15b-16 two unusual words occur. First is the term כֹּאֵב (cf. 4Q415 2 ii line 1) which in parallel fragment 4Q418 9a-9c reads with the variant כֹּאֵל. Whether the term כֹּאֵב ('as the Father') is read or כֹּאֵל ('as God') the referent is undoubtedly to God. The term that presents a challenge to translate is אֲדָנִים, rendered by Strugnell and Harrington as 'nobles'. The editors suggest that אֲדָנִים functions as the *middah* ('מדה') of אֵל. Divine names are occasionally contrasted with one another (e.g. יְהוּדָה = grace/mercy and אֱלֹהִים = judgement) by way of an interpretative method of juxtaposition, which they suggest is known in later Judaism as the *middoth* (b. *Pes* 70b). In the context of 4Q416 2 iii line 16 the editors propose that these two divine names אֵל (= creator and sovereign) and אֲדָנִים (= merciful and loving) contrast with one another.<sup>18</sup> The difficulties of accepting this theory are: (1) אֵב is not a divine name and אֵל is not accepted as the better reading; (2) אֲדָנִים is not necessarily a divine name either; (3) this would be the only document I am aware of that contrasts אֵל with אֲדָנִים; and (4) nothing in the context of 4Q416 2 iii suggests the implied attributes Strugnell and Harrington associate with the two titles.<sup>19</sup>

The form אֲדָנִי occurs very infrequently in the Hebrew Bible and Early Jewish literature outside of 4Q416 2 iii and its parallel in 4Q418 9a-9c. In 4Q416 2 iii the text addresses, among other topics, the idea of origins. While lines 15-16 allude to the

<sup>18</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 121.

<sup>19</sup> 'A man's father represents אֵל (God *qua* Creator, Sovereign, and Judge, and his mother (*qua* merciful, loving, and gracious) represents אֲדָנִים'; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 121.

Decalogue<sup>20</sup> lines 15-18 are fundamentally concerned with the origin and formation of the addressee. The parents are to be honoured because of their role they have played in his creation. The earthly mother and father's function in the formation of their offspring is likened in these lines to two other beings: i.e., a father to the Father/God and a mother to 'Lords' (אֲדֹנִים). Line 17 explicitly relates honouring and venerating parents with the notion that they are the place of one's origin ('they are the womb that was pregnant with you'). Also in line 17 the addressee is told that he has been fashioned according to a spiritual likeness (by the Spirit?), although the exact sense, and precise translation, of this statement is difficult to determine. Line 18 returns to the רִצְנוּ נִהְיָה, which is already noted as connected to 'origins' in line 9. A case for an allusion to Genesis creation traditions on the basis of motifs surrounding origins can be made. In speaking about origins the nature of humanity's creation is likely being referred to in lines 15-18. This suggestion may be made on the basis of three factors: (1) other occurrences of origins related to creation in the document (e.g. 4Q415 2 ii, above); (2) the indisputable allusions to Genesis that directly follow (4Q416 2 iii 21 – 4Q416 2 iv); and (3) the relationship that might exist between 4Q416 2 iii 15-18 and 4Q417 1 i 16-18 (see immediately below).

Collins suggests 4Q417 1 i lines 16-18 allude to an interpretative tradition of Genesis 1.26 where the plural 'us' refers to angelic participation in the creation of Adam. While 4Q417 1 i will be discussed in full below, I propose here that 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 may be attributing the addressee's origins to both God and angels somewhat similar to Collins' understanding of 4Q417 1 i. That human origins be in both an earthly parentage and a heavenly creation may be the central concern articulated in 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18.

<sup>20</sup> Compare the fifth commandment in Ex 20.12: כְּבֹד אֲבִיךָ וְאִמְךָ; with ll. 15-16 above: כְּבוֹד אֲבִיכָה בְּרִישָׁתָהּ וְאִמָּתָהּ בְּמִצְעָדֶיהָ.



If this is the case, one may question how the term אַדְנִים in line 16 should be understood, as a case might be made for it having connotations to angelic beings. If אַדְנִים refers in any way to angelic beings and if Collins' theory of reading 4Q417 1 i lines 16-18 as stemming from Genesis 1.26 is correct, then an allusion to Genesis 1.26 may be operative in 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-16 as well.

*Line 20.* An alternative transcription and translation of 4Q416 2 iii line 20 is possible. The editors propose reading this line as: '[without statute (חוק), thou hast taken a wife in thy poverty, take her offspring (מולדיה)'. However, one might just as easily read: 'without bosom (חיק); you have taken a wife in your poverty, understand her origins (מולדיה)'. The context is not adequately provided to determine which of these meanings is the more likely. The suggestion that the second letter be read as a *yod* (חיק)<sup>21</sup> rather than *waw* (חוק), or the latter as less frequent use of the term as 'bosom', is based upon: (1) the following context (4Q416 2 iv) where the phrase אַשַׁח חִיקָה occurs twice; and (2) the subject matter is related to the addressee's wife and the term appears to be used elsewhere in such a context (4Q415 2 ii). The imperative קח is used in *Musar leMevin* in with the רז נהיה (4Q418 77 4) as the object of the verb and could also be understood in the sense of 'understand' or 'grasp' rather than literally 'take'. The suggestion that the term מולד be translated as 'origin' rather than 'offspring' is made on the basis of: (1) line 9 ('by the רז נהיה study the origins (מולדיו) thereof'); (2) the discussion of origins in lines 15-19; (3) here in line 20 the term מולד is followed almost immediately by the רז נהיה; and (4) the occurrence of the term in 4Q415 2 ii (cf. 4Q299 1 4; 3a ii-b 13, 5 5). I would propose that 4Q416 2 iii 9 – 4Q416 2 iv fundamentally addresses issues of the origin of the

<sup>21</sup> This interpretation has not been advocated in other translations.

addressee and his wife. The reconstruction with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person feminine pronominal suffix -ה is not without parallel in *Musar leMevin*. The editors themselves reconstruct קח מן־לדיה in 4Q415 11 line 11, a column concerned with issues pertaining to one's wife or daughter.<sup>22</sup>

*Line 21.* The most straightforward allusion to Genesis 2 occurs in the final line of 4Q416 2 iii and continues through the beginning lines of 4Q416 2 iv. Here the addressee is exhorted to unite together (התחבר) and walk with his wife or 'helper of your flesh' (עזר בשרכה). The nature of woman as man's helper is found in Genesis 2.18 (אעשה לו עזר כנגדו). A similar allusion (quotation?) occurs in 4QMeditation on Creation (4Q303) line 10: עשה לו עזר and further demonstrates the use of this tradition. Any explication of this line should be done in conjunction with 4Q416 2 iv discussed below.

### 3.2.5) 4Q416 2 iv

As previously stated, 4Q416 2 iv is the final column of a four column fragment (4Q416 2 i, ii, iii, iv). Originally, 4Q416 2 iv consisted of either 21 or 22 lines; however only 13 presently remain. The column is also preserved in fragments 4Q418 10a, b. Elgvin places 4Q416 2 iv in columns 5-6, while S/L and Tigchelaar place it at the top of column 10.

Column 4Q416 2 iv is generally concerned with advice about the relationship of a wife to her husband after leaving her parents. Here it is the husband who is addressed. Allusions to Genesis 2 appear throughout the column.

- (1) את אביו [ו]את אמו ורב־ק
- (2) אוֹתָהּ הַמְשִׁיל בָּהּ וְתֵשׁ [ ] [אִבִּיהָ]
- (3) לֹא הַמְשִׁיל בָּהּ מֵאִמָּהּ הַפְרִיָּדָה וְאֵלֶיכָהּ [תְּשׁוּקָתָהּ וְחֶהְיָהּ]
- (4) לֶךְ לְבָשָׁר אֶחָד בְּתָכָה לְאַחֵר יִפְרִיד וּבְנִיכָהּ]

<sup>22</sup> DJD XXXIV, pp. 58-59.

(5) ואחה ליחד עם אשת חיקבה כי היא שאר ער[ותכה  
 (6) ואשר ימשול בה זולתכה הסיג גבול חייהו ברוחה  
 (7) המשילך להתהלך ברצונכה ולא להוסיף נדר ונדבה

(13) אשת חיקבה וחרפ[

- 1) his father [and] mother and cleave [to his wife],
- 2) he has set you in authority over her, [ her father]
- 3) has he not set in authority over her, from her mother he has separated her, but towards you [will be her *desire* and she will be]
- 4) for you one flesh, he will separate your daughter to another man and your sons [
- 5) and you will be a oneness with the wife of your bosom, for she is flesh of [ your] nak[edness']
- 6) and whoever rules over her, beside you has removed the border of his life. Over her spirit
- 7) he has set you in authority to walk in to your good pleasure. And let her not increase vows and votive offering[

13) wife of your bosom and shame[

In 4Q416 2 iv line 1 an allusion to Genesis 2.24 occurs and on that basis the editors reconstruct the line.<sup>23</sup> The following two lines are concerned with the husband's authority over his wife, which is the consequence of eating from the tree of knowledge in Genesis 3.16. Line 4 is to be associated with Genesis 2.24 where the addressee's own daughter will be separated from him and joined to another man. The phrase *בשר אחד* ('one flesh') in line 4 occurs only in Genesis 2.24. The enigmatic phrase *אשת חיקבה* ('wife of your bosom') appears in both lines 5 and 13 and will be explored later in relation to the surrounding allusions to Genesis and similar terms elsewhere in *Musar leMevin* (cf. 4Q418 186, 187). In line 5 the addressee is said to be made a 'unity' (*ליחד*) with the 'wife of his bosom' and also states that she is the 'flesh of [your nakedness]'; both these statements likely allude to Genesis 2.21-24.

Line 6 of 4Q416 2 iv begins a transition briefly to the theme of husband's authority over his wife (so ll. 7-10); in *Musar leMevin* this authority is applied to the exhortation that the husband forbid his wife from making many vows. Strugnell and

Harrington note that lines 7-10 have their closest affinity to Numbers 30.<sup>24</sup> Numbers 30.15-17 detail various vows that a daughter or wife may bind that, given the circumstances, the father or husband may bear the guilt when voiding. The transitional line 6, between a clear allusion to Genesis and then Numbers, makes the statement that 'who[ever] desires to rule over her, apart from you, has displaced the boundary of his life'. Genesis 3.16 and Numbers 30.17 share one basic similarity: both are concerned with the authority of the husband over his wife. Also, Genesis 2.20-25, like Numbers 30.17, is concerned with proper relations within the family between a man, on the one hand, and his wife and daughters on the other. Interestingly, Philo links and discusses Numbers 30 with Genesis 2 (*L.A.* ii.63-64) as does 4Q416 2 iv. 4Q416 2 iv lines 6-9 are ultimately concerned with the father and husband's relationship to daughter and wife.

The columns of 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-21 – 2 iv lines 1-13, then, may be said to contain significant allusions to Genesis 1-3. At this stage of analysis the more obscure terms and phrases (e.g. *אשת חיקכה, ארנים*) will simply be noted as possibly derived from a tradition of Genesis 1-3. However, in the case of the final line 21 of 4Q416 2 iii and first lines of 4Q416 2 iv there can be little doubt that Genesis 1-3 is used. We will return to this passage for further examination in chapter four.

### 3.2.6) 4Q417 1 i

Fragment 4Q417 1 i consists of twenty-seven lines. Both margins are visible with the left margin connecting to 4Q417 1 ii of the same fragment. Though the top and bottom of the column are very fragmentary, line 27 is clearly followed by the lower

<sup>23</sup> The editors reconstruct and translate 4Q416 2 iii 21 and 4Q416 2 iv line 1 as: 'Walk together with the helpmeet of thy flesh [*According to the statute of God that a man should leave*] his father and mother And should cleave to his wife, So that they (...) should become one flesh'; *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 113, 125.

<sup>24</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 129.

margin. Elgvin does not attempt to locate 4Q417 1 i in his reconstruction. However, S/L place this fragment within the context preserved in 4Q418 ii. Tigchelaar locates the fragment in the third column of the document. Tigchelaar, in discussing S/L's unpublished reconstruction, correctly observes, '[S/L's] claim that 4Q417 is a shorter manuscript than, for example, 4Q416 and 4Q418, has not yet been presented with full argumentation. It appears that they suggest that 4Q417 1 was the beginning of the manuscript. That would imply that 4Q416 and 4Q417 represent different stages of redaction'.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, in the conclusion of his monograph, Tigchelaar concludes that S/L's 'grounds for regarding 4Q417 1 i as the first column of 4Q417 are not cogent'.<sup>26</sup> Regardless of this dispute, both S/L and Tigchelaar agree to locate the fragment within the first few columns of the document. The reasons provided by Tigchelaar are convincing in my opinion and there appears to be no reason to definitively conclude that 4Q417 1 i was the first column of a manuscript of *Musar LeMevin*.

The content of 4Q417 1 i is addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular. Significant motifs in this column include the *נדיה*, judgement, reward, and discernment of good and evil. Only a few of the lines of this fragment are relevant for consideration as allusions to Genesis 1-3 creation traditions. Lines 2-3, 8-9 and 15-18 read and translate as follows:

(2) [ ] הבט [ו]ברוי פלא[י אל הנוראים חשכיל ראש  
(3) [ ] לו ב[פ ] כה והבט[ו] ברוי נהיה ומעשי קדם למה נהיה ומה נהיה

(8) עד ואז חדע בין [טו]ב ל[רע כ]מעשי[הם] כיא אל הדעות סוד אמת ברוי נהיה  
(9) פרש את אישה<sup>27</sup> ומעשיה [לכל חכ]מה ולכל [ע]רמה יצרה ממשלת מעשיה

<sup>25</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 167.

<sup>26</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 247.

<sup>27</sup> The editors transcribe *אשה* here and translate these two lines as: 'of eternity. Then thou shalt discern between *the* [good]d and [evil according to their] deeds. For the God of knowledge is the *foundation* of truth

- (15) כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול ע [ ] בני שות וספר זכרון כתוב לפניו  
 (16) לשמרי דברו והוא חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון וינחילונו לאנוש עם<sup>28</sup> רוח כ[י]א  
 (17) כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועוד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין  
 (18) [טו]ב לרע כמשפט [ר]וחו[ ] vacat ואתה בן מבין הבט vacat ברז נהיה ודע

2) [ ] . . . gaze, and on the mysteries of the wonders of the God of the awesome ones, you will ponder the beginning of

3) [ ] and gaze[ on the נהיה רז and the deeds from before, on what was and what will be

8) of eternity. And then you will know between good and evil according all their deeds, for the God of knowledge is the foundation/mystery of truth, by the נהיה רז

9) He separated woman and her deeds for all wisdom and all craftiness, He fashioned her, rule over her deeds<sup>28</sup>

15) because engraved is that which has been ordained by God against all the i[n]iquities of the sons of perdition and a book of memorial is written before him

16) for those who keep his words, and it is a vision of Hagu for a book of memorial. He gave it as an inheritance to humanity together with a spiritual people [becau]se

17) according to the image of the holy ones is his formation, but no more does He give Hagu to a spirit of flesh because it knew not the difference between

18) good and evil according to the judgment of his spirit vacat and you, understanding one, gaze vacat on the נהיה רז and know

*Lines 1-2.* The first two lines of 4Q417 1 i may vaguely have the created order in view. Harrington and Strugnell have interpreted the word ראש in line 2 in a chronological sense, but raise the possibility of reading 'poor' or 'poverty' as well.<sup>29</sup> If the rendering of ראש is 'the beginning of', then the phrase מעשי קדם<sup>30</sup> (literally 'deeds of before') likely refers to the creation. Further, this phrase is followed by the double נהיה מה, which could be read in either the sense of: 'what has been' or 'what will be'. It may be questioned whether there is a purposeful ambiguity in the use of נהיה as depicting both past and future. These lines could be co-ordinating *Urzeit* with *Endzeit*.

---

And by/on the mystery that is to come He has laid out its (=truth's) foundation, And its deeds [He has prepared with all wis]dom And with all[ c]unning has He fashioned it, And the domain of its deeds (creatures)'. DJD XXXIV, pp. 151, 154.

<sup>28</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 50, reads אשה and translates 1.9: hat er (die) Frau unterschieden, er hat gemacht [...] und für sie alle, und was ist ihre Gesinnung.

<sup>29</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 156.

<sup>30</sup> 4Q418 148 ii line 6 may elucidate this phrase, 'בינה לקדמותיה שים' translated by the editors, 'To understanding of the former things set [thy mind]'.

*Lines 8-9.* Another possible allusion to Genesis (2.20-25.) occurs in lines 8-9 of 4Q417 1 i. The editors struggle to transcribe and translate these lines. They consider the possibility that the third term of line 9 could be transcribed as אִישָׁה and translated as 'her husband'. However, they conclude that: 'since the preceding סֹד can mean "foundation", it becomes at least plausible to read here too אִישׁ "foundation", with its suffix referring to אִמָּה'.<sup>31</sup> However, if one reads אִישָׁה as 'woman', an option not considered by the editors, better sense may be made of these lines. Lines 8-9 would then be concerned with the acquisition of wisdom through the role of the female in Genesis 2. The phrase פֶּרֶשׁ אִישָׁה at the beginning of the line refers to the separation of woman from man in Genesis 2.20-25. Line 9, taken as a reference to the division of male and female in Genesis 2, elucidates several phrases in the surrounding lines. First, the exhortation to discern between good and evil in line 8 falls under the rubric of gaining knowledge of good and evil in Genesis 3. Second, the terms [חכ]מָה and, especially, [ע]רְמָה in line 9 are a play upon the female's role in partaking of the tree of knowledge. The term עָרוֹם is not only used in a word play in Genesis 2.25 and 3.1 but the female in 3.10 responds to God saying: אֶת קוֹלְךָ שָׁמַעְתִּי בִּגְן וָאִירָא כִּי עָרֹם אֲנִי וָאֶחְבֵּאת ('I heard your voice in the garden and I was afraid because I am naked and I hid'). The phrase 'her deeds' (מַעֲשֵׂיהָ) in line 9 is a reference to her eating of the tree of knowledge for all 'wisdom' and 'craftiness'. This is followed by a statement regarding her fashioning (יִצְרָה). The phrase וּמִמְשַׁלַּת מַעֲשֵׂיהָ at the end of line 9 is an allusion to Genesis 3.16 and the consequence of eating from the tree of knowledge: וְהָיָה יֹמְשָׁל בָּךְ (and he will rule over her').

---

<sup>31</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 158.

4Q417 1 i line 9 is likely an allusion to the creation of the female from the male. In lines 8-9 we find allusions to Genesis 2-3 in: (1) gaining knowledge of good and evil; (2) 'wisdom' and 'craftiness' (nudity?); (3) the female's fashioning; and (4) the male's authority over the female. Also of importance is the occurrence of the *רו נהיה* as instrumental at the end of line 8. It may be questioned, particularly in 4Q417 1 i, whether this mystery is a mystery derived from Genesis 1-3.

Lange argues that the *רו נהיה* in 4Q417 1 i likely refers to the history and origin of humankind. The mystery in these lines is instrumental; by it God has separated the woman from man.<sup>32</sup> Lange writes on line 8:

Gott ist das Fundament, auf dem die der Schöpfung zugrundeliegende Wahrheit ruht. Wie dies gemeint ist, zeigen die folgenden Zeilen (18-10). Dort wird die Schöpfung der Frau beschrieben...<sup>33</sup>

Lange relates the separation of woman in this line with God's creation of categories in the document. The teacher in *Musar leMevin* is able to differentiate between good and evil on account of the pre-existent order of creation. Distinguishing between men and women here is part of a larger differentiation in the document.<sup>34</sup>

*Lines 15-18.* The text in lines 15-18 distinguishes between those who are in the form/inclination of the holy ones and a spirit of flesh. The pronominal suffix of *יצרו* refers to *אנוש* which could be understood, initially, as: (1) the antediluvian 'Enosh' the son of Seth (Gen 4.25ff.); (2) 'humanity'; or (3), more specifically, the first man Adam. The distinction between the interpretations is perhaps the difference between reading this as a historical event or as a general anthropological statement (Enosh and a spiritual people of that time, or humanity and the people of the Spirit).

<sup>32</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 59.

<sup>33</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, pp. 62-63.

<sup>34</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 66.



Regardless of the ambiguity of אנוש, it is evident that the author understood the formation of אנוש and the עם רוח ('people of spirit') as being in the form/inclination of קדושים ('holy ones'; i.e. 'angels').<sup>35</sup> In contrast to the עם רוח, no meditation is given to the רוח בשר ('spirit of flesh'). The text thus appears to distinguish between two classes of human beings.

Collins has suggested that אנוש be read not simply as 'humanity' but literally the first man Adam. The creation and formation of Adam in Genesis 1.26 is alluded to in 4Q417 1 i. His reading of אנוש as a reference to Adam is based on a similar use of אנוש in 1QS 3.17-18 in the *Instruction on the Two Spirits*:

והוא ברא אנוש לממשלת חבל וישם לו שתי רוחות להתהלך בם עד מועד פקודתו

He created humanity/Adam to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk until the moment of his visitation.

Just as אנוש in 1QS 3-4, in drawing on Genesis 1.26, refers to the human being, so *Musar leMevin* understands two types of humanity. Humanity's creation is based on a reading of dual creations found in Genesis 1 and 2: a spiritual people formed according to the pattern of the holy ones (1.26) and a spirit of flesh. Collins explains that, while the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* and *Musar leMevin* formulate their ideas differently the concept remains the same: humanity is dualistically divided right from the very beginning, at the time of creation.<sup>36</sup>

It is unlikely, continues Collins, that the antediluvian 'Enosh' is the recipient of the revelation of the book of memorial (l. 16) when there is no parallel in a number of references to him in the *Hodayot*, *Serekh haYahad* and other key texts. The book of

<sup>35</sup> The term קדושים is typically used as an epithet for 'angels' in Early Jewish literature (e.g. 1QS 11.8; CD 20.8; IQM 10.12, 12.1; 4Q403 1 i 40; *1 Enoch* (Ethiopic) 1.9, 12.2, 14.23, 81.5). On some occasions it is

memorial has strong apocalyptic overtones (Mal 3.16), and heavenly books are frequently mentioned in the books of *1 Enoch* (47.3; 93.1-2; 108.3), Daniel (7.10; 10.21; 12.1) and *Jubilees* (30.20-22). Collins concludes from this that the knowledge contained in the book of Hagu (1.17) derives from angels, particularly in light of references such as *1 Enoch* 93.1-2: 'Enoch began to speak from the books . . . according to that which appeared to me in the heavenly vision, and which I know from the words of the holy angels understood from the tablets of heaven'. Collins' understanding of these lines, in summary, is that two types of humanity were created, and that here the addressees are offered the opportunity to share in the knowledge of the holy ones.<sup>37</sup>

Drawing on T. H. Tobin's work of the creation of man in Philo,<sup>38</sup> Collins mentions that *Musar leMevin* has in mind the creation of two Adams in the formulation of 4Q417 1 i:

Philo understands the two Adams in his own philosophical framework. The Qumran Sapiential text understands them as two types of humanity, a spiritual people in the likeness of the Holy Ones and a "spirit of flesh."<sup>39</sup>

However, it may be that the contribution of Philo to our interpretation of *Musar leMevin* is his preservation of an exegetical tradition of Genesis 1.26 in which humanity and angels are correlated, based in part upon the plural address 'let us' of Genesis 1.26. The notion of the creation of two sorts of human images in the first creation may have given rise to the division of humanity in *Musar leMevin*. On four occasions (*Op.* 72-76, *Conf.* 171-174, *Fug.* 65-70, *Mut.* 27-34) Philo refers to the role of angels in creation based upon

---

used as a reference to a holy community of humans (e.g. 1QM 6.6, 16.1; 4Q274 1 i 6); however, many references are ambiguous (e.g. 1Q13 2.9; 1QSb 3-4; *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*).

<sup>36</sup> Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, pp. 124-25.

<sup>37</sup> Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, pp. 123-24.

<sup>38</sup> T. H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (CBQMS 14; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1983).

<sup>39</sup> Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, pp. 124-25.

Genesis 1.26.<sup>40</sup> In each case that Philo takes up the theme of the first creation in Genesis, he correlates the plurality of images with a duality of inclinations. A comparison of Philo's exegesis, in the following chapter, with that of *Musar leMevin* will aid in setting the sapiential texts in a broader exegetical context and further elucidate the angelology and anthropology of these lines. As will be explored in chapter four, further evidence of this exegetical tradition of Genesis 1.26 is also found in *targumic* and rabbinic texts (e.g. *Tg. Ps.-J.* 1.26, *Ber. R.* 1.26, *B. San.* 38b).

We conclude that in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 the author has in mind the creation of humanity (or Adam) in Genesis 1-2 according to the form/inclination of the angels in the first creation. However, it is not entirely clear in *Musar leMevin* what the implications of the angelic image are for the understanding of human nature. While these issues and opposing interpretations will be explored in detail in chapter 4, it is enough here to agree with Collins that allusions to Genesis 1-3 are at work in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18. It may also be concluded that formation and divisions based upon line 9 and lines 15-18 are important motifs in the column. Thus, the column as whole holds significant allusions to Genesis and may be read afresh in light of Genesis allusions.

### 3.2.7) 4Q418 69 ii

4Q418 69 is a fifteen line fragment preserved with the right margin intact. Neither the top nor bottom remain. Elgvin locates 4Q418 69 in column nine of his reconstruction. S/L locate the fragment in column thirteen. Tigchelaar suggests a possible placement of the fragment somewhere between 4Q417 1 and 2. Tigchelaar

---

<sup>40</sup> For an overview of the relation of assistants in Philo to Platonism see D. T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1986): 242-51.

questions the editor's opinion<sup>41</sup> that 4Q418 69 (and 4Q418 55) were not written by the author of *Musar leMevin* but are likely independent compositions integrated by the author(s) at a later stage.<sup>42</sup> Tigchelaar concludes that 4Q418 69 ii (and 4Q418 55) 'have some features in common with the rest of *Instruction*... which may indicate that they have the same provenance as the rest of *Musar leMevin*. However, it is not impossible that these shared features should be attributed to slight editorial reworkings of a *Vorlage*.'<sup>43</sup>

Lines 1-4 of 4Q418 69 addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person singular contrast with the remainder of the column where the address is in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural (אִילִי לְב in ll. 4 and 8, the בְּחִירִי אֶחָד in l. 10, and the בְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם in l. 12-13). At the end of line 15 the addressee is called בֶּן מִבִּין ('understanding one'). In the first half of the fragment the 'foolish-minded' are said to be fashioned by God though certain judgement and destruction await them. According to the latter half of the fragment the 'chosen ones' and 'sons of heaven' are expected to rise up in judgement against the wicked and are encouraged to pursue knowledge for an eternal reward. Lines 4-6 below appear to describe the creation and fashioning of the 'foolish-minded':

(4) [הם] וברעה כול גליהם vacat ועתה אִילִי לְב מה טוב ללוא  
 (5) [ומה] השקט ללוא היה ומה משפט ללוא נוסד ומה יאנחו מתים על כ[ל יום]  
 (6) [ה אדם] ל נוצרם ולשחת עולם תשובתכם כי תקיץ [חטאכם]ה

4) [ ] of them and in knowledge all their waves vacat and now, foolish-minded ones, what is good to one who has not  
 5) [been?]<sup>45</sup> What] is quietness to one who has not been? What is judgment to a man who has not been established? What mourning will the dead make over their own death?

<sup>41</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 14.

<sup>42</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 212.

<sup>43</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 224.

<sup>44</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 92, reconstructs the first two words of this line, where *DJD XXXIV* does not, as כֹּל מִיָּה [הם]. This supplement of the translation is based on *DJD XXXIV*.

<sup>45</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 92, reconstructs the word נוצר here, which further emphasizes the motif of creation in these lines.

6) you were brought into existence [by] Go[d] but to the eternal grave you will return, for it will awaken [ ] you[r] sin

Similar to 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18, this text depicts the creation and fashioning of humanity. It appears that the question 'what is good to a man who has not been' in lines 4-5 rhetorically implies the cessation of the existence of the wicked.<sup>46</sup> Neither the wicked nor righteous can be silent if they have not come into existence, judgement is meaningless for those never established, and the dead certainly do not fear or mourn death. Line 6 emphasises that the wicked were fashioned by God but, as this line and those that follow state, judgement and destruction await them. While the future of the wicked and righteous are underscored in this fragment, concepts of the future are shaped by the motif of creation. The wicked are created and fashioned by God just as the righteous (l. 6 ל נוצרם [אחם]), which is consistent with 4Q417 1 i discussed above. 4Q418 69, in describing the condemned segment of humanity (i.e. the spirit of flesh) details their creation. This being the case, it is a motif that assumes the interpretation of creation in 4Q417 1 i and thus an allusion to Genesis 1.

### 3.2.8) 4Q418 77

4Q418 77 survives in two fragments (a-b) with a parallel in 4Q416 7 at the beginning of lines 3-4.<sup>47</sup> The lines below are a composite text consisting of 5 lines. Neither fragments 4Q418 77 nor 4Q416 7 have visible margins on top or bottom. This fragment has not been assigned in the reconstructions of Elgvin, S/L, and Tigchelaar.

4Q418 77 is too fragmentary to characterise generally. Lines 2 and 4 use the imperative קח ('take') in relation to the generations/origin of Adam as well as to the

<sup>46</sup> The editors propose reconstructing and translating lines 4-5 as: 'what is good to a man who has not [*been created?* And what] is tranquillity to a man who has not come into activity?': *DJD XXXIV*, p. 283.

<sup>47</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 297.

רז נהיה. Line 4 uses the imagery of a season or period, which recurs throughout *Musar leMevin* (approx. 21 occurrences; e.g. 4Q416 1 3, 8, 14; 4Q416 3 3, 4; 4Q417 1 i 7; 4Q418 69 ii 14; 4Q418 81 13; 4Q418 286 3; 4Q423 5 5).

- (1) [שמש ה] [בה]  
 (2) [רז נהיה וקח תולדות] [א]דם וראה בכוש[ר]  
 (3) [ופקודת מ]עשהו ואז חבין במשפט אנוש משקל]  
 (4) [מזל שפתיז לפי]רוחו וקח ברז נהיה על [מ]שקל קצים ומדת]  
 (5) [ל] [עדן]

- 1) [ ] sun [  
 2) [ ] רז נהיה and grasp the nature of [m]an and gaze on legitimacy/being[  
 3) [and the care of] his [deed] and then you will discern the judgement on humanity, weighing [  
 4) [to the outpouring of his lips and according to] his spirit, grasp the רז נהיה upon [w]eighing the end and the grief of[

The phrase קח תולדות אדם in line 2 could be another allusion to creation in so far as it is concerned with the motif of origins. It might initially be suggested that an allusion to Genesis 5.1 (זה ספר תולדת אדם ביום ברא אלהים אדם)<sup>48</sup> occurs in 4Q418 77; however, a few items taken together make this suggestion unlikely. First, as the editors note, the term can mean 'nature' or 'characteristics'.<sup>49</sup> Jacob Licht comments on the terms' broader usage in the Hebrew Bible and Tana'itic writings as:

טעמה לעולם מה שנוגד, החוצאות, ולא מקום-הלידה, המוצא

In the Dead Sea scrolls it is similar to the term מולד.<sup>50</sup> Second, the imperative 'take' (קח) has תולדות as the object which has parallels both in this fragment and elsewhere. For instance, in line 4 the addressee is exhorted to 'take' (לקח) רז נהיה, which should be understood literally in the sense of 'grasp' but also has the sense of 'study' or 'seek'. Moreover, the addressee is told in 4Q417 2 i line 11 to 'comprehend the origins/birth-

<sup>48</sup> However, if one were to argue for the allusion it is conceivable that a book describing the nature of Adam as being in the likeness of אלהים (i.e. angels) could be read in Gen 5.1 and subsequently 4Q418 77.

<sup>49</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 298.

<sup>50</sup> J. Licht. *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965) p. 85.

times of salvation' (קח מולדי ישע). A variety of imperatives precede the רז נהיה in *Musar leMevin* and 'take' is just one among those. 'Understanding' (בינה) is also an object of the imperative (4Q418 177 4). As discussed above, 4Q416 2 iii line 9 states, 'seek (דרוש) its origins' and then in line 20 'grasp/understand her origins'. Here in 4Q418 77 line 4 the רז נהיה occurs in parallel with the תולדות אדם, indicating the possibility that the two are similar in nature. Third, the term תולדות is not a frequent word in the Hebrew Bible, occurring a total of 12 times with 10 of those in Genesis (Gen 2.4, 5.1, 6.9, 10.1, 11.10, 11.28, 25.19, 36.1, 36.9, 37.2; Num 3.1; Ruth 4.18). Genesis 2.4 uses the word תולדות in the sense of 'origin' of the universe or account of the creation of the world rather than the strict sense of the 'genealogy' or pedigree of a person as it is used frequently elsewhere (e.g. Gen 10.1, 25.12, 36.1; Ex 6.16; Num 1.20).<sup>51</sup> The *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3.13-4.26) begins with an exhortation for the teacher to instruct the sons of light about תולדות כול בני איש. The *Instruction on the Two Spirits* directly addresses the nature of humanity, creation and purpose. Identifying the term תולדות with the nature and origin of humanity is semantically possible and is congruent with the emphasis on origins in the document as a whole. The likeliest referent of the allusion is Genesis 2.4 and possibly to creation and the רז נהיה.

The occurrence of the term ערן ('Eden') in 4Q418 77 line 5 is not certain. The first two letters are clearly distinguishable in the photograph but the final *nun* is more difficult to decipher. Even if the final *nun* were to be restored, the word may well be translated as 'luxury' rather than the proper name 'Eden' (cf. Gen 2.10, 15). There is no occurrence of the word ערן elsewhere in *Musar leMevin* where a context survives (cf.

<sup>51</sup> The LXX has a variant reading on Gen 2.4 which might be translated 'book of origins' (Αὕτη ἡ βίβλος

4Q418 138 3; 4Q418a 25 2).<sup>52</sup> Thus, though 'Eden' may occur in 4Q418 77, ultimately it remains uncertain.

### 3.2.9) 4Q418 81 + 81a

The composite text 4Q418 81 + 81a consists primarily of the larger surviving fragment 4Q418 81. 4Q423 8 is a four line fragment with only seven to eight words preserved and parallels lines 2-5 of 4Q418 81. 4Q418 81 is the first column on a sheet, portions of the left and right margins remain as well as the top. The surviving column consists of 20 lines with the final 16 lines missing approximately a third of the end of each line. Both Elgvin and S/L locate 4Q418 81 in column 15 of *Musar leMevin*. Tigchelaar tentatively locates it between columns 13 (4Q418 167) and 19 (4Q418 103) and suggests that 4Q418 103 is derived from the same sheet.<sup>53</sup>

Column 4Q418 81 + 81a is written in both the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person, often varying between the two. The author(s) describes what God has done and concludes how the addressee should respond or be considered in light of God's action.

- 1) שפתיכה פתח מקור לברך קדושים אתה כמקור עולם הלל [א]ז הבדילכה בכול
- 2) רוח בשר ואתה הבדל מכול אשר שני והנור מכול תעבות נפש[כי]א הוא עשה כול
- 3) ויורישם איש נחלתו והוא חלקכה ונחלתכה בתוך בני אדם[ובנ]חלתו המשילכ/מה ואתה
- 4) בזה כבדהו בהתקדשכה לו כאשר שמכה לקדוש קדושים[לכול] חבל וכול[א]ל[ים]
- 5) הפיל גורלכה וכבודכה הרבה מואדה וישימכה לו בכור ]
- 6) ושובתי לכה אתן ואתה להלוא לכה טובי ובאמונתי הלך חמיר

- 1) He has opened your lips, a spring to bless the holy ones, you are like an eternal spring of praise [ th]en He has separated/distinguished you from every
- 2) spirit of flesh, and you are separated/distinguished from everything that He hates, and (should) abstain from everything abhorrences of the soul, [fo]r He made everyone
- 3) and each one will inherit their inheritance, and He is your portion and your inheritance among humanity, [and over] His [in]heritance has He set you in authority, and you
- 4) honour Him in this: sanctifying yourself to Him, as He has placed you as a most holy one [ ] world, and with all angels
- 5) He cast your lot, and multiplied your honour/glory very much, and placed you for Himself as a first-born

γενέσως). The targums contain no significant or insightful variants on Gen 2.4.

<sup>52</sup> The phrase 'Garden of Eden' occurs by name in 4Q504 8 line 6.

<sup>53</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 165.



6) and my good things I will give to you. And you, are not my good things yours? So, in my faithfulness always walk

4Q418 81 + 81a shares a number of similarities with 4Q417 1 i lines 16-17. First, both columns conceive of a division between the addressees and a 'spirit of flesh'. The idea of an inheritance is found in both as well. In 4Q417 1 i line 17 refers to the fashioning of humanity, while here in 4Q418 81 + 81a line 2 the 'making' (עשה) of everything is mentioned. Certainly both of the words נחלה and רוח בשר appear frequently in *Musar leMevin*, but only in these two columns are the three themes of a division from all flesh, inheritance and creation. It is with some reticence that I suggest the occurrence of an allusion to Genesis 1-3 in the phrase עשה כול ('He made everything'). This statement is composed with general vocabulary that does not occur verbatim in Genesis 1-3, though the verb עשה itself does occur repeatedly in acts of creation in Genesis (1.7, 11, 12, 16, 25, 26, 31; 2.2, 3, 4, 18); for example, the conclusion of chapter 1 וירא אלהים את כל אשר עשה והנה טוב מאד. In addition, the verb עשה is used twice in 4Q422 1 lines 6-7 (4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus) in regard to God's creative work in Genesis 1.<sup>54</sup>

A few more similarities might be observed between 4Q418 81 + 81a and creation in Genesis. First, lines 1-2 use the verb בדל ('distinguish' or 'separate'; cf. 4Q418 126 ii 8; 4Q418 221 4). These first two lines exhort the addressee to distinguish (הבדילכה) between the 'spirit of flesh' so that he might be separated (הבדל) from all that God detests. These statements, concerned with differentiation, are followed immediately at the end of line 2 and beginning of line 3 with: 'because He made everything and caused each man to inherit his own inheritance'. The Genesis 1 creation account also uses the

verb *בדל* on a number of occasions. For instance, in Genesis 1.7 the text reads: ‘and God made (*ויעש*) the firmament and He distinguished (*ויבדל*) between the water below the firmament and that which is above the firmament’. The verb to ‘distinguish’ is used in Genesis 1 on three of the six days of creation: day one (vs. 4); day two (vss. 6-7); and day four (vs. 18). The acts of creation can be summarised as the dividing, separating, and ordering of creation of each thing to its kind and season. Here in 4Q418 81 + 81a lines 1-3 the combination of the motifs of creation and separation strongly support that we have here an allusion to Genesis 1.

### 3.2.10) 4Q418 126 i-ii

4Q418 126 i-ii preserves text from 16 lines. In fragment i, neither top nor bottom margins remain, but the right margin remains to lines 4-13 is visible. Fragment ii preserves the last portion of the final 8 lines. Neither Elgvin, S/L nor Tigchelaar assign a location to these fragments within the document in their reconstructions.

In lines 1-7 the general content is concerned with judgement of the wicked and the reward of the righteous or ‘poor’ (line 7). The address is composed in the third person:

(8) בכבוד עולם ושלווה עד ורוח חיים להבדיל ]  
(9) כול בני חוה ובכוח אל ורוב כבודו עם טובו ]

8) In eternal glory and peace everlasting and to separate the spirit of life [from ]

9) all the children of Eve and in the strength of God and the multitude of His glory together with his good things [

The phrase *בני חוה* is found neither in the Hebrew Bible nor elsewhere in extant documents of Early Judaism. Strugnell and Harrington note that Eve is the ‘origmatrix’ and at times ‘primogenetrix’ of sin and death in intertestamental texts (e.g. *Jub* 3.20-25;

<sup>54</sup> Line 6 reads: ] צבאם עשה בך [ השמים והארץ וכול (‘the heaven-and earth-and-all their host He made’); line 7:

*The Life of Adam and Eve* 10-11; and *1 Enoch* 62.7).<sup>55</sup> However, in non-biblical documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls the name Eve does not occur, nor does the epithet 'sons of Eve'. The condition of 4Q418 126 i-ii is too damaged to determine whether the phrase בני חוה is used negatively or positively. One possibility is that the phrase was used as a counterpart to בני אדם. However, for the task at hand any attempt to identify the meaning of the phrase is unnecessary. Rather, it is significant that חוה occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 3.20, 4.1) and is possibly an allusion to 'Eve' in Genesis.

### 3.2.11) 4Q418 177

4Q418 177 is an 8 line fragment with no surviving margins, top or bottom. Neither Elgvin, S/L or Tigchelaar locate this fragment in their reconstructions. The address is in the second person that reads:

- שח]ת אבדון אשר בקצהו לוא]

] וכסה חרפתכה vacat [

] וקח בינה האזינה ל [

] אחה רש וגריבים י [

(2) ]

(3) ]

(4) ]

(5) ]
- 2) [ the pi]t of Abaddon which in its boundary no[

3) [ ] and cover your shame vacat [

4) [ ] . . . and grasp understanding, give ear to [

5) [ ] you are poor and/but nobles [

The case for 4Q418 177 alluding to Genesis 1-3 should be made in conjunction with the content of 4Q418 178 below. Strugnell and Harrington suggest that these two fragments could have originally been proximate to one another.<sup>56</sup> Both fragments have the obscure phrase כסה חרפתכה which is not a construction found in the Hebrew Bible. Neither of the words כסה or חרפה occur in Genesis 1-3 but conceptually it may be an

---

אש]ר עשה ורוח קודש] ('that He made and/by His holy spirit').

<sup>55</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 354. Several articles have been produced on the children of Eve in this regard; most recently see F. García Martínez, 'Eve's Children in the Targumim,' in G. P. Luttikhuisen (ed.) *Eve's Children: The Biblical Stories Retold and Interpreted in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) pp. 27-46.

allusion to the state of Adam and Eve's nudity after partaking of the fruit of the tree of knowledge. *Jubilees* 3.21-31 applies similar language in the Garden of Eden narrative where Adam and Eve are said to 'cover their shame' after eating the forbidden fruit. Also, the term חרפה occurs in 4Q416 2 iv line 13 in the context of a running allusion to Genesis 2 (אשת חיקכה וחרפ[חכה]). I would propose that the combination of these observations suggest that the phrase 'cover your shame' is derived from a tradition in Genesis 1-3.

4Q418 177 line 2 mentions the relatively rare word אבדון. It is important to note that of the six occurrences of אבדון in the Hebrew Bible (Job 26.6, 28.22, 31.10; Ps 88.12, Prov 15.11, 27.20) Job 26.6 (ערום שאול נגדו ואין כסות לאבדון) the book of *Jubilees* depicts Adam and Eve as being naked and uncovered just as Abaddon and Sheol are in the Job passage. The term חרפה can be translated 'pudenda' and an allusion to Genesis 2.25-3.1 *vis-à-vis* Job 26.6, on the basis of a type of primitive *gezera sh'va*, may be a possible way of making sense of this fragment. The term ערום may be the link between Job and Genesis. The play on Job 26.6 in reading 'Sheol is naked' and 'Abaddon has no cover' followed by 'cover your shame' fits well with an allusion derived from Genesis 2.25-3.1 and the tradition known to *Jubilees* (3.27-31). It may be possible that these lines use an allusion to uncovered Sheol and naked Abaddon as being in some way analogous to 'shame'. While the connection between Job 26 and Genesis 2-3 in 4Q418 177 is not certain, strong similarities occur between it and 4Q416 2 iv, *Jubilees* and Genesis 2-3. Unfortunately, the context is too fragmentary to allow for any definitive conclusion.

---

<sup>56</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 403.

### 3.2.12) 4Q418 178

4Q418 178 survives in 5 lines with only lines 2-4 containing legible words. None of the margins of this fragment are extant. Elgvin, S/L and Tigchelaar do not locate 4Q418 178.

4Q418 178 line 4 has been reconstructed by Strugnell and Harrington to read כס]ה חרפתכה. As mentioned previously the phrase only occurs here and in 4Q418 177. The reconstruction כס]ה is based on its occurrence in 4Q418 177 and the surviving *heh* which precedes חרפתכה here. This fragment is written in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person masculine singular address. The text reads:

ב]ביתכה תעזור <i>vacat</i> ]	(2)
תמ]צא בית מכונים ]	(3)
כס]ה חרפתכה ]	(4)

- 2) [ in] your house she will help *vacat* [
- 3) [ she will f]ind a house, dwelling [
- 4) [ cove]r your shame[

The exhortation to cover one's shame is found in a context that is concerned with the role of a female. In line 2 a woman is described as a helper (עזר). The statement in line 3 'find your house prepared/established' envisages the female helper playing a prominent role in the preparation of the addressee's dwelling place. A female described as a helper would likely be an allusion to Genesis 2.18: 'I will make for him a helper (עזר)'. Recall 4Q416 2 iii line 21 (cf. 4Q418a 16b + 17 3) and the clear allusion to Genesis 2: התהלך עם עזר בשרכה. This allusion is more convincing when coupled with the occurrence of כסה חרפתכה here and in 4Q418 177. Taken together, 4Q418 177 and 178 appear to contain a running allusion to Genesis 2-3.

### 3.2.13) 4Q418 206

4Q418 206 is a five line fragment with the left margin intact but neither top nor bottom survive. Smaller fragments, such as 4Q418 206, are nearly impossible to locate when no overlaps with larger fragments exist. Thus, Elgvin, S/L and Tigchelaar have not attempted to locate it. Line 3 is addressed in the second person. The text reads:

[ מלך ]	[ קור ]	(2)
[ מם חיה ועוף כיא ]		(3)
[ וכה ומלכה ממשל ]		(4)
[ הל ואחה ינעזה ]		(5) [וממשל]

- 2) [ ] . . . [ ] reigns  
 3) [ ] animal and bird for  
 4) [ king]dom and realm, dominion  
 5) [and dominion ] and you have become weary

The proximity of the words חיה and עוף in line 3 followed by ממשל in lines 4 and 5 are suggestive of the role given to man to rule over creation in Genesis 1.28. The phrase עוף חיה occurs verbatim in Genesis 1.20. The word ממשל in line 4 is used in reference to a husband's rule over his wife in Genesis 3.16, while the word, וירדו is used in Genesis 1.28 in relation to creatures being in submission to humanity. Both 4Q422 1 line 9 (4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus) and 4Q504 8 line 6 (4QWords of the Luminaries<sup>a</sup>) are fragments that recount creation in Genesis 1-3 and substitute the verb משל for רדה in their paraphrase of the Hebrew Bible. The term משל is common in *Musar leMevin* (approx. 23 times)<sup>57</sup> and is used in a variety of ways. Most common is the notion of husband ruling over his wife (e.g. 4Q415 9 8; 4Q416 iii 21-iv). The addressee is also said to have been placed in authority over a glorious inheritance (4Q416 2 iii 12)

<sup>57</sup> Not including parallel occurrence these are: 415 9 8; 416 2 i 19; 416 2 iii 12, 17; 416 2 iv 2, 3, 6, 7; 417 2 i.13; 418 47 1; 418 81 + 81a 3, 9, 15; 418 228 2; 418 259 2; 418a 18 4; 423 1, 2 i; and 423 5 3. The editors comment: 'among the Qumran texts, המשיל is almost totally confined to 4QInstruction and very characteristic of it...4QInstruction uses המשיל with regard to the relation between parent and child (4Q416 2

and elsewhere in authority over Adam's/God's inheritance (4Q418 81 + 81a 3). At one point it is used in the context of ruling over creation (4Q423 1, 2 i). 4Q418 206 provides no context within which to view these similarities in vocabulary. Based upon the certain context of ruling or having authority in 4Q423 1, 2 i, and the probability of a similar context here, the occurrence of 'authority' in close relation to the terms עֵרָךְ and חֵיה indicate an allusion to creation. Similar to the notion of 'distinguishing', which could be traced back to creation, 'ruling' also seems to be a motif that could stem from the first chapters of Genesis.

### 3.2.14) 4Q418a 16b + 17

Fragment 4Q418a 17 consists of 5 lines with approximately a 10 character width. Elgvin, S/L and Tigchelaar do not attempt to locate this fragment. From this fragment, only the of one line is relevant:

] (3 [ ה עם עזר ב[שרכה

3) [ ] with the helper of [your flesh

Strugnell and Harrington consider the possibility that 4Q418a 17 could be another copy of 4Q416 2 iii line 21 where the same phrase occurs. However, they conclude on the basis of surrounding lines that it is not.<sup>58</sup> The reconstruction of בשרכה is plausible but not certain. If one can confidently reconstruct this phrase as 'helper of your flesh' it would be an almost indisputable allusion to Genesis 2.18.

### 3.2.15) 4Q423 1, 2 i

Elgvin, the editor of 4Q423 in DJD 34, notes that there is no continuous text which supports the association of fragments 1 and 2. It is, however, the shape of the

---

iii 17), husband and wife (4Q416 2 iv 2, 6, 7), as well as in a symbolic meaning (4Q418 81 3, 9, 15; 4Q416 2 iii 12)'; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 509.

fragments that warrants that they be placed together.<sup>59</sup> The left margin of fragment 2 and the top margin of both fragments are extant. Elgvin places 4Q423 1, 2 i in column 22 of his reconstruction, S/L do not locate it, while Tigchelaar assigns it to column 20. Tigchelaar is confident that 'most or all fragments [of 4Q423] belong to one of the final sections of the composition'.<sup>60</sup> The agreement between Elgvin and Tigchelaar in assigning 4Q423 1, 2 i among the final columns of the document are convincing in my opinion.

4Q423 1, 2 i lines 1-2 are written in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> person, while lines 3-4 and 6-8 are in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person, and line 5 is given in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person. This column is among the clearest of all materials examined thus far in alluding to and paraphrasing Genesis 1-3.<sup>61</sup>

- |     |  |
|-----|--|
| (1) | [ וכל פרי תנובה וכל עץ נעים נחמד להשכיל הלוא גן נעים ]               |
| (2) | [ הוא ונחמד ל[ה]שכיל מ[וא]דה ובו המשילכה לעבדו ולשמרו vac גן נאון ]ת |
| (3) | [ האדמה ] קוץ ודרדר תצמיח לכה וכוחה לא תתן לכה ]                     |
| (4) | [ במועלכה vacat ]  |
| (5) | [ vacat ילדה וכל רחמי הור[ת] ]ל[ ] ה ש[ ]תה כל אושכה                 |
| (6) | [ בכל חפציכה כי כל תצמיח לכה ]ם תמיד לא                              |
| (7) | [ ובמשע ]בם ה[ ]מואס הרע יודע הטוב                                   |
| (8) | [ב]ן דרכו ודרך   |

- 1) [ ] and every fruit of produce and every pleasant tree, desirable to make wise, is it not a lovely garden
- 2) [and desirable ]to make wise? He made you to rule over it to labour in it and guard it vacat an [enjoya]ble g[arden]
- 3) [ the earth] thorns and thistles it will sprout for you, and its strength it will not deliver to you, [
- 4) [ ] in your unfaithfulness
- 5) [ ] her child, and all the mercy of her that is pregna[nt ]you [... ]led all your secrets
- 6) [ ] in everything of your delights, for everything it will sprout forth [ for you ] not always
- 7) [ ] and in a planting[ ]them [ rejecting ]the evil and knowing the good,

<sup>58</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 490.

