

Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu, eds. *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. JSJSup 111. Leiden: Brill, 2006. Pp. xxv + 393. ISBN: 9004139974. ISBN-13: 978-9004139978. €145.00; \$195.00 USD, cloth.

1. This tribute to Michael A. Knibb comprises eighteen wide-ranging essays that the editors' Introduction divides into four categories corresponding to various areas of Knibb's publications during his thirty-seven year career at King's College London: 1 Enoch and Ethiopic Studies; Exile, Messianism, and Apocalyptic; Prophetic Traditions; the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha; the Bible in Transmission. The introduction is followed by a seven-page bibliography of his publications, principally from 1976-2005. Although the editors have arranged the contributions alphabetically by author (one way to solve the problem of organizing Festschrift articles that can be categorized in various ways), I will discuss them principally under three heads: 1 Enoch; the Dead Sea Scrolls and "the Qumran community"; Christian transmission of biblical tradition.

2. As the editors note (p. vii), alongside their summarizing introduction to the book, George J. Brooke's contribution serves well as a summarizing overview of Knibb's career. Entitled "The Formation and Renewal of Scriptural Tradition," this unusual essay weds the honoree and the Festschrift by creating from the diverse corpus of Knibb's publications an imaginative discussion of the notion of scriptural tradition. (A) It looks to the past with "fascination," in an attempt to understand causality in historical events ("aetiology"), but with a diversity of viewpoints that sees "alternative pasts." (B) It looks to the present, making the past present through "translation" and "exegesis," by "making sense of experience" through a "pluralism of tradition" and "the process of accretion," and "inventing the past" through pseudepigraphic "apocalyptic" claims that nevertheless reflect one's "experiences in the present." (C) It looks to the future with messianic scenarios that are, nonetheless, "based on the developments of traditions from the past." Concerning Knibb's work itself, Brooke concludes that he belongs "to that tradition of precise scholarship which through its careful and helpful reading of the evidence displays a keen ability in letting texts and traditions speak for themselves" (p. 59).

3. Michael Knibb is perhaps best known as a scholar of 1 Enoch. His first major publication was his critical edition and translation of *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols., 1978), and over three decades he has continued to publish on this and closely related topics. Two articles in this collection treat issues relating to 1 Enoch. In what may be the most controversial article in the book, "And Enoch Was Not, For Genesis Took Him," Philip R. Davies argues that the story of the watchers and the women in 1 Enoch 6-11 is not an interpretation of Gen 6:1-4 as this reviewer and others have argued. Rather, the early chapters of Genesis polemicize against an account of the origin of evil (due to a heavenly descent) that is presumed by P's flood story and that is epitomized in Gen 6:1-4 but preserved in fuller form in 1 Enoch 6-11. The argument has been made before by J. T. Milik (*The Books of Enoch*) and in a radical form by Margaret Barker (*The Older Testament*). The validity of the argument might tickle the fancy of Enochic scholars, whose subject matter would suddenly become must-reading for interpreters of the Hebrew Bible. The argument, however, should be scrutinized closely in several respects. One must demonstrate the priority of the P material over that in J and then prove that the story of a heavenly descent did, in fact, exist in P, and one must take seriously the eschatological character of much of the Enochic story of the watchers and the women. The issue is not whether Gen 6:1-4 is a fragment of a myth, an erratic boulder in landscape of Genesis 1-11, but whether 1 Enoch 6-11 preserves a fuller form of the myth epitomized in Gen 6:1-4.

4. In a second article on 1 Enoch, “Daniel 7 in the Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71),” James C. VanderKam, working very closely with the Ethiopic of the Similitudes and the Aramaic and the Greek versions of Daniel, argues persuasively that the portrayal of “the Son of Man” in the Similitudes is dependent on Daniel 7 and not on an earlier tradition common to both texts..

5. Reflecting a major component in Knibb’s oeuvre, seven contributors deal with issues relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls. In dialogue with each other, John J. Collins and Sarianna Metso take opposing views on one of the more debated sets of topics in current Qumran studies. What was the relationship between the community resident at Qumran and the group designated as the “yahad,” which is central to the Community Rule and is mentioned in perhaps a dozen other Qumran texts? How is the term *yahad* to be understood in relation to the groups of ten members (1QS 6:3), the *mahanot* of at least ten members (CD 13:1), and “the council of the community” consisting of twelve men and three priests (1QS 8:1)? What is the relationship between the *yahad* and the movement that attached itself to the Teacher according to CD 1? The variables in finding an answer to these and related questions are numerous, not least the fact that the evidence is found in several texts whose interrelationship is not clear and in the recensional history of the Community Rule. The publication of the Cave 4 fragments, not least of the Community Rule, makes it unfeasible to continue to speak with certitude about the identity and history of “the Qumran Community,” as tended to be done in an earlier stage of Qumran studies. These two articles, however, in their data, their argumentation, and their documentation, serve as an excellent resource for getting up to speed on the relevant issues. Metso’s book, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*, continues to be a model for dealing with the problematic interrelationships between textual and literary criticism.