<sup>59</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 508.

<sup>60</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 169; elsewhere he explains his rationale: 'Since the preserved 4Q423 fragments do not overlap with 4Q416, 4Q417, or 4Q415, one may surmise that they all originated from a section of the scroll not covered by those of other manuscripts, and that they all should be placed not too far from 4Q418 103', p. 165. Tigchelaar's putative column 4Q418a 4 (column 19 out of a total of 23) overlaps with 4Q418 103 ii.

<sup>61</sup> E. J. C. Tigchelaar, 'Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other texts found at Qumran),' in G. P. Luttikhuisen (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 37-62; he compares the Genesis Eden narratives of 1 Enoch, Jub, 4Q303-305, 4Q422, 4Q405 and 4Q423 1, 2 i.



8) [ be]tween his way and the way [of

The table below demonstrates the lexical and conceptual parallels between 4Q423

1, 2 i and Genesis 2-3:

(1) וכל פרי תנובה וכל עץ נעים נחמד להשכיל הלווא גן נעים	(2.9) ויצמח יהיה אלהים מן האדמה כל עץ נחמד למראה וטוב למאכל ועץ החיים בתוך הגן ועץ הדעת טוב ורע (3.6) כי טוב העץ למאכל וכי תאונה הוא לעינים ונחמד העץ להשכיל
(2) הוא ונחמד [ל]ה[שכיל מ]וא[דה ובו המשילכה לעברו ולשמרו גן נאורח	(1.28) וירדו ברגת הים ובעורף השמים ובכל חיה הרמשת עליה ארץ
(3) האדמה] קוץ ודרדר תצמיח לכה וכוחה לא תחן לכה	(2.15) ויקח יהיה אלהים את האדם וינחהו בגן עדן לעבדה ולשמרה (and 2.9; 3.6)
(4) במועלכה	(3.18) וקוץ ודרדר תצמיח לך ואכלת את עשב השדה
(5) ילדה וכל רחמי הורח	(3.16?) אלהי אשה אמר הרבה ארבה עצבונך והרבה בעצב תלדי בנים ואלאישך תשוקתך והוא ימשל בך
(6) בכל חפציה כי כל תצמיח [לכה] אם תמיד לא	(2.9) ויצמח (3.18) תצמיח
(7) ובמטען] בם ה[חרע יודע הטוב	(3.5?) כי ידע אלהים כי ביום אכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם והייתם כאלהים ידעי טוב ורע
(8) ב[ין דרכו ודרך	-

In line 1 an allusion to Genesis 3.6 occurs with some overlap with 2.9. Genesis 2.9 describes the tree of knowledge as 'desirable' (נחמד) in appearance, which is expanded upon in 4Q423 1, 2 i with the form 'lovely' (נעים). The text in 4Q423 1, 2 i line 1 alludes directly to Genesis 3.6 where the tree is described as desirable (נחמד) to make one wise. A significant difference exists between this line here and Genesis. In Genesis (2.9) it is only the tree in the centre of the garden that makes one wise while here in *Musar leMevin* it is the produce of every tree (כל עץ) that is desirable for making one wise.

Line 2 repeats the content of line 1 with the statement that the trees are 'desirable to make wise'. The phrase בו המשילכה ('He set you in dominion over it') in line 2 is of particular interest while Adam in Genesis 2.15-16 is made to rest (נוח) in the entire garden

and care for it, but is not specifically given dominion over the tree of knowledge. Genesis 1.28 exhorts Adam to rule over creation, but not the garden; the garden narrative is only taken up in Genesis 2-3. Outside of Genesis 1.28 the motif of dominion only explicitly occurs in 3.16 where male is given dominion over female. 4Q423 1, 2 i line 2 stands in contrast to Genesis 2.16-17 where Adam is warned off from the tree of knowledge; however, both have a command 'to work' (לעבד/ה) and 'to keep' (לשמר/ה) the garden.<sup>62</sup> Elgvin correctly finds an allusion to Genesis 2.15-16 in the word המשיל. He states that the term 'describes God placing man as steward over creation' (cf. Ps 8.7; Dan 11.39).<sup>63</sup> However, the general sense of stewardship over creation found in Genesis is somewhat different than the emphasis on dominion over trees of knowledge here. In *4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus* (4Q422) a tradition is preserved with this precise distinction: המשילו לאכול פרי [ ] לבלתי אכול מעץ הדעת ('he gave him dominion to eat the fruit of...except for eating from the tree of knowledge').<sup>64</sup> *4QWords of the Luminaries* (4Q504 8 6) simply states that Adam was made to rule in the Garden of Eden: בגן עדן אשר נטעתה המשלחה אותו ('in the Garden of Eden which you planted you made him rule'). It can be observed then that in the first two lines of 4Q423 1, 2 i two significant interpretations of Genesis 2-3 occur. First, all trees in the Garden bear wisdom. Second, dominion over these knowledge-bearing trees has been granted. The combination of

<sup>62</sup> The editors comment on the change of suffixes: 'while the suffixes referring to נ in Gen 2:15 are feminine, this text changes them to masculine, the usual gender for this word'; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 509.

<sup>63</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 509.

<sup>64</sup> The editors cite several texts that refer to humanities dominion over the earth, however, these either allude generally to the dominion of Gen 1.28 or not specifically to dominion over the tree of knowledge: 1QS 3.17-18; 4Q381 1 6-8; 4Q301 3 6; 4Q504 8 6. Note also that Jub 2.14 emphasises human dominion over the earth based upon Gen 1.28. Tigchelaar, 'Eden and Paradise,' p. 55, writes that it is not 'clear in what sense or with what purpose the Gen narrative [of 4Q423 1, 2 i] was being paraphrased. In view of some instructions in *4QInstruction* to farmers, one may consider the possibility that Eden and the paradise narrative is a metaphor for the earth (הארמה) in general, or the farmer's own land in particular, with, in the

these factors suggests that an interpretation of the Garden of Eden account is known where, in contrast to Genesis, partaking from the tree of knowledge is positively conceived.<sup>65</sup>

In line 3 the phrase describing the curse on man in Genesis 3.18 re-occurs: קוץ ודרדר תצמיח ('thorns and thistles it will sprout'). Here in 4Q423 1, 2 i a paraphrase of Genesis 2-3 that uses the imagery of 'thorns and thistles' does not necessarily mean it is to be understood as an interpretation of a curse for eating of the tree(s) of knowledge. In fact, Hebrews 6.8 alludes to Genesis 3.18 with the identical phrase ('thorns and thistles') within an agricultural analogy to one who has 'fallen away'. With line 3 straightforward allusions to Genesis in the column come to an end. In line 4 survives only one word and while one may guess how 'in your unfaithfulness' (במועלכה) could relate to the Genesis narrative, there is simply not enough context to come to a judgement about the matter. Line 5 is generally concerned with a woman's bearing of children and might be related to the curse of woman in Genesis 3.16. In line 6 the term 'it will sprout' (תצמיח) occurs which clearly continues with imagery from a planted garden.

Elgvin in DJD 34 considers line 7 to mark a change of subject from the garden to the elect end-time community. The term מנע (planting) occurs in the phrase מנע עולם ('eternal planting') in 4Q418 81 line 14 as a term for the community.<sup>66</sup> Elgvin comments on the transition of subject stating that 'the community is thus described with a term

---

lost part between lines 2-3, the protasis of a conditional sentence'. See comments on 4Q423 5 below (§ 3.2.16).

<sup>65</sup> Sirach 17.7 confirms a broader sapiential tradition that portrayed the gaining of knowledge positively based on the creation narrative: 'He filled them with knowledge (ἐπιστήμη) and understanding (συνέσις), and showed them good (ἀγαθά) and evil (κακά)'.

<sup>66</sup> On the metaphorical language of 'planting' see Tiller, "'The "Eternal Planting", 312-35; J. Licht, 'The Plant Eternal and the People of Divine Deliverance,' in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds.), *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Hekhal ha-Sefer, 1961): 1-27; D. Flusser, 'He has Planted it as Eternal Life in our Midst,' in *Tarbiz* 58 (1988-89): 147-53.

fitting the “garden theme” of this section’.<sup>67</sup> Both מַטַּע (CD I 7; *1 Enoch* 84.6; 93.5, 10) and מַטַּעַת עוֹלָם (1QS 11.8; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14.15, 16.6) occur elsewhere in Qumran literature as designations for the end-time community. Among these occurrences of ‘planting’ as a description for the community, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 16.6 alone sets it within a garden context. However, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 16.4-13 could hardly be considered a paraphrase of Genesis 2, though perhaps it remotely alludes to it. Here in 4Q423 1, 2 i, even though an epithet for the community may occur, there is no reason to consider a shift away from the paraphrase of Genesis 2-3. Therefore, the final words (הָרַע יוֹדַע הַטוֹב) of line 7 are most likely drawn from Genesis. It is more appropriate to consider how Genesis traditions have influenced the ‘planting’ metaphor in *Musar leMevin* rather than *vice versa*.

Elgvin suggests the reconstruction of מוֹאֵס הָרַע יוֹדַע הַטוֹב (‘rejecting the bad and knowing the good’) for 4Q423 1, 2 i line 7, basing it on Isaiah 7.15-16 (מֹאֵס בָּרַע בַּחוּר בְּטוֹב). However, several factors might call this reconstruction into question: (1) if ‘good’ and ‘evil’ are to be related to Genesis 3.5 then it is the gaining of a knowledge of both that could be in mind; (2) for the editor’s reconstruction one would expect the conjunction *waw* (וְ) מוֹאֵס הָרַע יוֹדַע הַטוֹב; and (3) elsewhere in the document the addressee is exhorted to know both good and evil as a general part of gaining wisdom (e.g. 4Q417 1 i 6-7; 4Q423 5). Although an alternative reconstruction to DJD 34 can be suggested, I would relate line 7 to Genesis 3 and the possession of the knowledge of good and evil as a product of eating of the tree of knowledge.

4QMeditation on Creation<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q303-304) also preserves a paraphrase of Genesis 1-3 and is useful as a source of comparison and contrast with 4Q423 1, 2 i. The text of

---

<sup>67</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 511.

4Q304 below preserves a fragmentary statement that the knowledge of good and evil were given to Adam.

- (1) ויברא בו חיות ]  
(2) נתן לאדם דע]ת  
(3) ורע לדעת]

- 1) and He created in it life [  
2) He gave to Adam knowled[ge  
3) and evil to know[

Beginning with line 1, this fragment describes God as the creator of life. In line 2 God is said to have given to Adam 'knowledge'. Certainly, the damaged and missing portions of lines 2-3 would have read that the knowledge of good and evil were in some manner given to Adam. Contra the Genesis account, 4Q304 may well preserve a tradition wherein God is depicted as having been a willing and active provider of knowledge.

It may be questioned, then, how the fragment in 4Q303 fits with 4Q304. This fragment is also concerned with the knowledge of good and evil as well as with Adam's created partner. The text reads:

- (8) ] ר ושכל טוב ורע ל[  
(9) ] לוקח ממנה ידים כיא[  
(10) ] עשה לו עזר כ[  
(11) ] לו לאשה כיא ממנו]

- 8) [ ]and understand good and evil for[  
9) [ ]<sup>Adam</sup> taking from her because[  
10) [ ]He made for him a help[  
11) [ ]for him for a wife because from him[

This paraphrase shares significant lexical overlaps with Genesis. However, it is conspicuous that the events of Genesis are given here in reverse order. Whereas the account of the woman's creation precedes the eating of the tree of knowledge in Genesis 2, here in 4Q303 the account of Adam accepting (the fruit?) from Eve precedes the account, or perhaps restatement, of woman's creation. In 4Q303 line 9 Adam takes

(something?) from her (ממנה) and the woman is then taken from him (ממנו) – apparently a play on the idea that woman was taken from man and man then takes from woman.<sup>68</sup>

If it is correct to understand the possession of the knowledge of good and evil as positive in these fragments, then woman's portrayal as the bearer of fruit and, therefore, originatrix of evil, loses negative connotations. This is a significant divergence from other Early Jewish literature where the opposite motif is frequently taken up (e.g. 1 Tim 2.14; Sir 25.24; 4 Macc 18.6-8; *Apoc. Mos.* 29.9, 32.2). One might then consider crucial in regard to the portrayal of woman in *Musar leMevin*, whether partaking of the tree of knowledge was conceived of as negative or positive. The determination of the interpretation of woman in the Garden of Eden, whether she bears guilt or responsibility for her role in introducing 'sin' into the world, could have importance for understanding views of woman in the document. This is especially the case since a cluster of allusions to Genesis 1-3 regarding woman occur in *Musar leMevin*.

It is far more likely that 4Q423 1, 2 i positively conceives of the gaining of knowledge of good and evil. It is difficult to know exactly how the Genesis tradition is used in regard to the phrase קִין וְרֵרֶדֶר הַצִּמְחָה in line 3. It could be that 'thorns and thistles' are not a result or 'curse' for eating from the tree(s) of knowledge but describe, for instance, the inherent struggle of faithfully pursuing and obtaining knowledge (cf. The Parable of the Sower in Mk 4.1-20). After all, the overarching task of pursuing

---

<sup>68</sup> One might also compare 4QParaphrase of of Genesis and Exodus (4Q422) and 4QWords of the Luminaries (4Q504). See E. G. Chazon, 'The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) pp. 13-24.

knowledge, the difficulties and travails that oppose this pursuit, is something that *Musar leMevin* is deeply concerned with.<sup>69</sup>

### 3.2.16) 4Q423 5

4Q423 5 is an 11 line fragment with neither top, bottom nor right margin. The left margin is barely distinguishable at the end of lines 6-7. The first line, designated by the editor as line 1a, does not appear to have been part of the original composition. Lines 5-6 are the most fully preserved portions of the fragment and show a damage point near the centre of line 6. The address is in the third person. This fragment is not located by Elgvin and S/L. Tigchelaar, as noted above, locates all 4Q423 fragments to the final columns of the document.

- (3) הוּא פִּלַּג [נ]חלת כל מושלים ויצר כל [מעש]ה בידו והוא פעולה  
 (4) [מעשיהמה ידע וישפוט]ט כולם באמת יפקוד לאבות ובנים [לגרי]ם עם כל אורחים ידבר  
 (5) אם אחת א[יש אדמה פקוד מועדי הקיץ ואסוף תבואתה בעתה ותקופת  
 (6) [קציר למועדו ה]תבונן בכל תבואתה ובעבודתה השכ[יל בדעת ה]טוב עם הרע

- 3) [ H]e divided the inheritance of all rulers and formed every [dee]d by His hand and the product of  
 4) [their deeds He knew, and He will judg]e all of them in truth and he will punish fathers and sons,[  
 visitors]s along with every native, He will speak  
 5) [ if you are a f]armer, observe the appointed times of the season and gather your produce in time, and  
 the season  
 6) [of harvest in its appointed time. C]onsider all your produce, and in your labour be wi[se in the  
 knowledge of] good and evil

4Q423 5 line 1, which is among the lines that precede the text above, begins with a phrase not found in precisely this form in the Hebrew Bible: משפט קורח (cf. Num 16; 4Q491 1-3). Lines 1 - 2 mention that 'he opened your ears', presumably to the נדיה רז, followed by a fragmentary reference to a 'leader of your people'. Line 3 is concerned

<sup>69</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 103, comments: 'Eden can be a metaphor for maintaining the lifestyle advocated by 4QInstruction and can also signify the addressee's failure to do so. Eden is used as a metaphor for the human condition. Both the right path and the wrong path are represented by Eden.' Similarly, it is likely that the motif of poverty or lacking also are part of a metaphor for the condition of the addressees.

with the inheritance of rulers (נחלת כל מושלים) and the fashioning of deeds (יצר כל מעשה), both motifs that recur throughout *Musar leMevin* (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii 18; 2 iii 10-11; 4Q417 1 i 24; 4Q418 81 3, 11, 20). The inheritance of rulers in line 3 could conceivably be related to other notions of ruling in *Musar leMevin* (Genesis 1.28?) and especially 4Q423 1, 2 i line 2 where the addressee is regarded as a ruler over a garden. Both 4Q417 1, i lines 17 (כחבניה קדושים יצרו) and 4Q416 2, iii line 17 (המשילמה בכה ויצר על הרוח) address issues of formation and perhaps of creation, and it may be that 4Q423 5 line 3 has connotations of creation (ויצר כל מעשה בידו) as well.

Lines 5-6 contain a number of agricultural terms and motifs. Line 5 opens with the phrase איש אדמה ('man of the earth' or 'farmer') which Elgvin understands as an allusion to Noah (Gen 9.20).<sup>70</sup> Both lines exhort the reader to observe the regular cycle of nature (cf. 4Q416 1 1-9) in order to discover a knowledge of good and evil. The term איש אדמה may not allude to Noah at all, but rather to the addressee as a cultivator or farmer who is being compared to Adam and the garden. This is even more convincing in light of 4Q423 1, 2 i which can be viewed as placing some agricultural motifs in *Musar leMevin* within a metaphor of the Genesis garden. This fragment could continue a metaphor of the addressee in an Eden-like-garden as opposed to views set forth that these lines are simply worldly-wisdom addressed to an addressee-farmer in the same manner as other sapiential literature.<sup>71</sup> The additional context that includes knowledge of good and evil suggests that more than straightforward agricultural advice is meant. It is somewhat uncharacteristic in agricultural advice to emphasise meditation on crops or seasons for

<sup>70</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 521; Elgvin also finds a reference to Noah in 4Q416 1 2 (=4Q418 201 1) that further substantiates this claim. The suggestion that the name 'Noah' occurs in *Musar leMevin* has not gained many supporters.



understanding good and evil. It does fit, however, with a general meditation on the created order and the garden of 4Q423 1, 2 i. Though Genesis 1-3 never uses the phrase *אִישׁ אֲדָמָה*, Adam is clearly cast as a worker of the earth (Gen 2.15-16).

### 3.3) Conclusions

As has been demonstrated above, creation traditions derived from Genesis are numerous in *Musar LeMevin*. We can hypothesise with relative certainty that allusions to creation both introduce and conclude the document (4Q423 fragments). Fragment 4Q416 1 can be confidently located in the first column of the document.<sup>72</sup> The introduction of this sapiential instruction presents themes of cosmology and eschatological judgement and in line 15 exhorts the addressee to understand the difference between good and evil. The cosmological theme that luminaries order seasons clearly alludes to Genesis 1. An exhortation to distinguish between good and evil occurs repeatedly throughout the document and is a theme that is broadly related to Genesis 1-3. Fragment 4Q417 1 i is likely located in a column shortly after 4Q416 1. 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 may conceive of the fashioning of humanity in the likeness of the 'holy ones' (Gen 1.26-27) and, if so, then proceeds to ground an understanding between good and evil on this view. Accordingly, 4Q417 1 i lines 17-18 describe the acquisition of knowledge of good and evil in terms of 'people of spirit' and 'spirit of flesh'. 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-17 describe the origin of the addressee as directly related to parents but in a complex with perhaps greater depth than simple earthly parentage – an analogy occurs with God and the rare term 'Lords' (*אֲדֹנִים*). 4Q418 81 states that God 'has made everyone' but has separated the

---

<sup>71</sup> Elgvin, 'The Reconstruction,' p. 580, summarises the contents of 4Q423 1-2 as 'The conditions of the farmer in light of the Eden story'.

<sup>72</sup> If one follows S/L it might be (?) that manuscript 4Q417 existed in a different redaction and 4Q417 1 i was the first column.

righteous from 'flesh' as well as given them bounty and goodness. 4Q418 69 refers to the 'fashioning' of the wicked and concludes that even though the wicked were created by God, certain judgement and destruction await them. As Elgvin and Tigchelaar have demonstrated, it can be reasonably assumed that fragments 4Q423 1, 2 i and 5 are located somewhere near the end of the composition along with the other 4Q423 fragments. Again, 4Q423 1, 2 i addresses the acquisition of the knowledge of good and evil in a paraphrase of Genesis 1-2. 4Q423 5 makes reference to 'fashioning' and the addressee is exhorted in both these fragments to know the difference between good and evil. This cluster of references to knowing good and evil appears to be linked to a running allusion to Genesis 1-3 traditions. From the beginning of *Musar leMevin* onward these themes re-occur and play a prominent role in the formation of the document's theology.

Fragment 4Q415 2 ii appears to refer to the origin of woman. Fragment 4Q416 2 iii makes similar statements, describing woman as 'flesh of your nakedness' and 'wife of your bosom'. While the fragment consists of only a few damaged lines, 4Q418a 16b + 17 likely has the phrase 'helpmeet of your flesh' which is presumably a reference to a wife. The context of fragments 4Q418 177 and 178 are poorly preserved but might allude to woman in Genesis as well. Finally, 4Q418 126 i-ii uses the phrase 'sons of Eve', though the connotations of this reference are indiscernible. Not only do these fragments display a number of allusions to Genesis 1-3 but a heightened interest in woman in *Musar leMevin*.

Fragment 4Q415 2 i + 1 ii may allude to Genesis 1-3 in the words 'fruit' and 'seed'. Fragment 4Q418 206 uses the terms 'beasts' and 'birds' as well as 'dominion' which suggests a possible reference to Genesis. The use of agricultural imagery and the

concept of cultivation occur throughout the document as seen in 4Q423 1, 2 i and 4Q423 5 above. Further, 4Q418 81 considers that bounty and goodness are given to the righteous. Agricultural motifs occur throughout *Musar leMevin* and could be used metaphorically at times in relation to Adam's role as a keeper of the garden.

The identification of allusions to Genesis in *Musar leMevin*, though questionable in some cases, establishes the significance of creation in the document. The allusions proposed above will be explored in chapters 4 and 5 that follow both thematically throughout the document as well as placed within a history of traditions context with relevant literature from early Judaism. These chapters will attempt to locate clusters of allusions and relate them to the issues identified in chapter one.

## 4) Angelology and Anthropology in *Musar leMevin*

### 4.1) Introduction

In chapter one (§1.3.7) angelology has been identified as one of the remaining contentious issues in *Musar leMevin*. In chapter three (§3.2.6) column 4Q417 1 i has been shown to contain an allusion to Genesis 1.26, in which clear reference is being made to the involvement of angelic beings in creation. Elsewhere in the document terms used as designations for angelic beings occur as well (e.g. 4Q418 55, 69 and 81). The focus of this chapter will be on a re-examination of 4Q417 1 i as an allusion to creation and the significance of the column for angelology throughout the document. In addition, other allusions to angelic beings may be identified within the context of multiple allusions to creation. Motifs of creation as found in 4Q417 1 i may be explored throughout the document and either elucidate or reveal similar themes elsewhere.

### 4.2) 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18

A number of very different translations and interpretations for 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 exist among researchers of *Musar leMevin*. A critical review of scholarly interpretations of these lines will be provided here. This will serve not only to demonstrate the significance of these lines for defining angel/human relations in *Musar leMevin*, but also to identify where difficulties in reading these lines lie. As Collins points out, among the more contentious terms to interpret are: תבנית, אנוש, קדושים, and יצרו.<sup>1</sup> While the column as a whole has a number of difficult terms to translate and identify due to the fragmentary state of many lines, the present inquiry will be limited to these terms in lines 15-18 alone. As will be seen, 4Q417 1 i is one

---

<sup>1</sup> Collins, 'Likeness of the Holy Ones,' pp. 609ff.

of the most pivotal columns in the document for establishing conceptions of angelology, anthropology and creation.

#### 4.2.1) Armin Lange

Lange, one of the first to write on the document *Musar leMevin*, translates these lines in 4Q417 1 i as follows:

(15) כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול ע [ ] בני שות וספר זכרון כחוב לפניו  
(16) לשמרי דברו והוא חזון ההגוי<sup>4</sup> לספר זכרון וינחילונו<sup>3</sup> לאנוש עם<sup>5</sup> רוח [כי]א  
(17) כתבנית קדושים יצרו ועוד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר כי לא ידע בין  
(18) [טו]ב לרע כמשפט [ר]וחו<sup>6</sup> vacat[ ואתה בן מבין הבט vacat ברו נהיה ודע<sup>5</sup>

(15) denn Eingemeißeltes wurde eingehauen von Gott um all der F[revel] der Söhne Seths willen, und das Buch der Erinnerung wurde vor ihm geschrieben (16) für die, die auf sein Wort achten, und die Vision der Erklärung ist das Buch der Erinnerung. Und er hat es Enosh gemeinsam mit dem Volk des Geistes zum Erbteil gegeben, [den]n (17) gemäß der Gestalt der Heiligen ist seine [Ge]sinnung. Doch die Erklärung wurde nicht dem Geist des Fleisches gegeben, denn er vermag nicht, zwischen (18) Gut und Böse zu unterscheiden gemäß dem Gesetz seines Geistes. vacat<sup>6</sup>

In discussing the phrase כיא כתבנית קדושים יצרו, he suggests an alternative reading to that given by Wacholder/Abegg.<sup>7</sup> Wacholder/Abegg, similar to Elgvin (§4.2.2 below), want to relate כתבנית to the ספר זכרון and translate 'because he created it as a sacred blueprint'. This reading is based upon occurrences of the term כתבנית that connote 'blueprint' in several passages of the Hebrew Bible and *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* (e.g. Ex 25.9, 40; 2 Kgs 16.10; 4Q403 1 i 43ff.). Lange rejects this reading and raises several arguments against it. First, the phrase 'because he created it as a holy blueprint' does not explain why the 'Vision der Erklärung' was given to Enosh

<sup>2</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom with and Without,' p. 25, reconstructs עולה here.

<sup>3</sup> Elgvin reads וינחילה.

<sup>4</sup> Elgvin reads הגי.

<sup>5</sup> The Hebrew text here is taken from *DJD XXXIV* and is not part of Lange's presentation. A number of translations of these lines will be discussed below and the Hebrew is provided here for reference purposes.

<sup>6</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 53.

<sup>7</sup> They translate: 'And he (Seth?) bequeathed it to Enosh with the people of the spirit. Because he created it as a sacred blueprint (*tabnith*). But Haguy had not as yet been entrusted to the spirit of flesh since it (spirit of flesh) had as yet not known the distinction between good and evil.' in Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, Fascicle 2 (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992): xiii.

and a 'spiritual people'. Second, it would be very surprising in the context that the verb יצר should denote the creation of this heavenly book, especially when the preceding context uses the verbs חרת, כתב and חקק. Lange prefers to relate the term קדושים as a reference to heavenly angelic beings, as is the case in *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* (e.g. 4Q403 1 i 24, 31). The term יצר should be understood as a noun rather than a verb with the 3<sup>rd</sup> person masculine suffix ו-. This suffix refers to 'Enosh' and serves as a reference to his character. Turning to *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*, Lange prefers to read the term חבנית as 'die Gestalt' or 'das Wesen' of the קדושים (cf. 4Q403 1 ii 3; 11QShirSabb 5 62). According to Lange's interpretation, Enosh is the only human being who was given the 'Vision der Erklärung' for the very reason that his character corresponds with the 'people of spirit'.

Lange understands the phrase עם רוח as referring to heavenly angelic beings or 'Engelvolk'.<sup>8</sup> He explains the significance and function of both אנוש and the עם רוח as counterpoints to the רוח בשר in 4Q417 1 i.<sup>9</sup> He refers to occurrences of the phrase רוח בשר in the *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup> 4.37; 5.30) where, according to the *opinio communis*, it denotes the spirit of a human being. In the *Hodayot*, the terms 'flesh' and 'spirit' are not used in the Pauline sense of two cosmic powers. Rather, in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5.30 the infinitive להבין is used to describe the purpose of the 'spirit of flesh' and points to the fact that 'spirit of flesh' refers to a type of human ability to understand and gain some

<sup>8</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 86.

<sup>9</sup> J. Frey, whose views are indebted to Lange's, in 'Flesh and Spirit' addresses classic parallels of בשר in the DSS. In the first category are usages where בשר is defined by complements עול and אשמה (1QM 4.4; 1QS 9.9). Next are occurrences of בשר that denote the notion of sin without complement. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5.30-36 contains the phrase רוח בשר, which in this instance is incapable of grasping God's deeds, counsel or appreciate His glory (the phrase occurs in context with the phrases ילוד אשה, מבנה עפר, and רוח נעה). Later in the same psalm this 'spirit of flesh' is contrasted with another 'spirit' that provides insight. Two other *Hodayot* passages taken up by Frey are 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7.34ff. and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12.30ff. In relation to the latter he writes, 'only through the "spirit" created by God can "flesh" grasp the power of God... the praise of God's salvific acts is strengthened by the corresponding confession of human incapability'. 1QS 9.26 – 11.22 also receive attention by Frey. Important to note is expression in these passages of בשר as representing sinful humanity while the community member confesses to sharing in

sort of insight. The phrase occurs elsewhere in *Musar leMevin* (4Q416 1 12; 4Q418 81 1ff.) and is used as a negative designation for a social group or segment of humanity who are ungodly. In these two contexts the use of the phrase is much closer to the contrast of 'spirit' and 'flesh' in Paul rather than the *Hodayot*.

Lange states it is very unlikely that the term אֱנוֹשׁ in 4Q417 1 i is the noun designating all humanity, contra Elgvin below. Since for him אֱנוֹשׁ does not refer to the 'spirit of flesh', who are a segment of ungodly humanity, it is difficult to understand the term as a reference to all humankind. The reasonable option that remains for Lange is that it is a reference to the proper name 'Enosh' the son of Seth (Gen 4.26). He finds confirmation for this reading in the comment that the ספר זכרון was written due to the outrage of the sons of Seth, a motif found in rabbinic tradition.<sup>10</sup> Lange also finds confirmation for reading the name of the antediluvian 'Enosh' in the positive portrayal of his person in Genesis 4.26 and *Jubilees* 4.12. Lange asserts that a myth set during the time of Seth's sons in which the fall of the angels and the beginning of the outrage occurs is the backdrop that 4Q417 1 i should be read against. According to this myth, Enosh together with the 'people of spirit' are portrayed as the only righteous ones who inherit the ספר זכרון as a result of these wicked events.<sup>11</sup>

The phrase עַם רוּחַ is known only from 4Q417 1 i and, according to Lange, could designate either a group of humanity positively qualified or a people of heavenly spirits ('ein Volk himmlischer Geister'). The latter suggestion is supported by a few arguments. First, since the 'Vision der Erklärung' was given to Enosh alone,

---

this lot as well (e.g. 1QS 9.9ff.; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12.30ff.). In the *Hodayot* specifically, those praying are flesh and sinners and yet simultaneously participate in revelation and salvation. pp. 378-85.

<sup>10</sup> Lange does not cite any specific rabbinic passages, but notes S. D. Fraade, *Enosh and his Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (SBLMS 30; Chico: Scholars Press, 1984).

<sup>11</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, pp. 87-88.

the only individual selected among all humanity on account of his character, this would clearly correspond with the angelic beings who are called קדושים. Further, angelic beings are frequently called רוחות and רוחים in texts from Qumran, this is especially the case in *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*. In 4Q400 it is emphasised that God created heavenly tablets in the presence of different angelic beings for all spiritual creatures (4Q400 1 i 4-6). In light of this, the phrase עם רוח in 4Q417 1 i may most likely refer to a heavenly spiritual people. According to Lange, it may be understood that the 'Vision der Erklärung' was revealed to the antediluvian 'Enosh' together with a 'Volk himmlischer Geister'. Lange then concludes:

Enosh und das Volk der Geister stehen dem Geist des Fleisches gegenüber, Weisheit der Torheit, Wahrheit dem Frevel etc. Erkenntnis ist nur wenigen Auserwählten, die sich würdig erweisen, möglich (I 11.16-18) – eine schroffe Abkehr von der in der Weisheit für jedermann angenommenen Erkenntnismöglichkeit.<sup>12</sup>

*Musar leMevin*, he explains, presents a pre-existing order of existence and a creation that is comprised of a dualistic understanding of the world. Unlike the wisdom of the Hebrew Bible, true knowledge and understanding are not available to everyone only a few chosen people have access to wisdom through exclusive revelation.

#### 4.2.2) Torleif Elgvin

In an article concerned primarily with relating *Musar leMevin* to Enochic traditions and the Essenes, Elgvin translates and comments on 4Q417 1 i.<sup>13</sup> His translation is as follows:<sup>14</sup>

... for the engraved is decreed by God for all the iniquity(?) of the sons of perdition. And the Book of Memory was written before Him for those who keep His word. It is the Vision of Hagi and a Book of Memory. He gave it as inheritance to man with a spiritual people, for He fashioned it as a model for the holy ones. He had not before given Hagi to the spirit of flesh, for he could not discern between [good] and evil with the judgment of his [spirit]. And you, a disciple of a man of understanding, gaze on the mystery to come, learn ...

<sup>12</sup> Lange, *Weisheit*, p. 89.

<sup>13</sup> Elgvin, 'The Mystery to Come,' pp. 139-47.

<sup>14</sup> The Hebrew text and enumeration follow *DJD XXXIV*.



Elgvin understands חוקן ההגוי to be a heavenly book rather than the 'Vision of Hagi' and identifies it with the Book of Memory (ספר זכרון). He further argues that the phrase חרות מחוקק refers to the engraving of the Law of Moses, and appeals to the use of the phrase חוק חרות in 1QS 10.8. Therefore, there are two books: (1) the Law of Moses, and (2) the heavenly Book of Hagi also referred to as the Book of Memory (cf. 4 Ez 14.44ff.; Dan 12). The earthly book and the heavenly book are contrasted: the Mosaic Torah was given to the people of Israel to reveal their iniquity, while the heavenly book was revealed only to the elect. According to Elgvin, the עם רוח in line 16 are considered to be the 'elect' and should be equated with the קדושים in line 17 and not to angels. The word חבנית at the beginning of line 17 is translated as 'image' or 'model' and refers to God's fashioning (יצרו) of the Book of Hagi as a model for the elect – rather than the fashioning of the 'spiritual people' as Lange interprets. Elgvin reads the phrase בני שור as a reference to the evil generations of both past and present (i.e. Balaam's Oracle in Num 24.17) rather than to 'the sons of Seth' (Gen 4.26). He understands the word אנוש in line 16 as 'man' or 'mankind' as is most often the case in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Elgvin notes that the term אנוש occurs in three other places in *Musar leMevin* (4Q416 4 11-12; 4Q418 55 11; 77 3) and always has the meaning: 'man' or 'humanity'.

It is difficult to understand Elgvin's interpretation of the phrase וינחילה אנוש, which he states 'refers to God's bequeathing the Hagi and eschatological salvation to the elect community'. If the term אנוש were understood as a reference to humanity generally, then its use as a reference to the 'elect community' makes little sense. Elgvin defends his translation of אנוש as 'mankind' by referring to 1QS 11.5-6 where 'the secrets of God are revealed to the elect, but withhold [*sic*] from אנוש'. Contra Elgvin, it appears that 1QS 11.5-6 uses the term אנוש in a way that would actually

prohibit the use of the word as a reference to the elect community. In 4Q417 1 i אנוש is associated with a 'spiritual people' whereas in 1QS they are opposed to the elect. While Elgvin may be correct in translating the term אנוש as 'humanity', it seems unlikely that as such it can also be a term that refers to the elect. One cannot disagree with Elgvin's conclusion that the term אנוש is used most often of 'humanity' in the Qumran literature. However, Elgvin does not adequately resolve the dilemma of 'humanity' and a 'spiritual people' occurring in conjunction with one another in the context of 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18.

Elgvin is alone in suggesting that אנוש should be read as 'humanity'. This reading is consistent with the interpretation of בני שוח as a reference to Balaam's Oracle rather than to the 'Sons of Seth'. Lange and others justify reading אנוש, in part, as the antediluvian figure 'Enosh' based upon reading 'Sons of Seth' in the preceding line. While a good case may be made for reading אנוש as 'humanity' generally, Elgvin fails to resolve the issue of the existence of some sort of dualism between 'spiritual people' on the one hand, and 'humanity' and the 'spirit of flesh' on the other. Further, his translation, as others, renders the phrase ויעד לוא נתן הגוי לרוח בשר as 'He had not before given Hagi to the spirit of flesh'. This is a peculiar way to translate ויעד לוא and, I would suggest, prevents Elgvin's interpretation of אנוש as 'humanity' from making sense of the division between a 'people of spirit' and 'spirit of flesh' in this context.

#### **4.2.3) George J. Brooke**

Brooke comments on 4Q417 1 i as well and suggests that the preceding context (line 15) where 'Seth' is mentioned justifies the reading of אנוש as the antediluvian 'Enosh' and 'not... a general reference to mankind'.<sup>15</sup> Brooke argues

---

<sup>15</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 213.

that familiarity with the biblical narrative (i.e. Enosh the son of Seth) displays how the author(s) of 4Q417 1 i incorporate an allusion to the antediluvian Enosh. Brooke regards Enosh in these lines as significant because he is the father of spiritual knowledge and possesses an item of eschatological and prophetic importance (i.e. the book of Hagu).<sup>16</sup> Brooke seems to suggest that the phrase בני שית/שוח alludes to both Genesis 4.26 (and 'Seth') and Numbers 24.17 (not 'Seth'), the only place in the Hebrew Bible where the phrase is found.<sup>17</sup> The phrase בני שוח found in Numbers 24.17 appears elsewhere in Qumran literature (4Q175 13, 1QM 11.6, CD 7.21) and in every reference it refers to opponents of God.<sup>18</sup> Brooke writes:

'Enosh was son of Seth. At one stroke the wisdom writer incorporates both an item which has an eschatological or prophetic ring to it, as well as an allusion to the significance of Enosh as the father of some specialist spiritual knowledge (prayer).'<sup>19</sup>

Brooke's interpretation of the allusion is primarily to Genesis 4. However, Brooke is not concise in defining or adjudicating whether the 'sons of Seth' is an allusion strictly to Genesis 4 or to Numbers (as well?). The identification of the 'sons of Seth' with Numbers 24.17, as Brooke notes, calls into question his reading of 'Enosh' as the antediluvian figure.<sup>20</sup>

#### 4.2.4) John J. Collins

Collins, another major contributor to the discussion of 4Q417 1 i, argues that while the term אנוש is frequently used as a designation for human beings, this particular rendering in 4Q417 1 i is problematic. Collins states that since 'אנוש is

<sup>16</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 213.

<sup>17</sup> Gen 4.26-ff. spells the name of the antediluvian figure as שוח. The oracle in Num 24.17 addresses the beating down of כל בני שוח, perhaps sons of 'strife,' 'pride,' or a place name on account of being parallel with Moab.

<sup>18</sup> Brooke notes these passages where 'sons of Seth' is derived from Num 24.17, p. 213, fn. 38; see also *DJD XXXIV*, p. 163.

<sup>19</sup> Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' p. 213.

<sup>20</sup> The antediluvian 'Seth' is consistently portrayed positively in Second Temple literature (e.g. *Jubilees*, *Apocalypse of Moses*, Philo). See A. F. J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (SNT 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977): 1-36. It could perhaps be argued that the negative portrayal

associated with a “spiritual people” but is not identified with them and is also distinguished from the “spirit of flesh”... the word, then, cannot be taken to refer simply to humanity in general’.<sup>21</sup> Whether this summary of the issue truly negates the possibility that the term אָנוֹשׁ might be used to refer to ‘humanity’ will be revisited below. Collins is also opposed to reading the term אָנוֹשׁ as ‘Enosh’ the son of Seth. Several factors cause him to call this rendering into question. The primary argument for reading ‘Enosh’ is based upon the preceding occurrence of the name ‘Seth’. However, the patriarch’s name usually occurs as שֵׁת, whereas in 4Q417 1 i it should be pointed as ‘Sheth’ (שֵׁתָה). As such, it would clearly be a reference to Balaam’s Oracle (Num 24.17) which is quoted several times in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q175 13, 1QM 11.6, CD 7.21) – so also Elgvin. Even if the issue of spelling could be resolved, Collins finds several other difficulties with reading the name of the patriarch Enosh here. Collins understands אָנוֹשׁ and the ‘spiritual people’ as constituting a righteous remnant.<sup>22</sup> He also notes that there is no known parallel for the interpretation where Enosh is set over against the sons of Seth. Also without parallel is the notion that Enosh is given a book. Rather than read the term simply as ‘humanity’ or ‘Enosh’, Collins finds a third way that אָנוֹשׁ might be understood:

‘In the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* we read אָנוֹשׁ לְמַשְׁלָה חָבֵל, “He (God) created אָנוֹשׁ to rule the world. In this case the reference is not to the son of Seth, but to Adam, the original human being created by God.”’<sup>23</sup>

Collins’ third way for interpreting אָנוֹשׁ is to read the word as the first man ‘Adam’.<sup>24</sup>

---

of ‘Seth’ in the context of 4Q417 1 i is due to a positive correlation of humanity and angels in Genesis 1.26 and the absence of this correlation in reference to Seth in Gen 5.3.

<sup>21</sup> Collins, ‘Likeness of the Holy Ones,’ p. 610.

<sup>22</sup> Lange, in reading אָנוֹשׁ as ‘Enosh’, views iniquity as beginning with the generation of Enosh, contrary to the idea of אָנוֹשׁ and the ‘spiritual people’ forming a righteous remnant.

<sup>23</sup> Collins, ‘Likeness of the Holy Ones,’ p. 612.

<sup>24</sup> *Musar leMevin* is not adverse to using the term אָדָם, it occurs seven times in the document (4Q418 55 11, 77 2, 81 3, 81 16, 251 1; 4Q423 8 2, 13 4). If the author of 4Q417 1 i truly had in mind an allusion to the creation of two types of Adam, then why did he use such an ambiguous term? Further, the *Instruction on the Two Spirits*’ use of the term אָנוֹשׁ could arguably be an allusion to ‘Adam’ ruling over creation as well as ‘humanity’ ruling over creation.

Collins presents a case for the term תבנית being used in the sense of 'image' or 'likeness'. In the Hebrew Bible the term תבנית is used both with the sense of a 'blueprint for a construction' (cf. Ex 25.9, 40) and for 'figure' or 'image'. In the occurrences of the term as 'image' or 'figure' Collins cites several references (Dt 4.16-18, Is 44.13, Ez 8.3, and 10.8). In Ezekiel the term תבנית is used as a variant at times for the word דמות. The term also occurs in a number of places in *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* (4Q403 1 ii 3 i; 4Q405 20 ii 22 8; 11QShirShabb 5-6 2) that demonstrate a clear usage as 'image' or 'likeness'.

Collins agrees with Lange in reading the term קדושים as angelic beings. He notes that while there is the well-known reference in Psalm 34.10 to Israel as 'holy ones' and that there are also a few ambiguous passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the majority of references clearly have in mind heavenly beings in the use of the term קדושים. In the cases where the reference is ambiguous it is due to sectarians enjoying some sort of fellowship with angels (e.g. 1QM 10.10). However, states Collins, there is no place where the term קדושים refers to human beings unambiguously in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Collins turns next to the term יצרו in 4Q417 1 i. Regardless whether one renders the word as a noun or verb, 'if God fashioned אנוש in the likeness of the Holy Ones (reading *yāsaro*) then his inclination (reading *yisro*) is in their likeness too'.<sup>25</sup> The term יצר is used in Genesis 2 (ייצר) in the description of the formation of man and, Collins points out, the two *yods* in Genesis Rabbah 14.3 are the basis for instigating a portrayal of humanity as having two inclinations.<sup>26</sup> *Genesis Rabbah* 14.3 also cites

<sup>25</sup> Collins, 'Likeness of the Holy Ones,' p. 614.

<sup>26</sup> 'There were two formations [one partaking of the nature] of the celestial beings, [the other] of the earthly creatures... He created him with four attributes of the higher beings [i.e. the angels] and four of the lower creatures [i.e. the beasts].... R. Tifdai said in R. Aha's name: The celestial beings were created in the image and likeness [of God] and do not procreate, while the terrestrial creatures procreate

Genesis 1.26-27 for the purpose of describing the formation of man as being in the likeness of the angels. The affinity between Adam and the angels is based upon creation in Genesis 1 and Adam is understood to be formed of both celestial and terrestrial elements. Similar to *Genesis Rabbah*, 4Q417 1 i can be understood as a paraphrase of Genesis 1.27. The term אלהים can be used to refer to angels (e.g. 4Q400 1 ii 7; 2 2; 11QMelchizedek 2 10) and so the phrase that אדם was made בצלם אלהים could be read as the first man Adam's formation in the likeness of angels. Collins cites other passages in the midrashim where Adam is said to be created in the likeness of angels rather than God (*Gen R* 21.5; *Ex R* 30.16). In support of reading 4Q417 1 i as Adam being fashioned in the likeness of the angels and the recipient of a book, Collins finds a parallel in *The Letter Sent to Adam by God* where Adam receives a revelatory writing from God.

Collins states that since in 4Q417 1 i אנוש is formed in the likeness of the holy ones without the qualification of a celestial and terrestrial element, like *Genesis Rabbah*, not all humanity shares the likeness. Only Adam and the 'people of spirit' share the likeness of the angels. 4Q417 1 i contrasts two kinds of human beings: the 'people of spirit' and the 'spirit of flesh'. Unlike the *Serekh haYahad*, where God created אנוש to rule the world and appointed two spirits in which to walk, in 4Q417 1 i אנוש does not walk in both spirits but is strictly associated with the 'people of spirit'. The statement לאנוש עם רוח [כי] כחבנית קדושים יצרו represents an interpretation of Genesis 1.26-27 and the phrase בצלם אלהים, whereas the 'spirit of flesh', those who do not discern between good and evil, represents an interpretation of the second creation

---

but not created in [His] image and likeness. Said the Holy One, blessed be He: "Behold, I will create him [man] in [My] image and likeness; [thus he will partake] of the [character of the] celestial beings, while he will procreate [as is his nature] of the terrestrial beings." R. Tifdai [also] said in R. Aha's name: The Lord reasoned: "If I create him of the celestial elements he will live [for ever] and not die; while if I create him of the terrestrial elements, he will die and not live. Therefore I will create him of

in Genesis 2. This failure to discern between good and evil by the 'spirit of flesh' assumes a tradition according to which the tree of knowledge was not prohibited, but in fact humanity was encouraged to partake of it.<sup>27</sup> Sirach 17.7, which retells Genesis 1-3, similarly conceives of Adam receiving the knowledge of good and evil from God at the beginning of creation ('He [God] filled them [Adam and Eve] with knowledge and understanding, and showed them good and evil'). Collins states that in 4Q417 1 i 'the one who fails to distinguish between good and evil is not the same human being who was created in the likeness of the Holy Ones.'<sup>28</sup> Whether 4Q417 1 i must necessarily exclude all humanity from creation in the likeness of the holy ones is an important point that will be discussed further, especially within Collins' framework of reading these lines. While Collins represents one tradition of interpreting Genesis 1.26-27, the phrase 'in our image and our likeness' has a broader interpretive history than he has discussed.

Collins briefly discusses the tradition of the double creation of humanity in Philo's compositions. In both Philo and 4Q417 1 i the two accounts of the creation of Adam in Genesis are used to portray two distinct types of humanity. While Philo and these Qumran documents conceive of two Adams each within their own philosophical framework, they share the same biblical text and possible elements of the same interpretative tradition. According to T. H. Tobin the two creation accounts in Genesis 1-2 are understood by Philo as depicting the creation of a heavenly man who

---

the upper and lower elements, if he sins he will die, and if he dies he will live.' H. Freedman and M. Simon (New York: Soncino, 1983).

<sup>27</sup> Somewhat paradoxical is the interpretation of אֱלֹהִים in Gen 1.27 as 'angels' and Adam being formed like them when in Gen 3.5 the serpent states that 'on the day you eat from it [the tree of the knowledge of good and evil] your eyes will be opened and you will be like אֱלֹהִים knowing good and evil'. It appears that 4Q417 1 i conceives of Adam being like the angels from the first creation and therefore knowing good and evil rather than becoming like the 'angels' as a result of eating from the tree. However, for angelic likeness to be associated with the knowledge of good and evil in Gen 1 the tradition would clearly need to know Genesis 3.5 and an interpretation of the word אֱלֹהִים as 'angels' also.

<sup>28</sup> Collins, 'Likeness of the Holy Ones,' pp. 616-17.

is part of the intelligible world and an earthly man who is part of the sensible world.<sup>29</sup> This duality is something that is different than that which is found in the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3-4). 1QS does not allude to Genesis 1.26-27 but reflects a dualism of Zoroastrian character: light and darkness. *Musar leMevin*, states Collins, in its own way conceives of the creation of Adam and a 'spiritual people' in the likeness of the angels in the first creation and a 'spirit of flesh' in the second creation. Since *Musar leMevin* positively conceives of the first creation and a correlation with the angels for a segment of humanity, and since these are set against the 'spirit of flesh', there is no room in Collins' interpretation for the term אנוש as a reference to 'humanity' generally.

In a more recent article Collins compares Wisdom of Solomon with *Musar leMevin* and makes several important observations which are relevant for the present discussion of 4Q417 1 i.<sup>30</sup> Collins retains the same reasoning here, namely, that 4Q417 1 i conceives of two types of humanity with their origin in two types of creation. However, Collins offers a fresh observation on the text, which is: in both Wisdom of Solomon and *Musar leMevin* all humanity possesses immortality. In comparing these two compositions, Collins argues they share the view 'that it was the intention of the creator that humanity should be immortal,' and 'this view was grounded in the understanding of Gen 1:27, which says that Adam was created in the image of God.'<sup>31</sup> In *Musar leMevin* this likeness is related to the angels while in Wisdom of Solomon to the eternity of God, but in both documents the likeness entails immortality. The creation image of Genesis 1.27 is contrasted with the

<sup>29</sup> T. H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983) p. 108.

<sup>30</sup> Collins, 'The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,' in F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters-Leuven University Press, 2003) pp. 287-306.

<sup>31</sup> Collins, 'The Mysteries of God,' p. 303.



creature of earth or flesh in Genesis 2. *Musar leMevin*, argues Collins, relates the distinction between the two types of people as based upon both creation and behaviour. *Musar leMevin* does not associate flesh with corruption and mortality, but rather represents 'the weakness of unaided human nature, and sometimes it is regarded as sinful'. In 4Q417 1 i, however, those regarded as the 'spirit of flesh' are just as immortal as the 'people of spirit' since they survive for punishment in the hereafter. Collins maintains that the term אָנוּשׁ, meaning the first man Adam, along with the 'spiritual people' should be understood as sharing the likeness of the holy ones. Collins, though raising an important observation, does not adequately resolve the basis upon which *Musar leMevin* conceives of all humanity as possessing immortality. That is, does all humanity possess immortality based upon the same creation or not?

If all humanity generally is immortal as Collins notes, this would seemingly be founded upon creation in Genesis 1.26-27, and the term אָנוּשׁ should be rendered as 'humanity'. According to Collins, two creations are at play in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18. Are we to assume that those of the second creation, that is a segment of humanity derived from earth, were not a part of the first creation and yet are portrayed as immortal? The distinction between the two peoples ('people of spirit' and 'spirit of flesh') could be based solely upon behaviour and not the sort of dualistic creation conceived of by Collins. In addition, issues of divine revelation and the mystery may also have a significant influence on the division of 'spirit' and 'flesh' and the origin of 'humanity' in this column. Collins' observation that *Musar leMevin* conceives of both groups as immortal may actually serve to delineate more precisely who is meant by the term אָנוּשׁ.

#### 4.2.5) Matthew J. Goff

Matthew Goff, a student of Collins, is one of the most recent contributors to the discussion of *Musar leMevin*.<sup>32</sup> His translation of 4Q417 1 i is as follows:

because engraved is that which has been ordained by God against all the in[iquities of] the sons of Sheth. The book of remembrance is written before him for those who keep his word – that is, the vision of Hagu for the book of remembrance. He bequeathed it to אנוש together with a spiritual people, be[cau]se he fashioned him according to the likeness of the holy ones. Moreover, he did not give Hagu to the fleshly spirit because it did not distinguish between [go]od and evil according to the judgment of its [spi]rit.<sup>33</sup>

In agreement with Elgvin and Collins, Goff states that the phrase בני שוה should not be understood as referring to the patriarch Seth. Tracing traditions of Seth throughout the literature of the period, he concludes that nowhere is the patriarch Seth depicted in negative terms. Instead, Seth is portrayed positively as one who possesses the image of God and served as a foil to Cain. Relating the appearance of the phrase בני שוה in other documents from Qumran, primarily *Damascus Document* 7.21-8.1, Goff concludes that the likely reference is to Numbers 24.17. In *Damascus Document* and *Musar leMevin* the phrase בני שוה ‘refers to the wicked whose punishment is determined but not yet fully realized’.<sup>34</sup> The phrase בני שוה is related to the ‘fleshly spirit’ who also await future judgement (cf. 4Q416 1 12; 4Q416 2 ii 2-3; 4Q418 69 ii 8), and both should be understood as terms used of the wicked.

In regard to the interpretation of the term אנוש in 4Q417 1 i, Goff follows Collins again. Since special revelation has been given to אנוש, he finds the translation of the term as ‘humanity’ in general difficult. However, Goff also translates the phrase ויעוד לו<sup>35</sup> as ‘moreover, he did not give’ rather than the expected ‘and no more does he give’, negating a reference that the ‘spirit of flesh’ at one time may have possessed revelation. While Goff does not detail his own misgivings with the

<sup>32</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, pp. 83-115.

<sup>33</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 84.

<sup>34</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, pp. 92.

rendering of the term as the antediluvian figure 'Enosh', he is clearly not inclined to understand the word as such. Goff sees in 4Q417 1 i an explanation of human behaviour and the creation of a 'spiritual people' in the likeness of the holy ones and the 'fleshly spirit' that is not. The word אנוש should be understood in line with its use with 1QS 3.17-18 where the first man Adam is referred to. Genesis 1-3 is used as the basis for a dualistic anthropology. The 'god-like Adam' in the first creation is juxtaposed to the earthly Adam in the second creation. This 'god-like Adam' corresponds to the 'spiritual people' while the earthly Adam corresponds to the 'fleshly spirit'. The phrase בצלם אלהים of Genesis 1.27 is used in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 as exegetical support of the view that some people were created in a way that is more like angels than others.<sup>36</sup>

Goff's translation of the phrase וְעוֹד לֹא נָתַן הַגִּי לְרוּחַ בָּשָׂר in line 17 as 'moreover, he did not give Hagu to the fleshly spirit', along with most other translations of this phrase, is problematic. While it is clear that the 'spiritual people' are aligned with the holy ones and receive heavenly wisdom, Goff makes the assertion that the 'fleshly spirit' never received 'Hagu'.<sup>37</sup> This is dependent on both the certainty that אנוש should not be rendered as 'humanity' as well as a translation of וְעוֹד לֹא as 'moreover' rather than 'and no more' (cf. Harrington and Strugnell's translation and commentary below; §4.2.6). Goff states that the distinguishing feature between the 'spiritual people' and the 'fleshly spirit' is access to divine revelation – recall Collins' assertion that the distinguishing characteristic between the two is behaviour and creation. Goff's distinguishing characteristic of 'access to divine

<sup>35</sup> I can find no basis for translating the phrase וְעוֹד לֹא as 'moreover' in the literature of the period.

<sup>36</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, pp. 97-98; see dissertation version p. 111.

<sup>37</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 99-100; see dissertation version pp. 111-12.

revelation' is dependant upon the certainty that אנוש should not be read as 'humanity' as well as the unlikely translation of ועוד לוא as 'moreover' in line 17.

Goff states that reading the term אנוש as 'Adam... points towards the theme of the knowledge of good and evil'.<sup>38</sup> Wisdom is the acquisition of the knowledge of good and evil and in Genesis 1-3 Adam attempts to possess such knowledge. However, if the phrase כתבנית קדושים truly is an adaptation of בצלם אלהים in Genesis 1.27 with angelic connotations, than the knowledge of good and evil is more than a simple knowledge of right and wrong, it entails a divine status (cf. Gen 3.5; 3.22). Goff notes that the translator of Genesis 3.5 in the LXX understands that the knowledge of good and evil would make Adam like divine beings (καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοὶ γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν). אנוש, then, along with the 'spiritual people' are given revealed knowledge through the vision of Hagu which is angelic and heavenly in nature.

If Collins is correct in observing that behaviour is the distinguishing characteristic between 'spirit' and 'flesh' and that judgement will be meted out to the 'spirit of flesh', then it may stand to reason that *Musar leMevin* conceives of all humanity as having possessed the knowledge of good and evil at one time. Further, whether Goff or Collins, a dualistic anthropology based upon creation needs more attention and reconsideration.

#### 4.2.6) Harrington and Strugnell

The editors of DJD 34 translate 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 as follows:

For engraved is that which is ordained by God *against* all the *ini*[quities of] the children of שור, And written in His presence is a book of memorial of those who keep His word. And that is the appearance/vision of the meditation on a book of memorial. And He/שור(?) gave it as an inheritance to *Man/Enosh Together with* a spiritual people. F[o]r according to the likeness of the Holy Ones is his (man's) fashioning. But no more has meditation been given to a (?) fleshly spirit, For it (sc. flesh) knew/knows not the difference between good and evil

---

<sup>38</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, pp. 100-4; see dissertation version p. 112.

according the judgement of *its* [sp]irit. *vacat* And thou, O understanding child, gaze on the mystery that is to come, and know<sup>39</sup>

Commenting upon line 17 and the phrase כחבניית קדושים יצרו, the editors remark that either God fashioned 'Enosh' or 'humanity' according to the likeness of the holy ones or according to the likeness of the holy ones is his יצר (i.e. 'inclination' or 'formation'). In determining whether 'Enosh', 'mankind' or 'Adam' are in view here, the editors write:

'It is still uncertain whether אנוש refers to mankind or to Enosh the son of Seth... The reader... would be completely unprepared for a reference to the individual Enosh in such an ethico-theological context or even in a narrative about a celestial court and judgement scene... While אנוש 'mankind' is frequent in Qurman literature and in 4Q415 ff., 'Enosh' is not (unless when mentioned in a patriarchal context, e.g. if justified here by a preceding 'Seth'). Both names, Seth and Enosh, occur in the chain of succession of wisdom teachers (Sir 49:16), but in general proper names are exceedingly rare in 4Q415 ff.'<sup>40</sup>

The editors also succinctly summarise what is at stake in interpreting the term as 'Enosh' or 'humanity'. If 'Enosh' is the one who is referred to then this is an occurrence of a historical narrative statement about 'a transaction with Enosh in primordial times'.<sup>41</sup> An interpretation as 'humanity' would be a general anthropological statement. The term יצרו could also be a statement of anthropology generally, stating a truth about the present as much as the past. Whether the statement in line 17 is of a historical nature or a general anthropological statement concerning a group of the righteous (i.e. either 'Enosh' and the עם רוח or 'humanity' and the עם רוח), they are collectively contrasted with the 'spirit of flesh' who are a group of evil humanity. If it is a general anthropological statement, when contrasted with the 'spirit of flesh', there would be support for taking the preceding suffix of יצרו as a reference to אנוש as 'humanity'. A historical statement that 'God bequeathed to him... for He formed him, etc.' could be a reference to either 'Enosh' or 'humanity'. Another particularly important comment by Strugnell and Harrington has to do with

---

<sup>39</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 155.

<sup>40</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 164.

their translation of the phrase *לוא ועוד* in line 17 as 'and no more'. The editors state in the commentary, 'the sense is probably not "not yet..."',<sup>42</sup> but rather "and no more, after being given to Enosh/mankind, was (the power of) meditation given to the *רוח בשר*".<sup>43</sup>

#### 4.2.7) Summary and Translation of 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18

From the outset, disputed terms with special importance for understanding human/angel relations in *Musar leMevin* were identified by Collins as: *אנוש*, *חבנית*, *קדושים*, and *יצרו*. Following the evaluation of the contributions by Elgvin, Lange, Brooke, Collins, Goff and the editors of DJD 34, it can be observed that little consensus exists in translating 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18. In addition, the phrases *לוא ועוד* and *בני שות* should be added to the list as well. Based upon my study and evaluation of the text, I propose the translation below:

(15) because engraved is that which has been ordained by God against all the i[n]iquities of the sons of perdition and a book of memorial is written before him (16) for those who keep his words, and it is a vision of Hagu for a book of memorial. He gave it as an inheritance to humanity together with a spiritual people [because] (17) according to the image of the holy ones is his (humanity's) formation, but no more does He give Hagu to a spirit of flesh because it knew not the difference between (18) good and evil according to the judgment of his spirit *vacat* and you understanding one gaze *vacat* on the *רוח נדיה* and know

The most contentious item in the above translation is no doubt the rendering of *אנוש* as 'humanity'. 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 depict the creation of all humanity in the image of the angels as well as recipients of special revelation (Hagu). Collins' suggestion that this creative likeness is based upon a tradition of reading Genesis 1.27 and 'Enosh' should be identified with 'Adam', necessitate further discussion. However, several things may be said about the dispute over rendering *אנוש* as 'humanity' or 'Enosh'. The editors make two observations that argue against the interpretation 'Enosh': (1)

<sup>41</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 163.

<sup>42</sup> 'Not yet' is one of the only other plausible translations of *לוא ועוד* and would imply a future time of giving revelation to the 'spirit of flesh', an interpretation that is highly unlikely.

<sup>43</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 166.

אנוש is almost always used of 'humanity' in Early Jewish literature;<sup>44</sup> and (2) proper names in *Musar leMevin* are exceedingly rare.<sup>45</sup> The one exception which would permit rendering אנוש as 'Enosh' in line 16 would be the identification of the phrase בני שוה with Genesis 4.26 (בני שוה). However, the editors write that 'the engraved decree would almost certainly be a heavenly text condemning the 'sons of Seth'.<sup>46</sup> Clearly, the phrase 'sons of Seth' derived from Numbers 24.17 (בני שוה) is relatively frequent in Qumran literature (4Q175 13; 1QM 11.6; CD 7.21). The negative context in which this phrase is found in 4Q417 1 i, combined with similar occurrences elsewhere, leads to the conclusion that the phrase connotes 'sons of perdition' rather than 'sons of Seth'. Therefore, the most reasonable translation of אנוש in line 16 is 'humanity'.

A contextual problem exists in the translations of Lange, Collins and Goff that prevents an interpretation of אנוש as 'humanity'; and thus, a general anthropological statement. How is one to understand the creation of all humanity in the likeness of קדושים when a clear distinction between two peoples is presented? One solution may be that the division between the עם רוח and humanity is a delineation between a dualism at the present time that was not part of primordial creation. In other words, both the original state of creation without a division and the present reality of two types of humanity are woven together in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18. The designation 'fleshly spirit' is given to those who 'knew not the difference between good and evil' (l. 17) and for whom revelation is no longer available. Thus, the author(s) can say of the 'spirit of flesh' in line 18: 'according to the judgement of his spirit'. For this

<sup>44</sup> Even in the case of the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3.17-18), which Collins appeals to for his interpretation of 'Adam' in these lines, the author's/authors' use of אנוש as opposed to אדם demonstrates an interpretation of 'Adam' as 'humanity'. Therefore, the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* could actually support the rendering of the term אנוש as 'humanity' rather than *vice versa*.

<sup>45</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 164.

<sup>46</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 162.

reason all humanity in *Musar leMevin*, whether those of the 'elect' or those who are among the 'fleshly spirit' are, as Collins details, immortal. The creation of all humanity in the image of קדושים and the bequeathing of divine revelation to them were followed by a subsequent failure of a segment of humanity to know and adhere to a pursuit of wisdom. The condemnation of this group of humanity follows their failure to seek wisdom, the result of which was the loss of revelation for these people and their designation as the 'spirit of flesh'.

The straightforward translation of ועוד לוא as 'and no more' renders the entire text senseless in the interpretations of Lange, Collins and Goff. If the 'spirit of flesh' no longer has possession of divine revelation the obvious conclusion is that they once possessed it. Therefore, translations of the phrase as 'He had not before given' and 'moreover' have been preferred to 'and no more'. The phrase ועוד לוא occurs seven times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 17.5; Deut 18.16; 2 Sam 7.10; Is 47.8; Jer 23.4; Job 24.20; 1 Chron 17.9) and is clearly used in the sense of 'no more' every time.<sup>47</sup> The phrase should be translated in 4Q417 1 i as 'no more' as well, indicating that at one time all humanity had access to wisdom.

The concept of primordial possession and present ability to fail in understanding good and evil fit with the concept of the fatigable human pursuit of

---

<sup>47</sup> Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 99, comments on the possibility of the translation 'no more': 'One can read the expression ועוד in 4Q417 1 i 17 as "but no more." This would suggest that at a certain point God stopped giving the vision of Hagu to this spirit: "But no more (ועוד) did he give Hagu to the fleshly spirit." One can speculate that the "fleshly spirit" once enjoyed the vision of Hagu, like the "spiritual people," and that they were originally a single group. In this reading the vision was taken away from the "fleshly spirit" when it failed to distinguish good from evil. This is an interpretive possibility. But it is unlikely, given that 4QInstruction displays no awareness of a fall of humankind rooted in Adam's sin'. Collins, 'The Mysteries of God', p. 302, likewise comments: '...but no more has Hagu been given to the spirit of flesh. This would mean that the Vision of Hagu was initially given to Adam, but withdrawn when he failed to distinguish between good and evil. In this case, however, we might wonder why Adam failed to distinguish between good and evil in the first case, since he had been endowed with the vision of Hagu as his inheritance. It is not clear to me, however, that 4QInstruction envisions a Fall, or a sin of Adam, at all'. Clearly, both Goff and Collins interpretations are limited by their rendering of the term אנוש; furthermore, a traditional 'fall' is likely not conceived of in *Musar*



wisdom elsewhere in the document. Furthermore, an urgency exists in the document for the addressee to seek wisdom, most often found in the revelation of the רב נדיה, with angelic beings as a type of indefatigable model.<sup>48</sup> Exhortations to know good and evil, pursue knowledge and not go astray align themselves more closely to a dualism based upon behaviour and revelation rather than creation. Motifs and imagery from the creation of two men in Genesis 1-2 in *Musar leMevin* need, then, to be understood as reflecting something other than the creations of two peoples (i.e. a created dualism). The angelic (spiritual) fashioning of Genesis 1 and earthly creation of Genesis 2 may serve as categories to which portions of humanity relate to as opposed to the creation of two types of humanity. Since Philo is an important point of departure for Collins in his portrayal of the dualism in 4Q417 1 i, further exploration of Philo's compositions may prove fruitful.

#### 4.2.8) Philo and 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18

The contribution of Philo to our interpretation of *Musar leMevin* is his preservation of an exegetical tradition of Genesis 1.26-27 in which humanity and angels are correlated. While Collins is concerned with the creation of two types of man, *vis-à-vis* Tobin's research on two creations in Philo, the contribution of Philo extends beyond this dualism.<sup>49</sup> On four occasions Philo addresses the role of angels

---

*leMevin* but a segment of humanity may have failed to seek wisdom and knowledge – portrayed as an arduous task in the document.

<sup>48</sup> This comes as little surprise as the superiority of the angels is something to which the community aspires in *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* (4Q400-406).

<sup>49</sup> Frey, 'Flesh and Spirit,' pp. 375-77, addresses the terms σάρξ and πνεῦμα in Philo in relation to Qumran sapiential texts and notes the following: 'But even if it is true that there are numerous examples for the negative view on human corporality, there is no clear evidence for the dualistic antithesis of σάρξ and πνεῦμα;' he also notes in comments upon *De gigantibus* 29ff. that 'in contrast to the Hebrew text, Philo applies the term πνεῦμα not to the Divine breath and the gift of life but to the spirit of pure insight...which is hindered by the fleshly nature of the human being...in this passage, flesh is even called "the chief cause of ignorance"...like σῶμα, the term σάρξ denotes the material and bodily life which burdens the soul and prevents it from its ascent to the divine sphere;' and 'in contrast to Paul, σάρξ is considered neither to be the reason or occasion for sin... even where Philo describes the flesh with personal images, he always withdraws them immediately and avoids any kind of mythic dualism'.

in creation based upon Genesis 1.26-27.<sup>50</sup> In every instance that Philo addresses the exegesis of the first creation in Genesis, he uses the plurality of images 'let us' to introduce a duality of inclinations distinct from the perceived creation accounts of Genesis 1 and 2. A comparison of Philo's exegesis with that of *Musar leMevin* will aid in setting the sapiential texts in a broader exegetical context. More specifically, Philo's exegesis of Genesis 1.26-27 displays that a division between the 'spiritual people' and the 'spirit of flesh' may be understood within a tradition where all humanity shared in the first creation rather than the dual creation of two peoples exclusive from one another.

The first explicit reference to Genesis 1.26-27 is in *de Opificio mundi*. Philo raises the exegetical question in regard to the reason for ascribing the creation of humanity to several (πλῆλοσιν) creators (72) and relates that the heavenly bodies, assuming they are angelic beings, are the second image of creation in Genesis 1.26-27. Before the creative process begins God is said to be without counsellor to help (23). The heavenly bodies who share the creative images with God on the sixth day of creation are said to have been created on the fourth day. In this account, Philo describes the first days of creation and angelic beings are created who later serve God as counsellors for the creation of humanity.

Philo explains God's reliance on other participants in the creation of humanity for the ultimate purpose of assigning blame for the existence of evil to subordinates (72-76). Philo's explanation and reasoning concerning the origins of evil is revealed in his description of creation. Philo's reasoning is as follows: In existence are plants and animals which are absent of mind and reason and are therefore not partakers in virtue nor vice. Mind and reason, he explains, are the dwelling place of virtue and

---

<sup>50</sup> For an overview of the relation of assistants in Philo to Platonism see D. T. Runia, *Philo of*

vice and are by nature constructed for their dwelling. Next, the heavenly bodies are living creatures; each is a mind unto itself, which participates in virtue only, not in vice. The minds of the heavenly beings are free from the temptation of any evil. Philo next describes humanity (ἄνθρωπος) who is of mixed nature: vice and virtue. This explanation emphasises that the existence of evil or vice does not have its origin with God, for it is written 'let us make'. Subordinates to God are responsible for attributes that are contrary to God's goodness. Consistently, however, Philo's description of creation presents two types of creatures (animal life and heavenly bodies) which possess no vice. Philo's purpose is to use the passage of Genesis 1.26-27 within an exegetical tradition that supports his theology rather than to develop a logical flow consistency.<sup>51</sup>

An examination of Philo's preservation of an exegetical tradition at this point raises an important observation. The attribution of vice to those who share in the process of creation is not simply a duality in human nature that can be explained as a division between what is heavenly and what is fleshly (i.e. the creation narratives in Genesis 1-2). Philo is producing a duality in the nature of the soul of man itself before the second creation in Genesis 2.7. It is necessary to distinguish between the two because Philo often emphasises the duality of spirit and flesh in creation (e.g. *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin*), but the duality of forms produced from Genesis 1.26-27 is distinct from that traditional division.

Another instance in which Genesis 1.26-27 is given explicit attention by Philo occurs in *de Confusione linguarum*. In the context that precedes an explanation of Genesis 11.7 and a subsequent quotation from Genesis 1.26 (171), Philo emphasises the omnipotence of God before explaining that God has around him numberless

---

*Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1986) pp. 242-51.

Potencies (δυνάμεις). The Potencies are described somewhat elusively as participating in the creation of the material world (172) and are further described as having their fairest parts in the sun, moon and sky (173). In the sky, bodiless beings that the inspired pages call angels (ἄγγελοι) are a constituent of these heavenly powers (174).<sup>52</sup> Philo emphasises that God was not in need of others at creation but nonetheless includes angels in creation as servants who bear the responsibility for evil attributes.

Following the introduction of angels into the act of creation, Philo provides an explanation of the nature of humanity and angels (176-178). The categories of creation are again as they were previously (*Op.*72-77; see also *Gig.*): (1) reasoning and mortal beings, (2) reasoning and immortal beings, and (3) unreasoning and mortal beings. The first category describes the nature of humanity while the second category is applied to bodiless souls in the sky. The second category, based on the previous description (174), refers to the angels. The angels are free of a body and immune from evil while humanity is aware of good and evil. The third category is assumedly the remainder of created beings.

As in *de Opificio mundi* (72-77) the beings that are recipients of the address in Genesis 1.26-27 are themselves free from evil but are included in creation to explain the origins of evil. However, in the introduction of Genesis 1:26-27 in this context (179), further details are provided in regard to who specifically is addressed and what their role is in the creation. The recipients of address are the angels to whom God delegated the fashioning of reason in the soul of humanity. The two parts of humanity are then a portion that is good while the other is free to choose (179). The portion of

---

<sup>51</sup> For an introduction to Philo's use of scripture see P. Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (SNT 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

the soul that God is responsible for is the involuntary and good portion, while the angels are responsible for the voluntary portion (179).

In the following, Philo elaborates on a judgement theme, which develops parallel to the duality thus far presented. The judgement of the wicked is assigned to God's subordinates (180), which Philo supports by a partial quotation of Genesis 48.16: '...the God who nourishes me from my youth; the angel who saves me from all evils'. This passage (181) is elsewhere repeated by Philo in conjunction with Genesis 1.26-27 (*Fug.*66) and is indicative of its importance for Philo's exegetical tradition or a tradition behind Philo. Philo uses the reference to make the statement that God is the nourishing one (ὁ τρέφων) and the angels' role is to divert any implication of evil from God (ὁ ῥυόμενος με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν). Along with taking part in the creation of humanity, all things considered evil including punishment, are assigned to angels. In the context of exacting vengeance from the humans who created the tower of Babel (Gen 11.7), God calls upon the angels to be judges. Philo makes it clear that in a scenario where salvation is needed it is God's role to nourish or to save (81-82).

The next reference to Genesis 1.26-27 occurs in *de Fuga et inventione*. In this passage there is a larger discussion on unintentional homicide where Philo introduces ministers of punishment (65-67). Similar to the context in *de Confusione linguarum*, Philo quotes Genesis 48.15 in reference to the angels' role as agents of punishment. The angels again divert from God any responsibility for evil and sin (ὅσα ἐκ φυγῆς ἀμαρτημάτων περιγίνεται θεράποντι θεοῦ). Here, Philo's exegesis of Genesis 1.26-27 is brief but specific (68-70). God is consulting with powers (δυνάμεσιν) which he has permitted to fashion the mortal portion of the human soul (69). God formed the sovereign portion of the soul while his subjects

---

<sup>52</sup> Philo portrays stars as living beings in *Gig.*8, *Plant.*12, and *Somn.*1.135. Angels are thought of as

(ὑπηκόων) formed the subjected (ὑπηκόου) portion. The primary reason the angels are necessary in creation is because the human soul is vulnerable to both good and evil (70). Consistently, Philo attributes the responsibility of the creation of freewill to the angels.

The final occurrence of Genesis 1.26-27 is in *de Mutatione nominum*. This final reference to Genesis 1.26-27 is similar to what has been observed previously, but is followed by a uniquely stated duality. Preceding the quotation of Genesis 1:26-27 God's self-sufficiency is emphasised (27-30). As expected, Philo stresses again that God had no involvement in creating the wickedness of the soul. There is more than one creator involved in the formation of the human soul and the wickedness of that portion is due to the angels' role in creation.

Almost immediately following this passage Philo explains the implication of the Genesis passage (32-34). Since God is the maker of what is good alone, those composed of the good voluntarily relieve themselves of external concerns and whatever is valued by flesh. The ones who discipline themselves serve the soul and in the end become bodiless minds. The duality of the images in Genesis 1.26-27 very clearly provides an opportunity for the division of humanity into two categories: 'soul' and 'flesh'. The similarities between Philo and *Musar leMevin* on the division of humanity at the first creation appear to share a common direction at this point. The first creation of Genesis 1 alone and the division of some as 'spiritual' and others as 'fleshly' may be constructed on the identification of the individual with one or the other.

The correlation of humanity and angels in 4Q417 1 i 16-17 is based upon humanity, אֱנוֹשׁ, and a spiritual people being fashioned in the form of the holy ones. In

---

stars in *1 Enoch* 43.1-4; and stars as bad angels in 86.1-6; and 90.20-27; Job 38.7; Mt 2.9-11; Rev 9.1,

Philo both God and angels, on the basis of Genesis 1.26-27, create humanity. Philo consistently uses an exegetical tradition of the plurality of images to assign the existence of free will and evil to God's subordinates. The motifs of the 'spiritual people' and the 'spirit of flesh' in 4Q417 1 i may be based upon two types of creation (Gen 1-2) but the role of angels in the creation of Genesis 1.26-27 could be understood as playing a crucial role in the division of humanity. Collins' suggestion that the two creations are the basis upon which humanity is divided, a spiritual being and a being of flesh,<sup>53</sup> is only one division within Philo's exegetical tradition; humanity may be divided in the first creation as well.

*Musar leMevin* and Philo, on these occasions, correlate angels and humanity on the basis of the role of angels in the first creation. In the four passages reviewed above Philo preserves an exegetical tradition of Genesis 1.26-27 wherein humanity is created and formed by God and angels. In one passage (*Mut.* 32-34) Philo's use of the Genesis passage serves not only his purposes of assigning the existence of vice to angels, but also implies a division of humanity into 'soul' and 'flesh'. The correlation with angels and the division of humanity appear in both *Musar leMevin* and Philo. 4Q417 1 i appears to conceive of both a fashioning of humanity in the likeness of angels as well as a division between spirit and flesh. This being the case, both a division of humanity on the basis of dual creators and humanity's relation to these images (Gen. 1.26) in addition to two creation accounts (Gen. 1-2) may be at play in *Musar leMevin*.

Philo's reason for correlating humanity with the angels is to explain the material side of anthropology. The angels are not necessarily evil themselves but are responsible for the negative qualities of humanity. *Musar leMevin* uses the

---

<sup>53</sup>12.4; and *T. Sol.* 20.14-17.

correlation for positive purposes of exhortation. But, we should ask, could *Musar leMevin* also use the correlation with all humanity to explain the existence of the ‘spirit of flesh’? The angels in *Musar leMevin*, as discussed in detail below, appear to be venerated by the community and are portrayed as ideal models to be followed. The image of the holy ones in 4Q417 1 i serves to identify and exalt the ones who share their likeness as elect ones, but could it also serve to condemn those who fail to identify with them? The image in the first creation in 4Q417 1 i is used to enhance those who share the image, but if an implied duality of images exists, as seen in Philo, then the creation of all humanity in angelic likeness may serve to divide them.

*Musar leMevin* and Philo share a correlation of humanity and angelic beings, and this correlation is derived in both from Genesis 1.26-27. However, in what way has this plural address been dealt with by other authors? More specifically, is there a coherent thread discernible among Jewish exegetes or has each author more or less represented their own point of view? Several late traditions preserve similar interpretations of Genesis 1.26-27, but the implications on anthropology and angelology are not entirely clear. In reviewing these traditions *Musar leMevin* may be more closely situated in its history of interpretation.

#### **4.2.9) Targums and 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18**

The Aramaic targum of Pseudo-Jonathan preserves a very clear interpretation which includes angels as playing a part in creation (Gen 1.26).<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, p. 124.

<sup>54</sup> G. J. Brooke addresses the use of targums in relation to earlier traditions, specifically Qumran material, in *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSupp 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985) pp. 25-36. Brooke concludes: ‘...it seems evident that throughout the targumic material available for study there can be located very specific uses of particular exegetical methods for rendering the Hebrew text more intelligible according to a particular tradition of that text’s interpretation, and that these exegeses belong in many instances to pretannaitic times. Furthermore, the targumic use of such exegetical principles shows that they belong not only in Alexandria, as Philo’s work has shown, but also in Palestine. The use of the Bible at Qumran confirms the pervasiveness of these principles in Judaism and the Hellenistic era.’ J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*:



ואמר אלקים למלאכיא דמשמשין קומי דאיתברין ביום תניין לבריית עלמא  
נעבד אדם בצילמא כדיוקנא וישלטון בנוי ימא ובעופא דבאור שמיא ובבעירא  
ובכל ריחשא דרחיש עילוי ארעא

God said to the angels ministering before him, being created on the second day of the creation of the world, 'let us make man in our image and our likeness and they will rule the fish in the sea, the birds in the air of the sky, and the cattle and over every creeping thing that creeps upon the earth.'

The angels here are said to have been created on the second day of creation, though in the targum they are not explicitly mentioned on the second day of creation. As noted previously, Philo clearly portrayed the angels as part of the created order as well, though he believed that their creation was on the fourth day (*Op.*23ff.). Nothing is known about the creation of angels in *Musar leMevin*, so little can be said on this point. The only observation that can be made is that Pseudo-Jonathan correlated humans and angels on the basis of Genesis 1.26-27.

#### 4.2.10) Rabbinic Literature and 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18

Rabbinic literature on occasion conceives of the angels as the recipients of God's address in Genesis 1.26 as well. According to *B. Sanhedrin* 38b the angels are created beings whom God consults in creation. Two hosts of angels, sequentially, appear before God and are consulted about the creation of humanity. Angels, speaking with words of scripture, ask, 'what is man that you are mindful of him and the son of man that you visit him'. God takes offence at the challenge to his authority and destroys them. A third host of angels is consulted about the creation of humanity and they reply 'the whole world is yours so whatever you wish to do there, do it'.

*Bereshith Rabbah* 1.26 presents four explanations of the plural address. First, R. Joshua b. Levi suggests that counsel was taken with the works of heaven and earth. R. Samuel b. Nahman says that the works of each day were consulted. R. Ammi says

---

*An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969) pp. 106-9; discusses targumic and rabbinic traditions on Gen. 1.26.

that God consulted his own heart. Finally, R. Hanina proposes that the ministering angels were consulted. As the Midrash continues, the angels express their concern that wickedness will spring from humanity. Ultimately God creates humans and declares them to be good. It is interesting that *Bereshith Rabbah* addresses the issue of the nature of humanity and God's role in creation even if the outcome greatly differs from the account of Philo.

#### **4.2.11) Conclusions on 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18**

The primary purpose of consulting these sources is to observe a continuation of an exegetical tradition and the ease with which this plural address lends itself as a reference to angels. The 'spiritual people' may not be the only ones formed in the likeness of the holy ones; rather, the subject of the pronominal suffix of יָצְרוּ in line 17 refers to all humanity (i.e. אָנוּ in line 16). This 'fashioning' (יָצָר), rather than 'inclination', of all humanity should be conceived of as being in the likeness of the holy ones or angels. However, on the basis of two creations in Genesis 1-2, humanity is created both as spiritual and fleshly. Unlike Philo, in *Musar leMevin* the angelic role in the formation of humanity could be viewed as positive rather than as a loophole by which God might be excused from participation in the creation of evil. It may be questioned whether it is possible to conceive of *Musar leMevin* as depicting all humanity as created in the likeness of the angels for a similar purpose? Whereas for Philo the origin of human evil (negative attributes of humanity) is found with angels, *Musar leMevin* emphasises the 'fleshly spirit' as the culprit. *Musar leMevin* finds fault with those of the flesh because they do not know the difference between good and evil. However, they once had access to such knowledge and it was removed from them. This would suggest that the correlation of humanity with angels, even though positive, does not guarantee a positive identification (e.g. 'spiritual people').

Unlike the traditional Christian interpretation (e.g. Romans) of Genesis 1-3 that conceives of a temptation, disobedience and subsequent fall of humanity, *Musar leMevin* appears to value the possession of the knowledge of good and evil as the greatest good (e.g. Sirach 17.7). It is not necessary to read 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 dualistically as a 'spiritual people' created in the likeness of the holy ones and a 'fleshly spirit' that is not. Instead, *Musar leMevin* states that 'no more has meditation been given to a fleshly spirit, for flesh knew not the difference between good and evil according to the judgement of its [sp]irit'. All humanity could be understood as having been 'formed' in the likeness of the holy ones. Therefore, all humanity has/had the ability to gain possession of the knowledge of good and evil and identify with the 'spirit' (Gen. 1) or identify with the creation of 'flesh' (Gen. 2). More precisely, the distinction or division of humanity here could be based upon pursuit and acquisition of the knowledge of good and evil. The absence of this knowledge and failure to identify and seek a spiritual identity with the holy ones are what divides the two types of humanity and allows the designations 'spiritual' and 'fleshly'.

#### 4.3) Angelic Reference in 4Q416 2 iii

Fragment 4Q416 2 iii may, like 4Q417 1 i, be based upon conceptions of dual creators that ultimately have their origins in an interpretative tradition founded upon Genesis 1.26-27. This suggestion has not been ventured among scholars thus far. The translation of 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 below are my own:

15) תביט ואז תדע מה מר לאיש ומה מחוק לגבר כבוד אביכה ברישכה  
 16) ואמכה במצעדיכה כי כאל לאיש כן אביהו וכאדנים לגבר כן אמו כי  
 17) המה כור הוריקה וכאשר המשילמה בכה ויצר על הרוח כן עובדם וכאשר  
 18) גלה אונככה ברו נהיה כבדם למען כבודכה וב[ ]הדר פניהמה

15) you will gaze. Then you will know what is bitter for a man and what is sweet for a man. Honour your father in your poverty,  
 16) and your mother in your *low estate* (lit. 'littleness'). For as God is to a man so is his own father and as אדנים are to a man so is his mother, for  
 17) they are the oven of your origin. As/when/while He has set them in authority over you and (He) fashioned/formed על the spirit so serve them. As/when/while

18) He uncovered your ear to the *לְרֹז נְהִיָּה*, honour them for the sake of your own honour And *with* [ ] *venerate* their presence,

Column 4Q416 2 iii may be better understood against the backdrop of 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18. The formation of humanity in *Musar leMevin* appears to enter into a tradition from Genesis 1.26-27 where the plural ‘us’ refers to angels (קְדוּשִׁים = אֱלֹהִים) participating with God in creation. In 4Q416 2 iii line 15b-16 an exhortation occurs to honour one’s father and mother. Immediately following, the conjunction כִּי (‘for’) introduces the simile that ‘as the Father is to a man so is his father and as the אֱלֹהִים/lords (literally) are to a man thus a mother’. It is possible that these lines conceive of both God and the angels (אֱלֹהִים) playing a role in the creation of humanity. This creative reality, or ontological fact for the authors, serves as the basis upon which the exhortation to honour one’s parents is founded. That is, since both had a role in humanity’s creation, they should both be honoured: mother and father along with heavenly counterparts, God and angels. 4Q416 2 iii lines 16ff. appear to maintain a deliberate ambiguity at points in regard to referent; the creators or parents could be either the earthly or heavenly.<sup>55</sup> Line 17 states that ‘they are the oven of your origin’ which could, conceivably, refer to either pair as well. Similarly, the notion that ‘they have been placed in authority over you’ could refer to either. The phrase ‘fashioned you according to their spirit, so serve them’ in the latter half of line 17 is reminiscent of 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 according to which humanity is fashioned in the pattern of the holy ones. The idea of ‘serving them’ followed in line 18 with the statement ‘he exposed your ears to the *לְרֹז נְהִיָּה*’ is also in keeping with the results of

---

<sup>55</sup> Terminology and motifs in *Musar leMevin* appear to be multivalent in places. Also, the influence of apocalyptic thought throughout the document may establish a purposeful ambiguity at points between imagery that could be read as either this-worldly or heavenly. Recognition of the occurrence of tensivē-symbols and steno-symbols in *Musar leMevin* may hold valuable insights and fresh perspectives on the theology of the document (e.g. poverty, inheritance, and origin).

creation described in 4Q417 1 i, as well as a general veneration (הדר; also 'serve them' in line 17) of angels elsewhere in *Musar leMevin* (cf. §4.5 below).

#### 4.3.1) Translating the Term אֲדָנִים

The suggestion that 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-21 base wisdom upon conceptions from Genesis 1.26-27 is hindered by the identification of the term אֲדָנִים. What is clear is that parents are honoured because they played a role in creation just as אב and אֲדָנִים are an ultimate source of origin. Also clear is the general significance of Genesis 1-3 in this fragment. Line 20 makes the statement that the addressee has taken a wife and progresses to address issues regarding offspring of that union. The beginning of line 21 mentions once again the רִז נָהִיָּה followed by an allusion to Genesis 2.20-25 in the phrase that the wife taken is the 'helpmeet of your flesh' (cf. 4Q418a 16b + 17) and then 'according to the statute of God that a man should leave his father and mother' (4Q416 2 iv 1). Though the exact phrase 'helpmeet of your flesh' does not occur in Genesis 1-3, there can be little doubt that an allusion to these chapters is at work.<sup>56</sup> Though the ending of 4Q416 2 iii is fragmentary, it appears that it continues to base worldly wisdom upon conceptions founded on a tradition from Genesis 1-3. The significance of Genesis traditions serves to complement the suggestion that the text has dual workers of creation (Gen 1.26-27) in view.

The use of the fifth commandment of the Decalogue (Ex 20.12) in 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 is clear. In addition to this allusion, there is also a probable allusion to Malachi 1.6 as well. It may be questioned whether the occurrence of the term אֲדָנִים in 4Q416 2 iii (and parallel MS 4Q418 9a-9c) alludes directly to any passage of the Hebrew Bible. If an allusion does occur here, it is possible that the author(s) has in

---

<sup>56</sup> 4Q303 10 (Meditation on Creation) follows the Hebrew Bible in עֲשֵׂה לְךָ עֹזֶר.

mind Malachi 1.6, which has several significant similarities with 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-16 that are readily apparent:

בן יכבד אב ועבד אדניו ואם־אב אני איה כבודי ואם־אדונים  
אני איה מוראי אמר יהוה צבאות לכם

A son honours a father and a servant his master. If I am a father where is my honour? And if I am lord(s) where is my respect? says the LORD of hosts to you.

One might further conjecture that a link exists between 4Q416 2 iii and Malachi. The tradition of linking Exodus 20.12 and Malachi 1.6 is preserved in *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* of Malachi 1.6 and is further evidence of a broader tradition where the two passages were combined, as may be the case in 4Q416 2 iii:

הא על ברא אמיר ליקרא ית אבא ועבדא למדחל מן קדם  
אנא אן דאתון דחלין מן קדמי אמר יוי צבאות רבוניה  
ואם כאב אנא אן דאתון מיקרין קדמי ואם כרבון

Behold concerning the son it has been said that he is to show honour to the father, and the servant that he should show fear from before his lord and if I am like a father how are you showing respect before me? And if I am like a lord (sing.) how are you fearing from before me? Says the Lord of hosts.<sup>57</sup>

The targum begins by introducing a reference to the fifth commandment of the Decalogue in the phrase ‘it has been said’, establishing a tradition of the linking of Exodus 20.12 and Malachi 1.6. For the most part the translation follows the Hebrew Bible closely, and only changes the plural אדונים to the singular Aramaic אדון. The plural reading of ‘lords’ is rather difficult and the change in the targum to the singular form of the word is not an unexpected correction. The non-explicit use of Exodus 20.12 and Malachi 1.6 in 4Q416 2 iii evidently chooses to preserve the difficult plural form (אדונים) in a conflation of the two passages. A deliberate preservation of the plural form may indicate the intent of the author(s) to denote more than simply ‘lord’.

In the Hebrew Bible Malachi 1.1 begins with the traditional phrase ‘and the word of the Lord came to Israel by the hand of...’ followed by the name of the prophet, ‘Malachi’ (מלאכי). The Septuagint translates מלאכי as ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ, which

indicates one interpretation of the proper name 'Malachi'. Further, it indicates that the Hebrew could have been read as 'my messenger/angel' and the Greek, clearly, 'his messenger/angel'. If the author(s) of *Musar leMevin* knew such a tradition it is possible to conceive of the book of Malachi as containing significant angelic overtones. In addition, 4Q417 1 i line 16 likely alludes to Malachi 3.16 and hence lends some credence to this suggestion.

The term 'lords' (אֲדֹנִים/אֲדֹנִים) occasionally occurs elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible (5x); however, with an orthographic variance from Malachi: no *holem waw* (אֲדֹנִים). For the most part the term occurs in a context that exalts the God of Israel (אֲדֹנִי אֲדֹנִים) over all other gods (e.g. Deut 10.17; Is 26.13; Ps 136.3). On two occasions the term might be better understood in the sense of earthly masters (1 Kgs 22.17, par. 2 Chr 18.16; Is 19.4).

The term אֲדֹנִים occurs only once in the Dead Sea Scrolls; however, it occurs a number of times in *Hekhalot* literature. Some of these occurrences may hold significant contributions for translating the term in 4Q416 2 iii line 16. Due to the paucity of the term אֲדֹנִים in the literature of the period, the significance of its use in these passages as a likely reference to angels is significant. First, 1QBook of Noah (1Q19 2) line 5 uses the term אֲדֹנִים in a context that is concerned with proper names and designations for angelic beings:

- (1) קדש[י השמים]
- (2) לאמר גלו מש[פסנו לפ]ני עליון
- (3) ולא תחתך ]
- (4) מיכאל ואוריאל רפ[אל וגבריאל ]
- (5) אֲדֹנִים וגב[ור גבורים]

- 1) [ Holy One]s of hea[ven]
- 2) [ saying, reveal] our [ca]se before [the Most High]
- 3) [ ] and not under you [ ]
- 4) [ Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel [ ]

<sup>57</sup> Translation mine.

5) [ Lord] of lords and Migh[ty One of mighty ones]<sup>58</sup>

Assuming that Barthélemy and Milik's reconstruction of 1QBook of Noah is accurate, line five indicates God's dominion over angels. Though fragmentary, line 1 mentions the 'Holy Ones of heaven', which is a clear reference to angelic beings.<sup>59</sup> Line 4 refers to the archangels by name, which establishes the context for the use of the term אֲדוֹנִים in line 5. The phrase גְּבוּרִים גְּבוּרִים as a reference to angels may be established in the use of the term גְּבוּרִים as an angelic epithet in *Shirot* 'Olat ha-Shabbat (4Q402 1 4, 4Q403 1 i 21). 1QBook of Noah line 5 clearly uses the term אֲדוֹנִים as a designation for angelic beings.

Among the three occurrences of the term אֲדוֹנִים in *Hekhalot* literature two occurrences can clearly be demonstrated as containing angelic connotations. It may be rightly questioned how medieval manuscripts serve as a witness to a 1<sup>st</sup> century CE document.<sup>60</sup> The use of Aramaic targums, rabbinic literature and more recently *Hekhalot* literature is notoriously difficult to use as a witness for earlier compositions. Perhaps the *Hekhalot* sources only display the ease with which the seldom used form of this term lent itself as a reference to angels. The first occurrence is in נ34 588§ (N8128):

תפילה שנייה תתקדש יהוה אלהי ישראל שמים וארץ אדון אדונים אדיר אדירים

<sup>58</sup> Hebrew text taken from *DJD I*; translation mine.

<sup>59</sup> 1Q19bis is popularly identified as 1QBook of Noah but may be a fragment from 1 Enoch. 4QEn<sup>b</sup> ar iii (=1 Enoch 8.2-94; 4Q202 iii) shares a number of similarities to 1Q19 including the names of archangels, however, the term אֲדוֹנִים does not occur here. See K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994) pp. 124-27.

<sup>60</sup> J. R. Davila concludes briefly on the origins of *Hekhalot* literature: 'There is a greater degree of consensus about the authorship and life situation of the *Hekhalot* literature. It is generally agreed that the movement has its roots in Amoraic (and perhaps even Tannaitic) Palestine, but that important and perhaps crucial developments also occurred in Amoraic and Geonic Babylon, and that (apart from the [Cairo] Geniza fragments) the surviving *Hekhalot* texts have also undergone a lengthy period of transmission and redaction in the hands of European Jewish communities'; in *Descenders to the Chariot: The People behind the Hekhalot Literature* (JSJS 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001) p. 22. See also G. G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed; New York: Schocken, 1954); M. D. Swartz, *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992); P. Schäfer, *The Hidden and Manifest God: Some Major Themes in Early Jewish Mysticism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992); D. J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988).



כרובים רוכב כרובים אל צבאות וממשלתי על צבאות אל משרתים

(In) a second prayer: you will be sanctified Lord God of Israel of heaven and earth, Lord of lords and Glorious One of glorious ones, cherubim riding cherubim, God of hosts and ruler over hosts, God of ministers.<sup>61</sup>

Here, the term occurs in a list of angelic epithets: glorious ones, cherubim, hosts and ministers. While the Hebrew Bible uses the term משרתים to refer to the priests who serve in the temple (e.g. Ez 44.11) the term is used in post-biblical texts with angelic connotations (cf. 4Q286 3 2; 4Q287 2 9-12; 4Q400 1 i 4-7; 4Q405 23 i 3-6; 4Q511 35 4). The use of the term אֲדֹנִים in a list of angelic epithets establishes the second occurrence of the term as a designation for angels.

The second important occurrence of the term in *Hekhalot* literature is in 277§ 13 (N8128). Metatron, the angel of Israel, is the subject of these lines:

Metatron whose name is called by eight names: Marguel is his name; Giutiel is his name; Ziutiel is his name; Izihel is his name; Huiel is his name; Miuel is his name; Sagsagiel is his name; Magar(?)yadi(?) is his name. Within love, those that love him, in the heights calling him, in the camps Metatron, servants of the LORD, slow to anger, abundant in mercy, blessed are you LORD, wise of mysteries (הַרְיוֹם), Lord of Lords (אֲדֹנִים) and the secrets (הַסְתָּרִים), amen, amen.<sup>62</sup>

The majority of the occurrences (approx. 17x) of the term אֲדֹנִים in *Hekhalot* literature are in the construct 'lord of lords' and usually set among similar constructs such as 'king of kings' and 'God of gods' (e.g. 33 O1 253§; 12 N 262§). In the pericope above; however, the preceding context describes aspects of the revered Metatron and the phrase 'lord of lords' occurs within an angelic context.

These three texts demonstrate that on the few occasions where the term אֲדֹנִים occurs it is used as a reference for angelic beings. These sources demonstrate that the use of the term אֲדֹנִים in 4Q416 2 iii line 16 as 'angels' is not only a possible translation but a likely rendering. It should also be noted that Greek traditions (cf. 1

<sup>61</sup> Hebrew text taken from P. Schäfer, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981) p. 224.

<sup>62</sup> Translation mine.

Cor 8.5) may preserve occurrences of the terms κύριος and κύριοι as epithets for angels as well.<sup>63</sup>

The combination of several factors from the context of *Musar leMevin* leads to an even higher probability that 4Q416 2 iii line 16 uses the term אַדְנִים to refer to angels in the act of creation. First, 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 most probably conceive of humanity being formed in the likeness of the holy ones. Second, 4Q416 2 iii line 17 states that both father and mother as well as God and lords are the 'oven of your origin', establishing a context and language not ordinarily associated strictly with earthly parentage. Third, the enigmatic phrase וַיִּצַּר עַל הָרוּחַ כֵּן עוֹבָדָם in 4Q416 2 iii line 17 is reminiscent of 4Q417 1 i line 17 and is concerned with formation beyond human parentage. Fourth, 4Q416 2 iii line 18 exhorts the addressee to 'venerate their presence', which, I will argue below, is congruent with concepts of angel veneration elsewhere in the document.

#### 4.3.2) Interpreting the Term נְדִיבִים

The use of the term אַדְנִים as a reference to angels in 4Q416 2 iii may have an important influence on the unusual use of the term נְדִיבִים, typically translated as 'nobles' or 'princes', that occurs in 4Q416 2 iii line 11 as well as one other fragment

---

<sup>63</sup> M. Werner, in his seminal work *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Tübingen: Katzmann-Verlag KG, 1941) pp. 307-12, provides six reasons he thinks that the term κύριοι was used in early Judaism and nascent Christianity for angels: (1) the term κύριος is not a transference of the LXX name for God to Christ since there is not one occurrence of the term used for God by Paul; (2) 4 Ezra uses the term κύριος for angels repeatedly and calls himself 'servant' as does Paul in relation to Christ; (3) the Christian apocalyptic works Shepherd of Hermas, Ascension of Isaiah, and Apocalypse of Zephaniah preserve a use of the term κύριος as a designation for angels; (4) Acts 10.3ff. describes Cornelius addressing the angel as κύριε and in Acts 9.5 Paul addresses the heavenly appearance of Jesus as κύριε (cf. the use of the term κυριόκλητος in Eph 1.21; Col 1.16; Jude 8; 2 Pet 2.10) indicating that the term in the NT is used for a class of angels; (5) the term κύριοι in 1 Cor 8.5, where Paul speaks of many lords and Christ as the one lord, serves as a link between early Jewish and primitive Christian teaching about the Christ and apocalyptic doctrine of angels; (6) and 1 Enoch 41.10 describes the anointed among the hosts of angels and the 'angels of lordship (κυριόκλητος)'. Werner's case for the use of the term 'lords' as a designation for angels stemming from early Judaism is made through relatively late Greek sources. The above discussion on the use of the term אַדְנִים serves to strengthen his hypothesis. See the response to Werner by W. Michaelis, *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum. Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (GBTh 1; Basel: Majer, 1942).

of *Musar leMevin* (4Q418 177 line 5).<sup>64</sup> The use the term נדיבים demands further investigation if we are to understand this column. Though the term is not used of angelic beings elsewhere in the Hebrew literature of the period, reading the term as an angelic epithet makes the best sense of this column. The pertinent lines are as follows:

- (9) גבולכה ואם[ ] ישיבכה לכבודכה התהלך וברז[נ] היה דרוש מולדיו ואז חדע  
 (10) נחלתו ובצדק תתהלך כי יגיה אל ת[אר]הו בכלל דרכיכה למכבדיכה תן הדר  
 (11) ושמו הלל תמיד כי מראש הרים ראשכה ועם נדיבים הושיבכה ובנחלת  
 (12) כבוד המושילכה רצונו שחר תמיד vacat אביון אתה אל תאמר רש אני ול[וא]  
 (13) אדרוש דעת בכל מוסר הבא שכמכה ובכל[ ] צרוף לבכה וברוב בינה  
 (14) מחשבותיכה רז נהיה דרוש והתבונן בכל דרכי אמת וכל שורשי עולה

- 9) your boundary, and if [ ] he restore you to your glory walk in it and by the רז seek its origins and then you will know  
 10) its inheritance, in righteousness you will walk for God will lighten his/its a[ppearance] in all your ways, to the one honouring you--venerate,  
 11) and his name praise always, because out of poverty he lifted your head and with נדיבים (angels) he has seated you and over a glorious inheritance  
 12) he placed you in authority; always strive after his good, you are needy/miserable, do not say 'I am poor and will n[ot]  
 13) seek knowledge, bring your shoulder under all instruction and in all [ ] prove your heart and in the abundance of understanding  
 14) your thoughts, seek the נהיה רז and understand all ways of truth and all roots of iniquity

In 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-12 it is said of the addressee that he has been: (1) lifted from poverty; (2) seated among the נדיבים; and (3) placed in authority over a glorious heritage. In addition, line 10 contains the term הדר ('venerate'), which occurs in line 18 of this column. In line 12 continuing through lines 13-14 the addressee is told that he is needy, but should: (1) not use poverty as an excuse for not seeking knowledge; (2) study the נהיה רז; and (3) know the difference between truth and the roots of iniquity. Similarly, in 4Q418 177 line 5 the fragmentary line reads, 'you are poor but (נדיבים) princes (and?)' and is followed in line 7a with the line, 'know his mysteries

<sup>64</sup> Harrington and Strugnell comment on the term נדיבים stating that it is a term 'frequent in 4Q415ff.', *DJD XXXIV*, p. 118. The term occurs five times in Instruction and two of those occurrences are in 4Q416 2 iii and parallel manuscript 4Q418 9, 9a-c. The other occurrence is in 4Q418 177, discussed here, and the remaining two survive as isolated occurrences due to the fragmentary state of the text (4Q415 2 i + 1 ii; 4Q418 149).