6. Four Qumran-related articles focus on issues of intertextuality and their social settings. Charlotte Hempel studies “*Maskil(im)* and *Rabbim*: From Daniel to Qumran.” In the first half of her article, she argues that the nexus of *maskil(im)* and *rabbim* in Dan 12:3 cannot be simply read into the Community Rule, where “the two terms are never closely linked to one another with one possible partial exception” (p. 143). Hempel rightly notes that *maskilim* and *rabbim* in Daniel 12:3 reflect the language of Isaiah 53:11 (and 52:13). To her bibliography should be added George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (HTS 56; Expanded edition; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006) 38-41, 83-87, 91-97, 130-34 (and corresponding pages in the original 1972 edition), where I lay out the much broader Jewish appropriation of this prophetic text. There is also some evidence that servant theology influenced the portrayal of the suffering teacher who speaks in the Hodayot (ibid., 184-85), although this should not be uncritically read into the Community Rule’s references to the *maskil*. The second half of the article, again reflecting the issue mentioned in the previous paragraph, is a close reading of passages in the various manuscripts of the Community Rule that employ the term *maskil*, with a view toward understanding the role of this figure in the history of the community that is reflected in the variety of textual embodiments of the Rule.

7. Matthias Henze studies the figure of Baruch in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (2 Baruch) and argues that its “author seeks to extend the prophetic authority of Jeremiah to his own work in order to transfer it to Baruch”—this in contrast to the roughly contemporary and closely related Paraleipomena of Jeremiah, where Jeremiah retains his dominant status. In the second part of his article, Henze traces “the apocalyptic roots of 2 Baruch to the two Qumran texts known as Pseudo Ezekiel and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, thus demonstrating one instance in which the Dead Sea texts help us better to understand the complex history of the traditions embodied in Jewish texts that we have long known and studied.

8. A similar situation obtains in Benjamin G. Wright's exegetically careful contribution, "From Generation to Generation: The Sage as Father in Early Jewish Literature." The father/son metaphor employed with reference to the relationship between the sage/teacher and his student is well known from the Book of Proverbs and the Wisdom of Joshua ben Sira. Taking his cue from Carol Newsom's analysis of the imagery in Proverbs, Wright studies its occurrence in a whole range of texts found at Qumran and concludes that the various strategies employed in these texts "serve to bolster the authority of the sage and the power of the values and symbolic order he presented to his students/readers. That is, by using this imagery, the sage imposes on his students the authority that a real father held over his children in the shaping of their behavior. Raija Sollamo's title and subtitle speak for themselves: "The Creation of Angels and Natural Phenomena Intertwined in the Book of Jubilees (4QJub^a): Angels and Natural Phenomena as Characteristics of the Creation Stories and Hymns in later Second Temple Judaism." Her texts are: Jubilees in its Qumran Hebrew form, the Hymn of the Three Young Men (Greek Daniel 3); the Hymn of the Creator (11QPs^a); Psalm 148; Psalm 135; Job 38; and Sir 42:15-43:33. She argues that creation texts with roots or composition in the second half of the third century B.C.E. feature the creation of angels and natural phenomena and the assignment to the angels of special duties at creation.

9. In the seventh article on Qumran texts, Florentino García Martínez presents a thematic study of "Divine Sonship at Qumran." The idea has four nuances: the angelic sons of God; Israel Son of God; the King, Son of God; the Messiah Son of God. The study is framed by references in 1 John 3:12 and its mention of "sons of the devil," and it is a pilot study in the development of "a new hermeneutic paradigm to look at the relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament which is based on the common use in both corpora of the elements provided by the Hebrew Bible" (p. 111).

10. An important element in Michael Knibb's scholarly career not mentioned by the editors has been his decades-long association with the Society of New Testament Studies. This interest, however, is saluted in seven articles that deal with traditions in the Hebrew Bible that have been transmitted in Christian circles.