(רזיז).<sup>65</sup> Both fragments indicate an unusual use of the concept of nobility and perhaps even poverty. 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-ff. state that the addressee has been removed from poverty and shares a place with the nobles and yet remains in an impoverished state in the following lines. 4Q418 177 line 5 is not preserved well enough to know if it contains the somewhat paradoxical concept of poverty that occurs here in 4Q416 2 iii. How can a state of economic poverty and a place among wealthy 'nobles' (cf. 1 Sam 2.8) co-exist? A number of conceivable options are available to reconcile the two. One possible reading of 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-14 is that the addressee's poverty at times denotes something other than literal economic deficiency.<sup>66</sup> Another option may be that *Musar leMevin* conceives of the addressee as sharing an inheritance with the angels even though in this world he is materially poor. These two options are not mutually exclusive. The addressee could be seated among the 'angels' and his poverty is a deficiency in his ability to pursue knowledge of good and evil. If this were the case, the repeated reminder that the addressee is poor/lacking would make much more sense.

If 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-12 state that the addressee has been seated among angelic beings, lifted from poverty, and has authority over an inheritance, but is closely followed with a statement of present poverty and potential failure (lines 13-14) then lines 11-12 speak of a reality not yet fully realised. The suggestion that lines 16ff. ultimately address issues of ontology would then function as an expansion on the relation of humanity to the angels and the proper response to it. These lines will be revisited below (§4.4.2).

---

<sup>65</sup> 4Q415 6 line 2 reads אבין אחה ומלכנים.

<sup>66</sup> Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, p. 118-19, is right in stating that, 'this poverty is not at all an ideal' but one should be reticent in asserting flatly that, 'it would seem that the text has material poverty in mind'. Murphy, Tigchelaar, Wright and Goff conclude that material poverty is being discussed in this column as well. Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 209, independently from my research, views the term נדיבים as a

## 4.4) Indefatigable Angelic Models

### 4.4.1) 4Q418 55

Fragment 4Q418 55 lines 8-12 may assist in comprehending the complexities of 4Q416 2 iii line 11 and 4Q418 177 line 5.<sup>67</sup> The bottom margin follows line 12.

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| היד]עתם אם לא שמעתמה כיא מלאכי קודש]]ל[ן] בשמים | ] (8  |
| אמת וירדפו אחר כול שורשי בינה וישקדו על         | ] (9  |
| ול]פי דעתם יכבדו איש מרעהו ולפי שכלו ירבה הדרו  | ] (10 |
| °[ ] הכאנוש הם כי יעצל ובן אדם כי ידמה הלוא     | ] (11 |
| עד והם אחוזת עולם ינחלו הלוא ראיתם              | ] (12 |

- 8) have] you [not kn]own, have you not heard that the holy angels in heaven to [him]  
9) [ ] truth, and they will seek after all the roots of understanding and will be watchful over  
10) [ Ac]cording to their knowledge they will honour a man more than his neighbour, and according to one's insight is his honour  
11) [ ] are they like humanity? For [humanity] is idle, and are they like a son of man? For he perishes, will not  
12) [ everlas]ting, and they will inherit an eternal possession, have you not seen

Fragment 4Q418 55 lines 8-9 compare heavenly angels who sanctify God with earthly humanity, presumably, who seek after the roots of understanding. The task of humanity is to seek understanding with the incentive (line 10) of personal glory or honour in the obtainment of knowledge. The task of performing truth and seeking knowledge undertaken by humanity varies with each individual as is indicated by degrees of recompense (line 10). Beginning with line 11 the angels are juxtaposed with humanity. Humans (אנוש) are dissimilar to angels in that they are idle or slothful. A person (בן אדם) is unlike an angel because he/she is mortal. Line 12 speaks of an eternal possession that 'they', most likely the angels from line 8, will inherit.<sup>68</sup>

---

reference to angelic beings. My interpretation of 4Q416 2 iii raises the possibility that 'poverty' in the document is multivalent on occasion.

<sup>67</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 224, questions whether 4Q418 55 and 4Q418 69 ii should be considered to have the same provenance as the rest of *Musar leMevin*, he concludes that the shared vocabulary (e.g. נחל, אמת, אל הדעות) between these columns and the rest of the document 'should be attributed to slight editorial reworkings of a *Vorlage*'. I am not convinced that the content or language of these columns warrants the conclusion that they were not a part of the original composition. Goff, *The Worldly*, p. 175, comes to the same conclusion.

<sup>68</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 119, discusses 4Q416.69 ii but not 4Q418.55. Here he asks: 'where else in QL or contemporary Jewish traditions do angels have an 'inheritance'? This is the privilege of the human elect, not angels'. The editors view is that angels are recipients of an inheritance in the

Reading line 12 as a reference to angels inheriting an eternal possession is suggested by two factors: (1) line 11 uses הם as a reference to angels in distinction to humanity; and (2) line 12 contains the third person plural address הם and switches to a second person plural address (ראיתם) directed toward the readers/hearers. However, the line is too fragmentary to determine with absolute certainty who the recipient of the inheritance is.

4Q418 55 lines 10-11 establish that the addressee is to pursue knowledge and yet is deficient and mortal in efforts to do so. Conversely, the angels are indefatigable and as such are portrayed as inheriting an eternal possession. 4Q416 2 iii lines 11-ff. portray the addressee as seeking knowledge by the רז נהיה, seated among nobles, lifted from poverty and yet hindered in the pursuit of knowledge by their deficiency. It appears that 4Q416 2 iii lines 11ff. conceive of the addressee as, on the one hand, being given a special situation (i.e. given the רז נהיה and being placed among nobles) while on the other hand, subject to human conditions that potentially hinder a pursuit of knowledge.<sup>69</sup>

#### 4.4.2) 4Q418 69

4Q418 69 lines 10-15 are also concerned that the addressees weary in pursuit of knowledge and works of truth.

- (10) *vacat* ואתם בחירי אמת ורודפי [משח] [שוקד]ים  
 (11) על כול דעה איכה תאמרו יגענו בבינה ושקדנו לרדוף דעת [בכול מ]  
 (12) ולא עיף בכול {נ} שני עולם הלוא באמת ישעשע לעד ודעה [תשרחנו וב]ני  
 (13) שמים אשר חיים עולם נחלחם האמור יאמרו יגענו בפעלות אמת ויעפנו  
 (14) בכול קצים הלוא באור עולם יתהלכו כבוד ורוב הדר אתם  
 (15) ברקיע ין [בסוד אילים כול] *vacat* [ואתה בן]

10) *vacat* and you, chosen ones of truth and pursuers of [ ] [ ] watchful

11) over all knowledge, how can you say: we are weary of understanding and we were watchful to pursue knowledge [ ] in all [ ]

document, *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 290-91. Whether or not evidence can be found in other Early Jewish literature is not relevant, the contexts of 4Q418 55 and 69 ii strongly suggest that angels are in view.

<sup>69</sup> *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* may similarly conceive of human deficiency in regard to worship and praise, 'what is the offering of our mortal tongue (compared) with the knowledge of angels?' (4Q400 2 7).

12) and does not tire in all the years of eternity, is not pleasure taken in truth forever, and knowledge [ ] serve him, and the s[ons of  
 13) heaven, whose lot is eternal life, will they say: we are weary in the deeds of truth and [we] are tired  
 14) at all times, will [they] not walk in eternal light [ ] glory and abundant splendour, you [ ]  
 15) in the firmament [ ] in the council of angelic beings is all [ ]. *vacat* and you, son of [understanding]

The addressees here are called בְּחִירֵי אֱמֶת and are said to pursue truth and keep vigil over knowledge. The implication of the question in line 11 regarding how the addressees can say they are tired of pursuing knowledge is that weariness threatens their vigilance. In lines 11-12 the editors reconstruct the phrase '*For [the Understanding One tires not] at all ti[m]es*'.<sup>70</sup> In this reconstruction 'the Understanding One', God, is portrayed as an indefatigable model who delights in truth and whom truth serves. In my opinion, the reconstruction of a term for God in line 11 is likely on account of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person masculine pronominal suffix of תְּשַׁרְתְּנוּ ('serve Him') in line 12. The end of line 12 through line 14 address the nature of the 'sons of heaven'. The editors of DJD 34 note that the phrase בְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם, 'is usually a non-metaphorical epithet for a group of heavenly beings, ...not a metaphorical title for a group of human "sons of God" whose lives are assimilated to those of the angels'.<sup>71</sup> The editors cite several references (1QS 4.22, 11.8; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 3.22; 4Q181 1 2) that use the phrase as a non-metaphorical epithet<sup>72</sup> while several other occurrences are available (1QH<sup>a</sup> 11.21, 26.11; 1Q19 6; 4Q427 7 ii 18; *1 Enoch* 101.1; 2 Macc 7.34).<sup>73</sup> The occurrence of the phrase בְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם in 4Q418 69 lines 12-13 should be read as a

<sup>70</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 283.

<sup>71</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 290.

<sup>72</sup> See for instance 1QS 4.21-22, 'He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth. . .in order to instruct the upright ones with knowledge of the Most High, and to make understand the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect behaviour. For those God has chosen for an everlasting covenant'; 1QS 11.7-8, 'to those whom God has selected he has given them as everlasting possession; and he has given them an inheritance in the lot of the holy ones. He unites their assembly to the sons of the heavens in order (to form) the council of the Community.' However, less clear is 4Q181 1 ii 2, 'According to the powerful deeds of God and in line with their evil, according to {the foundation of their impurity} their impurity, he delivered the sons of the he[avens] and the earth to a wicked community until its end'.

<sup>73</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11.21-23 read, 'the depraved spirit you have purified from great offence so that he can take a place with the host of the holy ones, and can enter in communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven. You cast eternal destiny for man with the spirits of knowledge'.

class of angels.<sup>74</sup> The concept that the angels have an inheritance is unique but could be attested also, as noted above, in 4Q418 55 line 12.<sup>75</sup> 4Q418 69 line 13 poses the identical question of the sons of heaven, regarding growing weary in pursuit of knowledge, as is asked of the addressee in 4Q418 55 line 11. However, line 11 introduces the question with 'how can you say' as opposed to line 13 'will they say' preceded by 'whose lot is eternal life', which sets the sons of heaven and the addressees in stark contrast with one another. The exhortation of lines 10-15 appears to encourage the addressee to continue in vigilant pursuit of truth and knowledge based upon the models of God and the angels.

In light of the nature of humanity and the angels as portrayed in 4Q418 55 and 69, fragment 4Q416 2 iii lines 11ff. may plausibly be understood as referring to the addressees' relation to angels. Unlikely is the possibility that the term נְדִיבִים should be read as the addressees being seated among this-worldly 'nobles' or 'princes'. While a reference to angels here cannot be demonstrated through the occurrence of the term נְדִיבִים used elsewhere as a reference to angels, both the immediate and broader context of *Musar leMevin* suggest angelic connotations.<sup>76</sup> In 4Q418 55 and 69 the addressees are doers of truth and chosen ones of truth who fail to pursue knowledge perfectly. In contrast, the angelic model is invoked in both fragments as an example of tirelessness. Reading the term נְדִיבִים as the addressees being seated with the angels clarifies how, at the same time, the reference to removal from poverty (l. 11) might be reconciled with

<sup>74</sup> The editors write: 'to understand "sons of heaven whose lot is eternal life' as the angels seems inescapable; that it should another description of a human and sectarian, group, the elect etc., though theoretically possible, is ruled out by the fact that the text has moved from being an address in the 2<sup>nd</sup> plural to being a question in the 3<sup>rd</sup> plural; and nothing points to the presence here of a distinct (3<sup>rd</sup> person) human group nor to the likelihood that the בחירי אמת (line 10) were an angelified group of humans'; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 290.

<sup>75</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, pp. 118-120, as noted previously, objects to this interpretation and argues that righteous 'angelmorphic' humanity is the referent of the phrase 'sons of heaven'.

<sup>76</sup> *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* uses infrequent terms as designations for angels and the term נְדִיבִים may have a parallel with the term נְשִׂאִים (4Q400 1 ii 14, 3 ii 2, 4Q401 1 i 1, 10, 21, 4Q405 13 2-3, 7, 13 4-5).



an insistence on present poverty and deficiency as an excuse for not studying (ll. 12-13).

4Q416 2 iii lines 9-10 could be read as an exhortation that the addressee study the origins/birth-time/descendant (מולדיו) of his/her inheritance by the רז נדיה in order to know 'what is *allotted* to it'. The end of line 11 and beginning of line 12 state that the addressee has been placed in authority over a glorious inheritance. Line 17 states that one's mother and father as well as God and lords/angels are the 'oven of your origin (הוריכה)' and have been placed in authority over the addressee. If it is correct to read lines 15-18 as a reference to the role of dual creators in the formation of humanity, then the exhortation of line 9 to study one's origin may have this union in mind. Being seated among the nobles may, then, be related to the nature of the addressee's formation in the lines that follow.

#### 4.5) 4Q418 81 – Reconstruction and Identification

4Q418 81 has attracted nearly as much scholarly attention as 4Q417 1 i and is another column that may be highly significant for understanding the relationship between humanity and angels in *Musar leMevin*. Among the issues raised are the authorship, addressees, identity of the 'holy ones', and reconstruction of various lines of the column. The text and translation presented are those of Tigchelaar:

- (1) שפתיכה פתח מקור לברך קדושים אחה כמקור עולם הלל ] מא[ז הבדילכה מכול
- (2) רוח בשר ואחה הבדל מכול אשר שנא והנור מכול תעבות נפש ] כי[א הוא עשה כול
- (3) ויורישם איש נחלתו והוא חלקכה ונחלתכה בתוך בני אדם ] ובנ[חלתו המשילכה ואחה
- (4) בזה כבדהו בהתקדשכה לו כאשר שמכה לקדוש קדושים ] לכול [חבל ובכול ] מ[ל[אכליו]<sup>77</sup>
- (5) הפיל גורלכה וכבודכה הרבה מואדה וישימכה לו בכור ב ] ל[
- (6) וטובתי לכה אתן ואחה להלוא לכה טובו ובאמונתו הלך תמיד ]
- (7) מעשיכה ואחה דרוש משפטיו מיד כול יריבכה בכול מו ]
- (8) אהבהו ובחסד {עולם} וברחמים על כול שומרי דברו וקנאתו ]
- (9) ואחה שכלן ] פ[תח לכה ובאוצרו המשילכה ואיפת אמת פ'קכה
- (10) אתכה המה ובידכה להשיב אף מאנשי רצון ולפקוד על ]
- (11) עמכה בשרם תקח נחלתכה מידו כבד קדושו ובשרם ]

<sup>77</sup> DJD XXXIV, pp. 300-1, reconstructs the final word of line 4: ]א[ל'ים].

- (12) פתח [ ] קד[ושים]<sup>78</sup> וכול הנקרא לשמו קודש  
 (13) עם כול ק[ ] ו<sup>79</sup> פארתו למשעת עו[לם]  
 (14) [ ] ה תב[ל] בו יתהלכו כול נוחלי ארץ כי בשמנים

- 1) (of) your lips He has opened a spring, to bless the holy ones. And you, as (with) an eternal spring praise [His name. Long ag]o, He separated you from every  
 2) spirit of flesh. And you, keep yourself apart from everything He hates, and keep aloof from all what is detestable. [Fo]r He has made everyone,  
 3) and has given every man his own inheritance. And He is your portion and your inheritance amongst the children of mankind. [And over] His inheritance He has given you authority. And you,  
 4) honour Him by this: by consecrating yourself to Him, in accordance to the fact that He has appointed you to be a most holy one [of all] the world. And among all [His a]n[ge]ls  
 5) He has cast your lot. And he has exceedingly multiplied your glory. And He has appointed you for Himself as a first-born son among [ ] [ ]  
 6) And my goodness I will give to you. And you, is not His goodness for you, and in faithfulness to Him walk continuously [ ]  
 7) your works. And you, seek His judgements from every adversary of yours in all [ ]  
 8) love him. And with {eternal} kindness and mercy towards all those who keep his word, and in zeal for him [ ]  
 9) And you, He has [op]ened insight for you, and He has given you authority over its treasure; and a true measure is entrusted [ ]  
 10) are with you. And it is in your hand to turn away anger from the men of good pleasure, and to appoint over [ ]  
 11) your people. Before you receive your inheritance from His hand, honour His holy ones, and befo[re]  
 12) open [ ] holy ones. And everyone who is called by His name, holy [ ]  
 13) with all [ ] his beauty for the eter[nal] plantation [ ]  
 14) [ ] wor[ld]. In it will walk all who inherit the earth, for in hea[ven]

Several things about the recipient(s)<sup>80</sup> of address may be ascertained from the column:

- (1) line 1 places him in a venerative position to the 'holy ones'; (2) lines 1-2 describe him as separated from 'all flesh'; (3) all humanity has an inheritance and 'He', presumably God, is his inheritance among the children of mankind; (4) in line 3 the addressee has authority over God's inheritance; (5) in line 4 he is instructed to consecrate himself on account of his most holy status in the world and his position among the angels; (6) line 5 speaks of his manifold glory and appointment as first-born son; (7) line 9 indicates that insight has been revealed, authority over a treasure entrusted and true measure given to him; (8) he has a role turning wrath from 'men of good pleasure'; (9) line 11 indicates that his inheritance is not yet fully realised or

<sup>78</sup> *DJD XXXIV* reconstructs these first words of line 12 - פתח [ ] שיר כול קדושים. The photographs do not entirely substantiate either reading, which appear to read - פתח [ ] שיר כול ק[ ] שים; another possible reconstruction may be: פתח [ ] שיר כול ק[ ] שים and rendered as 'he opened a spring for all holy ones'; see Elgvin, 'Wisdom With and Without,' p. 26.

<sup>79</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 300-1, reconstructs two words here: קצים הדרו.

realised in a continuing sense; and (10) lines 11-12 repeat the motif of venerating 'holy ones'.

A number of scholars have written on 4Q418 81 offering their own interpretive suggestions. However, none of these contributions has attempted to analyse 4Q418 81 and angelology within the document as a whole. Fletcher-Louis offers the most comprehensive discussion on angelology, but he does not take into account 4Q418 55 or angelic references in 4Q416 2 iii. A review of scholarship on 4Q418 81 followed by a brief discussion of angel veneration in Early Jewish literature will precede a synthesis of this column in the larger framework of angelology and anthropology in the document.

#### 4.5.1) Armin Lange

Lange has suggested that 4Q418 81 'should be interpreted as describing the election of either Aaron or Aaronite priests'.<sup>81</sup> The beginning point for this claim is the nearly explicit quotation of Numbers 18.20 in line 3, these texts may be compared:

(4Q418 81 3) וְהוּא חֲלָקָה וְנַחֲלָתָהּ בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי אֲדָם  
(Num. 18.20) אֲנִי חֲלָקָה וְנַחֲלָתָהּ בְּתוֹךְ בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

In the context of Numbers 18.20 Aaron is, of course, the recipient of the inheritance and the allusion here in 4Q418 81 is indicative that the identity of the addressee is the same. Lange finds confirmation that the addressee here is an Aaronic priest in the following arguments: (1) line 4 speaks of God placing an elected one 'at the holiest of holy things' (לְקָדוֹשׁ קְדוֹשִׁים); (2) line 1 speaks of praising God at an 'eternal well' which he states is an allusion to the motif of the priestly praise of God in the temple;<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> While the address is in the singular וְהוּא it could well be understood in a collective sense.

<sup>81</sup> Lange, 'Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot' in D. K. Falk *et al.* (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) p. 40.

<sup>82</sup> Lange, 'Determination of Fate,' points to evidence from the Hebrew Bible (Ez 47.1ff.; Ps 36.10, 46.5, 65.10) as well as the work of B. Ego, 'Der Strom der Tora – Zur Rezeption eines tempeltheologischen Motivs in frühjüdischer Zeit,' in B. Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* –

(3) line 2 exhorts the addressee to keep separate from all that God hates and uses the term נזר, which is often used in post-exilic literature with priestly connotations; and (4) the addressee in line 7 is instructed to דרוש משפטי, which is a phrase that Lange suggests denotes a specific priestly function.<sup>83</sup> The conclusion reached is that 4Q418 81 should be interpreted as describing the election of Aaron/ic priests by way of the 'oracle of the lot' (l. 5), which is a metaphor for the instrument used by God to determine the fate of human beings.<sup>84</sup>

A few questions and observations may be raised in regard to Lange's analysis of 4Q418 81. The previous discussion (chapter 2) on the use of citations and allusions of biblical traditions raised the question whether it is reasonable to assume that the allusion to Numbers 18.20 in 4Q418 81 line 5 necessarily bears the context of the biblical source. While no definitive answer is available, Lange's hypothesis has merit. However, observations of intertextuality, especially in a document such as the *Hodayot*, display that allusions and citations are used rather freely. As this is the case, the four points of confirmation produced by Lange need careful consideration. First, the placement of the addressee לקדוש קדושים would clearly fit with the conception that they preserve the true and faithful priesthood, though not definitively. Second, Lange considers the use of מקור in line 1 as an allusion to the motif of priestly praise of God in the Temple. The term מקור occurs in the Dead Sea Scrolls about 20 times, mostly in the *Hodayot*, and does not demand connotations of priestly praise in the temple, though at times it does (1QH<sup>a</sup> 4.21; 9.22; 10.18; 14.17; 16.4, 8; 19.19; 20.25, 29; 23.10, 12, 13; 1QS 10.12; 11.3, 6; 1QSb 1.3, 6; 4Q504 frags. 1-2 v 2; 4Q511 frags. 52,

---

*Community without Temple* (WUNT 2 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) pp. 205-14; Ego discusses the use of well imagery in Ben Sira as depicting the teaching of Torah.

<sup>83</sup> Lange, 'Determination of Fate,' pp. 40-41.

<sup>84</sup> Lange, 'Determination of Fate,' p. 48.

54-55, 57-59 2; 63 iii 1).<sup>85</sup> While the term may be used with priestly connotations in the Hebrew Bible or Ben Sira, there is little to substantiate the claim that this term *necessarily* indicates temple imagery in 4Q418 81. The most striking parallel to the language of 4Q418 81 is found in 1QS 11.3 where both the terms מקור and רז נהיה occur. Here, the author compares himself with the 'benders of the law' and states that in contrast God has opened a source of insight for him (i.e. the author) that enables him to know the 'mystery of existence':

כי ממקור דאחו פתח אורי ונפלאותיו הבישה עיני ואורת לבבי רז נהיה

Third, the term נור is not a highly frequent word in the Dead Sea Scrolls and is found nowhere in the Hebrew Bible in parallel with the term נבדל, as it is in 4Q418 81 line 2.<sup>86</sup> However, the term נבדל does occur in parallel with נור in Damascus Document 6.14-15 where we read:

ישמרו לעשות כפרוש החזרה לקץ הרשע ולהבדל מבני השחת להנזר מהון הרשעה

Here in the *Damascus Document* the terms are not used with a priestly sense; rather, they are used in a context of general admonition. The term נור does not necessarily connote priestly behaviour and there is no reason to demand such a connotation in 4Q418 81. Finally, Lange suggests that the phrase דרוש משפטי is definitely a priestly task. In the Hebrew Bible this is certainly not the case: the phrase generally has the sense of exacting justice (cf. Is 1.17; 16.5). In 1QS 6.7-8 both the phrases דרוש בחזרה and לדרוש משפט occur, in this context there is an assembly of men together with a

<sup>85</sup> Many of these occurrences have intriguing similarities for *Musar leMevin*: 1QS 11.6 speaks about wisdom hidden from all flesh and revealed to him detailed as מקור צדקה, מקור נבירה, and עין כבוד as well as the place of the elect among the holy ones; 1QSb 1.3 invokes a blessing upon the faithful and invites God to open a מקור עולם which does not dry up; 4Q511 52, 54-55, 57-59 2 states that God is a מקור הטהרה for Adam and his offspring; 4Q511 63 iii 1 has the author extolling God's justice and having placed upon his lips a מקור חזקה; 1H<sup>a</sup> 4.21 (cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9.21-22; 20.25) describes one born of woman as a structure of dust and water a מקור נדה with a depraved spirit; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10.18 (cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20.29) has God placing on the heart of an understanding one a מקור דעה; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14.17-18 (cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 26.4, 8) have the elect with the holy ones and as an everlasting plantation watered by the streams of Eden and a spring of light that will be עולם למקור.

priest who seek to understand the regulations. However, the context in 4Q418 81 does not equate משפט with חזרה; rather, the term could be understood in the sense of 'judgements' that will be exacted against God's adversaries. In conclusion, Lange's arguments that identify the addressee as an Aaronic priest do not necessarily compel one to conclude that the addressee must be a priest.

#### 4.5.2) Torleif Elgvin

Elgvin identifies the addressee of 4Q418 81 as a member of the end-time community stating the column is 'a meaningful entity only if the addressed individual is seen' as such.<sup>87</sup> The elect are here the אנשי רצון as well as the משעה עולם. These terms indicate that the author of *Musar leMevin* understood his 'circle(s)' as the nucleus of the community of the end-time, that will exist forever'.<sup>88</sup> Specifically, the imagery of the 'planting' is connected with conceptions of an end-time inheritance of the land. The elect in 4Q418 81 are exhorted to praise the holy ones who are the angels (ll. 1, 4, 11). The fellowship between the elect community and angels exists amidst images such as 'garden', 'planting', 'sprout' and 'fountain', all of which are used in exilic and post-exilic texts in connection to Eden and the temple. As such, Elgvin believes that the circles behind *Musar leMevin* understood themselves as a spiritual temple. The phrase פתח מקור for him, *apropos* Zechariah 13.1 and selected lines from *Hodayot*, clearly has temple connotations. Therefore, the addressees, according to Elgvin, are the elect end-time community estranged or separated from faithless Israel.<sup>89</sup> As such, Elgvin understands the elect as a group who were

---

<sup>86</sup> Lange, 'Determination of Fate,' suggests translations of the term as 'to dedicate, devote, consecrate oneself'.

<sup>87</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom With and Without,' p. 26.

<sup>88</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom With and Without,' p. 27.

<sup>89</sup> Elgvin, 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism,' p. 244.

estranged from and opposed to the Aaronic Jerusalem cult,<sup>90</sup> and the priesthood is 'reinterpreted as a promise to the elect individual'.<sup>91</sup>

One final comment on Elgvin's interpretation may be directed at his translation of the phrase לקדוש קדושים. Elgvin takes the term לקדוש as an infinitive and renders the entire phrase as 'to sanctify the holy ones'. He also notes that if 'holy of holies' was the intended reference the spelling would have been קדוש קדושים.<sup>92</sup> However, as Tigchelaar recognises, the term לקדוש as an infinitive cannot mean 'to sanctify' but could possibly be translated as 'to become holy'.<sup>93</sup>

#### 4.5.3) Harrington and Strugnell

The editors of DJD 34, in their extensive notes on 4Q418 81, comment upon several aspects of the column that are relevant here. First, they maintain that the phrase פתח מקור<sup>94</sup> in line 1 is related to blessing the holy ones, which is significant for line 12 where the word פתח appears and is followed by a gap of approximately three letter spaces, followed by the word קדושים. The sense of the metaphor in line 1 is to 'open up a spring for the utterance of words'.<sup>95</sup> The editors reconstruct פתח [שיר] in line 12 whereas Tigchelaar leaves the space blank. They note the possibility that the word [מקור] could be reconstructed in line 12 which would be a complementary reconstruction to the preceding line.<sup>96</sup> The primary difficulty for the editors in

<sup>90</sup> Frey in 'Flesh and Spirit,' p. 387, notes that, 'there are no indications linking it [*Musar leMevin*] to a specific religious community, let alone a community separated from the Temple...'; see also A. Lange, 'In Diskussion,' p. 131.

<sup>91</sup> Elgvin, 'The Mystery to Come,' p. 121.

<sup>92</sup> Elgvin, 'An Analysis of 4QInstruction,' p. 136.

<sup>93</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 233. The infinitive לקדוש does not occur in the Hebrew Bible only the *piel* infinitive construct לקדש (Ex 29.1, 29.33; Jer 17.27; Ez 46.20; Neh 13.22; 2 Chr 29.17), the singular masculine noun לקדש (Ex 31.11; 1 Kgs 6.16, 7.50; 2 Chr 4.22) and on one occasion the masculine singular adjective לקדוש (Is 58.13).

<sup>94</sup> The editors note that these two words appear in relation to one another elsewhere in the DSS (e.g. 1QS 11.3; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 2.18, 8.21, 10.31, 11.19, 18.10).

<sup>95</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 303.

<sup>96</sup> Judging from the photographs it is my opinion that the two surviving letters of the second word are *waw* and *resh* rather than *yod* and *resh* (compare the *yod* of the following word קדושים or the *yod* of

reconstructing the term [מק]ור here is the absence of any traces of the tail of a *qof*. The photograph of the fragment appears to me to show significant damage of the letter and *qof* cannot be confidently reconstructed here. Regardless of how the second word of line 12 is reconstructed it is the opinion of the editors that glorification of angels is present in these lines.<sup>97</sup>

The reconstruction of 4Q418 81 line 4 is also significant with regard to anthropology and angelology. The editors reconstruct here:

לקדוש קדושים] לכול [תבל ובכול] א[ל]ים]

(‘among all the angels’, continuing in line 5 ‘has He cast thy lot’) whereas Tigchelaar reconstructs the final word of line 4 as [מ]ל[אכיו]. The editors query whether the *maven* here is being appointed as ‘someone holy (or as a sanctuary<sup>98</sup>) for all the world’.<sup>99</sup> They also raise the possibility that lines 4-5 could refer to the special lot of Aaronic Priests, but wonder if it is not more likely in a sapiential context that ‘they treated of the priestly or quasi-priestly station of the *maven* in the administration’.<sup>100</sup> The editors can offer no definitive statement regarding the priestly status of the *maven* and are reluctant to identify him as such.

The editors identify and comment on references to the *maven* as קדוש קדושים and בכור, as well as the use of the phrases אנשי רצון (line 10) and מטעת עולם (line 13) – all of which are important for understanding the recipient(s) of address in 4Q418 81. They state that identifying the *maven* as a first-born is ‘a little surprising’ and as a ‘holy of holies’ as ‘not impossible’. The editors make no comments on their

---

מקור in line 1). The measurement of space in line 1 for the phrase פתח מקור, again from the photographs, is identical to the space available in line 12 (פתח ] זר[).

<sup>97</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 308.

<sup>98</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 233, comments on the phrase לקדוש קדושים: ‘The translation ‘holy of holies’ should perhaps be avoided, since it may suggest that the addressee is appointed as a sanctuary.’

<sup>99</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 305.

<sup>100</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 305.



translation of קדוש קדושים as 'Holy of Holies' but offhandedly suggest that this refers to a 'sanctuary'. With regard to the occurrence of the phrase אנשי רצון in line 10, they suggest that it is a 'theological description of the authors own group' and may not be a 'sectarian self-characterization (cf. the Lucan passage and the parallel in the Aramaic 4Q*Visions of Amram*<sup>c</sup> ar (4Q545) 9 18; cf. also מטעת עולם in line 13, which need not have been one either)'.<sup>101</sup> The phrase 'eternal planting' is found elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 8.5, 11.8; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 6.15, 8.6) and is often understood as a reference to a strictly sectarian group.<sup>102</sup> However, the editors consider that the phrase 'need not presuppose a dualistic or specifically sectarian theology' since the motif occurs in the Hebrew Bible. In conclusion, the editors express some surprise at the descriptions used of the *maven* and view the phrases אנשי רצון and מטעת עולם as references to the author's community, which is not necessarily sectarian. According to DJD 34, the address of the column has in mind both an exalted *maven* and a community that is subjugated to him. The conclusion of the editors, in my opinion, makes the best sense of this column.

#### 4.5.4) Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar

Tigchelaar's reconstruction and translation of 4Q418 81, as noted above, differs from that of others. In addition to the transcription and translation above, several other comments are beneficial in the present discussion. Tigchelaar explains the promise to Aaron in the allusion to Numbers 18.20 and the identification of the phrases רוח בשר and בני אדם in lines 1-3 as follows:

The phrase 'he has separated you from every spirit of flesh', may be interpreted in the light of line 3 והוא חלקכה ונחלכה בחוך בני אדם which quotes the promise to Aaron in Num 18.20. In Num 8.14 and 16.9 the same verb הבריל is used with regard to the Levites, where it is said that they have been separated from the midst of the Israelites, or the congregation of Israel. Deut 10.8-9 combines these concepts: בעת ההוא הבריל יהוה את שבט הלוי, 'at that time the Lord set apart the tribe of Israel' for several cultic tasks, followed in verse 9 by

<sup>101</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 305.

<sup>102</sup> See especially Tiller, 'The "Eternal Planting"', pp. 312-35.

על כן לא היה לליו חלק ונחלה עם אחיו יהוה הוא נחלתו. Just as בני אדם in line 3 replaces the biblical בני ישראל, so רוח בשר replaces בני ישראל or עדת ישראל in this phrase. In other words, רוח בשר and בני אדם seem to be synonymous in this fragment.<sup>103</sup>

However, Tigchelaar's reasoning may be questioned. The allusion to Numbers 18.20, in my observation, would appear to depict the addressee as being separated from the 'spirit of flesh' and serves the purpose not to communicate a priestly division but to distinguish him from a portion of humanity. There is no reason to conclude that the allusion here, which is not a verbatim quotation, is meant to remind the reader or hearer of the earlier text's (Num 18.20) context. Furthermore, one is not compelled to assume that this non-explicit occurrence of Numbers 18.20 found in 4Q418 81 connotes the priestly division found in Numbers 18.

Tigchelaar's hypothesis is that *Musar leMevin* 'consists of different sections directed to varying addressees'.<sup>104</sup> If this is in fact an accurate hypothesis, then one might understand this column as addressing various priests. The column as a whole, however, contains very little priestly language (e.g. purity language like טמאה, טהרה, נדה).<sup>105</sup> The possible explanation that Tigchelaar provides for the absence of such language is his hypothesis of differing addressees. He concludes that most of the references to a possible priestly addressee are 'obscure and broken'. Nevertheless, he argues that evidence for a priestly addressee may be found in the following two observations: (1) columns 4Q418 81 and 4Q415 1 ii-2 1 contain about half of all words related to the root קדש in the document; and (2) the addressee enjoys an elevated status such as when he is told to consecrate himself, is described as 'most

<sup>103</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 232.

<sup>104</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 236.

<sup>105</sup> Other sapiential literature such as Ben Sira or *Mysteries* have a greater occurrence of this priestly terminology.

holy', and blesses the holy ones. This elevated figure functions as an intermediary between the 'children of mankind or the men of good pleasure, and the holy ones'.<sup>106</sup>

The ultimate conclusion reached by Tigchelaar is similar to that of the editors: the column addresses both an exalted figure and a class of humanity of a lesser status. I also find convincing the interpretation of the 'holy ones' as angels and the interpretation of the intermediary role of an elevated addressee. However, the equating of the רוח בשר with the בני אדם on the basis of Numbers 18.20 and Deuteronomy 10.8-9 is less persuasive. The phrase בני אדם is more likely a term for all of humanity and רוח בשר a designation for a category of wicked humanity.

#### 4.5.5) Crispin Fletcher-Louis

Fletcher-Louis has written briefly on 4Q418 81 (see §1.3.7). He understands the addressee in this column to have a 'transcendent ontology' and points to his separation from the 'spirit of flesh' and his status as 'first born'. Much of Fletcher-Louis' attention is focused upon lines 1, 11, and 12 where, as we have seen, angels (קדושים) are the recipients of blessing, glorification and perhaps song. Fletcher-Louis questions whether there is sufficient evidence to read these lines as concerned with angel (i.e. the term קדושים should not be interpreted as 'angels') veneration or worship and states that 'unequivocal and extensive support in the primary texts has been difficult to find'. Rather than interpret these lines as a veneration of angels, he attempts to argue that *'the individual here described is a priest who is set apart from the laity, who are the "holy ones", whom he is called to bless and glorify'*.<sup>107</sup>

Fletcher-Louis makes his argument for the identification of the addressee as priestly. He appeals to Lange's criteria for such an identification and emphasises the strong priestly connotations of the term נזיר, understanding it in the sense of

---

<sup>106</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 236.

‘sanctification’ and relating it to the blessing of Levi in *Jubilees* 31.14.<sup>108</sup> Another criterion is the occurrence of the phrase ‘holy of holies’ in line 4 which is congruent with ways in which the priesthood within the Qumran community are established as a ‘holy of holies over against the laity who are the holy ones’.<sup>109</sup> However, Fletcher-Louis takes for granted that the phrase לקדוש קדושים should be translated as ‘holy of holies’, a translation discussed in relation to Elgvin. He further understands the reference to ‘holy of holies’ as part of a cultic cosmology where the priest is set apart and functions as a sacred centre of the whole cosmos, so that he and the rest of God’s people embody the ‘true Adam’. Fletcher-Louis also finds a distinction between the righteous in general and the position of the *maven* specifically in lines 3-4: ‘each [the righteous ones] man has his inheritance, and God is yours [singular ‘your’ which refers to the exalted individual]’.<sup>110</sup> He also states, ‘in this case the addressee is a priest who, like the high priest in 1QSb 4:28, is set apart “for the holy of holies” and given the divine privilege assigned to Aaron by the biblical text’. Fletcher-Louis also finds priestly language in line 4 where he glorifies God, כבדו (cf. Sirach 50; 1QSb 4; *Aristeas* 99). In line 10 the phrase אף מאנשי רצון is related to the same activity of the priest Phineas who turns away God’s wrath from the righteous and is thus further evidence of priestly language in 4Q418 81. Other evidence that the turning away of God’s wrath is strictly a priestly vocation is found in an assortment of other texts (1 Macc 3.3-9; Wis.Sol. 18.15-16; *Joseph and Aseneth* 22). Another priestly vocation is found by Fletcher-Louis in line 9 where the addressee has been given authority over a

---

<sup>107</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 178.

<sup>108</sup> See discussion above where Lange’s use of this term is used to identify the addressee as priestly.

<sup>109</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 179.

<sup>110</sup> Fletcher-Louis finds a shared theology in 1QS 8-9; 4QMMT and 4Q511 35.

treasure, an authority of such magnitude that it is only conceivable that it is given to a priest.<sup>111</sup>

Fletcher-Louis' case that the addressee in 4Q418 81 is to be identified as a priest is based upon two primary reasons. First, he cites Lange and his identification of the addressee as a priest. Second, he automatically takes the phrase קדוש קדושים as 'holy of holies'. While it may be that there is a strong likelihood that the identity of the addressee is priestly, the arguments presented by Lange are not without their limitations and should not be understood as definitively pointing to a priestly addressee. The translation of לקדוש קדושים as 'holy of holies' is not straightforward, it would have to be a plene spelling for the expected לקדוש הקדושים. Tigchelaar's translation of the phrase as 'a most holy one' seems the more probable and would dispense with notions of temple cosmology in the column. The idea that the task of turning away God's wrath is strictly a priestly vocation has some merit. Since it is difficult to find an exact parallel to this concept little can be said, except that the column is unique in a number of details. The claim that the act of honouring God (כבודו) is strictly priestly is only convincing if it can be demonstrated that the entire document is addressed to priests.<sup>112</sup> The concept of glorifying God is common throughout *Musar leMevin* (e.g. 4Q416 2 ii 18; 4Q416 2 iii 10, 15, 18; 4Q417 1 i 13; 4Q417 20 5; 4Q418 9 12; 4Q418 69 ii 14) and is scant evidence for the addressees' identity. Finally, the addressee's charge over a treasure would seem to have little significance for identifying the priestly status of the figure. Throughout the document the addressees are portrayed as possessing the רז נהיה which could be related directly or indirectly to the treasure in line 10.

---

<sup>111</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, pp. 182-83.

<sup>112</sup> It should be questioned: if the entire document is addressed to priests how is the 2<sup>nd</sup> person feminine singular address of 4Q415 2 ii to be understood?

Fletcher-Louis makes his case for treating the blessing and glorification of the 'holy ones' in lines 1, 11 and 12 as a witness to the theology of divine priesthood. His primary argument for reading these lines as a witness of angel veneration is the sheer lack of evidence in the Judaisms of the period.<sup>113</sup> Fletcher-Louis finds in *Jubilees* 31.15 an 'angelmorphic priesthood separated from all flesh [who] is to "bless all the seed of the beloved"'. 4Q418 81 lines 1, 11 and 12 should, he suggests, be understood within this context. Other corroborative evidence is found in 1 Maccabees 3.3 where Judas Maccabee 'enlarged the glory' of his people. Sirach 44-50 is also cited: Simon the high priest brings glory to Israel and 'encomiastic "praise of the fathers"'.<sup>114</sup> In conclusion, Fletcher-Louis is convinced that 4Q418 81 is addressed to a priestly individual who is separated from the laity ('holy ones') and whom the addressee is to bless and glorify. Both evidence in 4Q418 81 itself and elsewhere in the document do not substantiate this conclusion.

Furthermore, Fletcher-Louis' assertion that there is a general lack of evidence in the literature of early Judaism for angel veneration must be addressed. Fletcher-Louis takes the phrase קדושים in lines 1, 11 and 12 as a reference to the community or laity and not to angelic beings. In the preceding discussion on 4Q417 1 i the referent of this term was similarly debated (cf. §3.2.6). Collins states that there is no unambiguous reference to Israel as 'holy ones' in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and even in the Hebrew Bible there is only one ambiguous occurrence (Ps 34.10). I see no reason why Collins' opinion should not be accepted and further examination than has hitherto been done would be fruitless.<sup>115</sup> However, occurrences of angel veneration in

<sup>113</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, p. 186, cites 11Q*Berakhot* (11Q14 = 4Q285 1) 1 ii lines 5-6 as one of the only references to priestly blessing of angels: ברוכים כול מלאכי קדשו.

<sup>114</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory*, pp. 186-87.

<sup>115</sup> See Collins, *Daniel*, pp. 313-17.

documents from early Judaism will be briefly explored to further substantiate the proposed relationship of the addressee to the 'holy ones' as venerative.

#### **4.5.6) Loren Stuckenbruck: Angel Veneration in Early Judaism**

There is a general consensus among scholars that the addressee of 4Q418 81 enjoys an exalted status and is likely a priestly figure. In addition to this figure are: (1) the 'men of good pleasure' (l. 10) and 'eternal planting' (l. 13); and (2) the 'holy ones' (ll. 1, 11, 12). Before attempting to address further the identity and relation of each of these to the other, we turn briefly to issues of angelic blessing, praise and veneration. While I believe that the examination of the fragments in this chapter already leads towards the conclusion of a venerative relationship between a group of humanity to angels, a few words regarding angel/human relations elsewhere in early Judaism are in order before drawing conclusions about this column.

It is beyond the range of the present inquiry to review extensively a history of scholarship on the topic of exalted notions of angels as related to early Christology. However, it is from scholarship on early/late high Christology that most work on angel cults, angel worship, 'angelmorphism' and related themes has stemmed.<sup>116</sup> Fletcher-Louis' observes that no parallel for reading the קדושים as 'angels' exists and; therefore, objects to reading angel veneration in 4Q418 81. In my opinion, his assertion is unfounded. Stuckenbruck has demonstrated that in a number of texts 'angels could be made objects of veneration as beings aligned with and subordinate to God'.<sup>117</sup> A brief summary of a few relevant texts commented upon by Stuckenbruck should more than adequately provide a background against which the addressees of

---

<sup>116</sup> Stuckenbruck notes in his monograph that 'it is conspicuous that relatively little is said which seems to have a direct bearing on the problem of human veneration of angels', *Angel Veneration* p. 150. While the general topic of angelology in the DSS scrolls has been addressed, there remain few secondary sources that specifically deal with the veneration of angels. See also "'Angels" and "God": Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,' In L. T. Stuckenbruck and W. Sproston North (eds.), *Exploring Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (London: Continuum, forthcoming).

4Q418 81 can be further resolved. No attempt will be had here to provide an overview of human participation in angelic functions in early Judaism; rather, a brief synopsis of texts that preserve expressions of angel veneration, as set forth by Stuckenbruck, will be reviewed.<sup>118</sup>

Stuckenbruck's monograph is concerned with notions of angel veneration as related to Christology in the Apocalypse of John. In part two of his work, which is concerned with evidence of angel veneration, the two larger subdivisions are 'polemical texts' and 'non-polemical sources'.<sup>119</sup> While the first division primarily explores Rabbinic literature and the New Testament, the second division analyses Qumran documents and other early Jewish texts. For the sake of brevity, the latter sub-section will be the focus of attention here.

The two documents from Qumran that Stuckenbruck explores in relation to angel veneration are *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* and 11QBerakhot (=Sefer *haMilhamah*).<sup>120</sup> The first column that Stuckenbruck analyses is 4Q400 2 and the last line of connecting fragment 4Q401 14 i line 6.<sup>121</sup> The occurrence of angel veneration

---

<sup>117</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, p. 269.

<sup>118</sup> Other discussions of Angel Christology and angel veneration are found in the works of L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (London: SCM, 1988); and D. D. Hannah, *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT 2 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) pp. 104-21.

<sup>119</sup> In relation to polemical sources, Stuckenbruck summarises: '...we have reviewed evidence for a refusal tradition which functioned rhetorically in a narrative setting to prevent a seer from worshipping an angelic figure. In addition, it was suggested that this and some rabbinic traditions may be understood as a critique which presumes a common traditional heritage among authors and readers or between tradents and opponents. Nevertheless, no single instance of the kind of outright worship forbidden in the refusals turns up in early Jewish literature. It remains possible, if not likely, that some authors made use of polemical traditions in order to paint a dark picture of milder tendencies to venerate angels or to protect against potential misunderstanding of something within their own or similar writings. The question explored below is whether there is anything in early Jewish texts... which explains the use of the polemic in its various forms'; p. 164.

<sup>120</sup> Since Stuckenbruck's monograph was published it has been suggested that 11QBerakhot overlaps with 4Q285 and is thus a part of the *War Scroll*. See M. Abegg, 'Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment,' in *JBL* 113/1 (1994): 81-91.

<sup>121</sup> See also E. Eshel, H. Eshel, C. Newsom, B. Nitzan, E. Schuller and A. Yardeni (eds.), *DJD XI Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998) p. 207.



in this column was first suggested by A. M. Schwemer.<sup>122</sup> The following reconstruction is that of DJD 11 while the translation and divisions are those of Stuckenbruck:

- 4Q401 14 i
- (6) לראשי ממשלות ] שמי מלכות כבודכה
- 4Q400 2
- (1) להלל כבודכה פלא באלי דעת ותשבחות מלכותכה בקדושי ק[דושים  
 (2) המה נכבדים בכל מחני אלוהים ונוראים למוסדי אנשים פ[לא  
 (3) מאלוהים <ים> ואנשים יספרו הוד מלכותו כדעתם ורוממו  
 (4) שמי מלכותו ובכול מרומי רום חהלי פלא לפי כול  
 (5) כבוד מלך אלוהים יספרו במעוני עומדם *vacat* ו  
 (6) מה נחשב [ב]ם וכדנתנו מה במעונייהם וק[ודשנו  
 (7) קודש[י]הם [מה] תרומת לשון עפרנו בדעת אל[ים]  
 (8) [ל]ר[נתנו נרוממה לאלוהי דעת]  
 (9) ק[ודש ובינתו מכול ידע]<sup>123</sup>

(6) to the chief of the realms [ ] the heavens of Your gl[or]ious kingdom

(1) to praise Your glory,

a wonderful thing among the *elim* of knowledge  
 and (to praise) the praiseworthiness of Your kingdom,  
 (a wonderful thing) among the most holy ones.<sup>124</sup>

(2) They are honoured among all the camps of the *elohim*  
 and revered by human councils,  
 a [wonder] (3) (greater) than the *elohim* and human beings  
 alike,

for they recount the splendour of His Kingdom  
 according to their knowledge

and they exalt [His ... in all]

(4) the heavens of His Kingdom,  
 and in all the exalted heights wonderful psalms  
 according to all [their insight ...]

(5) the glory of the King of the *elohim* they recount  
 in the dwellings of their (assigned) position. *vacat*

An[d ...]

(6) how can we be reckoned [among] them,  
 and our priesthood,  
 how (can it be reckoned) among their dwellings?  
 and [our] ho[liness],  
 how can it compare with] (7) the[ir] ho[li]ness?

[And what] is the offering of our tongue of dust  
 (in comparison) with the knowledge of the *elim/elohim*?  
 (8) ...] our resounding,

let us exalt the God of knowledge [...]

(9) ... ho[liness],  
 and his understanding is beyond all who [have eternal]  
 knowledge.

<sup>122</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, p. 157; A. M. Schwemer, 'Gott als König in den Sabbatliedern' in *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der Hellenistischen Welt* (eds.), M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer (WUNT 2 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991) pp. 81-2 and 99-100.

<sup>123</sup> DJD XI, p. 187.

<sup>124</sup> DJD XI translates, 'among the holiest of h[oly ones]'.

The phrase 'chiefs of the realms' that occurs in 4Q401 14 i line 6 is 'the subject of הלל...[and] seems to be an elite group of angels probably equivalent to the נשיאים ('princes') mentioned in other *Shirot*'.<sup>125</sup> The role of the 'chiefs of the realm' is to praise God, which in 4Q400 2 1 is a wonderful thing among the קדושים and אלים. In the line following, the ראשים are 'characterized by two passive participial forms in predicate position; they are "glorified" and "revered"'. These lines go beyond applying attributes to angels found elsewhere; the syntax suggests that both angels and humans consider the 'chiefs of the realms' to be superior. Stuckenbruck suggests that the reason these chief angels are venerated is on account that 'they recount the splendor of His kingdom according to their knowledge'. These beings possess a superior understanding and their attainment of knowledge and the quality of their worship are something to which the addressees aspire. In general the community does not regard itself comparable in their priesthood, sanctity or knowledge to these angels. Despite the deficiency of the community, they are nonetheless allowed to participate in the heavenly cult. The acknowledgement by both angels and humans of the 'chiefs of the realms' superiority, and the glorification and reverence given them, is venerative.<sup>126</sup> The reason for such veneration is similar to that of *Musar leMevin* – the angels represent a superior model and possess superior knowledge.

The second column from *Shirot* 'Olat ha-Shabbat that contains a significant occurrence of angels as objects of veneration is 4Q403 1 i lines 31b-33a. The beginning of line 31 contains a reference to 'praiseworthy chiefs' (ראשי תושבחות) – similar to the above column. The end of line 32 and beginning of line 33 contain the phrase בנה תשבחות כול אלוהים, which Stuckenbruck suggests be translated as 'in

<sup>125</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, p. 158.

<sup>126</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, pp. 158-60.

it/through it is the praiseworthiness of all *elohim*'. Following the suggestion of Schwemer, he sees this as a reference to the 'praiseworthiness' of angels by the addressees rather than God's rule being made manifest or brought to expression through the angels' praises. An alternative reading to the praiseworthiness of the angels, he states, does not properly account for the parallelism between the word הדר in the preceding phrase (כי בהדר חשבחות כבוד מלכותו) 'for in/through praiseworthy majesty is the glory of His rule') and חשבחות here.<sup>127</sup> Understanding these lines as angels being praiseworthy would then seem to be the best interpretation.<sup>128</sup> Schwemer and Stuckenbruck's reading of these lines demonstrates the second occurrence of angel veneration in *Shirot* 'Olat ha-Shabbat.

11QBerakhot (=Sefer haMilhamah) contains an occurrence of the blessing of angels. Here, God's holy angels are 'the final predicate of a brief four-fold blessing to be recited by a (high-)priestly figure (וברוכים כול מלאכי קודשו)'. In the three blessings that precede the blessing of angels it would appear first that the community is blessed, then God's holy name, while the third predicate is lost due to fragmentation. While the blessedness of the community is dependant upon the name of God in the first blessing, the fourth blessing of the angels functions as a form of praise. Predicate blessings of humans and God are frequent in the Hebrew Bible, Dead Sea Scrolls, and other early Jewish literature, while the blessing of angels is scarce (cf. Gen 48.15-16; Tob 11.14). Here the praiseworthiness of the angels is due to their role as protectors and ones whose presence, similar to God's presence, is conceived of as guaranteeing the 'community's well-being'.<sup>129</sup>

<sup>127</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, pp. 160-61.

<sup>128</sup> Fletcher-Louis, *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT2 94; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1997), dismisses outright Stuckenbruck's findings on angel veneration: 4Q400 2 and Pseudo-Philo (LAB 13.6) pp. 5-6; and Tobit p. 38 fn. 20.

<sup>129</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, pp. 162-63.

While Stuckenbruck explores a number of texts from early Jewish literature (e.g. *Ps-Philo* 13.6; *1 En* 9.1-11; 15.2; 40.6, 9; 47.1-2; 99.3; 104.1; *T. Levi* 3.5-7; 5.5-6; *T. Dan* 6.2), a brief examination of the doxology in Tobit 11.14-15 is sufficient to provide a background against which *Musar leMevin* may be further understood. Following the recension of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus, a four-fold doxology in the 3<sup>rd</sup> person preserves the blessing of angels twice:

(14) Blessed God, and blessed his great name, and blessed all his holy angels; may his great name be upon us, and blessed all the angels unto all ages, (15) for he has afflicted me, but now I see my son Tobias!

Stuckenbruck argues that Codex Sinaiticus preserves an earlier recension than either Codices Alexandrinus or Vaticanus.<sup>130</sup> These latter two codices contain shorter blessings with only one blessing of angels and are more fully integrated into the story (2<sup>nd</sup> person). These codices contain a form that renders praise to angels less excessively than Sinaiticus. Elsewhere, Codex Sinaiticus contains loftier evaluations of angels by Tobit (cf. 8.15; 12.12-15) than Alexandrinus or Vaticanus. At the same time, the recension of Sinaiticus is careful to place the praise of angels alongside God, ensuring an 'essentially monotheistic outlook'. Alexandrinus and Vaticanus appear to be later recensions which continued to transmit the text with intensified concern in this regard.<sup>131</sup> Tobit 11.14-15 of Codex Sinaiticus preserves Tobit's response to the restoration of his sight and safe return of his son in the blessing of both God and His holy angels. Clearly, the evidence from Tobit would indicate that angels were on occasion recipients of blessing from human beings in some early Jewish literature.

Stuckenbruck demonstrates on a number of occasions that angels in documents from Qumran and other early Jewish literature were the object of varying degrees of veneration as beings subordinate to God. *Musar leMevin*, specifically

---

<sup>130</sup> For another discussion on these recensions see J. A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003) pp. 279-80.

4Q418 81, is closely aligned to the sort of pattern we find in *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*. Therefore, based upon both internal (4Q416 2 iii; 4Q417 1 i; 4Q418 55; 4Q418 69; 4Q418 81) and external evidence (esp. *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat*) it is reasonable to conclude that *Musar leMevin* conceives of the relationship between the addressees towards the angels (קדושים) as venerative.

#### 4.5.7) Angel Veneration in 4Q418 81

4Q418 81 appears to be addressed to an exalted figure(s) who stands between the superior and venerative holy ones ('angels') and a faithful community ('men of good pleasure'; 'eternal plantation'). The addressee of the column is likely a priestly figure, though this claim has been set forth with greater certainty than the textual evidence may merit. Line 17 of 4Q418 81 exhorts the addressee: 'from each of thy teachers get ever more instruction'. From whom is the exalted addressee to learn? Is the addressee to gain instruction from a superior human teacher or do the holy ones fulfil this role? Perhaps the relationships between various figures within the community, the 'men of good pleasure' and the 'eternal plantation', are not to be understood in a strictly hierarchical sense. Particularly in line 10 where the role of the addressee is to 'turn away wrath from the men of good pleasure' the column would indicate a superior role of the addressee to others within the community. However, does line 10 truly warrant a division between an exalted priestly figure and laity? If the addressees of the document generally have in common access to the רז נהיה and pursue and achieve knowledge to differing degrees (4Q418 55 10: 'According to their knowledge they will honour a man more than his neighbour, and according to one's insight is his honour'), then such a clear division may not be applicable. While the relationship between addressee(s) and 'men of good pleasure' in 4Q418 81 could

---

<sup>131</sup> Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration*, pp.165-67.

have expression in terms of an exalted figure and laity, I would propose that such distinctions may be too strict. Rather, it may be best to conceive of 4Q418 81 as addressed to an elect community whose members have attained varying degrees of sanctity and who all hold the holy ones in esteem as superior models who should be emulated and revered.

#### 4.6) Conclusions

The focus of this chapter has been to explore conceptions of angelology and anthropology in *Musar leMevin*. The first text to be examined was 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 where it was suggested that the author(s) drew upon an exegetical tradition of Genesis 1.26-27. *Musar leMevin*, it is argued, likely conceives of dual creators (i.e. God and angels) who fashioned all of humanity after their likeness. Bequeathed to all humanity was a divine revelation, which was rejected (or they failed to acquire it) by a portion of humanity called the 'spirit of flesh'. The association of human beings with knowledge (רו נהיה) and the understanding of good and evil serves to divide humanity into two basic categories: the עם רוח and רוח בשר. The continuing task of pursuing both knowledge and holiness appears to be laborious for the addressees as is expressed in other columns of the document (esp. 4Q416 2 iii; 4Q418 55 and 69 ii).

4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 are presented as more explicitly reflecting the notion of dual creators of humanity. In these lines it has been suggested that an analogy exists between mother and father as well as God and angels as creative partners. Both pairs are said to be set in authority over the addressee (line 17) and the רו נהיה revealed to them. The addressee, in response to creation, is exhorted to both honour them (father/mother; God/angels) and venerate (הדר) their presence (line 18).

In the preceding lines 9-14 of 4Q416 2 iii are unusual occurrences of the motif of the addressee's poverty and their relationship to nobles (נריבים). The addressee is

said to be both lifted from poverty, given a glorious heritage and yet still subject to poverty (cf. 4Q418 81 9 where the addressee has been set over a 'treasure'). The addressee is exhorted to study and not use poverty as an excuse for neglecting this pursuit. While poverty in *Musar leMevin* is frequently thought to be related to strict economic poverty, in the context of 4Q416 2 iii lines 9-14 I suggest that conceptions of poverty may at times be multivalent in the sense of 'to lack'. The addressees here should be understood as having a place among the angels in a sense that is not yet fully realised. This reading has merit, especially when understood through 4Q418 55 and 69 where the fatigable and mortal deficiency of the addressees is stated with greater clarity. If the addressee is economically poor it does not follow that he/she need reminding (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 2, 8, 12), whereas if this motif wavers between connotations of worldly poverty and a more metaphorical lacking, sense can be made of the author's insistence.

4Q418 55 depicts humanity as slothful in contrast to the angels who are unlike human beings. Humanity is said to pursue the 'roots of understanding' (l. 9) and each will receive his recompense according to their attainment of knowledge (l. 10). 4Q418 55 presents the deficiencies of humanity in relation to angelic beings as well as various degrees of obtaining understanding. 4Q419 69 similarly expresses humanity as wearying in their pursuit of knowledge. Line 11 asks of the addressees, 'how can you say, "we are tired of understanding, and/though we have been vigilant in pursuing knowledge?" For [the understanding One tires not] at all t[imes]'.<sup>132</sup> These two columns express an important anthropological understanding in the document: one of humanity's greatest tasks is the pursuit of understanding while confronted with deficiencies such as weariness and insufficiency.

---

<sup>132</sup> As reconstructed by the editors, *DJD XXXIV*, p. 267.

One may observe the following from 4Q417 1 i and 4Q416 2 iii. The creation of humanity is in the likeness of both God and angels. The addressees are continuing recipients of revealed mysteries and are distinguished from a portion of humanity who does not receive revelation any longer. 4Q418 55 and 69 are seen to express the frailty of humanity and their inferior ability to understand knowledge and mysteries compared to angels who are superior models for the addressees to follow. Therefore, the addressees are called upon to honour and venerate both God and angels. It is little surprise, then, that in 4Q418 81 the holy ones are set alongside God as recipients of blessing (l. 1). In light of 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18 we might better understand 4Q418 81 lines 1b-2a which read: 'long ago, He [God] separated you from every spirit of flesh'.

*Musar leMevin* conceives of humanity as originating from dual creators. The failure of a portion of humanity to pursue and adhere to revealed knowledge of good and evil serves to separate humanity into two groups. Those who pursue knowledge and are of the division of the 'people of spirit' conceive of angels as playing a pivotal role in their existence. The angels in the document are worthy of blessing as subordinates to God. The addressees are related to angels in creation, they look to angels as an example and will share with the angels ('seated among the nobles') in the future (or ideally in the present time). There should be no doubt, therefore, that venerative attitudes are explicitly expressed in *Musar leMevin*.



## 5) Female Address and Instruction in Light of Creation Allusions

### 5.1) Introduction

Several allusions (see §5.2.1 below) to Genesis 1-3 occur in *Musar leMevin* that refer to the female. In addition to this cluster of allusions the document contains instruction both to a woman (4Q415 2 ii) and about women on several occasions. In the case of the former, the occurrence of a 2<sup>nd</sup> person feminine singular address is rare in sapiential literature and unique among hagiographic works from early Judaism.<sup>1</sup> It may be questioned whether this cluster of allusions and address in the feminine singular suggests uniquely stated conceptions of woman? The characterisation of women in *Musar leMevin* and the extent to which this is based upon Genesis creation traditions will be the subject of this chapter.

More explicit allusions to Genesis 1-3 establish the significance of this tradition for the document. Also, *Musar leMevin* contains a number of references to woman that are either not attested outside of the document or only occur singularly elsewhere. The language and context of these allusions is at times related to other motifs and interpretations of Genesis 1-3 that merit broader investigation both within and outside the document. Conceptions of woman, her origin, relation to her husband and family based upon allusions to Genesis creation traditions are a few such motifs. Discussions of females outside of halakhic concerns and the role of women in relation to the 'Essene

---

<sup>1</sup> This address raises important questions about literacy and females. For instance one could ask: does this address suggest that the document was read aloud or, conversely, that women regularly read *Musar leMevin*? It is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine such questions thoroughly, but there can be no doubt that the significance of this address has not yet been fully examined.

monastic' community are rare in Dead Sea Scroll scholarship and presently no comprehensive treatment has yet been produced on the female in *Musar leMevin*.<sup>2</sup>

## 5.2) Allusions to Genesis 1-3 and the Female

### 5.2.1) 4Q416 2 ii-iv

The most explicit allusions to Genesis 1-3 occur in the final lines of 4Q416 2 iii and continues on into 4Q416 2 iv. These allusions occur only a few lines after the previously discussed reference to אֲדָנִים (4Q416 2 iii 16-18; see §4.3) which has been argued to be an allusion to the fashioning of humanity in the likeness of God and angelic beings. The lines of 4Q416 2 iii-iv read as follows:

- (20) בלוא חוק vacat אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדי
- (21) מרז נהיה בהתחברכה יחד התהלך עם עזר בשרכה
- (1) את אביו [ו] את אמו ודיב[ק]
- (2) אותכה המשיל בה ותש[ ] אביה
- (3) לא המשיל בה מאמה הפרידה ואליכה [חשוקתה ותהיה]
- (4) לך בשר אחד בתכה לאחר יפריד ובניכה[ ]
- (5) ואחה ליחד עם אשת חיקכה כי היא שאר ער[ותכה]
- (6) ואשר ימשול בה זולתכה הסיג גבול חייהו ב[רוחה]
- (7) המשילך להתהלך ברצונכה ולא להוסיף נדר ונדר[ה]
- (8) השב רוחכה לרצונכה וכל שבועת אסרה לנדר נדר[ר]
- (9) הפר על מוצא פיה וברצונכה הניא[ה]
- (10) שפתיכה סלח לה[ ] למענכה אל תרב[ה]
- (11) כבודכה בנחלכה[ ]
- (12) בנחלכה פן vacat
- (13) אשת חיקכה וחרפ[ ]

<sup>2</sup> Issues raised in regard to females in documents from Qumran are primarily *halakhic* or their relationship to the Essene 'monastic' community; see for instance: J. R. Davila, 'A Wedding Ceremony? (4Q502,' in *Liturgical Works* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) pp. 181-201; L. H. Schiffman, 'Laws Pertaining to Women in the Temple Scroll,' in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Forty Years* (Leiden: Brill, 1998) pp. 210-28; E. M. Schuller, 'Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) pp. 115-31; L. H. Schiffman, 'Women in the Scrolls,' in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994) pp. 127-44; H. K. Harrington, *The Purity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis* (SBLDS 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993); J. M. Baumgarten, '4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?' in *JJS* 34 (1983): 125-35; M. Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins: Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament* (BJS 48; Chico: Scholars Press, 1961); J. M. Baumgarten, 'On the Testimony of Women in 1QSa' in *JBL* 76 (1957): 266-69.

- 20) without statute. *vacat* A wife you took in your poverty, comprehend [her ?] origins[  
 21) from the נהיה רז, in your being joined together walk with the helper of your flesh,[  
 1) his father and mother and cling [  
 2) He has set you in authority over her and [        ] her father  
 3) He has not set in authority over her, from her mother He has separated her and towards you will be her  
 desire and she will be  
 4) to you one flesh, your daughter for another he will separate and your sons[  
 5) and you together/as a unity with the wife of your bosom, because she is the flesh of your nakedness  
 6) and whoever rules over her apart from you has misplaced the boundary marker of his life, over her spirit  
 7) He has given you dominion for her to walk in your good pleasure and not to multiply vows and offerings  
 8) return your spirit to your good will and every oath binding her to vow a vow  
 9) is annulled by the utterance of your mouth and in your good pleasure prevent[  
 10) your lips, He forgives her[        ]for your sake, and do not multipl[y your shame (?)  
 11) your honour and your inheritance [  
 12) in your inheritance lest *vacat* [  
 13) wife of your bosom and shame[

In addition to the allusions in these lines two other possible allusions to Genesis occur in fragment 4Q416 2. First, the final line 21 of 4Q416 2 ii reads פן תבוז חייכה וגם אל תקל כלי חיקכה ('lest you despise your life and also dishonour the vessel of your bosom'). Second, Harrington and Strugnell suggest a possible supplement of 4Q416 2 ii line 3 with the phrase תמשול בה ('you will have dominion over her').<sup>3</sup> Taken together these three columns (4Q416 2 ii-iv) hold substantial and significant allusions to woman in Genesis 2-3.

*Line 20.* It is relatively straightforward to identify the referent of some of the allusions in 4Q416 2 iii-iv. The instruction concerning relations between the male addressee and his wife begins in line 20 following a discussion about parentage. Just as the addressee was exhorted to honour his father and mother in his poverty (likened to אל and אדנים) in line 15 of this column, so here too marital relations begin with a reminder that he is impoverished. The editors suggest reading the final words of line 21 קח מולדי<sup>4</sup> as 'take [her] offspring'. They note that the term מולדים is not found in Biblical Hebrew

<sup>3</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 95.

<sup>4</sup> The editors do not reconstruct מולדי-ה but imply the reconstruction in their translation; *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 110, 113.

but that it is frequent elsewhere in the document (4Q415 2 ii 9; 4Q415 11 11; 4Q416 2 iii 9; 4Q417 2 i 11; 4Q418 9 8; 4Q418 202 1).<sup>5</sup> The term also occurs in 4Q*Mysteries* in construct with בית (4Q299 1 4; 4Q299 3a ii-b 13; 4Q299 5 5) and 4Q*Horoscope* (4Q186 2 i 4). According to the editors, in post-biblical Hebrew the term can mean 'issue, offspring, descendants, the act of giving birth, being born' as well as 'origins' and 'birth-times'.<sup>6</sup> The translation 'origins' or 'birth-times', I will argue, is the likeliest rendering here based upon the occurrence of the phrase elsewhere in the document (4Q416 2 iii 9; 4Q417 2 i 11) and the preceding context where the topic of origins is addressed (line 17; 'they [parent's] are the oven of your origin').

*Line 21.* In line 21 the phrase 'walk together with the helper of your flesh' (cf. 4Q418<sup>a</sup> 16b + 17 line 3) occurs, which is an allusion to Genesis 2.20-25. In Genesis 2.20, the female's creation is preceded with the phrase 'and for Adam a helper (עזר) was not found as his partner' (see also 2.18: (ויאמר יהוה אלהים לא-טוב היות האדם לבדו אעשה לו עזר כנגדו)). Following (2.23) this statement, the female is described by Adam as 'flesh of my flesh' (בשר מבשרי).<sup>7</sup> Significantly, nowhere else in the Hebrew Bible is the term עזר used to refer to woman as is clearly the case here.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>5</sup> The term is far more frequent in the document than elsewhere: 4Q415 11 11 [מל'י] 'origins'; 4Q416 2 iii 9 דרוש מולדיו 'seek its origins'; 4Q417 2 i 11 ישע 'gaze on the mystery of existence and take the birth times of salvation'; 4Q418 202 1 קח מולדי 'comprehend the origins'.

<sup>6</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 49; in post-biblical literature it occurs in: *Sot.* 11<sup>b</sup> זמן מולדיו; *Ex. R. s.* 1 מולד לבנה; *Pesik. R. s.* 15 מולד למולד; *B. Bath.* 16<sup>b</sup> מחרפה ממולדה; and *Keth.* 72<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>7</sup> While the exact wording of Genesis 2.23 does not occur elsewhere similar language is used to describe a relation in 2 Sam 19.13 (עצמי ובשרי).

<sup>8</sup> Almost without fail the term 'helper' is used in reference to God in the Hebrew Bible while in the DSS the term is not used frequently or elsewhere of woman. The Greek traditions of Sirach and Tobit do refer to the woman as helper with the same word as is used in LXX Genesis 2.18-20 (βοηθον). Sirach 36.24 reads 'he who acquires a wife gets his best possession a helper (βοηθον) fit for him and a pillar of support'. Tobit 8.6-7 (BA) reads 'You made Adam and for him You made Eve his wife as a helper (βοηθον) and support. From the two of them the human race has sprung. You said, "it is not good that the man should be

*Line 1.* 4Q416 2 iv line 1 alludes to Genesis 2.24 using verbatim vocabulary derived from the Genesis text. In line 1, the 3<sup>rd</sup> person masculine pronominal suffix ו- (אביו) of Genesis 2.24 (אִתּוֹ אִבְנוֹ וְאִתּוֹ אִמּוֹ וְדָבַק בָּאִשְׁתּוֹ) is not altered although both the preceding and following lines are addressed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> person masculine singular כה- (cf. Gen 2.23-24 and line 21 בשרכה and line 2 אוֹחֲזָכָה).<sup>9</sup> The use of the 3<sup>rd</sup> masculine singular suffix in line 1, as opposed to the 2<sup>nd</sup> person masculine address, indicates that this is a direct quotation rather than allusion.

*Lines 2ff.* 4Q416 2 iv line 2 expresses the dominion of the male over the female (המשיל בה) which is understood as congruent with one of the consequences the woman receives in Genesis 3.16 (ימשל בך) for her disobedience in partaking from the tree of knowledge. 4Q416 2 iv lines 3-4 are to be identified with Genesis 2-3 even though lexical parallels are not as strong. If the phrase חשוקה ('her desire') is a reliable reconstruction in the latter part of line 3, then the allusion would be to Genesis 3.16 ('her desire will be for her husband').<sup>10</sup> 4Q416 2 iv line 4 contains the phrase לך בשר אחד.<sup>11</sup> The phrase 'one flesh' occurs in the Hebrew Bible only in Genesis 2.24 (לבשר אחד) and in the Dead Sea Scrolls there is no occurrence outside of *Musar leMevin*. Given the

---

alone *let us* make a helper for him like himself". This tradition of a plural address 'let us make' occurs in LXX Genesis 2.18 while in MT 2.18 the verb is singular אעשה ('I will make').

<sup>9</sup> 4Q416 2 ii lines 3-4 contain some difficult pronominal suffixes to interpret, is it possible that these lines contain a quotation and can be resolved on this basis? This use of a quotation might find a type of parallel in CD 4.21 where Genesis 1.27 is used 'male and female He created them' as part of a polemic either against polygamy or divorce.

<sup>10</sup> The term חשוקה occurs only three times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 3.16, 4.7; Cant 7.11). The similarities between both Gen. 3.16 and 4.7 connect the phrases in the Hebrew Bible. An allusion to Gen. 3.16 in 4Q416 2 iv is more likely, but one might question whether 4.7 is also at play here. Compare (3.16b) 'and for your husband will your desire be and he will rule over you' and (4.7b) 'sin is lurking at the door its desire is for you, but you must rule over it (וְאֵלֶיךָ חֲשׁוֹקָהּ וְאַחֲזָהּ הַמֶּשֶׁל בָּהּ)'.  
<sup>11</sup> The spelling לך rather than לכה must be defective. A likely occurrence of 'for one flesh' occurs in line 1, the editors reconstruct the latter half of line 1 באשחור ויהיו לבשר אחד; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 123.

surrounding context there can be little doubt that the phrase 'one flesh' in line 4 is an allusion to Genesis 2.24.

*Lines 8ff.* 4Q416 2 iv lines 8-10 have been broadly noted as alluding to Numbers 30.6-9 and the husband's right to annul the vows of his wife.<sup>12</sup> While this allusion should not be questioned due to the strong lexical and conceptual links, little has been said in regard to its association to surrounding Genesis allusions. In this same fragment, 4Q416 2 ii line 16, the phrase 'lest...you greatly increase [תרבה] your shame' occurs. The verb  $\sqrt{\text{רבה}}$  occurs eight times in *Musar leMevin* manuscripts and the 2<sup>nd</sup> person masculine singular imperfect form  $\text{תרבה}$  only twice, always with an extant object (cf. par. 4Q417 2 ii+23 21). A plausible reconstruction at the end of line 10 might be 'do not multipl[y your shame]'. One may question whether the allusion to Numbers 30 in these lines, in the context of a running allusion to Genesis, might add insight into the occurrence of 'shame' in this column and elsewhere in the document? That is, is shame related somehow to the manner in which one properly relates to his wife as derived from Numbers 30 and Genesis 1-3?

In 4Q416 2 iv lines 5 and 13 the phrase  $\text{אשת חיקכה}$  ('wife of your bosom'; cf. parallel frags. 4Q418 10a, b line 7) merits special attention. A likely related phrase,  $\text{כלי חיקכה}$  (4Q416 2 ii line 21), will also be explored in relation to Genesis 2-3 below. Another line that will be explored in connection to these two phrases is 4Q415 2 ii line 3. This line, which occurs in a fragment addressed to a female as mentioned previously, has an occurrence of the phrase  $\text{ובחיקו}$  ('in his bosom'). How is this phrase to be understood

---

<sup>12</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 129; see also G. J. Brooke, 'Biblical Interpretation,' pp. 201-22.

and could it too be related to conceptions from Genesis 2-3? 4Q417 1 i lines 8-9 will also serve to elucidate the phrase.

The phrase *אשת חיקך* is not unknown in the Hebrew Bible or Dead Sea Scrolls although it is rare.<sup>13</sup> In the Hebrew Bible it occurs only in Deuteronomy 13.7 and 28.54 (*אשת חיקך*) in a list of familial titles and exhorts Israelites not to worship idols or false gods.<sup>14</sup> The *Temple Scroll* (11Q19 54.20) is the only other document among the Dead Sea Scrolls other than *Musar leMevin* that uses the epithet 'wife of your bosom'. In the *Temple Scroll* the occurrence is undoubtedly reliant upon Deuteronomy 13.7.<sup>15</sup> If *Musar leMevin* does not derive the phrase from Deuteronomy or the *Temple Scroll* then other possible connotations of this epithet might be suggested. Sirach 9.1 uses the epithet as well stating 'do not be jealous of the wife of your bosom (*γυναῖκα τοῦ κόλπου σου*)' which is similar to the Septuagint's rendering of Deuteronomy 13.7 (*ἡ γυνὴ ἢ ἐν κόλπῳ*).<sup>16</sup> While the phrase in the contexts of Deuteronomy and the *Temple Scroll* appear to be simply an idiomatic expression for a man's wife, two observations might be made. First, the epithet is infrequent and is not well attested in the Hebrew from the period, but is used on at least two occasions in *Musar leMevin* independently from any use of Deuteronomy.<sup>17</sup> Second, the idiom taken quite literally is descriptive of the origin of the female in Genesis 2.20-25. It has been argued in chapter 4

<sup>13</sup> The editors of *DJD XXXIV*, p. 128, initially consider the possibility of reading *אשת חוקכה* ('your lawful wife') but decide against this reading in light of the phrase *כלי חיקכה*. The closest parallels to *אשת חיקך* in the Hebrew Bible occur only in: (1) Gen 16.5 (*אנכי נחתי שפחתי בחיקך*); and (2) 2 Sam 12.8 (*ואתנה לך אית*)).

<sup>14</sup> The targums on Deut translate the phrase in a variety of ways: *Onqelos* 'the wife of your covenant'; *Ps.-Jn.* 'the wife who sleeps on your bosom' while *Neofiti* preserves the original 'wife of your bosom'.

<sup>15</sup> See Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983) p. 246. The dependence of *Temple Scroll* 54.20 on Deut 13 is readily apparent.

<sup>16</sup> This portion of Sirach is not extant in Hebrew.

<sup>17</sup> To the best of my knowledge the phrase 'wife of your bosom' occurs nowhere else in the literature of the period, including both targums, *Hekhalot* literature and Rabbinic literature, outside of these references.

that *Musar leMevin* instructs the addressee on the basis of the addressees' origin. It may be questioned whether the creation of the female, separate from the male in Genesis 2, was conceived of as a foundation for forming instruction both *to* her and *in regard to* her.

The creation of the female, according to Genesis 2.20-25, contrary to the present natural order in which women alone bear life, portrays man bearing the first human being: woman. Here Adam gives birth to the first woman by way of a creative act of God in the Garden. Genesis 2.23 uses the narrative to explain the Hebrew term used of the female: 'she will be called woman (אִשָּׁה) for from man (אִישׁ) was she taken'.<sup>18</sup> *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* (cf. *Neofiti*) on Genesis 2.23 place these words on the lips of Adam: 'this time, but never again will woman be created from man as this one has been created from me'.<sup>19</sup> Likewise, the author of 1 Timothy 2.13 implicitly takes up the idea that Eve came from Adam: 'for Adam was formed first and then Eve'. The first woman, fashioned from one of Adam's ribs, is literally a creation from the breast of man. Paul, in 1 Corinthians 11.7-12, also speaks of the origin of woman stating explicitly that 'indeed man was not made from woman but woman from man'. The narrative of Genesis 2.20-25 is intricately woven and both separates a helper for man and then reunites man with his' helper (וְהָיָה לְבָשָׂר אֶחָד).<sup>20</sup>

4Q416 2 iv line 5, in addition to allusions in the preceding lines, is also dependent on Genesis 2.20-25 traditions: 'you will be a unity with the wife of your bosom because she is the flesh of your nakedness'. The final word of line 5 has been reconstructed based

<sup>18</sup> Reading the ה- of אִשָּׁה as a directive *he* is a further grammatical indication of the origin of woman.

<sup>19</sup> See also Philo (*QG* 1.27); and Plato's *Symposium* (189-191) where some interesting points of comparison occur.

<sup>20</sup> 1 Cor 11.12 states the reversal of order as 'for just as the woman is from the man, so also the man is through the woman'. In light of the concept that 'one flesh they began, two flesh they became and to one flesh they return'.



on the context. The fragment itself reads 'שאר ער' with approximately four letter spaces available for reconstruction. The choice to reconstruct שאר ער here is based upon the occurrence of the phrase בשר ערוה in Exodus 28.42.<sup>21</sup> However, with the general appeal to Genesis 2.20-25, another possibility is the reconstruction שאר ער ומכה. Not only would this fit with the context of Genesis 2.25 (ערומים) and the description of the serpent in the following verse (3.1; ערום), but is also an attested term elsewhere in the document (4Q417 1 i 9), unlike the term ערוה.<sup>22</sup> While the two terms carry distinct meanings, they share a general definition of 'naked'.<sup>23</sup> This singular occurrence of the phrase that one's wife is 'flesh of your [husband's] nakedness' preceded almost immediately by the description of the unity of man and woman in the same line has its closest affinity with Genesis 2.24-25 ('for this reason a man will leave his father and mother and cling to his wife, and *they will be one flesh*, and the two of them were *naked*, Adam and his wife, and were not ashamed').

The final line 13 of 4Q416 2 iv may be valuable for deciphering line 5. Here the phrase אשת חיקכה is immediately followed by the term חרף ('shame' or 'reproach'). If the term חרף here in line 13 should be understood as synonymously parallel to a corresponding term in line 5, then a case for reading ערוה is stronger. In line 13 a context is not preserved that aids in understanding the term 'shame'. However, in a sub-section below the phrase 'cover your shame' (כסה חרפתכה; cf. 4Q418 177; 178) in *Musar leMevin* will be explored as it relates to the woman and Genesis 2-3. The significance of 4Q416 2 iv line 13 for the moment is the proximity of the term 'shame' and the epithet 'wife of

<sup>21</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 128; see also Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 48.

<sup>22</sup> The term occurs in 4Q417 1i line 9 'He has prepared with all wisdom and with all cunning [ערמה] has He fashioned it'; and 4Q423 22 line 2 [ערמה וחון] 'craftiness/nudity (?) and riches'. 4Q417 1 i line 9 could be a play on Genesis 2-3.

your bosom'. Although the phrase 'cover your shame' in other fragments of *Musar leMevin* might be displayed as relating to the woman, line 13 provides the most significant link between 'shame' and the female.

If the phrase 'wife of your bosom' in 4Q416 2 iv is rightly to be associated with Genesis 2.20-25 what significance, if any, does this have for an interpretation of the epithet כלי חיקבה in 4Q416 2 ii line 21? Both Strugnell and Elgvin consider this phrase as a background for 1 Thessalonians 4.4 and the phrase σκεῦος κατὰσθαι.<sup>24</sup> More recently, Menahem Kister has argued that the phrase כלי חיקבה should not be read at all, but rather בלי חוקבה.<sup>25</sup> If the phrase כלי חיקבה is to be read, how helpful is 1 Thessalonians for understanding the phrase in *Musar leMevin*? 1 Thessalonians contains only the term 'vessel' and *Musar leMevin* the epithet 'vessel of your bosom' – the supplement of חיקבה is significant. Certainly 4Q416 2 ii states 'do not dishonour' in contrast to the positive exhortation to 'honour' in 1 Thessalonians; however, the extent to which the interpretation the one has on the other should not be exaggerated.<sup>26</sup>

<sup>23</sup> ערום can mean either 'naked' or 'crafty/cunning' while ערונה can mean 'nudity', 'shame' or 'pudenda'.

<sup>24</sup> T. Elgvin, 'To Master his Own Vessel: 1 Thess 4.4 in Light of New Qumran Evidence,' in *NTS* 43 (1997): 604-619. See also J.E. Smith, 'Another Look at 4Q416 2 ii.21, a Critical Parallel to First Thessalonians 4:4,' in *CBQ* 63 (2001): 499-504.

<sup>25</sup> M. Kister, 'A Qumranic Parallel to 1 Thess 4:4? Reading and Interpretation of 4Q416 2 II 21,' in *DSD* 10 (2003): 365-71.

<sup>26</sup> The exhortation to 'not dishonour' in *Musar leMevin* is likely related to negative qualities attributed to the woman in the following column 4Q416 2 iv ('wife of your bosom and shame'). C. Murphy, *Wealth*, p. 189; observing this exhortation states: 'in the context of living within one's means, dishonoring one's wife might mean depleting her dowry, which functioned as her chief asset if divorced or widowed. This suggestion is borne out by the subsequent advice against taking from goods which one holds in deposit. Legally, the dowry functioned as a deposit, from which the husband enjoyed the right of usufruct but only while married to his wife.' Murphy, in reading this column as traditional sapiential material, does not consider this unusual epithet or question why the author would employ it.

### 5.2.2) Menahem Kister on 4Q416 2 ii line 21

Kister has suggested that 4Q416 2 ii line 21 should be read בלי חוקכה (or בלו חוקכה), meaning 'without your prescribed portion'.<sup>27</sup> Kister prefers this to the reading proposed by the editors of DJD 34, כלי חיקכה, 'the "vessel" (or "wife") of thy bosom'.<sup>28</sup> In regard to the phrase 'vessel of your bosom' Kister writes that it 'appears (almost certainly) not to be the correct reading of the text'.<sup>29</sup> This conclusion is based upon a twofold argument: (1) the first letter of the phrase 'looks more like *bet* than *kaf*' especially in 4Q417 2 ii 25; and (2) 'this reading makes better sense in the context'.<sup>30</sup> In both regards Kister's conclusion may be challenged.

Based upon palaeography one cannot determine whether בלי חוקכה or כלי חיקכה should be read. First, the term בלי/כלי in 4Q416 2 ii line 21 itself is far too damaged to conclude whether *bet* or *kaf* is the better reading. However, 4Q417 2 ii line 25, a parallel manuscript, preserves the top one third of the three letters of the word. On the basis of the top third of these letters Kister states that 'the traces of the *bet* are clear in 4Q417'.<sup>31</sup> The 'traces' of which he writes can only be assumed to be either the left downward stroke (pronounced tick) that begins the letter or the right tick.

The editors note in their discussion on the palaeography of 4Q417: 'In the *bet*, the tick of the right upper shoulder is maintained... in the medial *kaf*, one can observe how the descender is in fact a separate stroke, though sometimes the tick at the upper right

---

<sup>27</sup> M. Kister, "A Qumranic Parallel to 1 Thess 4:4? Reading and Interpretation of 4Q416 2 II 21," in *DSD* 10 (2003): 365-71.

<sup>28</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 93.

<sup>29</sup> Kister, p. 366.

<sup>30</sup> Kister, p. 366.

<sup>31</sup> Kister expresses his gratitude to Elisha Qimron for confirming his reading and checking it with the original in the Israel Museum, p. 366, fn. 9. However, in the photograph of 4Q416 2 ii line 21 the image is not clear enough to decipher between *bet* and *kaf*.

shoulder is flattened'.<sup>32</sup> The upper right tick of *bet*'s and *kap*'s do not distinguish them from each other; nor does the beginning left stroke. The left tick of *bet*'s and *kap*'s in 4Q417 are often identical. One characteristic that may help distinguish *bet*'s and *kap*'s in this manuscript is the length of the top horizontal left to right stroke. Typically, this stroke of a *bet* is longer while that of a *kap* is slightly shorter. Based upon the photograph provided in DJD 34 it would appear that the top stroke here is shorter than other *bet*'s preserved in the same column and, therefore, actually a *kap*. However, this by no means proves which letter it originally was. In this early Herodian hand a *kap* may only really be distinguished from a *bet* according to the depth of the letter. The bottom two-thirds of the word בל/כלי is not extant in 4Q417 2 ii 25. Contra Kister, it is impossible to conclude on the basis of palaeography that בלי rather than כלי should be read in 4Q416 2 ii line 21.

Furthermore, Kister's proposal that חוקכה ('prescribed portion') be read rather than חיקכה ('your bosom') should be questioned as well. First, *yod*'s and *waw*'s are indistinguishable in this hand. Second, the editors comment that 'it is unlikely that the same scribe would read חוקכה כלי in col. ii and חיקכה אשת in col. iv'.<sup>33</sup> There is no clear occurrence of חוק in *Musar leMevin*. However, the term חיק is used on three occasions. First, in the twice occurring phrase אשת חיקכה in 4Q416 2 iv lines 5 and 13. Second, it occurs in 4Q415 2 ii line 3.

This observation returns us to Kister's second criterion, that is: his reading makes better sense. Kister interprets the phrase as part of instruction regarding poverty and

---

<sup>32</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 144-45.

<sup>33</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 108.

living within one's means.<sup>34</sup> While poverty, particularly the term מחסור, is abnormally frequent in *Musar leMevin*, so too are references to women both in this fragment and elsewhere in the document. Both poverty and women are equally important themes in the document, particularly in 4Q416 2 ii-iv. Below, I will argue that the phrase כלי חיקבה fits best within a cluster of references to the female and allusions to Genesis creation traditions. Following the editors, the phrase כלי חיקבה and אשה חיקבה should be read in light of one another.

### 5.2.3) Elgvin on 4Q416 2 ii line 21

Elgvin, in his discussion of the phrase כלי חיקבה, is adamantly opposed to reading the term כלי as either 'wife', 'vessel' or 'body' and argues that in 4Q416 2 ii it is a euphemism for the 'male member' (i.e. organ).<sup>35</sup> Speaking of Essene modesty, Elgvin details the prohibition against uncovering one's member (יד) in 1QS 7.12-14 as well as Josephus' description of Essene decency while defecating (*Wars* 8.148). Elgvin has no difficulty with viewing both the terms יד ('penis') and כלי חיקבה as synonymous in the Qumran literature. To support his reading of the phrase as the 'male member', Elgvin

<sup>34</sup> Kister, 'A Qumranic Parallel,' pp. 366-67, translates חקל בלו חוקבה וגם אל חקל בלו חוקבה as: 'lest you be unmindful of your life. And do not be disgraced by (living) not according to your prescribed portions'. In the remainder of the article Kister argues that the wisdom of this line parallels other worldly wisdom that encourages the addressee to live beneath one's means (e.g. 4Q416 2 iii 8-9: if you are poor, do not aspire to anything but your portion, and do not harmed by it, lest you decrease your boundary). In a personal correspondence, Daniel Schwartz has commented that Kister's translation of line 21 is unnatural: (1) the verbs חבן and חקל should be read as parallels so if the first is "do not scorn" the second should not be passive; and (2) correspondingly, just as חבן is followed by ל, and refers to scorning something else, so too חקל is normally followed by ב and refers to scorning something else. Kister's reading requires the second verb be vocalized חקל and then ב taken to refer to the medium through which one is scorned.

<sup>35</sup> These three translation options are the only three that either Elgvin or the editors consider for the term כלי. According to Elgvin there exists no occurrence of the term כלי with the meaning 'wife' in the Hebrew literature of the period whereas the term is used in the sense of 'male organ' in 1 Sam. 21.6. Worth noting is that 1 Sam. 21.6 is the only occasion where the term is so used among 522 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible and approximately 30 occurrences in the DSS. Elgvin states 'the phrasing of the term כלי חיקבה for the male organ was probably influenced by the expression אשה חיקר/חיקר "the wife of your/his bosom", Deut 13.7, 28.54 (28.56 has the parallel איש חיקה "the man of her bosom") and the use of כלי "vessel" in 1 Sam.

refers to 1 Thessalonians 4.4 where he concludes that there also the term *σκεῦος* is used of the 'male member'. The argumentation used by Elgvin, that 1 Thessalonians 4.4, in light of 1 Samuel 21.6, supports the reading 'male member' in 4Q416 2 ii and *vice versa*, is unconvincing in my opinion.<sup>36</sup> Even though 1 Samuel 21.6 uses the term כלי as he suggests, as a euphemism for 'penis', the term itself is well attested in Hebrew literature but only in 1 Samuel is it used in this sense. Also, 4Q416 2 ii line 21 uses the term כלי in construct with חיקכה, neither 1 Samuel or 1 Thessalonians uses the term as such.

#### 5.2.4) Harrington and Strugnell on 4Q416 2 ii line 21

Harrington and Strugnell are also not persuaded by Elgvin's argumentation that the term should be rendered as the 'male member'.<sup>37</sup> As discussed briefly above, they translate 4Q416 2 ii line 21 as 'do not treat with dishonour the "vessel" (or "wife") of thy bosom', thus favouring a translation of כלי as 'woman' as opposed to 'body' or 'penis'. One of the relevant objections for translating the Greek term *σκεῦος* (כלי) as 'woman' in 1 Thessalonians 4.4, in relation to 4Q416 2 ii, is the assertion that there is no evidence for the term's usage as such elsewhere. However, those who have advocated a reading of 1 Thessalonians 4.4 as a reference to 'woman' cite a few Rabbinic texts as evidence.<sup>38</sup> The first is found in *b. Meg.* 12b (par. *Esther R.* 1.11) and reads 'Ahasveros said to them "the vessel [כלי] which I use is neither Median nor Persian but Chaldean, do you want to see

---

21.6.' Elgvin does not elaborate upon this theory and I find the relationship as explained here lacking. See Elgvin, 'To Master His Own Vessel,' pp. 607-8.

<sup>36</sup> Nor has this interpretation been convincing to many others. J. Whitton, 'A Neglected Meaning of *skeuos* in 1 Thessalonians 4.:4,' in *NTS* 28 (1982): 142-43 argues for the rendering of the term as a euphemism for 'penis'.

<sup>37</sup> *DJD* XXXIV, p. 109.

<sup>38</sup> In support of rendering the term *σκεῦος* as 'wife' in 1 Thess. 4.4 see O. L. Yarbrough, *Not Like the Gentiles: Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul* (SBLDS 80; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985) p. 7; R. F. Collins, 'This is the Will of God: Your Sanctification' (1 Thess 4:3), in *LTP* 39 (1983): 27-53; F. F. Bruce, *1 & 2 Thessalonians* (WBC; Waco: Word Books, 1982): 83-84; C. Maurer, 's.v. *σκεῦος*,' in *TDNT* 8 (1971): 365-67.

her?" they answered "only if we can see her naked". The second occurrence is in *b. Baba Mezia* 84b (parallels *Pesiqta* 94 b; *y. Shab.* 10.6; *Qoh. R.* 11.2) where the widow of Rabbi Eleazar b. Simeon replies to Judah the Prince's request for marriage with the statement 'should the vessel [כלי] which was used by a holy man be used by a secular man?' While both texts understand the term כלי as carrying significant overtones of a wife as a sexual object there can be no doubt that the term is indeed used for 'wife' or 'woman'. Harrington and Strugnell comment upon this sense of the term stating, 'when כלי...occurs in literary texts like frg. 2 ii 21, whether it refer to a lawful wife or contemptuously (?) to a concubine, ...the original metaphorical reference to sexual organs and sexual partnership, which developed independently in many languages fades, and the metonymous sense "woman" is no longer felt to need justification'.<sup>39</sup> Although Elgvin views such uses of the term כלי as connoting the female pudenda and thus verification of an earlier use as a reference for the male organ, the editors note this tendency in the document to use metonyms. Also significant is the use of the term רחם ('womb') and בטן ('womb') as references simply to 'woman' even though they can also be technical terms for the pudenda.<sup>40</sup> In general, the view of the editors is that 4Q416 2 ii line 21 is directing the fifth commandment of the Decalogue, to honour one's father and mother (cf. 4Q416 2 iii) to the addressee's wife (כלי חיקכה).<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 109. Predating the *DJD* volume, Strugnell published the article, 'More on Wives and Marriage in the Dead Sea Scrolls: (4Q416 2 ii 21 [cf. 1 Thess 4:4] and 4QMMT § B),' in *RevQ* 17 (1996): 538-40.

<sup>40</sup> The phrase להורות במנכה occurs in 4Q415 9 line 2 and the editors comment that the word בטן may mean 'wife' (cf. *Job* 3.10; 19.17) though they are uncertain about the precise form of הרה here. The term בטן occurs elsewhere in *Musar leMevin* as: 4Q423 3 ראשית פרי במנכה 'first born of your womb' likely meaning 'your wife's first born'; and 4Q423 3a בפרי בטנו 'the fruit of his womb' meaning 'his wife's offspring'.

<sup>41</sup> Strugnell, 'More on Wives,' p. 539.

As demonstrated above, 4Q416 2 iv contains several allusions to Genesis 2-3. The phrase **אשת חיקכה** occurs in a fragmentary context in conjunction with terms for shame or nudity (**ערוה** or **ערום** in l. 5 and **חרף** l. 13). The epithet **כלי חיקכה** is not attested in the Hebrew literature and suggestions for interpreting the phrase have been largely dependent upon the use of the term **כלי** or **σκεῦος**, not in a construct state, used elsewhere. Though the phrase will undoubtedly remain somewhat cryptic due to the fragmentary nature of the document and to the lack of external parallels, the discussion below will attempt to shed further light on the phrase in several ways. First, a few more things might be said regarding the rendering of the term ‘vessel’ elsewhere in the New Testament – a case, for example, might be made for reading the term as ‘body’. Second, the phrase might be synonymous, or closely related to, the epithet **אשת חיקכה** and an allusion to Genesis 2. 4Q417 1 i lines 8-12, I will argue, likely address issues pertaining to the female’s origin. Finally, 4Q415 2 ii contains an occurrence of the term **בחקר** in a fragment that is addressed to a female and might be helpful for understanding epithets in 4Q416 2 ii-iv.

1 Peter 3.7 is a passage that neither Strugnell and Harrington nor Elgvin note in their discussion of the phrase **כלי חיקכה**. While 1 Thessalonians 4.4 is the closest parallel in the New Testament, 1 Peter 3.7 clearly uses the term **σκεῦος** in relation to one’s wife but not necessarily as a term for ‘wife’ – such a use in this context would clearly be redundant. Furthermore, like 1 Thessalonians the occurrence of the term in 1 Peter also associates the concept of honour with wives:

Οἱ ἄνδρες ὁμοίως, συννοικοῦντες κατὰ γνώσιν ὡς ἀσθενεστέρω σκεύει τῇ γυναικίῳ, ἀπονέμουντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ συγκληρονόμοις χάριτος ζωῆς εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐγκόπτεσθαι τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.



Likewise husbands, live with your wives in an understanding way as with a weaker vessel, since she is a woman and grant her honour as a fellow heir of the grace of life, so that your prayers may not be hindered.

The majority of exegetes and commentators on 1 Peter 3.7 understand the term σκεῦος here in terms of 'body'.<sup>42</sup> References in the New Testament that elucidate a flexible and at times similar use of the term are: (1) 2 Timothy 2.20-25 where σκεῦος is used in the sense of 'a *member* in a great house'; (2) Romans 9.21-23 where it is used to describe *elements* of humanity; and (3) most significantly 2 Corinthians 4.7 where it is simply a metaphor for the fleshly 'body'. The term כלי and equivalent Greek term σκεῦος occur elsewhere and are indicative of a broader knowledge of 'vessel' as 'body' terminology (e.g. Philo *Migr. Abr.* 193; *De. somn.* 1.26; *T. Naph.* 8.6; *Barn.* 7.3; 11.9. 21.8; *Herm. Man.* 5.1.2). The term σκεῦος as 'body' in 1 Peter 3.7 implies the weakness of the female form physically.<sup>43</sup> This is a notion that is also mentioned by Philo (*Ebr.* 55). 1 Peter 3.7 uses the term 'vessel' in the sense of 'body', but here, as seen above, it refers to the wife. Of course there are also several who read the term σκεῦος in 1 Thessalonians 4.4 as 'body' as well.<sup>44</sup> On the one hand, if the term כלי in 4Q416 2 ii is best understood as 'body', the majority opinion that 1 Peter 3.7 uses the term 'vessel' for 'body' is strengthened. On the other hand, those who interpret σκεῦος in 1 Peter 3.7 as 'body' lend support for rendering כלי as 'body' in *Musar leMevin*.

<sup>42</sup> See for instance J. H. Elliot, *1 Peter* (New York: Doubleday, 2000); P. J. Achtemeier, *1 Peter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); J. R. Michaels, *1 Peter* (Waco: Word Books, 1988); J. N. D. Kelly, *The Epistle of Peter and of Jude* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969).

<sup>43</sup> Biologically speaking muscles account for approximately 23% of the female body weight while for males it is nearly 40%.

<sup>44</sup> Lührmann, 'The Beginning of the Church at Thessalonica', in D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson, and W. A. Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) pp. 237-49; M. McGehee, 'A Rejoinder to Two Recent Studies Dealing with 1 Thess 4.4,' in *CBQ* 51 (1989): 82-89.

### 5.2.5) 4Q417 1 i lines 8-12

Harrington and Strugnell struggle to make sense of 4Q417 1 i line 9. They reconstruct and translate lines 8-9 of the column as:

(8) עד ואז חדע בין [טו]ב ל[רע] כ[מעשי]הם [כיא] אל הדעות סוד אמת ברז נהיה  
(9) פרש את אושה ומעשיה<sup>45</sup> [לכל חכ]מה ולכל [ע]רמה יצרה וממשלת מעשיה

8) of eternity. Then thou shalt discern between *the* [goo]d and [evil according to their] deeds. For the God of knowledge is the *foundation* of truth And *by/on* the mystery that is to come  
9) He has *laid out* its (= truth's) *foundation*, And its deeds [He has *prepared with all wis]dom* And *with all* [c]unning *has He fashioned it*, And the *domain* of its *deeds* (*creatures*)

The editors comment on line 9 as follows:

פרש. Both here and in line 10, this verb can be reconstructed in the light of its clear occurrence in line 11; in each case, however, the context does not help to establish the correctness of the supplement or to define the sense of the verb and phrase. In line 9 one has an uncertain אושה as object, and [פ]רש למ[ב]ינהם לכול מן in line 10. Other 3<sup>rd</sup> fem. sing. suffixes occur in the surrounding text (מעשיה and יצרה). Since אישה 'her husband' would be surprising and unexpected as an object, and since the preceding סוד can mean 'foundation', it becomes at least plausible to read here too אוש 'foundation' with its suffix referring to אמת (cf. also probably the suffixes in מעשיה and יצרה). But what meaning of פרש would be possible? Is it perhaps parallel to a verbal יצרה? In order to say 'lay a foundation', one might perhaps use פרש 'spread, lay out a foundation'...<sup>45</sup>

However, much more sense can be made of these lines if the formation of the female is in view. In addition, lines 15-18 have already been demonstrated as referring to the creation and formation of humanity. I propose that lines 8-9 have in view the separation of the female from the male and her formation. That is, rather than reading אושה ('foundation'), אישה ('woman') should be read. Furthermore, better sense can be made of the term פרש (usually translated 'separated') as well. I propose the following translation of lines 8-9:

8) eternity, and then you will understand between good and evil, according to their deeds, for the God of knowledge is a foundation/mystery of truth, and by the נהיה רז

9) He separated woman, and her deeds [ in all wis]dom and all [cra]ftiness He fashioned her, dominion of her

<sup>45</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 158.