11. Two articles, framing the collection, deal with texts in the New Testament itself. Edward Adams demonstrates how the biblical "Coming of God" tradition has influenced New Testament texts about the parousia of Jesus. While he is correct that the wording of many biblical theophanic texts is evident in both Jewish and New Testament texts, I am less certain than he whether this wording does not sometimes involve "unconscious combination rather than explicit selective citation" (wording from George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36, 81-108* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001] 144, questioned by Adams, p. 7). As has been recently argued by Richard G. Horsley (*Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007], 158), combinations of biblical expressions may sometimes reflect scribal familiarity with a particular register of prophetic speech rather than explicit and conscious quotation of specific prophetic texts. This does not totally exclude direct knowledge of a (set of) biblical passage(s); the question is at what point in the transmission of tradition might a set of expressions take on a life of its own. In the case of 1 Enoch 1:3b-7, 9, Adams might have noted that the combination of biblical texts that I cite is partly paralleled in T. Moses 10:1-8 (Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 144). Do both texts directly allude to the prophetic passages mentioned, is one text dependent on the other, do both texts depend on a tradition that has already combined phraseology from a variety of sources? At what point does Adams's "selective combination" (p. 7) take place? These questions are not easily answered, and perhaps they can never be answered with certainty.

However, it seems worthwhile to attempt to distinguish between explicit quotation of authoritative scripture (e.g., in the Qumran *pesharim*, and in the New Testament, notably Matthews and Hebrews) and a more dynamic process of appropriating authoritative tradition. One final point. On pp. 6-8, Adams cites the example not only of 1 Enoch 1:3b-7, 9, but also 1 Enoch 52-53 and 4 Ezra 13:1-3, where “‘coming of God’ imagery is applied to the divine representative. In the case of 1 Enoch 52-53, it should be made explicit that the author of the Similitudes is reinterpreting not the prophetic texts as such, but 1 Enoch 1. That is, within the Enochic corpus itself, and with reference to itself, we have the same paradigm that Adams identifies in the New Testament: theophany becomes “‘huiophany.” As to 4 Ezra 13, we should also note that, like the Similitudes, this text combines imagery that stems from three biblical sources: Davidic oracles; Daniel 7, and Deutero-Isaianic Servant songs (briefly, *Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1*, 45-46).

12. The book’s second New Testament article is by Adela Yarbro Collins, “Christian Messianism and the First Jewish War with Rome,” a study of Mark 13 and 2 Thessalonians. She makes three points: (1) instruction on early Christian messianism and apocalyptic eschatology in the second half of the first century was presented as the authoritative teaching of founding fathers (Jesus in Mark, Paul in 2 Thessalonians); (2) early Christians perceived the first Jewish war as an historical crisis that had to be addressed and interpreted from a Christian point of view; (3) creative exegesis, especially of the book of Daniel, played an important role in the process of updating that authoritative teaching in response to the perceived rhetorical exigence (p. 343). The identification of the “man of lawlessness” as a political/royal figure is an important point for the exegesis of 2 Thessalonians. As Yarbro Collins notes, the tradition, applied solely to such figures, can be traced back to the second century B.C.E. For an extensive discussion of the tradition, see Nickelsburg, *Resurrection*, 27-28, 91-92, 98-104, 130-33, 217-18, 309 (discussion also in the first edition of 1972). Yarbro Collins’s identification of “the restrainer” as an angel, perhaps Michael, also fits well with this tradition (*ibid.*, 27-28).

13. Two articles in the collection discuss the transmission of biblical traditions in Christian texts of the second and, perhaps, early third century. Judith M. Lieu takes up “Justin Martyr and the Transformation of Psalm 22” in the Dialogue with Trypho. Noting that the passion narratives have been colored by the language of the psalm as far back as we can trace, she demonstrates how Justin continues the process of obscuring the difference between text and event, not least in depiction of the Jews as Jesus’ enemies. Arguing, as he has for more than fifty years, that the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are a Christian rather than a Jewish document, Marinus de Jonge here compares the Testaments’ teaching on the two ways with that in other documents of Christian antiquity, namely, the Didache, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Doctrina Apostolorum, the Apostolic Church Order, and the Mandates of Hermas. He concludes that the Testaments “do not offer any real help to those who want to go back to the Jewish roots of the ‘Two Ways’/‘Two Angels’ instruction found in the Didache, Barnabas and related sources.” “They should be studied as an interesting case of incorporation and assimilation of traditional material (which may be called ‘Jewish’ and ‘Christian’)—alongside other Christian documents. . .” (p. 194).