In lines 10-12 that follow, the column may be further demonstrated to be addressing issues of formation and creation than previously discussed in regard to lines 15-18 in chapter 4:

(10) לִכְ[ו]ל־לְמַה וְכֹל[א] תְּכִ[ו]ל־בְּאֶפְרַשׁ לִמְ[ב]ינָחם לְכֹל מְעִשֵׁי הָלְהַחֲלֹךְ  
 (11) בְּ[יָצַר] מְבִינָחם וִיפְרֹשׁ לֵאמֹ[ ] [ ] רִיָּה וּבְכוּשֶׁר מְבִינֹת נֹדֶ[עו] נִסְ[תָּרִי  
 (12) מִחֲשָׁבוֹ...]

10) over all her [ ] and everything [ ] a[1] He separated for their understanding, all her deeds/creation, to walk  
 11) in the likeness of their understanding, and He separated for m[an (?) ] and in the fitting understanding which was made known in the secrets of  
 12) his plans...

4Q417 1 i lines 8-12 are a description not only of the separation of the female, but separations in creation generally. In line 9 the dominion of the addressee over (her) deeds is expressed. This is a motif likely derived from Genesis 3.16 ('he will rule over you') and found also in 4Q416 2 iii line 2 ('He has set you in authority over her'). The רִזְ נָחִיָּה (l. 8) should be understood as instrumental; it appears to be a mystery that reveals, in part, the order and nature of creation and thus divisions. The terms 'wisdom' and 'craftiness' in line 9 may be allusions to the gaining of knowledge (cf. l. 8) in Genesis 2-3 and the description of the serpent as 'crafty' in Genesis 3.1.

4Q417 1 i is likely to be located in the first few columns of the document. As such, this description of the separation of the female and command to rule over her most likely preceded the phrases אִשָּׁה חִיקָבָה and כְּלִי חִיקָבָה discussed above.

#### 5.2.6 4Q415 2 ii

4Q415 2 ii is another column that may elucidate the phrases אִשָּׁה חִיקָבָה and כְּלִי חִיקָבָה. Here in line 3 the phrase בְּחִיקָה occurs. 4Q415 2 ii is the only other place

outside of 4Q416 2 ii and iv where the term חֵיק occurs in *Musar leMevin*.<sup>46</sup> Several factors necessitate a discussion of the fragment in its entirety: the address to the female, the language of origin, and obscure phrases that might be construed in relation to a Genesis tradition.

- (1) כאב כבדי ]
- (2) אל חמישי בלבבך וע]
- (3) כול היום ובחיקו בר]
- (4) פן חפרעי ברית קודש]
- (5) ואויבת לנפשך וב]
- (6) א ] [שה עד לש]
- (7) בבית מכו[רותך ] ובבריתך ח]
- (8) תהלה [ ] י כלל אנשים ]
- (9) [ ] ל ] מבית מולדים ]

- 1) like a father honour[
- 2) do not return<sup>47</sup>/remove your heart[
- 3) all the day/continually, and in his bosom[
- 4) lest you ignore a holy covenant[
- 5) and one hated by your soul[
- 6) a w[i]fe (?) until[
- 7) in the house of yo[ur origins] and in your covenant[
- 8) a praise [ ] all men[
- 9) from the time of birth<sup>48</sup>

Lines 1, 3 and 4 all use the 2<sup>nd</sup> person feminine singular address. As the editors note, there is nothing to suggest hypostatised wisdom in this fragment; rather, this is a rare occurrence of a sapiential address to a female – perhaps a wife or daughter.<sup>49</sup> The fragment begins in line 1 with a command for the female to honour someone ‘like a father’.<sup>50</sup> Previously discussed is the occurrence of an allusion to the fifth commandment

<sup>46</sup> The term is relatively scarce in Qumran literature.

<sup>47</sup> See Prov 17.13 for חמישי.

<sup>48</sup> 4Q299 1 4, 4Q299 3a ii-b 13, 5 5 all render מולדים as ‘times of birth’ see *DJD XX*. On the use of the term מולד in *Musar leMevin* see discussion in relation to 4Q416 2 iii 20 above.

<sup>49</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 48.

<sup>50</sup> The phrase כאב is similar to the occurrence in *Jub* 1.25-26 (‘like a father’) and is one of the few places in early Jewish literature outside of *Musar leMevin* where God is referred to as ‘father’ (cf. 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-16).

of the Decalogue in 4Q416 2 iii lines 16-18 (cf. 4Q416 2 ii line 21).<sup>51</sup> The editors suggest that the woman's father-in-law could be in view here, though they raise it only as a possibility. Perhaps a more likely figure whom the woman is exhorted to honour is her own husband.<sup>52</sup> This suggestion not only makes sense in light of the present discussion, but is also a tradition that Philo preserves in relation to the female in Genesis 2. In *Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin* (1.27) Philo queries why the woman is formed from a rib of Adam and not from the earth as were other creatures (Gen 2.21):

'why was not woman, like the other animals and man, also formed from earth, instead of the side of man? First, because woman is not equal in honour with man. Second, because she is not equal in age, but younger... Third, he wished that man should take care of woman as of a very necessary part of him; but woman, in return, should serve him as a whole. Fourth, he counsels man figuratively to take care of woman as of a daughter, *and woman to honour man as a father*. And this is proper; for woman changes her habitation from her family to her husband.'<sup>53</sup>

Philo preserves here an exegetical tradition in which the female's creation is linked explicitly to honouring her husband like a father. The fifth commandment of the Decalogue and the rule of man over women from Genesis 3.16 are seen to be joined in *Musar leMevin*. The emphasis of the dominion of the man over the woman from Genesis 3.16 is a motif already encountered elsewhere in the document (4Q416 2 iv line 7; 4Q417 1 i 8-9; cf. 4Q418 228; 4Q418a 18). If the suggestion that the female addressee is being called upon here to honour her husband like her father, then the following lines may be related to the already observed emphasis in the document on woman's creation as derived from her husband.

<sup>51</sup> It is conceivable that the addressee of 4Q415 2 ii is called upon to honour God like a father in keeping with the concept expressed in 4Q416 2 iii line 16 'for as God is to a man so his own father', however this seems unlikely here since the phrase is 'like your father'. 4Q418 86 line 1, a five line fragment with less than ten intact words, has the phrase וְכַמֵּן עַל [ב]נֵי 'as a father over daughters'. See also 4Q415 2 ii lines 15-16 'and then you will become for him/her (?) as a father'.

<sup>52</sup> E. M. Schuller comments briefly on 4Q415 2 ii that 'what is most distinctive is that in one place [in *Musar leMevin*] a woman is addressed directly, though the advice given to her appears to be rather conventional'; 'Women: Daily Life,' in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 983. If my thesis is correct, the instruction to the woman is rather unconventional.

The latter surviving portion of 4Q415 2 ii line 3 states that 'in his bosom' which is followed immediately by 'ברן'. The editors suggest a possible reconstruction of these letters as ברןית in the sense of 'marriage covenant' (cf. Prov 2.17; Mal 2.14) and read the *waw* and *yod* of the preceding word as בחוקי ('in the statutes of') rather than as בחיקו. However, they comment that 'this reading then would give us a conceivable but banal phrase, but a reading בחיקו...would also be more congruous with the context...there would be no obvious supplement, however, for the בר/בר at the end of the line that would continue the thought of בחיקו...'.<sup>54</sup> Given the language of origins in lines 7 (מכן[רוחיד])<sup>55</sup> and 9 (בית מולדים), as well as the previous suggestion that אשת חיקכה is a phrase that literally bespeaks the origin of woman in Genesis 2, an alternative reconstruction might be set forth. I would suggest that the term בחיקו could be supplemented with ברןאך or ברןאשיחך, in the sense of 'in his bosom is your creation/beginning'.<sup>56</sup> Two motifs would then emerge from 4Q415 2 ii. The first is the origin and creation of woman (lines 1, 2, 7 and 9). The second is the woman's 'covenant' (ברית; lines 4 and 7) which could be understood as 'marriage'. While the fragmentary context does not allow us to understand how these themes are interwoven, one might speculate that the creation of woman from man is the basis upon which familial codes and marital relations are founded. This would come as no surprise in light of 1 Corinthians 11.2-16 and Ephesians 5.21-33 where similar motifs are founded upon a Genesis 2-3 tradition.

<sup>53</sup> Translation by R. Marcus, *Loeb Classic Library*, p. 16; italics mine.

<sup>54</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 48.

<sup>55</sup> The editors comment upon this reconstruction: 'in light of the following references to marriage (if ובבריתך should thus be interpreted also here) and birth (line 9), one may also suggest tentatively ביה מכרוחיד "the house of thy origins" ... or "thy fixed place". מכרוחיד is rare; but see Ez 21:35; 29:14; and especially 16:3, where מכרוחיד is parallel to מלוחיד.

<sup>56</sup> 4Q418 119 is a five line fragment with only six extant words, line 3 reads מצולה נולדה ('depths she was born'). Is there any way this phrase might be construed as a reference to woman's origin?

In column 4Q416 2 iii line 20 is an occurrence of this same motif, it is transcribed in DJD 34 as: בלוא חוק vacat אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדין. It might also be (reconstructed and) transcribed as בלוא חיק אשה לקחתה ברישכה קח מולדין and translated: 'without bosom. A wife you have taken in your poverty, understand her origins'. A context does not survive in which to understand how the phrase 'without bosom' could be understood. Reading חיק rather than חוק does not further the present inquiry; however, given the language of origins and the term's occurrence elsewhere in this column, 'bosom' is a more likely rendering. Regardless, in the case of the phrase 'understand her origins', such a translation is easily justified in the use of the imperative קח used with the רז נהיה (e.g. 4Q418 77 4) and the term מולד used of origins in the previously discussed occurrences. Further, in 4Q416 2 iii line 9, only some lines before, the term מולד is coupled with the רז נהיה and exhorts the addressee to seek his origins. It would seem then, that 4Q416 2 iii first conceives of the addressee's origins as coming from God and angels (4Q416 2 iii 15-18) and then proceeds to discuss the origins of the female in the lines that follow (4Q416 2 iii 20 – 4Q416 2 iv). 4Q416 2 iii line 20 introduces a succession of allusions, in which we find the twice occurring phrase 'wife of your bosom', with an exhortation to 'understand her origins'.

In conclusion, the occurrences of the word חיק in *Musar leMevin* always appear in relation to the female. 4Q415 2 ii uses the expression בחיקו in a fragment which is addressed to a woman and is concerned with her origin. Despite the fragmentary state of the column, it may be deduced that the feminine singular address of 4Q415 2 ii exhorts the female addressee to honour her husband on account of her place in creation. In

*Musar leMevin*, the female is derived from the male, separated from him, and on this basis wives are to honour husbands and they are to rule over their wives.

### 5.2.7) Synthesis of References to the Origin/Separation of the Female

It may be concluded, therefore, that the term כלי in 4Q416 2 ii line 21 is best understood as 'body' and the term חיקכה as 'your bosom'. The phrase could be translated simply as 'wife of your bosom'. However, the epithet is not used simply as 'wife', but rather as a phrase used to signify one's wife as derived from man.<sup>57</sup> She is, literally, the vessel taken from the male addressee's bosom. The phrase אשת חיקכה, which occurs in a context with multiple allusions to Genesis 2-3 two columns later, may be seen as a synonymous epithet. The phrase would have been known from Deuteronomy and the *Temple Scroll*, but the author(s) of *Musar leMevin* likely used the existing epithet with a significance which was apparently not intended in other compositions.

The metaphorical description of the female as 'wife/body of your bosom' is congruous with one sense of Ephesians 5.28 that 'husbands should love their wives as their own bodies' – a concept founded upon Genesis 2.20-25 only a few verses later (see Eph 5.31 where an explicit citation of Gen 2.24 occurs). Since the woman in Genesis is literally 'flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones', Ephesians 5.29 is able to state that 'no man ever hated his own flesh (ἐαυτοῦ σάρκα)'. It is not necessarily only that the two become 'one flesh', but that they also are one flesh on account of the female's derivation. Here, the epithet 'wife/vessel of your bosom' is coined on the basis of the imagery of the origin of woman in Genesis 2.

In *Musar leMevin* the phrases 'vessel of your bosom' and 'wife of your bosom', expressions of the origins of the female, are found in columns with multiple allusions to



Genesis creation traditions (4Q416 2 ii-iv). In addition, 4Q417 1 i lines 8-12, a column which addresses the creation of humanity, explicitly states that ‘the God of knowledge...separated woman [from man]’. 4Q415 2 ii basis its instruction to the female on notions of honouring one’s husband and considerations of her birth times. It has also been observed that similar motifs are taken up in the New Testament, Philo and the later Targums. Taken together, these columns appear to express a particular conception of woman, which is: the female originates from man, as in Genesis 2, and her behaviour is to reflect the implications of this derivation.

#### 5.2.8) 4Q418 126 i-ii

4Q418 126 i-ii is a somewhat obscure fragment that has received almost no comment outside of the DJD 34 volume.<sup>57</sup> This fragment survives in 16 lines with substantial damage to the left side – none of the lines survive intact. As a whole, the column addresses issues of condemnation and judgement of the wicked and redemption and attainment for the poor. In general the column would appear to depict a division that will take place between ‘children of life’ (רוח חיים, line 8) and ‘workers of iniquity’ (line 6). Line 9 opens with the phrase כול בני חוה (‘all the children of Eve’). Comprehending what this phrase might possibly denote is complicated by several factors. First, no immediate preceding context exists and what immediately follows seems to embark on a new thought. Second, the phrase does not occur elsewhere in either the Hebrew Bible or Dead Sea Scrolls. Lastly, it may even be possible to read the final word of the phrase as the noun חיה (‘life’) rather than חוה. More important than investigating what is meant by

<sup>57</sup> Perhaps in one possible sense of Eph 5.28 that ‘husbands should love their wives as their own bodies’.

<sup>58</sup> See A. Caquot, ‘Les textes de Sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu Préliminaire),’ in *RHPR* 76 (1996): 1-34.

the phrase is adjudicating the likelihood that this is a reference to 'Eve' and therefore an allusion to the first woman in Genesis.

The name 'Eve' (חַוָּה) occurs only twice in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 3.20; 4.1) and nowhere else in early Jewish Hebrew literature.<sup>59</sup> Likewise, neither the phrase 'sons of life' or 'sons of Eve' occur in the Hebrew literature. In the Septuagint 'Eve' is translated with two terms: Ζωη (Gen 3.20) and Εὐαν (Gen 4.1). In the New Testament and Apocrypha 'Eve' is spoken of only by the name Εὐα (2 Cor 11.3; 1 Tim 2.13; Tob 8.6). The closest parallel to 'sons of Eve' is likely in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (62.7).<sup>60</sup> In the *Similitudes* the Ethiopic expression 'walda 'eg'ula- 'emmaheyyaw' is used. Although this expression is used generally of a human being or 'Son of Man', similar to the Ethiopic term 'walda sab'e', it literally means 'offspring of the mother of the living'. E. Isaacs comments that the 'first person to be described as "the mother of the living" in the Bible is Eve, so Eth[iopic] grammarians sometimes interpret the expression "offspring of Eve"'.<sup>61</sup> If the expression in *Similitudes* 62.7, referring to the Son of Man, and 4Q418 126 i-ii line 9 are comparable, the implication might be that this singular occurrence of 'sons of Eve' in *Musar leMevin* could be rendered similarly to *1 Enoch* as 'person' or 'son of people'. If this were indeed the case, one might question whether the expression in *Musar leMevin* is truly an allusion to Eve in Genesis 3. Nonetheless, the comparison

<sup>59</sup> There is one occurrence in *Hekhalot* literature (866 v §79 line 7) 'you reveal this mystery to the son of man born of woman... they have been created: heaven and earth, sea and dry land, mountains and hills, rivers and springs and their sources and fire and hail and the garden of Eden and the tree of life and fashioned in it were Adam and Eve (חַוָּה) and beasts and creatures of the field and birds of the sky...' (translation mine). The traditions surrounding Eve that could be considered relevant here are very limited. *The Life of Adam and Eve*, *Genesis Apocryphan* and *Eve's Testament* in the *Apocalypse of Moses* are by far the most extensive works from early Judaism that include Eve, however they contain almost nothing from the first three chapters of Genesis. Eve is also mentioned in *1 Enoch* 69.6; *2 Enoch* 31.6; *Apoc. Abraham* 23.1; *b. Td. Yeb.* 103b; *Ab. Zar.* 22b; and *Shab.* 146a. Secondary literature devoted solely to Eve in early Judaism is almost non-existent.

<sup>60</sup> See Caquot, 'Les texts,' pp. 1-9.

with *Similitudes* strengthens the likelihood that 4Q418 126 i-ii line 9 can be read as בני חיה over against בני חרה and therefore increases the likelihood that this fragment contains an allusion to the first woman Eve.

### 5.2.9) Male Dominion Over the Female

In addition to 4Q417 1 i line 9, two, perhaps three, other fragments not yet discussed contain the motif of the dominion of the male over the female. The first is 4Q415 9 lines 7-8 where we read ממשל זכר את נקבה...רוחה המשל בה ('dominion of the male over the female...her spirit make you (m.) to rule over'). This fragment contains two other references to woman: line 2 states 'so that your womb [במנכה] should *bear* [להורות]'; and line 11 the word נקבה. 4Q415 9 appears to allude to Genesis 3.16. The second possible occurrence of this motif is in 4Q418 228, a four line fragment with only seven extant words. Here the editors suggest a possible translation of המשילה as 'He has [not (?)] set her in authority'.<sup>62</sup> This fragment is too small to discern with complete certainty what precisely the meaning is; it may be suggested, however, that it is a statement of the female's subjugation to the male framed within a rhetorical statement. The third occurrence is in 4Q418a 18 line 4, another small fragment that survives in only three lines with less than 7 extant words. Line 4 reads המ[שילכה להחיה]לך which is translated in DJD 34 as: 'over her has he set] *thee* in authority so that *she* should wal[k'. The concept of the male ruling over the female has its most likely origin in Genesis 3.16

<sup>61</sup> J. H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume One* (New York: Doubleday, 1983) p. 43.

<sup>62</sup> The term המשיל is abnormally frequent in *Musar leMevin* when compared to other Qumran documents and may be descriptive of other relations other than husband and wife, perhaps parents and children as well (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 17). 4Q423 1, 2 i line 2 describes the addressee as being placed in dominion over the Garden of Eden.

and each of these fragments may allude to male dominion over the female (cf. 4Q417 1 i 9).

Already briefly discussed in relation to 4Q416 2 iii line 21 was the phrase עזר בשרכה. This phrase also occurs in 4Q418a 16b + 17 line 3, a fragment that survives in only five lines with less than eight intact words. These two occurrences may indicate that the phrase 'helper of your flesh' was another epithet used for 'wife' which was derived from Genesis 2.20-25. Without parallels in the Hebrew Bible or Dead Sea Scrolls, an allusion to Genesis, based upon lexical similarities (עזר; בשר) and in the context of 4Q416 2 iii-iv, is probable.<sup>63</sup> One might also question whether there are any similarities between the phrases 'wife of your bosom' and 'helper of your flesh' if both are to be taken as references to 'woman' or epithets for 'wife'.

#### 5.2.10) 4Q423 1, 2 i

The fragmentary text of 4Q423 1, 2 i paraphrases portions of the Garden of Eden story in Genesis 1-2.<sup>64</sup> Lines 1-2 speak not of one tree of the knowledge of good and evil but of 'every fruit' of 'every tree' which is 'wonderful to make wise' (נחמד להשכיל; Gen 2.9; 3.6). In other words the whole garden appears to provide wisdom. Line 2 also recounts how the addressee (2<sup>nd</sup> person masculine singular address כה-; perhaps future) was set in authority over the garden to work and keep it. Line 3 alludes to Genesis 3.18 and the result of eating from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the curse related to Adam: 'the earth will bring forth thorns and thistles' (קין ודרדר הצמיח לכה).<sup>65</sup> Only the word במעלכה ('in your transgression/unfaithfulness') is preserved in line 4 and

<sup>63</sup> There is an occurrence of the term עזר used for a man in *Musar leMevin*, 4Q417 2 i 7 reads 'do not count a man of iniquity as a helper'.

<sup>64</sup> For a brief discussion of this fragment in relation to *Apoc. of Moses* see J. Doehhorn 'Sie wird dir nicht ihre Kraft geben,' pp. 351-66.

this followed by a *vacat*. It may be that this lone word is descriptive of the disobedience of Adam and the resulting curse, but there is nothing in the context that demands an interpretation of the narrative as portraying eating from the trees of wisdom as exclusively negative.<sup>66</sup> Line 5 reads '[h]er child, and all the compassion of her that is pregna[nt]'. The editors mention the possibility that 'this line could paraphrase the curse of the woman, Gen 3:16, referring to pregnancy and giving birth as well as the woman's relation to her husband'.<sup>67</sup> Line 7 reads 'rejecting] the bad and knowing the good' and could refer to partaking of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as described in Genesis 2.9 and 3.22 (הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו לדעת טוב ורע). Sirach 17.7 refers to this in a brief summary of the Eden story where he says, 'He filled them with knowledge and understanding and showed them good and evil'.<sup>68</sup> Though comment on this fragment could be extensive, for the subject at hand it is only pertinent to note that line 5 is a likely allusion to the female in Genesis 3.16.

1Q26 1 (parallel 4Q423 4) is a relatively small fragment preserved in only nine surviving lines, all without either full right or left margins. The most complete are lines 5-7, two of which have been reproduced in full below. The first line contains only the phrase ברו נדיה, line 2 the term תבואתכה 'your harvest', line 3 is indecipherable and in line

<sup>65</sup> Both 1QH<sup>a</sup> 16.25 and Heb 6.8 allude to Gen 3.18 with the phrase 'thorns and thistles'.

<sup>66</sup> So ingrained is the traditional Christian interpretation of Genesis 2-3 as the origin of human sinfulness at the 'Fall' that it has become difficult to even conceive that another interpretation is possible. Could one positively conceive of partaking from the tree of wisdom in Genesis 2-3 and maintain the tradition of female and male 'curses'. The obtainment of wisdom and understanding of the 'mystery of existence' are the greatest good in the document. Further, childbirth, male dominion over the female and the travails of tending crops are all recurring themes in *Musar leMevin* – each of which is a theme consequential to gaining wisdom or eating of the tree of knowledge.

<sup>67</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 510.

<sup>68</sup> One of the few other Qumran texts that paraphrase the Eden story and the tree of knowledge is 4Q422 1 9-11 '[t]ree, He gave him dominion to eat the fruit[...with the exception of eating from the tree of kn[owledge...he rose up against him and they forgot'.

4 the phrase *רז נהיה* occurs again in the statement ‘He has revealed your ear to the *mystery of existence*’. Here, a possible allusion to woman and an Eden tradition may occur:

(5) [ לכה השמר לכה למה תכבדכה ממנו ]  
 (6) [ ונארוחה בכול חבואתכה ונ[כל]מתה בכול מעשיכה ]

5) ] for you, watch out for yourself, lest she honour you more than him [  
 6) ] and are accursed in all your produce and you be ash[amed] in all your deeds [<sup>69</sup>

The context that follows is difficult to evaluate. Line 7 begins with legal terminology (רִיב) and is followed by what the editors reconstruct as ‘and He said to him, “I am [thy] por[tion and thy inheritance] (?)”’. However, this is an extensive reconstruction of lines 7b-8a and cannot be relied upon for setting lines 5-6 in a broader context. Line 5 appears to refer to the female honouring her husband (cf. Philo *QG* 1.27; 4Q415 2 i) more than God while line 6 describes the curse of Adam and the resulting shame in Genesis 3. Although line 6 shares no precise lexical similarities with Genesis 3 the themes themselves are familiar: (1) a cursed earth; and (2) shame (see §5.4 below). If line 5 is a description of the first woman, then something may be learnt about honouring one’s husband in relation to God. The exhortation found in line 5 could be derived from a reminiscence of Eve bearing the fruit of wisdom to Adam. This act in and of itself could be construed as positive and ‘honourable’, however, an act of disobedience to God (reading *ממנו* as ‘than Him’). Line 6 then would describe the consequences that could befall man if he fails to heed this wisdom. Another possibility is that the addressee in line 5 is exhorted to guard against one’s wife honouring him more than her father (‘than him’). This interpretation would fit well with the motif of honouring one’s husband encountered in 4Q415 2 ii.

<sup>69</sup> See *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 536-37 for justification of translation and reconstruction by Strugnell and Harrington. Elgvin, *DJD XXXIV*, p. 516-17, in the same volume translates 4Q423 4 lines 1-2 almost

### 5.2.11) Summary

The identification of these allusions to Genesis 2-3 reveals that *Musar leMevin* apparently conceived of the woman as subjugated to man based upon her creation and 'curse'. The derivation of the female in creation and allusions to Genesis 2 in the document function both to describe and exhort husbands and wives how to relate to one another. The woman could be exhorted to relate to her husband 'like her father' both because of perceptions of him as her originatrix as well the dominion of her literal father passing on to her husband. In general, conceptions of the origin of woman, the uniting of the woman to her husband, and results of partaking from the tree of knowledge are all themes that are related to the female in *Musar leMevin*.

### 5.3) 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 and the Female

Column 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 have been discussed in chapter four. Here, an analogy between the creator figures God and angels (אֲדֹנִים) is made with mother and father (line 16: 'for as God is to a man, so is his own father, and as *angels* are to a person so is his mother'). This column may be more directly related to a Genesis creation tradition. Since angels at one point are likened to a female ('mother'), implications for this relationship to the female can be further explored. Specifically, later Aramaic targumic traditions portray woman as related to the angels at times in Genesis 2-3 and may have a bearing for the emphasis on females in *Musar leMevin*.

*Targum Pseudo-Jonathan's* translation and interpretation of the first three chapters of Genesis portrays ministering angels as assisting God in the creation of humanity. *Pseudo-Jonathan* on Genesis 1.26 reads, 'God said to the angels who minister

---

identically '...to you. Tak]e care [lest] she honour you more than Him and[...and you be cursed in a]ll [your] crops [and put] to shame in all your deeds...'.  

---

before him, who were created on the second day of the creation of the world, “let us make man in our image, in our likeness””. The significance of reading the plural address ‘let us’ as an address to angels was discussed in detail in chapter four. Another variation from the Hebrew Bible in the targum is the response of the serpent to the woman after she describes God’s prohibition of eating from the tree of knowledge: ‘and [the serpent said] to the women, “you will not die. But every craftsman hates his fellow craftsman. For it is manifest before the Lord that on the day on which you eat of it you will surely be like the great angels, who are able to distinguish good from evil’ (3.4-5). M. Maher cites *Bereshith Rabbah* 19.4 in relation to the statement of ‘fellow craftsman’.<sup>70</sup> In *Bereshith Rabbah*, God is depicted as eating of the tree of knowledge before creating the world and forbids Adam and his wife from partaking of the tree lest they create other worlds. In both texts (*Ber. R.* 19.4; *Ps.-Jn.* 3.4) the phrase ‘fellow craftsman’ is used. Also of significance is the interpretation of the term אֱלֹהִים in the Hebrew Bible and commonly in Early Jewish texts as ‘great angels’ in *Pseudo-Jonathan*; avoiding a direct statement that the woman could become like ‘God’. It may be possible that this construal of Genesis, that the woman would become or is likened to angels, is a tradition that is reflected in 4Q416 2 iii 15-18 and may reflect generally on conceptions of woman in the document.

*Pseudo-Jonathan* on Genesis 3.22 expands upon the Hebrew Bible stating that, ‘the Lord God said to the angels who minister before him, “behold, Adam was alone on the earth as I am alone in the heavens on high...”’. However, God is not portrayed as being entirely alone in the heavens, but is in the company of the angels (*Ps.Jn.* 1ff.). It is possible that *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* on Genesis 1-3 has in mind an analogy, perhaps very slight, between God and angels and Adam and Eve just as 4Q416 2 iii. In *Pseudo-*

---

<sup>70</sup> M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1992) p. 25 fn. 4.



*Jonathan* 3.22 the analogy between God and Adam is clear, though only rendered as a simile. This suggestion is also made in light of the addition of the phrase 'fellow craftsman' (3.4). *Pseudo-Jonathan* could reflect conceptions of humanity having creative power analogous to that of God and the angels. Further, it is said of the woman that if she partakes of the fruit she will become like the 'great angels', in contrast to the analogy in 3.22 between God and Adam. Other minor points of comparison may be found in expressions of the creation of woman being in the 'likeness' of Adam in chapter two.

Also, the woman instigates the introduction of disobedience, understood in some traditions as 'evil', into the world whereas the angels at times bear responsibility for 'evil' in creation by sharing ('let us') in the formation of humanity (cf. Philo).

*Targum Neofiti* preserves several similar readings. At 3.5, the serpent responds to the woman, saying 'on the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and that you will be like the angels before the Lord' (3.5). *Targum Neofiti* also adds the statement that 'the Lord God said, "Behold, the first Adam whom I have created is alone in the world as I am alone in the heavens on high"'. The analogy between God and Adam continues in the following sentence: 'numerous nations are to arise from him'. M. McNamara argues that the phrase 'from him' corresponds to 'of us' or 'from us' (במנו, i.e. become like one of us') and reflects a successful attempt to avoid an inherent anthropomorphism.<sup>71</sup> *Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Neofiti* thus appear to preserve a tradition wherein God and angels are analogous to some degree with Adam and Eve. 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18 also draw this analogy between mother and father and God and angels. Constructing a broader picture of the female in *Musar leMevin* should certainly take into account this possible analogy and its likely origin in Genesis 2-3 tradition. Since angels in 4Q416 2 iii are likened to a

mother and the *targumic* traditions preserve a similar tradition, angels and females might be more broadly conceived of as analogous elsewhere in the document.

#### 5.4) 'Cover Your Shame'

In 4Q416 2 iv lines 5 and 13 are occurrences of an epithet for wife in conjunction with terms for 'shame' and 'nudity' (אשת חיקכה וחרפה; אשת חיקכה כי היא שאר ער[ומכה]). The connection in 4Q416 2 iv between a term for woman and the concept of shame within a fragment with numerous allusions to Genesis 2-3 suggests that 'shame' might be related to an Eden account both in this column and elsewhere in the document. If the concept is to be related to Eden accounts, does it bear the idea of nudity or are there other conceptions of 'shame' at play in the document? Since wisdom is highly esteemed in *Musar leMevin*, shame might be related to the addressee's failure to gain wisdom. Another possibility is a 'shame' related to properly relating to one's wife and the created order. In order to ascertain more clearly the relationship of 'shame' here to Garden of Eden accounts, an examination of each occurrence of the term is necessary. Occurrences of 'shame' elsewhere in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Early Jewish literature will also aid in delineating conceptions thereof in *Musar leMevin*. The term חרפה occurs in *Musar leMevin* (approx. 8x) considerably more than any one of the other documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls (approx. 9x total).<sup>72</sup> The relative frequency of occurrences and broad distribution suggests its significance in the document. A brief survey of conceptions of

<sup>71</sup> M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd, 1992) p. 63 fn. 23.

<sup>72</sup> חרפה occurs in *Musar leMevin* in 4Q416 2 ii 3 (par. 4Q417 2 ii + 23 5); 4Q416 2 ii 16 (par. 4Q418 8 2); 4Q416 2 iv 13; 4Q417 2 i 23, 26; 4Q418 177 3; 4Q418 178 4; 4Q418<sup>a</sup> 19 4 – 8x. In the Qumran library in 1Q34 3 i 3 (*Liturgical Prayers*; par. 4Q508 1); 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10.9; 10.33-34; 4Q200 1 i 3 (Tobit); 4Q200 1 ii 1; 4Q501 5 (*Apocryphal Lamentations B*); 4Q481<sup>e</sup> 3 (*Narrative H*); 4Q525 14 ii 8 (*Beatitudes*); 4Q525 15 7 – 9x.

shame in Eden accounts and the term's usage elsewhere will precede a treatment of it as it is used in *Musar leMevin*.

#### 5.4.1) Occurrences of 'Shame' in Other Early Jewish Literature

In the conclusion of *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* to Genesis 2, a variant from the Hebrew Bible occurs: 'the two of them were *wise*, Adam and his wife, but they did not remain in their glory' (2.25). Whereas in the Hebrew Bible it states: 'the two of them were *naked*, Adam and his wife, and they were not ashamed'. The Hebrew word עָרָם can mean both 'crafty', 'wise' or 'naked' and is used to describe the nudity of Adam and his wife in chapter two while in the line that follows the craftiness of the serpent. In *Pseudo-Jonathan* Adam and his wife are said to be 'wise' while in the first verse of chapter 3 the serpent is said to be 'evil'. After eating from the tree of knowledge *Pseudo-Jonathan* reads, 'the eyes of both of them were enlightened and they knew that they were naked...and they saw their shame' (3.7). The description of their nudity as 'shame' is an addition to the Hebrew Bible and occurs in *Targum Neofiti* as well. The final verse of *Neofiti* on Genesis 2 translates, 'both of them were naked, Adam and his wife, and as yet they did not know what shame was'.

The tradition of the description of Adam and Eve's nudity as 'shame' in *Pseudo-Jonathan* (3.6; 3.10) and *Neofiti* (2.25) is also preserved in the book of *Jubilees*. In *Jubilees* nudity is described as 'shame' and may reflect a prohibition against gentile nudity in the gymnasium.<sup>73</sup> In *Jubilees* 1.9, in an address by God to Moses, it is

---

<sup>73</sup> See J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2001) pp. 23-27; J. van Ruiten, 'The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3.1-31,' in *Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie* 57 (1996a): 305-17; J. C. Endres, *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987), M. Albani, J. Frey and A. Lange (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Siebeck, 1977); R. H. Charles, *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: A & C Black, 1972). For a discussion on the female in Jubilees see B. Halpern-Amaru, 'The First Woman, Wives, and Mothers in Jubilees,' in *JBL* 113 (1994): 609-26.

predicted that, 'they [Israelites] will forget all of my commandments... and they will walk after their defilement and shame'. However, the motif of nudity is not elaborated on outside of this reference in 1.9 and the subsequent description of the fall in chapter 3. In fact in *Jubilees*, before the Garden of Eden account, Adam is said to be naked but that he 'neither knew it nor was he ashamed' (3.16). When the female partakes of the forbidden fruit the immediate result is that she first 'covered her shame' (3.20), and when Adam likewise eats, 'he covered his shame' (3.22). The next reference to 'shame' and nudity occurs in 3.30 where Adam is described as the only one among the beasts and cattle allowed to 'cover his shame'. The following verse concludes on the matter and states: 'Therefore, it is commanded in the heavenly tablets to all who will know the judgement of the Law that they should cover their shame and they should not be uncovered as the gentiles are uncovered' (3.31). *Musar leMevin*, like *Jubilees*, uses the phrase to 'cover shame' (4Q416 iv; 4Q418 177 3; 178 4) in a context related to Genesis creation traditions. In addition to this the motif of a heavenly tablet or book also occurs in *Musar leMevin* (4Q417 1 i) similar to *Jubilees* (3.31). *Jubilees* contains the closest parallel from the literature of early Judaism to the phrase 'cover your shame' in *Musar leMevin*.

A similar expression to *Jubilees* occurs on the lips of Adam in *the Apocalypse of Moses* 20:4 where he states: 'I looked for leaves in my area to hide my shame [αἰσχυστην]'. In the Septuagint the term ערוה is often translated by the term αἰσχυστην (Is 20.4; 47.3; Ezek 16.36, 38; 22.10; 23.10, 18, 29). Here again the notion of nakedness and shame are closely linked.

In addition to the *Apocalypse of Moses*, the association of shame and nakedness also occurs in the *Apocalypse of John* on two occasions. The first is in 3.18: 'the shame [αἰσχυνην] of your nakedness'. The second is in 16.15: 'blessed is he who is awake, keeping his clothing that he may not go naked and be ashamed [αἰσχυνην]'. Though there is no clear connection in John's apocalypse to nakedness and shame with Adam and Eve, the association of nudity with 'shame' is significant.

*The Book of Watchers* in *1 Enoch* also preserves a brief paraphrase and interpretation of the Garden of Eden account. In the *Book of Watchers* (32) Enoch views the garden of righteousness (Eden) within which there is a tree described as 'the tree of wisdom, of which one eats and knows great wisdom'. Enoch describes the tree's beautiful appearance and the angel Raphael says (32.6):

'This very thing is the tree of wisdom from which your old father and aged mother, they who are your precursors, ate and came to know wisdom; and (consequently) their eyes were opened and they realized that they were naked and (so) they were expelled from the garden.'<sup>74</sup>

A few observations may be made from this passage. First, the tree of wisdom is not described in terms of good and bad (Gen 2.9) but is positively conceived as able to make one wise (Gen 3.6). Second, Eve is not portrayed as the transgressor and no specific fault is focused upon her. Finally, a sequence of cause and affect is described: Adam and Eve (1) eat of the fruit of the tree of wisdom and as a result their eyes are opened; (2) when their eyes are opened they see their nudity; and then (3) their nudity leads to their expulsion from the garden. The realisation of their nudity is emphasised over any act of disobedience or deception; certainly their eyes being opened to their nudity here is significant as it is the direct cause, though not the ultimate one, for being expelled.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Translation by E. Isaacs.

<sup>75</sup> Sirach is also concerned with shame and mentions it on 15 occasions (4.21; 5.14; 6.1; 15.4; 20.22, 23, 26; 24.22; 26.8, 25; 29.14; 41.16; 42.1, 11, 14). However, none of these occurrences are directly related to

Two occurrences of the term חרפה in non-biblical documents may also have some bearing on the use of the term in *Musar leMevin*. 1QLiturgical Prayers (1Q34) survives in only a few fragments and is a relatively short document with less than twenty intact lines. The document begins with thanksgiving to God for gathering together His exiles and having mercy upon His people. God's actions are likened with natural provision such as rainfall and produce of the earth. The order of nature, the greater light of day and perhaps lesser light of night, establish a more general order that is applicable to understanding the nature of humanity. The document clearly distinguishes humans into two groups: the wicked and the just. The just will experience redemption while the wicked will be destroyed. At one point (3 ii 2) some are said to have 'dominion over the whole world' (וממשלתם בכל תבל); cf. Gen 1.26-27), while the seed of man (אדם) has not understood his inheritance and does not know God or has to act righteously. In the final surviving lines of the document the author praises God for renewing His covenant with the elect in the 'vision of glory' (מראה כבוד). This is done by the words of His 'holy spirit'. In addition, a 'faithful shepherd' is said to have been established for them. 1Q34 3 i lines 1-2 read:

(2) [ ] בגורל צדיק ולרשים<sup>76</sup> גורל  
(3) [ ] בעצמותם חרפה לכל בשר וצדיקים [ ]

2) [ ] in the lot of the righteous and lot of the wicked

3) [ ] in their bones a shame for all flesh and the righteous ones [ ]

What do bones have to do with 'shame'? Though the term עצם occurs in the *Hodayot* in a number of descriptions of the suffering of the author (1QH<sup>a</sup> 13.6-7; 13.35; 15.4; 16.30;

---

creation. Sirach 42.14 relates shame to the woman: 'better is the wickedness of a man than a woman who does good; it is a woman who brings shame and disgrace'.

19.21), it is a very infrequent term among other non-biblical documents found at Qumran (11QT 51.4-5). In *Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah* (4Q394) 8 i lines 11-12 (par. 4Q397) a prohibition occurs against those who are not to enter the assembly and take a wife, with the sentence 'take wives to become one bone (ונשים לוקחים להיוחם עצם אחת)'. In *Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah* the concept of 'one bone' would seemingly be alluding to Genesis 2.23 and the concept that Adam's partner is *עצם מעצמי*. Based upon the association of 'shame' with Genesis 2 as well as the possible connection of 'bone' with the woman in the same passage, it may be possible that this liturgical prayer reflects shame in relation to woman.<sup>77</sup>

Another occurrence of the term *חרפה* is in the so-called *Apocryphal Lamentation B* (4Q501) line 5. *Apocryphal Lamentation B* is a short column with only nine surviving lines. The lamentation begins with a plea not to give the inheritance of the community to foreigners and to remember the covenant made with them. The author appears to envisage his community in line 4 as suffering persecution at the hands of the 'wretched ones of your people' who are called liars. Lines 4-6b read:

(4) [כפופים ואין זון] קף<sup>78</sup> סבבנו חילכיא עמכה בלשון שקרמה ויופכו  
 (5) [על כה] ופארחכה לילוד אשה הביטה וראה חרפת בני  
 (6) [עמכה כיא נכמר] עורנו...

<sup>76</sup> Orthographically, one would expect to read *לרשעים* for 'wicked'. *לרשים* could also be read as 'poor' but given the immediate context of the 'lot' and the following lines where *רשע* occurs twice there can be little doubt that this term should be read as 'wicked'.

<sup>77</sup> To my knowledge, no one has previously suggested this connection. See E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat ma'aseh ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994); *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (eds.), J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>78</sup> 4Q501 is a fragment that survives without any right margin while the margins of both the left as well as top and bottom are visible. The only surviving letters at the beginning of line 4 are 'קף' and M. Baillet, *Qumran grotte 4. II (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982) p. 80, comments 'la restitution *כפופים ואין זון* est inspirée de Ps 145<sup>14</sup> 146<sup>8</sup>'. It is difficult to say with any certainty the precise number of letter spaces that originally existed in the column and Baillet's reconstruction is only an educated guess. The final word of line 4, *ויפכו*, is the best source for searching for possible reconstructions, but it will not be from the Hebrew Bible or other DSS since the term in this form, as far as I am aware, does not occur.

4) [for all those bowed down there is no rais]ing up, wretched ones of your [God's] people have surrounded us with a their lying tongue and they turned away

5) [ ] your [God's] bough to one born of woman, gaze and see the shame of the sons

6) of [your [God's] people for our skin is burning...

In the following lines 7-9 the author(s) calls upon God to avenge Himself against His enemies and concludes with a depiction of the adversary as acting violently against the poor and needy (עני ואביון). The referent of the pronominal suffix (-כה) in lines 4-6 is God. Though the missing portion of the beginning of line 5 is nearly impossible to ascertain, the context suggests that some of those who are considered to be part of God's people have gone astray and turned from God's 'bough' (פארה; cf. Ez 31.8-13)<sup>79</sup> after 'one born of woman'. In line 6 some who are considered a part of God's people are described as shameful. The author responds to the shameful activities by expressing indignation towards them as well as a state of burning skin (cf. Lam 5.10 עורנו כחור נכמרו; cf. 5.1 where the term חרפה occurs). While an allusion to Lamentations 5 is possible, it is also possible that Genesis 2-3 are at play here. The term 'bough' has possible connotations to the Garden of Eden, by way of Ezekiel, as does the term for 'shame'.<sup>80</sup> If shame is on

<sup>79</sup> This term occurs in only three passages in the Hebrew Bible (Is 10.33; Ez 17.6; 31.8-13) and in Ez 31.8-13 is used repeatedly. Since the word does not occur elsewhere in the DSS, to my knowledge, it may be that Ezekiel is the referent of an allusion in 4Q501 line 5, compare: 'The cedars in the garden of God could not rival it, nor the fir trees equal its boughs; the plane trees were as nothing compared with its branches (פארה); no tree in the garden of God was like it in beauty. <sup>9</sup> I made it beautiful with its mass of branches, the envy of all the trees of *Eden* that were in the garden of God. <sup>10</sup> Therefore thus says the Lord GOD: Because it towered high and set its top among the clouds, and its heart was proud of its height, <sup>11</sup> I gave it into the hand of the prince of the nations; he has dealt with it as its wickedness deserves. I have cast it out. <sup>12</sup> Foreigners (זרים; cf. 4Q501 1) from the most terrible of the nations have cut it down and left it. On the mountains and in all the valleys its branches have fallen, and its boughs (פארה) lie broken in all the watercourses of the land; and all the peoples of the earth went away from its shade and left it. <sup>13</sup> On its fallen trunk settle all the birds of the air, and among its boughs (פארה) lodge all the wild animals. <sup>14</sup> All this is in order that no trees by the waters may grow to lofty height or set their tops among the clouds, and that no trees that drink water may reach up to them in height'. Tigchelaar, 'Eden and Paradise,' p.37, writes: 'In a different manner [than Ez 28.12-19] the trees of the Garden of Eden enter the scene in Ezek 31'.

<sup>80</sup> See also G. J. Brooke, '4Q500 1 And the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard,' in *DSD* 2 (1995): 268-94, where Brooke discusses the imagery of fragment 4Q500 in relation to Eden.



occasion associated with nudity, the word עור here could hold an allusion to Genesis 3.21 where God clothes Adam and Eve in garments of skins (עור).<sup>81</sup>

Finally, a fragment of the *Hosea Pesher* (4Q166) associates 'shame' and hunger with divine judgement. 4Q166 i lines 12-13 read:

(12) פשרו אשר הכם ברעב ובערום להיות לקלון[ן]  
(13) וחרפה לעיני הגוים אשר נשענו עליהם והמה

12) its interpretation: He has struck them with famine and with nakedness, to be a shameful nakedness  
13) and a shame before the eyes of the nations whom they relied upon, and they

While this pesher does not rely upon or allude to traditions stemming from Genesis, it indicates, similar to the Apocalypse of John, that nudity and 'shame' were often associated in early Jewish literature.

*Targums Pseudo-Jonathan, Neophiti, Jubilees* and *Apocalypse of Moses* each introduce the idea of shame explicitly in their presentations of Genesis 2-3. 'Shame' in these contexts is directly associated with eating from the tree of knowledge and resulting realisation of nudity. In addition to this, both the *Liturgical Prayer* and *Miqsat Ma'aseh ha-Torah* lend some credence, perhaps questionable, that the concept of 'shame' may have an association with Adam and Eve and the Eden narrative elsewhere in the Qumran literature. In light of these sources and the occurrence of 'wife of your bosom' and 'shame' in 4Q416 2 iv perhaps some sense might be made of two small fragments designated as 4Q418 177 and 178.

#### 5.4.2) Occurrences of 'Shame' in *Musar leMevin*

4Q418 177 and 178 both have occurrences of the phrase כסה חרפתכה ('cover your shame'). In the preliminary identification of these fragments with a Genesis 1-3 tradition

---

<sup>81</sup> Later Rabbis interpreted the term skins (עור) as garments of 'light' (אור); see L. Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909), 1:332, 5:104.

(cf. §3.1.12-13), a possible allusion in 4Q418 177 lines 2-3 to Job 26.6 in the phrase עָרוֹם שְׂאוֹל נִגְדָּו וְאֵין כְּסוּת לְאַבְדּוֹן ('naked is Sheol and there is no covering for Abaddon') was suggested. Job 26.6 shares two important lexical correspondences with this fragment: אַבְדּוֹן and כְּסוּת. The phrase 'cover your shame' in line 3 has conceptual links with Job 26.6 by way of Genesis 2-3 in the term עָרוֹם and *vice versa*.<sup>82</sup> Therefore, it may be possible to understand conceptions of shame as related directly to the preceding line 2 and the term 'Abaddon'. 4Q418 177 reads as follows:

שח]ת ואבדון אשר בקצהו לוא ]	(2)
] וכסה חרפתכה vacat ]	(3)
] וקח בינה האזינה ל ]	(4)
] אחת רש ונדיבים ]	(5)
]הלכו כול צ ]	(6)
] אחת דע רזיו כ ]	(7a)
] ה השמר מאן]ר ]	(7)
] אומכה] ]	(8)

2) pi]t and Abaddon that in its border no[  
 3) ]and cover your shame vacat [  
 4) ]and take understanding, give ear to  
 5) ]your are poor but nobles  
 6) ] all walk [  
 7a) ] know (you) his mysteries [  
 7) ] keep very much [  
 8) ] your secrets [

Due to their fragmentary state, the motifs that occur in the surviving lines contribute little to an understanding of the phrase 'cover your shame' in line 3. Line 4 appears to be an exhortation to understand and give ear to the נהיה רז.<sup>83</sup> Line 5 states that the addressees are poor and yet nobles, a statement that was discussed in chapter 4 in relation to 4Q416 2 iii. Line 7a repeats the theme of understanding or knowing mysteries. Line 8 uses the

<sup>82</sup> In theory a form of Hillel's seven *middoth* (*Aboth de R. Nathan* 37), or exegetical rules, may be at play between the Genesis and Job passages. The second *middah* גזירה שוה is an inference or linking of passages based upon either analogous terms or identical roots.

<sup>83</sup> Commands to 'give ear' and 'understand' in *Musar leMevin* almost always occur in relation to the נהיה רז.

phrase ‘your secrets’, assuming אַסְרֵי should be rendered ‘secret’, and are presumably the secrets of the addressee (כֹּהֵ) since the mysteries in line 7a are ‘His mysteries’ (וְ-).

4Q418 177 should be read together with 4Q418 178 where the phrase כֹּסֶה חֲרַפְתָּכָה also occurs. 4Q418 178 contains several terms that associate it with other occurrences of woman in *Musar leMevin*. This small fragment reads as follows:

- |   |                          |       |   |     |
|---|--------------------------|-------|---|-----|
| ] | ב[בִּיתְכָּה תַעֲזֹר     | vacat | ] | (2) |
| ] | תִּמְצֵא בֵּית מְכוּנִים |       |   | (3) |
| ] | כֹּסֶה חֲרַפְתָּכָה      |       |   | (4) |

- 2) [ in] your house she will help vacat [  
 3) [ she will] find a house of habitations/a house established [  
 4) [ co]ver your shame [

The editors suggest that 4Q418 178 be likened to 4Q415 11, a fragment they understand as relating to the maven’s marrying off of his daughter.<sup>84</sup> 4Q415 11 is the largest remaining fragment in *Musar leMevin* that addresses issues relating to woman that has not yet been discussed as directly alluding to Genesis creation traditions. While understanding 4Q418 178 in light of 4Q415 11 may be helpful (see §5.5 below), as the editors suggest, relating this fragment to some of the previously discussed allusions to woman in Genesis 2-3 may also prove insightful. Each of these three lines can be related to the woman in Genesis traditions elsewhere in the document. Line 2 describes the role of the woman as helping in the addressee’s house, and the woman as man’s ‘helper’ is a theme already encountered (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 21; 4Q418a 16b + 17 3). In regard to line 3 the editors comment that the words בֵּית and מְכוּנִים are associated in 4Q415 11 line 12 and are also the object of the verb תִּמְצֵא. They also comment that this ‘phrase in 4Q415 11 12 also stood in a passage about marriage and the bride’s leaving her father’s *potestas* for

<sup>84</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 403.

that of her husband, with whom she will establish a permanent dwelling place'.<sup>85</sup> If this is indeed the sense of 4Q418 178 line 3, the likelihood of this terminology having a basis in Genesis 2.20-25 increases. Also, 4Q415 11 might be discussed as alluding to Genesis 2-3 as well.

Line 4 and the exhortation to 'cover your shame' in this fragment appears to be related to the female. Identifying 'cover your shame' here with the 'shame' in targumic Eden traditions as well as 'cover your shame' in *Jubilees* make the best sense of the phrase in this fragment. In addition to this identification, a better understanding of 'cover your shame' in 4Q418 177 may be gained by: (1) the possible association of the phrase with Job 26.6; and (2) the occurrences of covering one's 'shame' in 4Q416 2 iv lines 5 and 13. However, before attempting to infer a coherent viewpoint from this analysis, the remaining occurrences of the term חרפה need to be considered.

The term חרפה occurs twice in 4Q416 2 ii (see parallels: 4Q417 2 ii + 23; 4Q418 8) which in DJD 34 is a composite text. Compared to other columns of the document 4Q416 2 ii is a relatively complete column. The column consists of twenty-one lines and is preceded by two fragmentary lines of 4Q416 2 i in DJD 34 which set the first lines of 4Q416 2 ii in context. This column may be generally summarised as containing instruction regarding the addressee's relations to a creditor and consequences of debt. Poverty is a particularly recurrent idea throughout this column. In these lines several admonitions are surrounded by terms and phrases that would appear to extend beyond earthly concerns – language and implications of poverty and debt go beyond normal fiscal consequences. A detailed description and analysis of the context where this term

---

<sup>85</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 404.

occurs here is necessary to understand properly the possible senses associated with 'shame':

- (1) פתח רח[מיו למל]א כל מחסורי אוטו ולתת טרף  
 (2) לכל חי ואין ] ואם [יקפוץ ידו] ונאספה רוח כול  
 (3) בשר אל תק[ח תמשול<sup>86</sup> בה ו] בחרפת[ו] חכסה פניכה ובאולחו  
 (4) מאסיר<sup>88</sup> כמה] בהון ישכה<sup>87</sup> הנושה בו מהר ]שלם ואחה תשוה בו כי כים

- (15) [ואחה דמה לו לעבד משכי]ל וגם אל תשפל נפשכה לאשר לא ישוה בכה ואז תהי[ה]  
 (16) [לו לאב ] לאשר אין כוחכה אל תגע פן תכשל וחרפתכה תרבה מאודה  
 (17) [אל תמ]כור נפשכה בהון טוב היוחכה עבד ברוח וחנם תעבוד נוגשיכה ובמחיר  
 (18) אל תמכור כבודכה ואל תערבהו בנחלכה פן יוריש גיחכה אל תשביע לחם  
 (19) ואין כסות אל תשת יין ואין אכל אל תדרוש תענוג ואחה vacat  
 (20) חסר לחם אל תתכבד במחסורכה ואחה רוש פן vacat  
 (21) תבז חייכה וגם אל תקל כלי חיקכה<sup>89</sup> vacat

- (1) He opened His mer[cies... ]  
 to fill all the lacking of His *secrets*<sup>90</sup>  
 to give nourishment (2) to each living being  
 and there is not [ ...  
 if] He closes His hand *then* will be gathered *in* the spirit of all (3) flesh  
 do not [take... ...and you will rule over her]  
 in his shame cover your face  
 and (also) in his folly (4) of *captivity* (?)  
*much* wealth the creditor lent *him*  
 quickly] pay and you will be equal/similar with him  
 because your hidden purse/treasure

- (15) but be to him like an understanding servant  
 and also do not humble/lower your life for one who is not  
 similar/equal to you  
 and then you will be (16) [to him a father... ]  
 for one who does not have your strength  
 do not touch lest you [cause him/her to] stumble  
 and your shame you greatly multiply (17)  
 [do not se]ll your life for wealth  
 it is good to be a servant in the spirit  
 freely serve your task-master  
 for a price (18) do not sell your honour/glory  
 and do not *pledge/mortgage* your inheritance  
 lest it dispossess your body

<sup>86</sup> Harrington and Strugnell suggest this alternate reconstruction to כשיל. If the concept of 'shame' is related to Gen 3 then the notion that one 'has dominion over her' may have more merit. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 46-47, does not reconstruct the word.

<sup>87</sup> Martínez and Tigchelaar omit the word ישכה here, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2, pp. 849-50. Tigchelaar reconstructs: כמה] אם בהון הנושה.

<sup>88</sup> It is difficult to decipher between a *yod* and *waw*, the difference between the two here being 'prisoner' or 'imprisonment'.

<sup>89</sup> Except for underlined terms this text follows that of *DJD XXXIV*, p. 90.

<sup>90</sup> For a thorough treatment of the rare term אוט see *DJD XXXIV* pp. 31-32 (§3.4.a).

do not be full with bread (19)  
*vacat* when there is no covering do not drink wine  
 when there is not food do not seek luxuries  
 and you (20)  
*vacat* lacking bread be not honoured in your lacking  
 and you are poor  
 lest (21) *vacat* you despise/despoil your life  
 and also do not dishonour the 'vessel' of your bosom<sup>91</sup>

Attempts to decipher and explicate this column are hindered not only by physical damage to the various manuscripts but also by the occurrences of obscure terms and phrases as well. While the subject matter is most often related to motifs of wealth and poverty, it is presented in a less than predictable context. The column begins (ll. 1-2) with God's mercy extended to fill the deficiencies of His secrets;<sup>92</sup> God is the one who nourishes all life, and the 'spirit of all flesh' owe its present existence to God's mercy. Line 3 holds a possible allusion to Genesis 3 in the phrase 'you will rule over her'; however, the editors prefer to read כשיל בה ('stumble in it') instead. In the same line the terms '[his] shame' (חרפת[ו]) and 'his folly' (אולתו) occur, but it is difficult to make sense of the pronominal suffixes. The editors suggest translating these lines: '[thou shalt not make the poor] stumble *at* it (sc. At his poverty) and (nor) from him shalt thou in his shameful condition (actions) hide thy face, and at his foolish acts (turn away thy face) from the prisoner' (3-4a).<sup>93</sup> This extensive supplementation to these lines is forced due to an odd assortment of pronominal suffixes, and is a projection of expected traditional

<sup>91</sup> Translation and divisions are mine.

<sup>92</sup> C. Murphy, *Wealth*, pp. 170-71, makes an astute observation on this line, 'note that it is not God's mercies or creation itself which are labeled deficient, but rather God's secrets, which by definition humans lack. If the secrecy rather than the mere privacy of God's "business" is conveyed by the term אש, then the weight of explanation for the present lack lies not in acts of divine deprivation but rather in the nature of divine revelation. Thus the author thus (*sic*) deftly avoids attributing deficiency directly to God'.

<sup>93</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 95. García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate these lines: (2) And there is not [...if] he closes his hand, the spirit of all flesh [will be gather]ed in. (3) Do not ta[ke...]in it. And] at [his] reproach you will cover your face, and at the folly (4) of imprisonment, how [...also with money, and the one who has lent him...quickly] repay, and you will be even with him.

sapiential material within a document characterised by unusual expressions of wisdom themes.<sup>94</sup>

4Q416 2 ii lines 3-4 indicate that issues of poverty and folly are associated with 'shame'. Here, the proper response to another's 'shame' is to cover one's face.<sup>95</sup> An argument might be made for interpreting חרפה here as 'nakedness'. This is a theme that occurs in line 19 of the same column where it states 'when there is no covering (כסות), do not drink wine'. In line 4, one might understand the phrase בחרפת[ו] חכסה פניכה as 'and when he/she is naked, cover your face'. Given the immediately preceding preposition with the feminine pronominal suffix (בה) this might also be a command to not look upon a woman's nakedness (בחרפת[ה]). The editors argue that this would conflict with the pronominal suffix of the following word (ובאולחו). However, the reconstruction and sense of the entire phrase that follows is unclear. Perhaps another reading of the column, in my opinion unlikely, is that the author(s) envisaged a scenario in which lacking/poverty could include the dispossession of a covering.

In line 16, the occurrence of חרפה does not appear to be associated with 'nakedness', which casts doubt on such an interpretation in line 4. The term חרפה in line

---

<sup>94</sup> For instance, in this column the general content is related primarily to the relation between creditor and borrower and the repaying of debts, but how does 'exchanging your holy spirit' (line 6); or pledging one's inheritance resulting in the dispossession of the body (line 18) relate to straightforward issues of debt (especially when 'inheritance' is used metaphorically in the document)? Further, while this column would seemingly address straightforward issues of lacking and hunger it is at the same time related to the obscure term אום (line 1), compare 4Q418 81 lines 15-16 where 'provision' or 'food' are also related to the term אום. C. Murphy, *Wealth*, p. 183, finds a parallel in other sapiential literature (Prov 17.2; 27.18) to the idea that a debtor could become like a first born son to a creditor; however this type of a relationship in my opinion seems very unusual. 4Q418 81 line 5 also contains language of 'first born' in a description of an exalted addressee and may suggest that the debtor/creditor relationship in this column extends beyond typical fiscal concerns.

<sup>95</sup> C. Murphy, *Wealth*, pp. 169-170, assuming the reconstruction and supplementation of the editors, comments that 'as the writer hopes God will not shut his hand, so too the maven is not to hide his face from the poor man or cause him to stumble by aggravating his shame. The preceding lines indicate that hiding one's face or aggravating the poor man's shame are euphemisms for providing food...'. Such an interpretation does not seem as straightforward to me.

16 occurs in the phrase, 'and your shame you greatly multiply'. The increase of the addressee's shame in the latter half of this line is said to result in the case of causing someone else to stumble. The editors suggest a possible reading of פן תכשל as 'lest you cause her to stumble'.<sup>96</sup> They summarily justify this translation as follows:

In sum, one could read, in accord with 4Q416's orthographic practices and the meanings of each *binyān*, either a 3<sup>rd</sup> fem. *Nip'al* or a 2<sup>nd</sup> masc. *Pi'el*; the former, however, is highly unlikely in view of the suffixes and the preceding stich, but a residual ambiguity between תכשל and תכשיל and between תרבה (2<sup>nd</sup> masc. *Hip'il*) and תרבה (*Qal* 3<sup>rd</sup> fem.) is difficult to resolve definitely. A decision between תרבה and תרבה will depend (a) on the form and sense of the idiom חרפה + רבה, (b) on the subject of פן תכשל (as found in the preceding sentence), and (c) on whether there are any parallels, sapiential or other, to the notion of the shame of fighting with women...in that case, one could supply לה as well as לו as the missing retrospective suffixed preposition.<sup>97</sup>

In view of these comments and given a case for reading the term 'shame' in light of a tradition from Genesis 2-3, can sense be made of this line as an exhortation not to touch (חגע; 'smite' ?) a woman and, therefore, multiply one's shame? Furthermore, the first two words of this line have been reconstructed from 4Q418a 19 lines 4 as אז תהיה לו לאב. However, the reading of the *waw* of לו is uncertain,<sup>98</sup> and it is difficult to conceive of the addressee who is exhorted to be a wise servant in line 15, becoming a father to his creditor.

It might make better sense to read the preposition with the feminine suffix לה and this line as 'then you will be to her a father...for the one who does not have your strength do not touch lest you cause her to stumble and your shame you greatly multiply'. Admittedly, the change to the topic of relations between husband and wife would be sudden; nevertheless, a few considerations strengthen this reading. First, line 3 may be reconstructed with the phrase 'and you will rule over her'. Second, line 21 contains the

<sup>96</sup> Recall the possible reconstruction of תכשיל in line 3. Distinguishing between *kof* and *mem* is as difficult at times as between *waw* and *yod*.

<sup>97</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 105.



statement 'do not dishonour the vessel of your bosom'. Third, the suggestion that a woman relates to her husband as a father (4Q415 2 ii) has already been proposed. Fourth, the idea that the female form is weaker, as seen in 1 Peter 3.7, would make sense of the statement 'do not touch one who does not have your strength'. Finally, 4Q416 2 ii-iv contain significant allusions to the woman in Genesis 2-3 and such content would not be out of place in the column or fragment as a whole.

4Q416 2 ii lines 3 and 16 each have an occurrence of the term חרפה. The term is used in a context that is concerned with the paying of debt to one's creditor; however, the subject matter does not always strictly relate to this theme. In the case of line 3, the addressee is said to cover (כסה) his face on account of shame and this shame could be related in the same sentence to folly (אולה). Whose shame it is is not certain; the pronominal suffix could theoretically be reconstructed as the feminine ה-. Unfortunately, the surrounding context is too fragmentary to provide an adequate description of the sense of 'shame' here and admittedly the likelihood that it is related to woman is questionable.

4Q417 2 i (par. 4Q416 2 i) lines 23 and 26 contain the last two occurrences of the term חרפה. As a composite text, it is among the lengthier columns in the document. The column as a whole is concerned with issues of poverty, lacking, borrowing, repaying, sin, salvation, forgiveness and relations with an associate. With regard to the theme of lacking and borrowing, this column is similar to 4Q416 2 ii; however, in 4Q417 2 i the motif of 'sin' is present (lines 4 and 14): ואל תעבור על פשעיכה ('do not disregard your own sins'). In line 7, the author cautions the addressee not to accept help from a 'man of

---

<sup>98</sup> The available photographs appear to preserve either a very sloppy *waw* or perhaps another letter that has faded or been rubbed away.

iniquity' and line 8 provides assurance of punishment upon the wicked/wickedness. In line 11 the addressee is exhorted to comprehend the birth-times of salvation and to know who will inherit 'glory' and 'toil'. Line 15 speaks of the abating of God's anger towards sin and the judgements of God. Line 17 is concerned with the subject of material poverty and lacking, a circumstance that is eased by sharing things in common.

Line 21 addresses the issue of borrowing money from others while in the state of impoverishment. Here, the addressee is urged to allow no sleep for himself until he repays the debt. Lines 22-23 then command that one should not lie to their creditor 'lest you bear guilt' for lying. 4Q417 2 lines 23-26 read as follows:

(23) אל מכוב לו למה חשה עון וגם חרפה לנ[ ] וד לרעהו	(23) Do not lie to him lest you bear guilt and also from shame for/to [ ] to his neighbour
(24) ובמחסורכה יקפץ ידו כחכה] וכמוהו לזה ודע מא]	(24) and in your lacking he closes his hand and your strength [ ] and like him borrow and know
(25) ואם נגע יפושכה ואצ] אל חסתר מליגע <sup>99</sup> בכה]	(25) and if calamity should meet you [ ] do not hide from that which plagues you]
(26) פן יגלה חרפתכה ה] מושל בו ואז]	(26) lest it uncover your shame [ ] rule over it and then]

23) Do not lie to him lest you bear guilt and also from shame for/to [ ] to his neighbour  
 24) and in your lacking he closes his hand and your strength [ ] and like him borrow and know  
 25) and if calamity should meet you [ ] do not hide from that which plagues you]  
 26) lest it uncover your shame [ ] rule over it and then]

A few similarities between lines 23-26 and 4Q416 2 ii occur in relation to the term חרפה. First, the preceding context in lines 2-3 of 4Q416 2 ii warns that God will close his hand on all flesh (ידו ונאספה רוח כול בשר), while here in line 24 a similar idea is expressed that one (lender or perhaps God?) will close his hand. Second, though no context survives in either column, the term כוחכה occurs in both texts in close proximity to 'shame' (4Q416 2 ii line 16 לאשר אין כוחכה אל תגע; 4Q417 2 i line 24). Third, the term נגע also occurs in both columns in close relationship to 'shame'. Fourth, the idea of hiding from or concealing one's face appears in close proximity to 'shame' in both columns (4Q416 2 ii ובאולתו; 4Q417 2 i line 25). Finally, there is the

possibility of reading the phrase מושל בה in 4Q416 2 ii line 3 which could correspond in some way with מושל בו here. These similarities indicate a common use and context of shame between these two columns.

4Q417 2 i line 26 states 'lest it uncover your shame' which likely refers to hiding from that which potentially plagues the addressee. The phrase גילה חרפתה is particularly important in light of the phrase כסה חרפתה. 'Shame' then is something that the addressee is exhorted to cover in one context and something that can be uncovered as a consequence of hiding from מנוגע ('creditor') in another. Unless one were to read line 26 as poverty and debt resulting in being physically uncovered, considered briefly above in relation to 4Q416 2 ii 4, חרפה as 'nudity' does not seem to fit within the context of 4Q417 2 i.<sup>100</sup> Consequentially, if the threat of 'uncovering your shame' is not linked to 'nudity' then 'covering your shame' may well have a different sense as well.

#### 5.4.3) Conclusions Concerning 'Shame' in *Musar leMevin*

The two compelling reasons that 'shame' in *Musar leMevin* may be linked to Genesis 2-3 are the combination of the following factors: (1) in 4Q416 2 iv there are two occurrences of the similar phrases 'wife of your bosom and shame/nudity' within a context of multiple allusions to Genesis 2-3; and (2) in 4Q418 177-178 there is the unique occurrence of the phrase 'cover your shame' which is also attested in the book of *Jubilees*' Eden narrative. A possible allusion to Job 26.6 in fragment 4Q418 177 may serve to orient the phrase 'cover your shame' closer to Genesis 2-3. The same phrase

<sup>99</sup> Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 55, reads here מנושה ('from your lender').

<sup>100</sup> The closest parallel in the DSS to חרפתה is found in CD 5.10-11 regarding laws of incest that apply equally for males and females: ואם תגלה בת האח את ערות אחי אביה ('the daughter of a brother who uncovers the nakedness of the brother of her father').

occurs in 4Q418 178 in a context that refers to a woman. More often than not, references to the female in the document are found in an allusion to Genesis.

Occurrences of the term חרפה elsewhere in *Musar leMevin* are more difficult to evaluate. While one might conjecture that one or two of the other occurrences (4Q416 2 ii line 3; 4Q417 2 i line 26) could connote a sense of 'nudity', this is clearly not possible in other cases. For instance, one cannot 'greatly multiply' their 'nakedness' but can do so to one's 'shame' (4Q416 2 ii line 16). The conclusion, then, is that the term חרפה cannot be taken in *Musar leMevin* to refer exclusively to nudity. Nonetheless, this does not negate the term's use as stemming from conceptions of 'shame' in Genesis 2-3 in some cases.

Another possibility is that the term חרפה could be understood as denoting the consequences of gaining knowledge since the addressee is presently in a state of 'shame'. This state of shame is indicated in almost every reference to the term in the document: (1) in order to 'cover your shame' or 'uncover your shame' the addressee must have 'shame'; and (2) to increase one's 'shame' exceedingly necessitates the present possession of 'shame'. If we recall that the addressee is also counted among the 'people of spirit', which is distinguished from the 'spirit of flesh' and is in possession of special revelation (i.e. רזי נדיה), this state of shame is all the more significant. It coheres with motifs already discussed, such as being poor but nobles, or possessing and seeking knowledge as fatigable beings. The addressee enjoys a unique status among humankind, but it is by no means one of being in a state of perfection.

Finally, the plausible reconstruction of the phrase אל חברנה חרפתכה in 4Q416 2 iv line 10 was previously suggested. The phrase 'do not multiply your shame' here would

be associated with both allusions to Numbers 30 as well as Genesis 2-3. The allusion to Numbers 30 and the husbands authority to nullify his wife's vows is related to dominion over a woman passing from father to husband. The multiplication of 'shame' could be linked to a failure to properly rule over one's wife as set forth in Genesis 2. Further, the occurrence in line 13 of 'wife of your bosom and shame[' as related to the 'shame' associated with the woman's actions in Eden could allow one to read conceptions of vows in this light. If the term 'shame' is at times to be related to 'nudity' then 'wife of your bosom and shame' may also function as an epithet for the female. The female is 'wife of your nakedness' (4Q416 2 iv) and the addressee is to 'cover his nakedness' (4Q418 177-178).

#### 5.5) 4Q415 11 and the Female

4Q415 11 (par. 4Q418 167) lines 4-13 are the only lines in *Musar leMevin* not yet discussed that address issues related to woman. This fragment was mentioned briefly in relation to 4Q418 178 above where it was suggested that the marrying off of the *maven*'s daughter in the column might share the same subject matter with 4Q415 11. While this may be the case, 4Q418 178 likely should be associated with Genesis 2-3 as well. To complete the picture of woman in *Musar leMevin* a presentation of 4Q415 11 is necessary. Further, it may be that a close examination of this column raises issues and observations that relate to allusions to woman in Genesis 2-3 elsewhere in the document. These lines read as follows:

(4) ] ל אשר לוא ויחד ] [ר] וחמה<sup>101</sup> ליפי מראה  
(5) ] [מבינים כי לפי רוחות ית] כנו חכנתה ביחד רוחמה<sup>102</sup>

<sup>101</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, pp. 57-58, the editors consider two serious possibilities for reading חמה here. They choose to reconstruct the word רוחמה but consider the viable option of simply חמה 'the sun'. Unlikely is the option of reading the *het* as a *heh*.

- (6) [כ]ול מומיה ספר לו ובגויתיה חבינה[ו]  
 (7) [ ] ל<sup>104</sup>] [תהיה לו כמכשול לפניו ]  
 (8) [כ]שלו<sup>105</sup>] ונפדו וחרה אפו בס]  
 (9) עם משקל תכינה רוחם בש]  
 (10) ל[ו] א יכשול בה ואם ינגף ב]  
 (11) ואם נפרדה בהריחכה קח מו[לדי  
 (12) התהלכה החבונן מוארה אם ]  
 (13) מכוניה לוא תמצא באלה בחנהה[ ] א

- 4) that are not together[ *their spirit* to the beauty of *her* appearance ]  
 5) understanding that according to spirits they will be est[ablished you established them together by their spirit]  
 6) all her faults tell him and in her bodily defects let [him] understand[  
 7) [ ], she will be an obstacle before him[ stumbling in her iniquity  
 8) they staggered and stumbled and his/His anger burned against[  
 9) with weight their spirit is established ]  
 10) he will not stagger in her and if he stumble[  
 11) and when she is separated *in being pregnant for you* comprehend [the origins of  
 12) walk and understand greatly whether ]  
 13) her foundations you will not find, in these examine her<sup>106</sup>

According to Qimron, as the editors quote in DJD 34, this fragment 'can be interpreted as having one common theme, giving advice to the maven (cf. l. 6) on one subject, namely on his marrying off his daughter'.<sup>107</sup> One point of comparison is found with 1QS 9.12-16, where the *maven* weighs the sons of Zadok 'according to their spirits' as is the case of the woman here, the phrase תכן ביחד רוחם in light of this passage should be understood as referring to a public examination of the would be bride. Another parallel is with 4Q271 3

<sup>102</sup> It is possible to read the word not as רוחמה but as רוחכה both here and in lines 4 and 9, since כ- and מ- are difficult to distinguish, however from the context the better reading would seem to be מ-.

<sup>103</sup> The editors reconstruct נגף at the end of line 6 rather than line 7, this follows Tigchelaar's reconstruction, *To Increase Learning*, pp. 36-37.

<sup>104</sup> The editors reconstruct באופל ('darkness' or 'iniquity') as the first word of this line, Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, p. 37, raises a number of convincing reasons why this reconstruction is problematic.

<sup>105</sup> The editors reconstruct שלח נפדו 'he sends forth His blow' here.

<sup>106</sup> Compare with the translation in DJD XXXIV; p. 59: (4) which are not *together*...And *their spirit* to the beauty of its appearance...(5) understanding ones, For *according to* the spirits will they be me[asured out]...Thou has measured out *their spirit* in *public* (?)...(6) [A]ll her blemishes recount thou to him, And make [him] understand *her bodily defects*. And it will be when he stubs his foot (7) in the da[rk]ness, [The]n she will (not?) be for him like a stumbling block in front of him...[And God] (8) [will] send forth[His blow, and His anger will burn against...(9) with a weight their spirit will be meted out in...(10) he will n[o]t stumble against it. And if he stub against...(11) If she be divided (?) when she is pregnant for thee; Take thou the off[spring of her...(12) her walking consider very diligently. If male or female...(13) her foundations thou shalt not find. By these things test her....

<sup>107</sup> DJD XXXIV, p. 59.

lines 7-9, a fragment of the *Damascus Document* that is inspired by Deuteronomy 27.18, and reads 'if [a man gives his daughter to someone], he should recount all her blemishes to him, lest he bring upon himself judgement'. The details of her blemishes (מומיה) in the following lines of 4Q271 3 are related to sexual promiscuity and a bad reputation before marriage.<sup>108</sup>

Several things may be questioned about Qimron and the editors' interpretation of this column. First, the phrase חכן בייחד רוחם (line 5) may not necessarily refer to a public examination of the would-be bride (i.e. the *maven's* daughter) but rather might read 'you established them together *by* their spirit' or '[their spirit, established them together]'. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, for example, read here 'your [רוחכה] spirit established them together'. The editors note the usage at times of the term בייחד meaning 'in public assembly', but the most common sense of the term is simply 'together'.<sup>109</sup> The term בייחד also occurs in line 4 ('*not* together') preceding a statement about their spirit and the 'beauty of her appearance' (cf. 4Q415 9 line 7 נקבה נזכר את נ). It could be that lines 4-5 are concerned with how a husband and wife are established together, while line 4 addresses issues of physical beauty and appearance of the woman (מראיה) and line 5 underscores that it is according to their spirits they are established together. Line 9 could repeat this idea of the two being established (together?) in the statement 'with weight their spirit is established'. Line 10 speaks of her separation (נפרדה),<sup>110</sup> perhaps from her husband, and is followed by the obscure term בהריתכה. The concepts of being established

<sup>108</sup> The editors comment that 'to read מומיה "her blemishes or faults" does not at first glance improve the parallelism with גייתיה "corpses", but a later meaning of גייתיה "her bodily defects" (recorded by Jastrow), produces an excellent parallel'; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 60.

<sup>109</sup> The word יחד occurs nine times in *Instruction* but never in the sense of the sectarian community.

<sup>110</sup> The editors suggest the word פרח ('bloom' or 'fly') as an alternative reading, however the word does have a *niph'al* form (נפרחה). Tigchelaar states that the *dalet* of the word is 'certain'; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 38.

together and separated could possibly complement one another. The concept of being 'established together' and separated could be related to Genesis 2.20-25 and the concept of two becoming one flesh and being separated from her parents. This is undoubtedly the case in 4Q416 2 iii line 21 where we read בהתחברכה יחד ('you established them together').

The editors question whether the term בהריתכה should go with the preceding or following colon as well as how the term should be rendered. The editors understand the root of the word to be הרה while García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate the term as 'your instruction'.<sup>111</sup> The two possibilities presented by the editors are the substantive options of 'your pregnant wife' or 'your mother' and the infinitive renderings. In translating the term בהריתכה as an infinitive, they comment '(understanding a 3rd fem. sing. subject from נפרדה), could mean either "when she becomes pregnant with thee" (masculine suffix of a direct object) or better "when she becomes pregnant for thee"'.<sup>112</sup> The editors translate the term in the infinitive and reconstruct the following קח מן' as קח מן־לדיה ("when she is pregnant for thee, Take thou the offspring of her"). The reconstruction of מולדי is likely given that the 2<sup>nd</sup> masculine singular imperative קח occurs on three other occasions with the term מולדי in *Musar leMevin*. Less certain is the rendering of the term as 'offspring' with the singular feminine pronominal suffix (ה-). The three other occurrences of this combination of קח מולדי strongly indicate that a better translation is 'comprehend the origins/birth-time of' rather than 'take children', especially in the case of 4Q417 2 i line 11: וקח מולדי ישע ודע מי נוחל כבוד ועמל: (cf. 4Q416 2 iii 20; 4Q418 202 1; 4Q416 2 iii 9). If this rendering is more accurate, a parallel would

<sup>111</sup> *Dead Sea Scroll Study Edition*, vol. 2, p. 847.

<sup>112</sup> *DJD XXXIV*, p. 62.



be found with 4Q415 2 ii line 9 and perhaps 4Q415 2 iii line 20. However, the sense of *בהריתכה* remains relatively obscure.<sup>113</sup>

Several other curious things appear in these lines. First, line 6 exhorts the addressee (the father ?) to make known the woman's faults and bodily defects, presumably to the would-be groom. This does not necessarily take place in a public venue though. If they are established together in the spirit, then her faults and defects could be related to perceived weaknesses of the female body and issues of purity laws that are more exhaustive for females than males (e.g. 4Q266 6 ii; 4Q284; 4Q265; 4Q274; 11Q19 48.14-17). Another possibility is that the idea of her being pregnant for the addressee in line 11 is related to her fault or bodily defect; after all, the 'curse' of woman is that she will bear children with pain (Gen 3.16). The end of line 7 states 'stumbling in her iniquity' and then in line 8 that 'they staggered and stumbled and his/His anger burned against['. Line 8 might be understood as a past tense narrative statement recounting God's anger against Adam and Eve for their disobedience and shameful actions. Line 10 continues with language of staggering and stumbling exhorting that the addressee 'will not stagger in her' and is followed by a broken subjunctive statement that 'if he stumble['. This too could be made sense of within a context of reading women as bearing fault from the first female onward. Finally, the last line (13) of the column informs the addressee that he will not find her 'foundations' (*מכונתה*) and exhorts him to test her. A similar and perhaps antithetical statement is found in 4Q178 line 3 in relation to the woman where it says 'she will find a house established (*מכונים*)'. The term *מכון* could be variously rendered as 'place, habitation, foundation, fixed place, or

<sup>113</sup> The term *הריתכה* occurs several times in *Musar leMevin* and is certainly of significance, recall the phrase *המה כור הריתכה* in 4Q416 2 iii line 17 – perhaps these lines are key to understanding the term in 4Q416 9; 11.

establishment'. It is unlikely that the addressee is unable to locate her literal places of 'residence', more probable is the translation 'foundations'. However, despite being unable to find her foundations, he is to examine her.<sup>114</sup> The occurrence of the female's foundations touches again upon the motif of woman's origin.

### 5.6) 4Q415 9 and the Female

Fragment 4Q415 9, briefly discussed above in reference to male dominion over the female, requires more consideration at this point. Several motifs occur in this damaged column that echo themes from 4Q415 11. This column reads as follows:

- (1) [ ] תתמהמה
- (2) להורות בטובה לכ[ה]
- (3) שומ[ ] תרב[ ]
- (4) אנשים vacat ]
- (5) עם אולת לוא תשוה לריש[כה]<sup>115</sup>
- (6) בה הכינה כיא היאה תכון[ ]
- (7) יחד ממשל זכר את נ[קבה]
- (8) רוחה המשל בה כ[ ]
- (9) ומחסורמה זה מז[ה]
- (10) ולפי זה [ ]
- (11) נקבה וכמוזני[ ]

- 1) [ ] you will (not ?) delay [ ]
- 2) your womb ('wife') to bear for yo[u]
- 3) ... [ ] ...
- 4) men vacat [ ]
- 5) with foolishness do not compare [your] poverty
- 6) on it he has established her, for it is the foundation[ ]
- 7) together, male ruling fe[male]
- 8) her spirit, have dominion over her[ ]
- 9) and in their lacking of the one from the oth[er]
- 10) and according to this [ ]
- 11) female, and as the scales of [ ]

Several similarities between 4Q415 9 and 4Q415 11 can be observed: (1) the occurrence of the term  $\sqrt{\text{הרה}}$  in both fragments (frg. 9 line 2; frg. 11 line 11); (2) the occurrence of

<sup>114</sup> Though *Musar leMevin* is not to be located among 'Essene' and 'sectarian documents' a statement made by Josephus that the Essenes 'put their wives to the test for a period of three years' (*Wars* 2.161) is suggestive of the occurrence 'testing' here.

establishment'. It is unlikely that the addressee is unable to locate her literal places of 'residence', more probable is the translation 'foundations'. However, despite being unable to find her foundations, he is to examine her.<sup>114</sup> The occurrence of the female's foundations touches again upon the motif of woman's origin.

## 5.6) 4Q415 9 and the Female

Fragment 4Q415 9, briefly discussed above in reference to male dominion over the female, requires more consideration at this point. Several motifs occur in this damaged column that echo themes from 4Q415 11. This column reads as follows:

- (1) [ ] תתמהמה
- (2) להורות בטנכה לכ[ה]
- (3) שומ[ ] תרב[ ]
- (4) אנשים vacat ]
- (5) עם אולת לוא תשוה לרש[כה]<sup>115</sup>
- (6) בה הכינה כיא היאה תכונ[ ]
- (7) יחד ממשל זכר את נ[קבה]
- (8) רוחה המשל בה כ[ ]
- (9) ומחסורמה זה מו[נה]
- (10) ולפי זה [ ]
- (11) נקבה וכמוזני[ ]

- 1) [ ] you will (not ?) delay [ ]
- 2) your womb ('wife') to bear for yo[u]
- 3) ... [ ] ...
- 4) men vacat [ ]
- 5) with foolishness do not compare [your] poverty
- 6) on it he has established her, for it is the foundation[ ]
- 7) together, male ruling fe[male]
- 8) her spirit, have dominion over her[ ]
- 9) and in their lacking of the one from the oth[er]
- 10) and according to this [ ]
- 11) female, and as the scales of [ ]

Several similarities between 4Q415 9 and 4Q415 11 can be observed: (1) the occurrence of the term  $\sqrt{\text{הרה}}$  in both fragments (frg. 9 line 2; frg. 11 line 11); (2) the occurrence of

<sup>114</sup> Though *Musar leMevin* is not to be located among 'Essene' and 'sectarian documents' a statement made by Josephus that the Essenes 'put their wives to the test for a period of three years' (*Wars* 2.161) is suggestive of the occurrence 'testing' here.

'foundations' in both (frg. 9 l. 6 חֲכֹן; frg. 11 l. 13 מְכוּנָה); (3) the use of the term יָחִיד in reference to male and female; (4) the use of the term רוּחַ (רוּחָה frg. 9 l. 8; רוחות/רוחמה frg. 11 ll. 4-5 and 9); and (5) the use of language related to measurements in both (frg. 9 l. 11 כְּמֹזֶנִי; frg. 11 l. 1 כְּמֹזֶנִי, line 3 לעֹמֵר וְעֹמֵר לְאִיפָה וְאִיפָה, l. 9 מִשְׁקָל 9).<sup>116</sup>

Here in 4Q415 9 line 9 there is another occurrence of the term מַחְסֹר. On this basis I suggest the possible rendering in line 5 of רִישׁ ('poverty') rather than רֹשׁ.<sup>117</sup> Further, the most extensive allusions to Genesis 2-3 and woman in *Musar leMevin* (4Q416 2 iii-iv) are introduced with comments regarding poverty (2 iii ll. 19-20 (אִשָּׁה לִקְחָתָה בְּרִישָׁכָה; וְאִם רֹשׁ אֶתָּה). The term מַחְסֹר is disproportionately frequent in *Musar leMevin* (approx. 26 occurrences) when compared with its use in other early Jewish documents. It may be questioned whether all occurrences of poverty in this document reflect literal this-worldly poverty or perhaps at times another conception of 'lacking'. Harrington and Strugnell translate line 5 as 'a foolish *people thou shalt* not treat as equal to a leader'. In line 5 the term עִם can be read as the preposition 'with' rather than 'people', the term שוּרָה can be rendered as 'compare', and the palaeographical indistinguishable *waw/yod* of רִישׁ/רוּשׁ allow also for a translation: 'with folly you will not compare [your] poverty'.<sup>118</sup> In addition to this the phrase זֶה מֹזֶנִי following מַחְסֹר in line 9 might fit well with the exhortation to 'not compare' in line 5. Line 6 speaks of laying the foundation of the woman on 'it' (בָּהּ). One might hypothesise that the 'it' of line 6 refers

<sup>115</sup> The editors read 'רוש' ('leader') here; *DJD XXXIV*, p. 54.

<sup>116</sup> Fragment 4Q418 172 shares some similarities with these fragments as well: (1) [...] the mystery of existence[...] (2) [...] the spirit and weighing [...] (3) [...] will be established together [...] (4) [...] with perfection of way until the end [...] (5) [...] according to the multitude of a man's inheritance in truth [...] (6) [...] to you with [her] kids [...] (7) [...] her children, peace in their going forth [...] (8) [separa]te from the beasts of the field and the birds [...].

<sup>117</sup> 4Q415 line 3 has the identical term רִישָׁכָה, which is preceded in line 2 by the phrase אֲבִינָא אֶתָּה וְמַלְכִּים.

back to 'poverty' in line 5 and that the woman's foundations are somehow linked to notions of poverty and lacking. The motif of the dominion of the male over the female in lines 7-8 could be in response to the nature of the female, that is her poverty is greater than his. If this were the case how might one understand the phrase 'her foundations you will not find' in 4Q415 11 line 13?<sup>119</sup>

4Q415 11 portrays a woman as one who should be examined, measured and tested. She is also conceived as one who could potentially cause the addressee to stumble. Assuming that fragments 9 and 11 are in the same vein, based upon similarities observed above, it might also be the case that the woman is conceived of as lacking to a greater degree than the male.<sup>120</sup> In light of these two fragments, the broken phrases *אשת חכמה וחרפ[כה]* and *חכמה כי היא שאר ער[ומה]* in 4Q416 2 iv might be better understood.

### 5.7) Conclusions on the Female in *Musar leMevin*

The portrayal of the female in *Musar leMevin* is largely based upon allusions to Genesis 2-3. It has been suggested that issues of the woman's origin, her 'shame', her analogous association with angels, and her subjugation to her husband all aid in establishing relations between wives and husbands as well as family in the document. Sapiential instruction in the document is framed within a context of cosmological and anthropological concerns, both for the male addressee and the female addressee. Among

<sup>118</sup> In regard to the term *אולה* here, and interesting use of this word occurs in 4Q418 243 line 2 *אולה* [('woman abounding in folly').

<sup>119</sup> 4Q184 or 'Wiles of the Wicked Woman' states in l. 4 regarding the woman *מוסדי חושך ורוב פשעים*, might the exhortation to 'test her' following a statement about her foundations (4Q415 11) have in mind a misogynist notion such as found in 4Q184?

<sup>120</sup> A phrase that occurs in 4Q416 1 6 that has baffled readers of *Musar leMevin* is *לפי מחסור צבאם* ('according to the lacking of their host'). In l. 4 of the same fragment is the phrase *לפי צבאם למשורר במשורה* ('according to their host to rule by dominion'). 4Q416 1 is likely the first column of this manuscript and is characterised by cosmological concerns. If an analogy exists between woman and angel even to a small degree in *Musar leMevin* and woman is conceived of as lacking to a greater extent than man, the phrase 'lacking of their host' could be better understood.

the documents from the Dead Sea Scrolls that address issues pertaining to women<sup>121</sup> *Musar leMevin* is unique in that it contains what might be termed a theoretical discussion of the origin of the female. The behaviour of both wives and husbands are built upon the nature of their creation in the document. However, conceptions of 'shame' cannot simply be associated to an easily identifiable exhortation to avoid nudity. Rather, categories such as 'origins' and 'shame' spill over into broader cosmological concerns and issues for the addressee. The implications of this observation could affect an understanding of other motifs in the document, such as lacking and poverty as well as the *רו נהיה*.

Allusions to Genesis 1-3 provide a foundation for instructing the addressees how to behave. In the case of 4Q416 2 iii it is connected to honouring one's parents. In 4Q416 2 iv and elsewhere, it serves to elaborate upon relations between man and woman. The cosmos has been established in a certain way and more general instruction need not at every point allude directly to creation traditions in Genesis. The *רו נהיה* is conceivably a mystery that stems from notions of cosmology and therefore creation. The universe, its origins and function, serve as a basis for which more general instruction might be constructed. The *רו נהיה* could point back to everything that God has established and alluding to Genesis 2-3 for female and male relations and the origin of woman is indicative of the assumption that the *רו נהיה* is the 'mystery of creation/existence'. Issues regarding the female open a window to larger concerns within the document. The instruction of the author(s) is not negotiable; God has set up the universe in a specific way and proper behaviour must follow this pattern. In the case of the woman, she is to act according to her creation and origins and likewise the man. In seeking the mystery of

<sup>121</sup> See for example CD 4.20-21; 5.9-11; 7.6-7, 11.1-2; 4Q271 3.7-15; 1QM 8.3-ff.; 1Q28<sup>a</sup>; 11Q19 57.17-19; 4Q159 2-4; 4QMMT 80-82; 4Q513 2 ii; 4Q251 7; 4Q284 and 4Q502.

existence, the truth and wisdom surrounding creation, one might manifest on earth the proper behaviour revealed therein. The multiple allusions to Genesis in *Musar leMevin* provide valuable insight into the רז נהיה and reveal that cosmology and creation are part of the very fabric of wisdom in the document.<sup>122</sup>

Sapiential instruction in *Musar leMevin* is concerned with worldly wisdom based upon a heavenly order of the cosmos. This wisdom, more specifically, is often derived from reflections on creation traditions. The addressees are repeatedly exhorted to seek the רז נהיה, which is a meditation on creation. How the addressees conceive of their relationship with angels, for instance, stems from the role angelic beings played in human creation. Likewise, women are to reflect on their own creation based upon the role man played in their creation. However, women are also participants in the act of creation, which, it may be argued, is analogous to angelic participation in the creation of humankind. The origin of women is used to exhort the male addressee on how he is to relate to his wife as well.

As we have seen, *Musar leMevin* has in mind addressees who are burdened with difficult issues of usury. The insistence on the poverty of the addressees, though often this-worldly, may be seen against a heavenly reality. That is, poverty is multivalent. The poverty of the addressees is presupposed first on the basis of a more general 'metaphysical' lacking, in terms of wisdom, and second on the basis of economic

---

<sup>122</sup> 4QMysteries (4Q299-301) shares several similarities with *Musar leMevin*, perhaps the most notable are the phrases רז נהיה and בית מולדים as well as an emphasis on creation. 4Q299 1 lines 03-04 read '...but they did not know the רז נהיה and the former things they did not consider, nor did they know what will befall them and they did not save their lives from [the knowledge of the] רז נהיה.' Several lines later the phrase בית מולדים occurs in a broken context (line 4). In another fragment of 4QMysteries (4Q299 3a ii-b lines 7-16) the creative work of God is emphasised and mysteries and the 'times of birth' are again mentioned. In 4Q300 1a lines 02-03 the author accuses the addressee 'you did not look at the eternal secrets (ברזי ער) nor did you contemplate with understanding... you did not look at the root of wisdom (בשורש חוכמה)...' This 'root of wisdom' is the basis of instruction and likely directly linked to creation.

hardship. Exhortations to pursue the mystery of existence is foundational for overcoming this lacking. One comes closer to understanding the mystery when one comprehends how created beings relate one to the other. Even in terms of agricultural language and instruction in the document, it may be hypothesised that Eden accounts are intertwined with practical advice to the farmer.

### **5.8 Observations on the New Testament**

Observations and conclusions on the female in *Musar leMevin* might further elucidate three New Testament passages referred to briefly above (1 Tim 2; Eph 5; 1 Cor 11). On the one hand, the significance of *Musar leMevin* for these passages may be as simple as providing an earlier exegetical tradition that these later New Testament authors preserve. A particular exegesis of the origin of the female in the document appears to serve as a foundation for behaviour and familial codes in the document. Likewise, on a few occasions in the New Testament a similar tradition based upon Genesis 2 is the basis for instructing males and females. On the other hand, conceptions of woman based upon Genesis 2-3 in *Musar leMevin* might serve to suggest an exegetical tradition that provides details that clarify or enhance analogies, metaphors or illustrations at play in the New Testament.

It lies beyond the scope of the present chapter to address these New Testament passages thoroughly. The following is a brief expansion upon similar and dissimilar motifs that occur in the New Testament passages and *Musar leMevin*.

*1 Timothy 2.11-15.* A comparison between 1 Timothy 2 and *Musar leMevin* reveals that their exegesis of Genesis 2 is more dissimilar than similar in regard to details. However, a few significant general similarities can be observed. First, both refer to the



origin and sequence of the genders to instruct on proper relations between male and female (2.13 'Adam was formed first and then Eve'). Second, similar in both is the authority of man over woman based upon Genesis 2 (1 Tim 2.12; 4Q415 9 7-8; 4Q418a 18 4). Third, both attribute a certain fault to the woman for her role in 'shame' ('wife of your bosom and shame' 4Q416 2 iv 13) or in the case of 1 Timothy 'transgression' (2.14): 'Adam was not deceived but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor' (δὲ γυνὴ ἑξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν). Neither 1 Timothy nor *Musar leMevin* present an entirely positive view of the female in their use of Genesis 2. 1 Timothy 2.15 describes the salvation, due to her deception and transgression, of female as coming from child bearing, faith, love, holiness and modesty. However, *Musar leMevin* does not conceive of 'salvation', but rather of humanity as divided already into two groups ('people of spirit' and 'spirit of flesh'). *Musar leMevin*, as discussed previously, exhorts the addressee not to 'despise [אֵל תִּבְחֹן] the wife of your bosom'. A statement in itself that reflects a type of animosity towards woman and further suggests the woman's part in 'transgression'. It might be suggested that for the male addressee of *Musar leMevin*, exhortations occur to pursue understanding while for the female, to relate to men in the proper fashion (4Q415 2 ii).

In regard to dissimilarities between 1 Timothy 2 and *Musar leMevin*, 1 Timothy's term 'transgression' in relation to the woman's deception in Genesis 2 and subsequent 'fall' of humanity is a wholly inadequate and likely inappropriate term to use related to *Musar leMevin*. There is no reason to assume that *Musar leMevin* conceives of the eating from the tree of knowledge as the origin of evil. On the contrary, there are good reasons to argue for an entirely positive conception of eating from the tree of knowledge as is the

case in other documents in early Jewish traditions (e.g. 4Q423 and the continual exhortation to seek understanding). Conversely, 1 Timothy 2.14 most probably envisages a 'fall' in the use of the terms 'deception' and 'transgression'. Therefore, while a similarity exists between the two in attributing something negative to woman based upon a Genesis tradition, whether 'shame' or transgression, in the case of *Musar leMevin* it is more vague and almost certainly different than what is found in 1 Timothy 2.14.

*Ephesians 5.21-33*. The contribution of *Musar leMevin* to the background of Ephesians 5.21-33 is two fold: (1) the extent to which a form critical analysis of household codes in Greco-Roman literature should be seen as influencing verses 21-33 may be reconsidered; and (2) the ongoing debate on how to interpret the metaphor between Adam and Eve and Christ and church in these verses may be elucidated by the observations made above. Though much could be said in relation to both of these points, the comments below only summarise possible contributions.

Martin Dibelius first suggested that Greco-Roman *Haustafeln* were adopted by New Testament authors.<sup>123</sup> Particularly, the writings of Aristotle, Plutarch and Seneca preserve a form of household codes that provide conventional advice to heads of households (husbands and masters). New Testament authors, unlike Greco-Roman authors, adapt this form to include subordinates (e.g. wives, children and slaves) in their addresses. Since Dibelius, others have taken up this theory and argued that New Testament household codes have their origin, with various nuances, in Greco-Roman sources.<sup>124</sup> *Musar leMevin* provides new evidence for a background to the 'household

---

<sup>123</sup> M. Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon, 3<sup>rd</sup> revised edition*, (ed.), H. Greeven (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953).

<sup>124</sup> J. A. D. Weima, 'What does Aristotle have to do with Paul? An Evaluation of Rhetorical Criticism,' in *BBR* 5 (1995): 177-198; M. Gielen, *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelnethik* (BBB 75;

code' in Ephesians 5. In both Ephesians and *Musar leMevin* is preserved an exegetical tradition that reflects upon creation as a source for instructing various subordinates how to conduct themselves. *Musar leMevin* does not necessarily reflect a dependence upon the Greco-Roman *Haustafel* form for instructing husbands and wives. Ephesians 5, though sharing similarities with the *Haustafel* form, has far more in common with *Musar leMevin* and it is reasonable to speculate that Paul was familiar with a Jewish tradition such as we find here. Therefore, in the case of Ephesians, based upon instruction found in *Musar leMevin*, an alternative background in early Jewish literature may be proposed.

Second, the language about the body in Ephesians 5.21-33 draws on an analogy based directly upon notions of the first man Adam and the female Eve. This relationship illuminates the relationship between Christ and the church based upon Genesis 2.24-31. Interpretations of this metaphor have been the subject of much scholarly discussion.<sup>125</sup> If Paul is drawing upon a tradition similar to *Musar leMevin* the implications for interpreting Ephesians 5.21-33 would be significant. For instance, one heavily contested issue is the rendering of the term κεφαλή in 5.23 as either 'source' or 'authority over'.<sup>126</sup> If Ephesians 5 is located in a history of traditions that emphasises the origin of the female from the male at creation, and subsequently instructs husbands and wives on this basis,

---

Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1990); D. Balch, *Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981); J. E. Crouch, *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

<sup>125</sup> See for example the works of G. W. Dawes, *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33* (BIS 30; Leiden: Brill, 1998); K. H. Fleckenstein, *Ordnet euch einander unter in der Furcht Christi: Die Eheperikope in Eph. 5,21-33: Geschichte der Interpretation, Analyse und Aktualisierung des Textes* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1994); S. F. Militic, *'One Flesh': Eph 5.22-24, 5.31: Marriage and the New Creation* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1988); J. P. Sampley, *"And the Two Will Become One Flesh": A Study in Eph 5.21-33* (SNTSMS 16; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).

<sup>126</sup> For example see: R. S. Cervin, 'Does κεφαλή Mean "Source" or Authority Over' in Greek Literature,' in *TJ* (1989): 85-112; C. C. Kroeger, 'The Classical Concept of *Head* as "Source",' in G. G. Hull (ed.), *Equal to Serve* (London: Scripture Union, 1987) pp. 267-83; W. Grudem, 'Does κεφαλή ("Head") Mean

then reading the term 'head' as 'source' would likely be the sense here. That is, since man is the *source* of woman, so also Christ is the *source* of the church. While the debate has centred exclusively upon issues of language, *Musar leMevin* provides a tradition history that Ephesians 5.23 may be viewed against.

Another contribution of *Musar leMevin* to Ephesians 5.21-33 may be for understanding the great μυστήριον in verse 32.<sup>127</sup> In verse 28 husbands are exhorted to love their wives as 'their own bodies' and in verse 29 'for no one ever hated his own flesh'. Then in verse 30 the analogy between the source of Eve coming from Adam is likened to the church coming from Christ: 'for we [the church] are part of his body [Christ], part of his flesh and bone'. In verse 31 is a direct quotation of Genesis 2.25. The 'great mystery' of this is debatable. However, on the basis of *Musar leMevin* we may reflect on creation and origins both for the female and male in relation to the רז נהיה ('mystery of existence'). The division of male and female as well as the union between them (i.e. the female being separated for man and then reunited) based upon Genesis 2 is, in and of itself, a mystery in *Musar leMevin*. The use of this mystery in an analogy with Christ and the church may deepen the sense of the mystery but is not necessarily the mystery itself. The term 'mystery' occurs in Ephesians 3.9 and 6.19 as well. While 6.19 may be of little help in deciphering the intent of Paul in 5.32; 3.9 is: 'to

---

"Source" or "Authority Over" in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2336 Examples,' in *TJ* (1985): 38-59; S. Badale, 'The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles,' in *JTS* (1954): 211-15.