14. Sebastian Brock turns to the *Lives of the Prophets*, a document that is quite possibly a Christian work of the fifth century (so David Satran, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine* (SVTP 11; Leiden: Brill, 1995; Brock is less certain) and summarizes the Syriac textual evidence, thus providing a companion piece to Michael Knibb’s editing of some of the Ethiopic evidence. His “soundings”—which treat the classification of the witnesses, the order of the books, etymologies, the relationship to the Greek versions, and some inner Syriac developments—invite some enterprising Syriac text critic to produce an edition and a detailed

analysis of the content that places this edition in its Syrian religious, intellectual, and social contexts.

15. Deborah W. Rooke takes the Christian interpretation of biblical tradition into the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries in “Sex and Death, or, the Death of Sex: Three Versions of Jephthah’s Daughter (Judges 11:29-40).” Her three versions are the story in Judges, George Buchanan’s 1450 line tragedy *Jephthes sive votum*, and Thomas Morell’s libretto for Handel’s dramatic oratorio *Jephtha*. For the author of Judges, Jephthah’s daughter is “given to the deity as spoil, in a ritual of death that both mirrors and replaces sex as her exit from her virgin state” (p. 259). In Buchanan’s play, which focuses substantially on the legitimacy of Jephthah’s fulfilling his vow, “Iphis” (as she is called with strong allusion to the myth of Iphigenia) “transcends her womanly body by means of her manly spirit, and dies as a warrior on behalf of her country in a sacrifice of atonement” (pp. 263-64). For Morell, “the idea of Iphis’s death is commuted to that of her celibacy, whereby she dies to sex and is thus transformed into a quasi-deathless being” (p. 271), as happens to Iphigenia. Two comments to complement this suggestive study. Iphis’s “conceptual sex change” to one who evinces “courage and manly spirit” (p. 262) has an interesting parallel in 2 Maccabees 7, also a story of tragic death, in which the mother of the seven sons “stirs up her woman’s reason (τὸν θῆλυον λογισμὸν) with a man’s passion (ἄρσεινι θυμῶ)” (v 21). It is not quite true that it was Buchanan who rescued the unnamed daughter in Judges from the shadows of anonymity (p. 261). Already in Pseudo-Philo (first century C.E.), she is given a name (Seila, LAB 40:2).

16. Ronald E. Clements takes the Christian transmission of biblical tradition into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in “A Fruitful Venture: The Origin of Hebrew Studies at King’s College London.” It is an enlightening and, for a biblical Festschrift, an unusual study of one of the contexts of modern biblical studies, as Christians sought to deal, to some extent apologetically, with the recognition that their “Old Testament” was also the Bible of the Jews, who read it in very different ways.

17. One final contribution to this volume admirably fits the theme of the book, but ill-fits my attempt to organize a discussion of the essays. Sarah J. K. Pearce compares the Greek of Deut 17:8-13 with the Hebrew text and shows how the translator’s interpretation seeks to make the ancient text relevant in a new context. It is one of a growing number of studies that recognize the integrity and legitimacy of the Greek Jewish Bible as a collection of texts in its own right, generated to speak to their own contexts, and not simply as a resource for the textual criticism of the Hebrew and Aramaic Bible.

18. Apart from being a fine collection of essays around a common and important topic, this book has another dimension. Most, if not all, of its articles reflect significant new or developing currents in biblical and related scholarship during the years of Michael Knibb’s career. To name a few: the increasing interest in biblical *Nachgeschichte* as it is evidenced in both Jewish and Christian texts; the transformation of Qumran studies aided and abetted by the publication of the remainder of the Cave 4 fragments, which has muddied the waters of a previous generation’s confident and relatively simple historical schemata, and has provided new resources for the historical and literary study of texts that we had previously known; a renewed interest in the apocalyptic collection known to us as 1 Enoch; a recognition that some of the texts once confidently identified as Jewish are arguably and in some cases certainly Christian compositions (which to some degree robs us of some of the resources previously employed for the reconstruction of Jewish religion and culture in the Greco-Roman period); a growing interest in the dynamics of Christian-Jewish interaction over the centuries; the genesis, growth, and

fruitfulness of feminist hermeneutics and, along with that, a growing number of women scholars in a field that used to be populated almost exclusively by men.

George W. E. Nickelsburg
The University of Iowa
george-nickelsburg@uiowa.edu

© Copyright TC: *A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 2008.