<sup>127</sup> Too many works have been written on Eph. 5.32 to mention here. Commentators have variously looked at Eph. 3.9 and 6.19 for the background of 5.32 as well as the in Qumran literature (cf. 1QpH 7.1-5). See for example: M. N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT2 36; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Paul Siebeck, 1990) p. 204; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Colossians, to Philemon and the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984) pp. 394-95; C. C. Caragounis, *The Ephesian 'Mysterion': Meaning and Content* (CBNTS 8; Upsala: CWK Gleerup, 1977); M. Barth, *Ephesians* (New York: Doubleday, 1974) p. 643; J. Coppens, "'Mystery" in the Theology of St. Paul and its Parallels at Qumran', in J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul at Qumran: Studies in New Testament*

make everyone see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things’.

*1 Corinthians 11.2-16.* The contributions of reading 1 Corinthians 11.2-16 in light of *Musar leMevin* are: (1) the background of the metaphor of male and female creation as derived from Genesis may be more broadly elucidated;<sup>128</sup> (2) reading the term ‘head’ in 11.3-4 may be better understood as ‘source of’;<sup>129</sup> (3) subsequently, the sense of the term ἐξουσία may be understood as ‘authority over’; (4) the term ‘shame’ may be considered in light of ‘shame’ in *Musar leMevin*; and (5) the phrase ‘on account of the angels’ may be read in light of angelology and creation in the document.<sup>130</sup> *Musar leMevin* shares a number of thematic overlaps with 1 Corinthians 11.2-16 and, like Ephesians 5, may hold keys to a fresh interpretation of these verses.

---

*Exegesis* (London: Chapman, 1968) p. 146; J. Cambier, ‘Le grand mystère concernant le Christ et son Eglise: Ephesians 5,22-33,’ in *Biblica* 47 (1966): 43-90.

<sup>128</sup> The overwhelming number of works that attempt to explicate these verses are too many to list here. For a selection of works, outside of commentaries, that deal specifically with 1 Cor. 11.2-16 see: J. M. Gundry-Volf, ‘Gender and Creation in 1 Cor. 11:2-16: A Study in Paul’s Theological Method,’ in J. Adna, S. J. Hafemann and O. Hofius (eds.), *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche : Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997) pp. 151-71; D. B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995) pp. 229-49; L. A. Jervis, “‘But I Want You to Know...’: Paul’s Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshippers (1 Cor. 11:2-16),’ in *JBL* 112 (1993): 231-46; G. P. Carrington, ‘The “Headless Woman”: Paul and the Language of the Body in 1 Cor. 11:2-16,’ in *PRS* 18 (1991): 223-31; J. Murphy O’Connor, ‘Sex and Logic in 1 Cor. 11:2-16,’ in *CBQ* 42 (1980): 482-500; W. O. Walker, ‘1 Cor. 11:2-16 and Paul’s Views Regarding Women,’ in *JBL* 94 (1975): 94-110; L. Cope, ‘1 Cor. 11:2-16: One Step Farther,’ in *JBL* 97 (1978): 435-36; B. K. Waltke, ‘1 Cor. 11:2-16: An Interpretation,’ in *BSac* 135 (1978): 46-57; A. Feuillet, ‘L’Homme “gloire de Dieu” et la femme “gloire de l’homme” (1 Cor. XI:7b),’ in *RB* 81 (1974): 161-82; W. J. Martin, ‘1 Cor. 11:2-16: An Interpretation,’ in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (eds.), *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Presented to F. F. Bruce* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970) pp. 231-41.

<sup>129</sup> See: A. C. Perriman, ‘The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of in 1 Cor. 11:3,’ in *JTS* 45 (1994): 602-22; J. A. Fitzmyer, ‘Another Look at κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3,’ in *NTS* 35 (1989): 503-11; P. S. Fiddes, “‘Woman’s Head is Man”: A Doctrinal Reflection upon a Pauline Text,’ in *Baptist Quarterly* 31 (1986): 370-83.

<sup>130</sup> See: R. S. Carlè, *Because of the Angels: Unveiling 1 Cor. 11:2-16* (Paraparaumu Beach: Emmaus, 1998); J. A. Fitzmyer, ‘A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. 11:10,’ in *NTS* 4 (1957-58): 48-58. Fitzmyer’s analysis of Qumran Angelology does not take into account the angelology of *Musar leMevin*. I suggest that the angelology of this document serves as a better backdrop against which to view the angelic reference in 1 Cor 11.

1 Corinthians 11 is more explicit than *Musar leMevin*, 1 Timothy or Ephesians in detailing the origins of woman in contrast to the current order of creation. Again, this theme is used to exhort men and women how to behave, here it is in regard to their manner of appearance when praying. The relations between man and woman based upon Genesis 2.23-25 (and 1.26-27), like Ephesians 5, hold an analogy with Christ. However, in 1 Corinthians 11 it is a different analogy: Christ is the head of man in the same way man is the head of woman (in contrast to the metaphor in Eph. that Christ = man and church = woman). The analogy then is that just as woman comes from man, so man comes from Christ, Christ from God (vs. 3) and everything ultimately from God (vs. 12). In *Musar leMevin* the origin of a humanity in the image and likeness of God and angels is used to structure anthropological and cosmological conceptions (4Q417 1 i 15-18). Likewise, the origin of woman plays a significant role in defining her present relationship to man.

Another observation might be made between two linked motifs that occur in both 1 Corinthians 11 and *Musar leMevin*. 4Q416 2 iv line 13 reads 'wife of your bosom and shame', which I suggest is related to Genesis 2.22-23 and the origin of woman. The term 'shame' is related to woman here and in light of the occurrences of 'cover your shame' in 4Q418 177-178, I argue that 'covering your shame' is also linked to woman or one's wife. Therefore, the origin of woman and 'covering' merge; however, due to the fragmentary state of *Musar leMevin* it is nearly impossible to determine precisely how.

Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians 11 assumes the audience possesses knowledge of an interpretative tradition, one which is not entirely known to the modern reader. While *Musar leMevin* cannot solve this puzzle it might add one piece; 1 Corinthian 11,

like *Musar leMevin*, addresses the origin of woman and exhorts woman (shame?) to be covered. Perhaps the interrelated motifs of angels, man and woman in *Musar leMevin* are distantly related to the tradition Paul assumes of his readership.

While much more may be said about the relationship between these New Testament passages and *Musar leMevin*, it is beyond the scope of this thesis to comprehensively address the overwhelming literature on the subject. However, this brief section reveals one significant point: *exegetical traditions on Genesis 1-3 were widespread in the 1<sup>st</sup> centuries BCE and CE and were a source for instructing various communities on how males and females should relate to one another as well as to God and angelic beings*. Most persistent in the literature reviewed is the use of Genesis 2.25 as a source of reflection on the female. The origin of the female, within the context of these allusions, was subsequently used in Ephesians and Corinthians in a metaphor with Christ and the church, whereas in *Musar leMevin* the female may have been understood at times in an analogous relationship with angelic beings.

## 6) Conclusions

From the outset the intent of this thesis has been to identify and explicate traditions in *Musar leMevin* that are derived from Genesis 1-3. Chapter one is a review of scholarship on the document and is dedicated to introducing several of the primary issues left unresolved by previous publications. Chapter two focuses on constructing a methodology for identifying and adjudicating non-explicit occurrences of earlier literary traditions in later texts. Based upon this methodology, chapter three identifies nearly twenty allusions in *Musar leMevin* to Genesis creation traditions. Chapters four and five thematically explore these allusions in relation to the themes of angelology, anthropology and cosmology. In doing so, we have not only found it possible to determine the theological importance of creation traditions in the document, but also to view from this perspective some of the unresolved issues raised in chapter one.

The analysis of this study has led to several theological contributions. A sustained examination of creation traditions in *Musar leMevin* offers several important insights regarding the angelology in the document. The participation of angelic beings in the creation of humanity in 4Q417 1 i lines 15-18, originally suggested by Collins, appears to be a significant motif. It not only occurs in 4Q417 1 i but also in 4Q416 2 iii lines 15-18. The addressees are expected to conceive of their relationship with angels in several ways: (1) they are to understand themselves as bearing a spiritual likeness with the angels, and they are to act in accordance with it; (2) they venerate the angels as co-creators with God and as paradigmatic figures who seek and gain knowledge untiringly; (3) they have a share in an inheritance similar to that of the angels, an inheritance which



is both present and future (4Q416 2 iii); and (4) it is possible they conceive of the relationship between husband and wife as analogous to God and angels.

*Musar leMevin* is unique in its presentation of angelology. The document may be viewed as one of the most substantial works from Early Judaism that displays a venerative attitude towards angelic beings (esp. 4Q418 81). The addressees conceive of themselves as presently relating to the angels in the heavenly realm and yet not sharing in their perfect state. The particular character of angel veneration in the document is found in providing reasons for this attitude: (1) angelic beings participated in creation; and (2) angelic beings presently serve as supreme examples of those who pursue understanding. Whereas a document such as *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* envisages human and angelic worshipers coming together in the act of Sabbath praise, *Musar leMevin* conceives of the angels somewhat more distantly. While the addressees relate to angelic beings on one level, they are never seen as participating in a human event (e.g. as co-worshippers or as participants in a final eschatological battle [*Sefer haMilhamah*]).

*Musar leMevin* also applies unique language for angels. Both the terms אַרְנַיִם and נְרִיָּם have been seen to be used as terms for angels. In the case of the term אַרְנַיִם, *Musar leMevin* offers new evidence against which the Greek term κύριαι in early Judaism and nascent Christianity may be read (e.g. 1 Cor. 8.5). The identification of this term as an epithet for angels, suggested briefly in chapter four, is cause for reconsidering elements of M. Werner's hypothesis on the *Kyriostitel*.<sup>1</sup>

*Musar leMevin*'s witness to a tradition where members of a community venerated angelic beings is significant for ongoing discussions in early Angel Christology.

---

<sup>1</sup> See B. G. Wold, 'Reconsidering an Aspect of *Kyriostitel* in Light of Sapiential Fragment 4Q416 2 iii,' in *ZNW* (forthcoming).

Fletcher-Louis' theory that *Musar leMevin* is a witness to a larger phenomenon of 'angelmorphism' seems to be unsustainable. Rather, the document attests a view of angels which aligns itself far better with Stuckenbruck's thesis of angel veneration as the background for early Angel Christology. While it is beyond the scope of this work to relate angelology to the larger discussion of Angel Christology, there can be little doubt of its import for research taking place in this field.

Another important theological contribution of this thesis concerns the understanding of the female. We have seen that the relation between husband and wife and between daughter, father and mother are grounded in the text's allusions to creation. It may even be speculated that the female's derivation from the male in *Musar leMevin* has an analogy with angelic beings and God. The derivative nature of the female from the male reflects the created order itself, which is encapsulated by the expression רז נהיה. It may be that the רז נהיה serves as a replacement for traditional 'wisdom' and this-worldly sapiential instruction can itself be derived from this mystery.

Allusions to Genesis 2.25 as the foundation for instructing wives and husbands in *Musar leMevin* may be seen as a background for Ephesians 5 and 1 Corinthians 11. Briefly discussed in chapter five, the use of a metaphor derived from the creation of the female in Genesis 2 in these New Testament passages has long been the focus of debate. Issues of contention, particularly interpreting the term 'head' in these chapters, may be elucidated by the use of Genesis 2 in *Musar leMevin*.

Equally as important as creation allusions for establishing instruction for males and females in *Musar leMevin* is the address to the female in 4Q415 2 ii. It may be questioned whether this address presupposes literacy on the part of females in the

community. If so, the contribution of this column is not only theological, but historical as well. The Babatha Archive found in Nahal Hever (Cave of Letters) in 1961 is not necessarily indicative of literacy on the part of Babatha.<sup>2</sup> If we are to understand that 4Q415 2 ii was read by female members of a religious community then it is an exceptional discovery for studies of females in late antiquity. Another possible option is that the female address here was intended for a woman but was to be transmitted through the male addressee.

The distribution of allusions to Genesis creation traditions in *Musar leMevin* is relatively widespread. Not only are allusions broadly distributed, but they are not limited in use to one concern. 4Q416 1, very likely the opening column of the document, uses creation to frame cosmology. 4Q417 1 i, which should be located within the first few columns of the document, alludes to creation for issues pertaining to the female (ll. 8-9) and for angelic participation in the creation of humanity (ll. 15-18). 4Q416 2 ii-iv, columns which are to be located at or near the beginning columns of the document, hold numerous allusions to creation traditions as well. 4Q423 fragments (esp. 1, 2 i and 5), likely to be located in the last columns of the document, are concerned with the Garden of Eden as well as agricultural motifs. Many of the fragments proposed to hold allusions to Genesis 1-3 have not been located. It may be that remaining allusions were distributed from beginning to end throughout *Musar leMevin*, but unfortunately there is simply not enough material to determine if this was the case. Furthermore, throughout the document

---

<sup>2</sup> An archaeological expedition led by Yigael Yadin in March of 1961 in Nahal Hever discovered a cache of letters among which were 6 legal documents that belonged to a woman named Babatha. Precious household objects and keys were hidden with the documents when she fled from the Romans during the Bar Kokhba Revolt sometime between 132-134 CE. See Y. Yadin, 'Expedition D – The Cave of Letters,' in *IEJ* 12 (1962): 227-57.

there are multiple addressees (fem. sing; masc. sing.; and plural) and yet creation motifs appear in each context.

Although scholars have been generally aware of the significance of Genesis creation traditions in *Musar leMevin*, until now no sustained attention has been given to the topic. Nor, for that matter, has any work focused exclusively on angelology or anthropology in the document. Sustained attention yields important results. Creation traditions are operative in a number of passages and it appears to be an underlying thread in the document and not just a topic that arises in one specific context in connection to a given theme.

This study, however, is only one endeavour to understand biblical traditions in *Musar leMevin*. Before one can assert any predominance of creation traditions in *Musar leMevin*, it would be further necessary to explore biblical traditions throughout the document and not just traditions stemming from Genesis 1-3. Throughout this study, caution has been taken not to force a creation grid on the document. A proper analysis would require documenting and discussing the occurrence of all biblical traditions in *Musar leMevin*, and this thesis is just one step in this larger task. Therefore, creation provides at least one important framework within which the coherence of the document may be ascertained.

There are a large number of documents that allude to or quote creation traditions but are not founded upon creation traditions (e.g. *Hodayot*, 1QS, or *Sirach*). We see in *Musar leMevin* that creation is a significant tradition that surfaces repeatedly. It should be delineated, then, whether creation traditions should be seen as: (1) foundational for the document; or (2) merely frequent. In order to determine which of these two options best

describes the role of creation in *Musar leMevin*, it is important to revisit the רז נהיה and the significance of creation for this motif in the document.

Unlike traditional sapiential literature such as Proverbs (or Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, 4Q185), where an exalted view of wisdom occurs, *Musar leMevin* does not reflect such a view. Rather, the רז נהיה functions as a substitute for exalted wisdom and sapiential instruction in the document falls under its umbrella. No other topic in *Musar leMevin* is as significant as the רז נהיה. Therefore, if this mystery is to be identified with creation, then allusions to Genesis 1-3 are to be seen as foundational.

Much of the research on *Musar leMevin* has concentrated on a source critical rather than on a narrative approach. Not surprisingly, therefore, studies on the רז נהיה have not paid much attention to the larger networks of biblical traditions that might go with it. A narrative approach to *Musar leMevin*, such has been attempted in parts of chapters four and five above, explores the document on a level that relates disparate parts to one another. The רז נהיה, when interpreted in relation to the multiple allusions to creation in the document, may be understood as referring to the 'mystery of creation'. The רז נהיה is preserved approximately 28 times in *Musar leMevin*. More often than not, the phrase occurs in fragments that are too small or damaged to determine the context of the phrase (e.g. 4Q415 6 4; 24 1; 4Q416 17 3; 4Q418 17 4; 77 2, 4; 190 2; 219 2).<sup>3</sup> However, and importantly: *the vast majority of the time, the phrase רז נהיה occurs in those fragments which contain allusions to creation* (4Q416 2 ii 9; 2 iii 9, 14, 18, 21; 4Q417 1 i 2, 8, 13, 18, 21, 25; 4Q418 177 7). Such occurrences of the רז נהיה in creation contexts, I suggest, presuppose a link between this mystery and creation.

In chapter one (§1.3.4) various opinions on the interpretation of the *רז נהיה* were reviewed. In my opinion, it is unlikely that this mystery refers to an actual composition (e.g. Hagi or Hagu). Therefore, three interpretative options remain: (1) it is an eschatological mystery; (2) it is a mystery of creation; or (3) it is a mystery that encompasses everything from creation to judgement. If the mystery is to be associated with a meditation on the nature of creation, the relevance of this mystery for judgement would not be negated. Instruction in the document, and exhortations to pursue understanding by means of the mystery, is understood as consonant with the created order. The mystery itself might be discerned, in part, behind a number of distinctions drawn at the time of creation: (1) heavens, earth and seasons; (2) the 'spiritual people' and the 'spirit of flesh'; (3) humanity and angelic beings; and (4) male and female. This understanding derives from creation; it is the basis for sapiential teachings in the present, and transgression against this order will lead (or has led to) condemnation.

*Musar leMevin* repeatedly instructs the addressees to pursue the *רז נהיה*. As this thesis has attempted to demonstrate, wisdom instruction in the document is often found within the context of allusions to Genesis 1-3. Further prominent are the interrelated motifs of usury, poverty and lacking. While the notion of 'lacking' in the document may be seen to be this-worldly on many occasions, it may at times become a multivalent concept in *Musar leMevin* (in contrast to its more straightforward meaning in other sapiential compositions). The twin emphases of the document on the *רז נהיה* and instruction conceptually based on creation traditions – especially those instructions which are concerned with how the addressees should understand themselves – suggest that the

---

<sup>3</sup> An occurrence of the *רז נהיה* in a fragment that may questionably hold an allusion to creation is 4Q418 123 i-ii 2-4: for the coming forth of times and the going out of times [ ] all that has been, which was and will be

notion of 'lacking' may have an anthropological aspect. The motif of 'lacking' in *Musar leMevin* is one example of how the mystery of creation, as demonstrated in relation to angels and the female, combines apocalyptic elements with sapiential instruction. The רז נהיה, then, is not so much concealed from the addressees as it is revealed within the very instructions of the document.

---

[ ] its seasons which he revealed to the ear of the understanding ones in the רז נהיה.

## Selected Bibliography

### 1) Primary Sources and Reference Works

- Alexander, P., and Vermes, G., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXVI: Qumran Cave 4. XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
- Allegro, J. M., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert V: Qumran Cave 4. I (4Q158-4Q186)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969).
- Baillet, M., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert VII: Qumran grotte 4. III (4Q482-4Q520)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982).
- Barthelémy, D., and Milik, J. T., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert I: Qumran Cave 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955).
- Baumgarten, J. M., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert 18: Qumran Cave 4: The Damascus Document* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996).
- Beyer, K., *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).
- Black, M., *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970).
- , *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP 7; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985).
- Charles, R. H. (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913).
- Charlesworth, J. H., et al. (ed.), *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991).
- , *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1983-1985).
- Colson, F. H. and Whitaker, G. H., *Philo*, 10 vols. (LCL ; London: Heinemann, 1929-1943).
- Eisenman, R. H. and Robinson, J. M. (eds.), *Fascimile Edition*, 2 vols. (Washington, D. C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991).
- Elgvin, T., Kister, M, Lim, T., Nitzan, B., Pfann, S, Qimron, E., Schiffman, L. H., Steudel, A., *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XX: Qumran Cave 4. XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)



- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W. *et al.* (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984).
- Eshel, H., Eshel, E., Newsom, C., Nitzan, B., Schuller, E. and Yardeni, A. (eds.), *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).
- Freedman, D. N. (gen. ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, 6 vols. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1992).
- Freedman, H. and Simon, M. (trs. eds.), *The Midrash Rabah* (New York: Soncino, 1983).
- García Martínez, F., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, English translation by W. G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- García Martínez, F., Tigchelaar, E. J. C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998).
- Gaster, T. H., *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976).
- Ginzberg, L., *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909).
- Grossfeld, B., *The Targum Onqelos to Genesis* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988).
- Harrington, D. J., Strugnell, J., and T. Elgvin, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXXIV: Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Text, Part 2 4QInstruction (Mūsār l' Mēvîn): 4Q415ff.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).
- Hatch, E. and Redpath, H. A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament, Including the Apocryphal Books* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998).
- Jastrow, M., *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and Midrashic Literature* (Brooklyn: P. Shalom, 1967).
- Knibb, M. A., *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978).
- Licht, J., סרך הסרכים (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965).
- Lohse, E., *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1971).
- Luttikhuisen, G. P. (ed.), *Eve's Children: The Biblical Stories Retold and Interpreted in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

- Maher, M., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992).
- Margolioth, M. (ed.), *Sepher ha-Razim: A Newly Recovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period, Collected from Genizah Fragments and Other Sources* (Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966). Hebrew.
- McNamara, M., *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1992).
- Nestle, E. *et al.* (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27<sup>th</sup> ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993).
- Newsom, C., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Qimron, E., and J. Strugnell, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert X: Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat ma'ase ha-Torah* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).
- Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta*, 2 vols. in 1 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935).
- Roth, C. and Wigoder, G. (eds.), *Encyclopedia Judaica*, 16 vols. (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971-1972).
- Schäfer, P. (ed.), *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1984).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 2; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1981).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Übersetzung der Hekhalot-Literatur* (TSAJ 17, 22, 29, 46; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987-1991).
- Schiffman, L. H., VanderKam, J. C. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, 6 vols. (München: C. H. Beck, 1922-1956).
- Strugnell, J., 'The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran – 4QSerek Širôt 'Olat Haššabat', in *Congress Volume: Oxford 1959* (VTS 7; Leiden: Brill, 1960) pp. 318-45.
- Tanzer, S. J., '424: 4QInstruction-like Composition B' in S. J. Pfann *et al.* (eds.), *Discoveries in the Judean Desert XXXVI, Qumran Cave 4 XXVI. Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. (Oxford: Clarendon, 2000) pp. 333-46.
- Thackeray, H. S. J. *et al.* (ed.), *Josephus*, 10 vols. (LCL; London: Heinemann, 1926).

-1965).

Vermes, G., *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997).

Wacholder, B. Z., and Abegg, M. G., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave 4* (Fasc. 2; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeological Society, 1991-1992).

\_\_\_\_\_, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls. The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave 4, Fasc. 4: Concordance of Fascicles 1-3* (Washington DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1996).

Yadin, Y., 'The Masada Fragment of the Qumran Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice', in *IEJ* 34 (1984): 77-88.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

Zuckerman, M. S. (ed.), *Tosephta* (Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1963).

## 2) Secondary Sources

Aitken, J. K., 'Apocalyptic, Revelation and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature,' in P. J. Harland and R. Hayward (eds.), *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and the Millennium. Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (SVT 77; Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 181-93.

Achtemeier, P. J., *1 Peter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996).

Albani, M., Frey, J. and Lange, A. (eds.), *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (TSAJ 65; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Siebeck, 1977).

Allison, D. C., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993).

Anderson, G. A., *The Genesis Perfection: Adam and Eve in Jewish and Christian Imagination* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001).

Anderson, H., 'The Old Testament in Mark's Gospel,' in J. M. Efird (ed.) *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays: Studies in Honor of W. F. Stinespring* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1972) pp. 280-306.

Badale, S., 'The Meaning of κεφαλή in the Pauline Epistles,' in *JTS* (1954): 211-15.

Balch, D., *Let Wives be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).

Barr, J., 'Adam: Single Man or All Humanity?' in J. Magness and S. Gitin (eds.), *Hesed*

*Ve-Emet: Studies in Honor of Ernest S. Frerichs* (BJS 320; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) pp. 3-12.

Barth, M., *Ephesians* (New York: Doubleday, 1974).

Baumgarten, J. M., 'On the Testimony of Women in 1Qsa,' in *JBL* 76 (1957): 266-69.

\_\_\_\_\_, '4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?' in *JJS* 34 (1983): 125-35.

Becker, J. C., 'Echoes and Intertextuality: On the Role of Scripture in Paul's Theology,' in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) pp. 64-69.

Bernstein, M., 'Contours of Genesis Interpretation at Qumran: Contents, Context, and Nomenclature,' in J. L. Kugel (ed.), *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (Cambridge: Harvard University Center for Jewish Studies, 2001) pp. 57-85.

Black, M., 'The Theological Appropriation of the Old Testament by the New Testament,' in *SJT* 39 (1986): 1-17.

Boccaccini, G., *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: the Parting of the Ways Between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

Bockmuehl, M. N. A., *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990).

\_\_\_\_\_, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT2 36; Tübingen: J. C. B. Paul Mohr Siebeck, 1990).

Borgen, P., *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (SNT 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

Bowker, J. *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Brawley, R. L., *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

Brewer, D. I., *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis Before 70 CE* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

Brin, G., 'Studies in 4Q424, Fragment 3,' in *VT* 46 (1996): 271-95.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Studies in 4Q424 1-2,' in *RevQ* 18 (1997): 21-42.

Brooke, G. J., 'Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre,' in *RevQ* 10 (1979-1981): 483-503.

- \_\_\_\_\_, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985).
- \_\_\_\_\_, '4Q500 1 And the Use of Scripture in the Parable of the Vineyard,' in *DSD* 2 (1995): 268-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community,' in B. Ego *et al.* (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) pp. 285-301.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 201-22.
- Broshi, M., 'Matrimony and Poverty: Jesus and the Essenes,' in *RevQ* 19 (2000): 629-34.
- Brown, R. E. *The Semitic Background of the Term 'Mystery' in the New Testament* (BS 21; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1968).
- Brownlee, W. H., 'Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *BA* 14 (1951): 54-76.
- Bruce, F. F., *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (London: Tyndale Press, 1959).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Epistle to the Colossians, to Philemon and the Ephesians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984).
- Buchanan, G. W., 'The Old Testament Meaning of the Knowledge of Good and Evil,' in *JBL* 75 (1956): 114-20.
- Burkes, S., 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Wisdom of Solomon,' in *HTR* 95 (2002): 21-44.
- Callaway, P., 'Remarks on Some Sapiential Texts from Qumran,' in *The Qumran Chronicle* 8 (1998): 121-27.
- Callender, D. E. Jr., *Adam in Myth and History: Ancient Israelite Perspectives on the Primal Humans* (HSS 48; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000).
- Cambier, J., 'Le grand mystère concernant le Christ et son Eglise: Ephesians 5,22-33,' in *Biblica* 47 (1966): 43-90.
- Caquot, A., 'Les text de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire),' in *RHPhR* 76 (1996): 1-34.

- Caragounis, C. C., *The Ephesian 'Mysterion': Meaning and Content* (CBNTS 8; Upsala: CWK Gleerup, 1977).
- Carlè, R. S., *Because of the Angels: Unveiling 1 Cor. 11:2-16* (Paraparaumu Beach: Emmaus, 1998).
- Carrington, G. P., 'The "Headless Woman": Paul and the Language of the Body in 1 Cor. 11:2-16,' in *PRS* 18 (1991): 223-31.
- Cathcart, K. J., 'Numbers 24:17 in Ancient Translations and Interpretations,' in J. Krasovec (ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible: The International Symposium in Slovenia* (JSOTSup 289; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998) pp. 511-520.
- Cervin, R. S., 'Does κεφαλή Mean "Source" or Authority Over" in Greek Literature,' in *TJ* (1989): 85-112.
- Charles, R. H., *The Book of Jubilees or the Little Genesis* (London: A & C Black, 1972).
- Charlesworth, J. H., 'The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel,' in J. J. Collins and G. W. E. Nicklesburg (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980) pp. 135-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Pseudepigrapha as Biblical Exegesis,' in C. A. Evans and W. F. Stinespring (eds.), *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987) pp. 139-52.
- Chazon, E., 'The Creation and Fall of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in J. Frishman and L. Van Rompay (eds.), *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation: A Collection of Essays* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997) pp. 13-24.
- Collins, J. J., *Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Daniel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility,' in L. J. Perdue, B. B. Scott and W. J. Wiseman (eds.), *In Search of Wisdom in honor of John G. Gammie* (Louisville: Westminster, 1993) pp. 165-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1997).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wisdom, Apocalypticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJS 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997) pp. 369-83.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wisdom Reconsidered in Light of the Scrolls,' in *DSD* 4 (1997): 265-81.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text

- from Qumran,' in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 609-18.
- , 'The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls', (handout, Orion International Symposium, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, 20-22 May 2001).
- , 'The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon,' in F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters-Leuven University Press, 2003) pp. 287-306.
- Collins, R. F., '“This is the Will of God: Your Sanctification” (1 Thess 4:3),' in *LTP* 39 (1983): 27-53.
- Cope, L., '1 Cor. 11:2-16: One Step Farther,' in *JBL* 97 (1978): 435-36.
- Coppens, J., "“Mystery” in the Theology of St. Paul and its Parallels at Qumran,' in J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis* (London: Chapman, 1968) pp. 132-58.
- Crouch, J. E., *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (FRLANT 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).
- Davidson, M. J., *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1-36, 72-108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).
- Davies, W. D., "“Knowledge” in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30,' in *HTR* 46 (1953): 113-39.
- , 'Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit,' in K. Stehndahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1957) pp. 157-82, 276-82.
- Davila, J. R., 'A Wedding Ceremony? (4Q502),' in *Liturgical Works* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) pp. 181-201.
- , *Descenders to the Chariot: The People Behind the Hekhalot Literature* (JSJS 70; Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- Dawes, G. W., *The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33* (BJS 30; Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Dibelius, M., *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon, 3<sup>rd</sup> revised edition*, (ed.), H. Greeven (Tübingen: Mohr, 1953).

- Dimant, D., 'Qumran Sectarian Literature,' in M. E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984) pp. 483-548.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,' in M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, II 1* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) pp. 379-419.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community,' in A. Berlin (ed.), *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East* (Bethesda: University Press of Maryland, 1996) pp. 93-103.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Noah in Early Jewish Literature,' in M. E. Stone and T. A. Bergen (eds.), *Biblical Figures Outside the Bible* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998) pp. 123-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_, '4QInstruction (Mussar la-mevin) – A Sectarian Wisdom,' (handout, Orion International Symposium, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, 20-22 May 2001) 5 pages.
- Dochhorn, J., '«Sie wird dir nicht ihre Kraft geben» – Adam, Kain und der Ackerbau in 4Q423 2 3 und Apc Mos 24,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 351-66.
- Ego, B., 'Der Strom der Tora – zur Rezeption eines tempeltheologischen Motivs in frühjüdischer Zeit,' in B. Ego et al. (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel* (WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999) pp. 205-14.
- Elgvin, T., 'Admonition Texts from Qumran Cave 4,' in M. O. Wise et al. (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site. Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ANYAS 722; New York: The New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) pp. 179-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A (\*),' in *RevQ* 16 (1995): 559-80.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing,' in *SBLSP* (1995): 440-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *An Analysis of 4QInstruction* (Ph.D. dissertation submitted to Hebrew University, 1997).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'To Master His Own Vessel, 1 Thess 4:4 in Light of New Qumran Evidence,' in *NTS* 43 (1997): 604-19.



- , 'The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation,' in F. H. Cryer and Th. L. Thompson (eds.), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (JSOTSSup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield, 1998) pp. 113-50.
- , 'Early Essene Eschatology: Judgment and Salvation According to *Sapiential Work A*,' in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 126-65.
- , 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE: The Evidence of 4QInstruction,' in L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000) pp. 226-47.
- , 'Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic,' in D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E. M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 15-38.
- , 'Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction' (handout, Orion International Symposium, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, 20-22 May 2001).
- Elliot, J. H., *1 Peter* (New York: Doubleday, 2000).
- Endres, J. C., *Biblical Interpretation in the Book of Jubilees* (Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1987).
- Evans, C. A., 'Listening for Echoes of Interpreted Scripture,' in C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders (eds.), *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 83; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993) pp. 47-51.
- Evans, C. A. (ed.), *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity: Studies in Language and Tradition* (JSPSup 33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
- Feuillet, A., 'L'Homme "gloire de Dieu" et la femme "gloire de l'homme" (1 Cor. XI:7b),' in *RB* 81 (1974): 161-82.
- Fiddes, P. S., "'Woman's Head is Man": A Doctrinal Reflection upon a Pauline Text,' in *Baptist Quarterly* 31 (1986): 370-83.
- Finkel, A., 'The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures,' in *RevQ* 4 (1963-1964): 357-70.

Fishbane, M., 'The Qumran Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics,' in *PWJCS* 6 (1977) I: 97-114.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,' in M. J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, II 1 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988) pp. 339-77.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Well of Living Water: A Biblical Motif and its Ancient Transformations,' in M. Fishbane and E. Tov (eds.), *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992) pp. 3-16.

Fisk, B. N., *Do You Not Remember: Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Psuedo-Philo* (JSPS 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

Fitzmyer, J. A., 'A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angels of 1 Cor. 11:10,' in *NTS* 4 (1957-58): 48-58.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,' in *NTS* 7 (1960-1961): 297-333.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1: A Commentary* (BibOr 18a; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Another Look at κεφαλή in 1 Cor. 11:3,' in *NTS* 35 (1989): 503-11.

Fleckenstein, K. H., *Ordnet euch einander unter in der Furcht Christi: Die Eheperikope in Eph. 5,21-33: Geschichte der Interpretation, Analyse und Aktualisierung des Textes* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1994).

Fletcher-Louis, C. H. T., *Luke-Acts: Angels, Christology and Soteriology* (WUNT2 94; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997).

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Some Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity Texts Among the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *DSD* 7/3 (2000): 292-312.

\_\_\_\_\_, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the DSS* (Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Flusser, D., 'He Has Planted it as Eternal Life in Our Midst,' in *Tarb* 58 (1988-1989): 147-53.

- Fox, M. V. 'Words of Wisdom,' in *ZAH* 6 (1993): 149-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Words for Folly,' in *ZAH* 10 (1997): 4-15.
- Fraade, S. D., *Enosh and his Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Post-biblical Interpretation* (SBLMS 30; Chico: Scholars Press, 1984).
- Frey, J., 'Die paulinische Antithese von "Fleisch" und "Geist" und die palästinischjüdische Weisheitstradition,' in *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45-77.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Notion of "Flesh" in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,' in D. Falk *et al.* (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 197-226.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Flesh and Spirit in the Palestinian Jewish Sapiential Tradition and in the Qumran Texts: An Inquiry into the Background of Pauline Usage,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 367-404.
- García Martínez, F., 'Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?' in F. García Martínez (ed.), *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters-Leuven University Press, 2003) pp. 1-16.
- Gielen, M., *Tradition und Theologie neutestamentlicher Haustafelnethik* (BBB 75; Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1990).
- Goff, M. J., *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (Ph.D. dissertation submitted to University of Chicago, 2002).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Mystery of Creation in 4QInstruction,' in *DSD* 10 (2003): 1-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Gordis, R., 'The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls,' in *JBL* 76 (1957): 122-38.
- Gottstein, M. H., 'Bible Quotations in the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *VT* 3 (1953): 79-82.
- Grudem, W., 'Does κεφαλή ("Head") Mean "Source" or "Authority Over" in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2336 Examples,' in *TJ* (1985): 38-59.
- Gundry-Volf, J. M., 'Gender and Creation in 1 Cor. 11:2-16: A Study in Paul's

- Theological Method,' in J. Adna, S. J. Hafemann and O. Hofius (eds.), *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche : Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997) pp. 151-71.
- Halpern-Amaru, B., 'The First Woman, Wives, and Mothers in Jubilees,' in *JBL* 113 (1994): 609-26.
- Halperin, D. J., *The Faces of the Chariot: Early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988).
- Hannah, D. D., *Michael and Christ: Michael Traditions and Angel Christology in Early Christianity* (WUNT2 109; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).
- Harrington, D. J., 'Wisdom at Qumran,' in E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994) pp. 137-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Rāz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415-418, 423),' in *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Ten Reasons Why the Qumran Texts are Important,' in *DSD* 4 (1997): 245-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom. Sirach and Qumran Sapiential Work A,' in *JSP* 16 (1997): 25-38.
- Harrington, H. K., *The Purity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis* (SBLDS 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- Hays, R., *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Hayward, C. T. R., 'The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities,' in *JSJ* 23 (1992): 1-20.
- Hempel, C., 'The Qumran Sapiential Texts and the Rule Books,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 168; Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 277-96.
- Holm-Nielsen, S., *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960).
- Horgen, M. P., *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1979).

- Horton, F. L., 'Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature,' in *RevQ* 7 (1969-1971): 505-14.
- Huppenbauer, H., 'בשר "Fleisch" in den Texten von Qumran,' in *Theologische Zeitschrift* 13 (1957): 298-300.
- Hurtado, L. W., *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (London: SCM, 1988).
- Ibba, G., 'Il "Libro dei Misterei" (1Q27, F. 1): Testo escatologico,' in *Henoch* 21 (1999): 73-84.
- Jefferies, D. J., *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Ph.D. dissertation; University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2001).
- , *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions of 4QInstruction* (Gorgias Dissertations NES 3; Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2002).
- Jervell, J., *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, 76 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
- Jervis, L. A., "'But I Want You to Know...': Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshippers (1 Cor. 11:2-16),' in *JBL* 112 (1993): 231-46.
- de Jonge, M. and Tromp, J., *The Life of Adam and Eve and Related Literature*. (GAP; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Kampen, J. 'The Diverse Aspects of Wisdom at Qumran,' P. W. Flint and J. C. Vanderkam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 1998) pp. 1.211-43.
- Kandler, H. J., 'Die Bedeutung der Armut im Schriftum von Chirbet Qumran,' in *Judaica* 13 (1957): 193-209.
- Keck, L. E., 'The Poor among the Saints in Jewish Christianity and Qumran,' in *ZNW* 57 (1966): 54-78.
- Kelly, J. N. D., *The Epistle of Peter and of Jude* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969).
- Kimball, C. A., *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- Kister, M., 'A Qumranic Parallel to 1 Thess 4:4? Reading and Interpretation of 4Q416 2 II 21,' in *DSD* 10 (2003): 365-71.

- Kittel, B. P., *The Hymns of Qumran* (SBLDS 50; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981).
- Klijn, A. F. J., *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (SNT 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977).
- Kroeger, C. C., 'The Classical Concept of *Head* as "Source",' in G. G. Hull (ed.), *Equal to Serve* (London: Scripture Union, 1987) pp. 267-83.
- Küchler, M., *Frühjüdische Weisheitstradition* (OBO 26; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1979).
- Kugel, J. L., *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1990).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Bible As It Was* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999).
- Kuhn, K. G. (ed.), *Kondordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
- Lange, A., *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wisdom and Predestination in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *DSD* 2 (1995): 340-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'In Diskussion mit dem Tempel. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel,' in A. Schoors (ed.), *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998) pp. 113-59.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, The Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature,' in D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E. M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 39-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 3-30.
- Lehmann, M. R., 'Midrashic Parallels to Selected Qumran Texts,' in *RevQ* 3 (1961-1962): 545-51.
- Levison, J. R., *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSS 1;

Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).

Licht, J. 'The Plant Eternal and the People of Divine Deliverance,' in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds.), *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of E. L. Sukenik* (Jerusalem: Hekhal ha-Sefer, 1961) pp. 67-69.

\_\_\_\_\_, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judea*. Hebrew (Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute, 1965).

Lichtenberger, H., 'Eine weisheitliche Mahnrede in den Qumranfunden (4Q185),' in M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân, sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, 1978) pp. 151-62.

\_\_\_\_\_, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*. (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980).

Lipscomb, W. L. and Sanders, J. A., 'Wisdom at Qumran,' in J. G. Gammie *et al.* (eds.) *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978) pp. 277-85.

Longenecker, R., *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

Lucassen, B., Steudel, A., 'Aspekte einer vorläufigen materiellen Rekonstruktion von 4Q416-4Q418,' handout *Forschungsseminar: Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran, Tübingen, 22-24 Mai; 20-21. Juni 1998*.

Lührmann, 'The Beginning of the Church at Thessalonica,' D. L. Balch, E. Ferguson and W. A. Meeks (eds.), *Greeks, Romans and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) pp. 237-49.

Mach, M. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabinscher Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992).

Margalioth, M. *Sepher Ha-Razim* (Jerusalem: Yediot Achronot, 1966).

Martin, D. B., *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995).

Martin, W. J., '1 Cor. 11:2-16: An Interpretation,' in W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (eds.), *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Presented to F. F. Bruce* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970) pp. 231-41.

Maxwell, J. M., 'In the "Image" and "Likeness" of God,' in *JBL* 91 (1972): 289-304.

McGehee, M., 'A Rejoinder to Two Recent Studies Dealing with 1 Thess 4.4,' in *CBQ* 51 (1989): 82-89.

- Metso, S., *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Metzger, B. M., 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the New Testament and the Mishnah,' in *JBL* 70 (1951): 297-307.
- Michaels, J. R., *1 Peter* (Waco: Word Books, 1988).
- Michaelis, W., *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum. Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (GBTh 1; Basel: Majer, 1942).
- Michel, D., 'Weisheit und Apokalyptik,' in A. S. van der Woude (ed.), *The Book of Daniel in the Light of New Findings* (BETL 106; Louvain: University Press, 1993) pp. 413-34.
- Militic, S. F., *'One Flesh': Eph 5.22-24, 5.31: Marriage and the New Creation* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1988).
- Miller, M. P., 'Targum, Midrash, and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,' in *JSJ* 2 (1971): 29-82.
- Morgan, M. A., *Sepher Ha-Razim: The Book of Mysteries* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).
- Morgenstern, M., 'The Meaning of בית מולדים in the Qumran Wisdom Texts,' in *JJS* 51 (2000): 141-44.
- Moyise, S., *The Old Testament in the Book of Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament,' in S. Moyise (ed.), *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North* (JSNTSup 189; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) pp. 14-41.
- Murphy, C. M., 'Wealth in Instruction,' in *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Literature* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2001) pp. 163-206.
- Murphy, R. E., 'Yeşer in the Qumran Literature,' in *Biblica* 39 (1958): 334-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Wisdom and Creation,' in *JBL* 104/1 (1985): 3-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Tree of Life: An Exploration of Biblical Wisdom Literature* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).
- Murphy O'Connor, J., 'Sex and Logic in 1 Cor. 11:2-16,' in *CBQ* 42 (1980): 482-500.



- Newsom, C., 'The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Function of the Maskil,' in J. G. Gammie and L. G. Perdue (eds.), *The Sage in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) pp. 101-20.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., 'Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity,' in J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs (eds.), *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985) pp. 73-91.
- , 'Wisdom and Apocalypticism in Early Judaism: Some Points for Discussion,' in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1994* (SBLSP 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) pp. 715-32.
- Niehr, H., 'ערמא, ערומ, ערמ,' in G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament VI*, (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989) pp. 387-92.
- Nitzan, B., 'The Idea of Creation and Its Implications in Qumran Literature,' in H. G. Reventlow and Y. Hoffman (eds.), *Creation in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002) pp. 240-64.
- Osten-Sacken, P., *Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (StUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969).
- Paul, S., 'Heavenly Tablets and the Book of Life,' in *JANESCU* 5 (1973): 345-53.
- Perdue, L. G., 'Cosmology and the Social Order in the Wisdom Tradition,' in J. G. Gammie and L. G. Perdue (eds.), *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990) pp. 457-78.
- , *Wisdom and Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994).
- Perriman, A. C., 'The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of in 1 Cor. 11:3,' in *JTS* 45 (1994): 602-22.
- Piper, O. A., 'The "Book of Mysteries" (Qumran I 27): A Study in Eschatology,' in *JR* 38 (1958): 95-106.
- Puech, E., Steudel, A., 'Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ7 = 4Q417 ou 4Q418),' in *RevQ* 19/76 (2000): 623-27.
- Qimron, E., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).
- Rabinowitz, I. L., 'The Qumran Author's spr hhgw/y,' in *JNES* 20 (1961): 109-14.

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Peshet/Pittaron: Its Biblical Meaning and Significance in the Qumran Literature,' in *RevQ* 8 (1972-1975): 219-32.
- Reicke, B., 'The Knowledge Hidden in the Tree of Paradise,' in *JSS* 1/3 (1956): 193-201.
- Roberts, B. J., 'Bible Exegesis and Fulfillment in Qumran,' in P. R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds.), *Words and Meaning: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: University Press, 1968) pp. 195-207.
- Rofé, A., 'Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran,' in G. Sterling and J. J. Collins (eds.), *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).
- Ruiten, J. van, 'The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3.1-31,' in *Bijdragen: Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie* 57 (1996a): 305-17.
- Runia, D. T., *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato* (Leiden: Brill, 1986).
- Sampley, J. P., "'And the Two Shall Become One Flesh': A Study in Eph 5.21-33 (SNTSMS 16; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971).
- Sanders, J. A., 'Habakkuk in Qumran, Paul and the Old Testament,' in *JR* 39 (1959): 232-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Intertextuality and Canon,' in S. L. Cook and S. C. Winter (eds.), *On the Way to Nineveh* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999) pp. 300-29.
- Sanders, J. A. with Charlesworth, J. H. and Rietz, H. W. L., 'Hymn to the Creator,' in J. H. Charlesworth et al. (eds.), *Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project volume 4A* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998) pp. 198-99.
- Sawyer, J. F. A., 'The Meaning of בְּצֶלֶם אֱלֹהִים ('In the Image of God') in Genesis I-XI,' in *JTS* 25 (1974): 418-26.
- Schiffman, L. H., 'Women in the Scrolls,' in *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994) pp. 127-44.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Laws Pertaining to Women in the Temple Scroll,' in P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 210-28.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Halakhic Elements in the Sapiential Texts,' (handout, Orion International Symposium, Mount Scopus, Jerusalem, 20-22 May 2001)

Scholem, G. G., *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (New York: Schocken, 1954).

Schoors, A., 'The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 61-98.

Schuller, E. M., 'Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in M. O. Wise, N. Golb, J. J. Collins and D. G. Pardee (eds.), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994) pp. 115-31.

Schwartz, M. D., *Mystical Prayer in Ancient Judaism: An Analysis of Ma'aseh Merkavah* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

Schwemer, A. M., 'Gott als König in den Sabbatliedern,' in M. Hengel and A. M. Schwemer (eds.), *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der Hellenistischen Welt* (WUNT2 55; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991) pp. 81-100.

Scott, J. M., 'Korah and Qumran,' in P. W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran. Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) pp. 182-202.

Sekki, E. *The Meaning of ruah at Qumran* (SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

Shum, Shiu-Lun, *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans* (WUNT2 156; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

Shupak, N., *Where can Wisdom be Found?* (OBO 130; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).

Slomovic, E., 'Towards an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *RevQ* 7 (1969-1971): 3-15.

Stanley, C. D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Stegemann, H., 'Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyptik,' in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989) pp. 495-530.

\_\_\_\_\_, 'Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments,' in L. H.

- Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (JSPSup 8; JSOT/ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) pp. 189-220.
- Steinmetz, D., 'Sefer heHago: The Community and the Book,' in *JJS* 52 (2001): 40-58.
- Stone, M. E., 'Lists of Revealed Things in the Apocalyptic Literature,' F. M. Cross *et al.* (eds.), *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976) pp. 414-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Parabolic Use of Natural Order in Judaism of the Second Temple Age,' in S. Shaked, D. Shulman, G. G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Gilgul. Essays on Transformation, Revolution and Permanence in the History of Religions Dedicated to R. J. Zwi Werblowsky* (SHR 50; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987) pp. 298-308.
- Stordalen, T., *Echoes of Eden: Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000).
- Strugnell, J., 'More on Wives and Marriage in the Dead Sea Scrolls (4Q416 2 ii 21 [Cf. 1 Thess 4:4] and 4QMMT §B),' in *RevQ* 17 (1996): 537-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Sapiential Work 4Q415ff and Pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran: Lexical Considerations,' in D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds.), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 595-608.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Smaller Hebrew Wisdom Texts Found at Qumran: Variations, Resemblances, and Lines of Development,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 31-60.
- Stuckenbruck, L. T., *Angel Veneration and Christology* (WUNT2 70; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).
- \_\_\_\_\_, '4QInstruction and the Possible Influence of Early Enochic Traditions: An Evaluation,' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 245-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_, '"Angels" and "God": Exploring the Limits of Early Jewish Monotheism,' in L. T. Stuckenbruck and W. S. North (eds.), *Exploring Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (London: Continuum, forthcoming).
- Tigchelaar, E. J. C., 'הבא ביחד in 4QInstruction (4Q418 64 = 199 = 66 par 4Q417 1 i 17-19) and the Height of the Columns of 4Q418,' in *RevQ* 18/4 (1998): 589-93.

- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Eden and Paradise The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts,' in P. G. Luttikhuisen (ed.), *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 1999) pp. 37-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'More Identifications of Scraps and Overlaps,' in *RevQ* 19 (1999): 61-68.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Addressees of 4QInstruction,' in D. K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E. M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran. Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998. Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000) pp. 62-75.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001).
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels),' in C. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger (eds.), *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (BETL 168; Leuven: University Press, 2002) pp. 99-126.
- Tiller, P. A., 'The "Eternal Planting" in the Dead Sea Scrolls,' in *DSD* 4 (1997): 312-35.
- Tobin, T. H., *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation* (CBQMS 14; Washington D. C.: The Catholic Biblical Association, 1983).
- Trever, J. C., 'The Qumran Covenanters and Their Use of Scripture,' *Per* 39 (1958): 127-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting,' in G. Vermes (ed.), *Post Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975) pp. 37-49.
- VanderKam, J. C., 'The Interpretation of Genesis in 1 Enoch,' in P. W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001) pp. 129-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 2001).
- Vermes, G., 'Genesis 1-3 in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic Literature before the Mishnah,' in *JJS* 43 (1992): 221-25.
- Walker, W. O., '1 Cor. 11:2-16 and Paul's Views Regarding Women,' in *JBL* 94 (1975): 94-110.
- Waltke, B. K., '1 Cor. 11:2-16: An Interpretation,' in *BSac* 135 (1978): 46-57.

- Weeks, S., *Early Israelite Wisdom* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Weima, J. A. D., 'What does Aristotle have to do with Paul? An Evaluation of Rhetorical Criticism,' in *BBR* 5 (1995): 177-98.
- Weitzman, S., 'Allusion, Artifice, and Exile in the Hymn of Tobit,' in *JBL* 115 (1969): 49-61.
- Werman, C., 'What is the Book of Hagu?' in G. Sterling and J. J. Collins (eds.), *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings from the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).
- Wernberg-Møller, P., 'Some Reflections on the Biblical Material in the Manual of Discipline,' in *ST* 9 (1955): 40-66.
- Werner, M., *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* (Tübingen: Katzmann-Verlag KG, 1941).
- Whitton, J., 'A Neglected Meaning of *skeuos* in 1 Thessalonians 4:4,' in *NTS* 28 (1982): 142-43.
- Wold, B. G., 'Reconsidering an Aspect of *Kyriostitel* in light of Sapiential Fragment 4Q416 2 iii,' in *ZNW* (forthcoming).
- Wright, B. G., 'The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature,' in G. Sterling and J. J. Collins (eds.), *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings from the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001* (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).
- Yadin, Y., 'Expedition D – The Cave of Letters,' in *IEJ* 12 (1962): 227-57.
- Yarbrough, O. L., *Not Like the Gentiles: Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul* (SBLDS 80; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).

